BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE — LS-386

| | |
|---|---|
| IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF SELMA ENERGY CENTER, LLC, IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES 40-360 ET SEQ., FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AUTHORIZING THE SELMA SOLAR PROJECT GENERATION TIE LINE, WHICH CONSISTS OF A NEW, APPROXIMATELY 2.3 TO 2.9-MILE-LONG, 230KV TRANSMISSION LINE CONNECTING THE PLANNED SELMA ENERGY CENTER LOCATED WEST OF HIGHWAY 87 NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF EAST SELMA HIGHWAY AND HIGHWAY 87 IN UNINCORPORATED PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA, TO THE EXISTING SALT RIVER PROJECT VAH KI SUBSTATION. | DOCKET NO. L-21324A-24-0210-00237<br>LS CASE NO. 237<br>EVIDENTIARY HEARING |

At: Casa Grande, Arizona

Date: October 21, 2024

Filed: October 25, 2024

# REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## VOLUME I
(Pages 1 through 172)

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

By: Jennifer Honn, RPR
Arizona CR No. 50558

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| VOLUME I | October 10, 2024 | Pages 1 to 172 |
| VOLUME II | October 11, 2024 | Pages 173 to 400 |

INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS



INDEX TO THE TOUR

INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS



INDEX TO EXHIBITS



//

INDEX TO EXHIBITS (continued)

| NO. | DESCRIPTION | IDENTIFIED | ADMITTED |
|---|---|---|---|
| SEC-10 | AZGFD Correspondence | 265 | 334 |
| SEC-11 | Notice of Service to Affected Jurisdictions | 154 | 334 |
| CHMN-1 | Proposed Form of CEC | 336 | For Reference |
| CHMN-2 | CEC with Edits | 336 | For Reference |

BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee at Francisco Grande Hotel & Golf Resort, 12684 West Gila Bend Highway, Casa Grande, Arizona, commencing at 1:01 p.m. on October 21, 2024.

BEFORE: ADAM STAFFORD, Chairman

GABRIELA S. MERCER, Arizona Corporation Commission
DAVID FRENCH, Arizona Department of Water Resources
R. DAVID KRYDER, Agricultural Interests
MARGARET "TOBY" LITTLE, PE, General Public
DAVE RICHINS, General Public (via videoconference)
JOHN GOLD, General Public

APPEARANCES:

For the Applicant:

Jeffrey W. Crockett
CROCKETT LAW GROUP PLLC
2198 East Camelback Road
Suite 305
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

CHMN STAFFORD: Let's go on the record.

Now is the time set for the hearing on the application of Selma Energy Center, LLC, for a certificate of environmental compatibility, Docket Number L-21324A-24-0210-00237, or line siting case 237.

Let's start with taking roll of the members. Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Representing Arizona Agriculture, David Kryder. I'm here.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Mercer.

MEMBER MERCER: Present.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Present.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member French.

MEMBER FRENCH: Present.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Representing the public, I'm present.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Let's take the appearance of the applicant.

MR. CROCKETT: Good afternoon, Chairman Stafford, Members of the Committee. My name is Jeff Crockett. I'm appearing on behalf of the applicant Selma Energy Center, LLC.

Seated to my left is Anna Galanis who's an

in-house attorney with NextEra Energy Resources.

CHMN STAFFORD: No parties have applied for intervention.

Mr. Crockett, would you care to make an opening statement.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, I would. Thank you, Chairman Stafford.

Again, Chairman Stafford, Members of the Committee, good afternoon.

Thank you for being here today. We're looking forward to presenting the evidence in this case, and we appreciate the personal sacrifice of you attending these line siting hearings. It's an important function, and we're grateful that you're here for this.

Selma Energy Center, LLC, is a wholly owned, independent, direct subsidiary of NextEra Energy Resources, LLC.

NextEra Energy Resources is an American owned and operated company with more than 37,000 megawatts of total net generating capacity. In the United States, NextEra Energy Resources is one of the largest wholesale generators of renewable energy from the wind and the sun and is a leader in energy storage.

NextEra Energy Resources has operating wind, utility-scale solar, and energy storage projects

across Arizona and other projects in various phases of development.

You will hear more about these projects through the company's witnesses today.

NextEra Energy Resources is a subsidiary of NextEra Energy, Inc., a New York Stock Exchange traded Fortune 200 company headquartered in Juno Beach, Florida.

In addition to NextEra Energy Resources, NextEra Energy, Inc., owns Florida Power & Light, America's largest electric utility serving approximately 5.9 million customer accounts or more than 12 million people across the State of Florida.

Through NextEra Energy Resources and its other affiliated subsidiaries, NextEra Energy, Inc., is the world's larger generator of renewable energy from the wind and sun and a world leader in battery storage.

Selma Energy Center, which I will refer to today as Selma or the applicant, is planning to construct an up to 150-megawatt solar photovoltaic generation facility on approximately 1,053 acres of privately owned land paired with an up to 150-megawatt battery storage system.

The solar project is located within the City of Coolidge and parts of unincorporated Pinal County in the vicinity of Selma Highway and State Route 87.

Construction is anticipated to start in late 2026 with an anticipated commercial operation date in late 2027.

On September 4, 2024, Selma filed an application for a certificate of environmental compatibility to construct the Selma Energy Center Interconnection Project, which is a new 2.3 to 2.9-mile-long 230kV alternating circuit generation-tie transmission line that will connect the Selma Energy Facility Project at its substation to the point of interconnection, which is the Salt River Project Vah Ki Substation.

The interconnection project will utilize tangent monopoles, dead-end monopoles, overhead-to-underground transition structures, riser and dead-end monopoles and/or a frame dead-end structure depending upon final engineering design.

The structures will be placed from 100 to 1400 feet apart, and the applicant anticipates up to 30 structures. The typical structure heights will be between 60 and 110 feet with a maximum height of 146 feet.

I note that as the planning of this project has progressed the maximum height of the structures and the maximum distance between the structures have both been increased from what was stated in the application.

We will have witnesses that will discuss these changes in the presentation of the evidence this afternoon.

I note also that while Selma has requested a CEC to construct the entire length of the gen-tie aboveground, one or more portions of the gen-tie may be constructed underground. Again, the witnesses will address these areas of undergrounding in their testimony.

While the solar facility, battery storage, and project substation are described in the application for the information of the committee, the applicant seeks a CEC only for the jurisdictional gen-tie.

As described in the application, Selma is proposing a preferred gen-tie route, a sub route option for a short portion of the gen-tie, and two alternative route options for entering the Vah Ki Substation. Selma is proposing a single gen-tie route from the project substation east to State Route 87, and then north along State Route 87 to Earley Road.

At that point, Selma is proposing a sub route option, which would extend east from State Route 87 along the south side of Earley Road. Then north and then northwest where it would rejoin the preferred route on State Route 87.

From that point the gen-tie continues north along State Route 87 to just south of Laughlin Road. At

that point Selma is proposing two options for entering the Vah Ki Substation, option A and option B. Both option A and option B cross the existing Saint Solar energy facility, which is owned by an affiliate of Selma.

The option ultimately selected will depend upon discussions with SRP as well as a determination regarding the best path through the existing Saint Solar project. Again, as I stated earlier, the gen-tie will be 2.3 to 2.9 miles long depending upon which routes are selected.

The gen-tie and the gen-tie corridor are located on private property within the City of Coolidge and unincorporated Pinal County. The gen-tie will cross the Arizona Department of Transportation right-of-way on State Route 87 as well as rights-of-way controlled by the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District and the Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District.

In addition, the gen-tie will cross the existing Tucson Electric Power Pinal Central Tortolita 500kV transmission line as well as a transmission line of SunZia Transmission, LLC.

Selma is requesting a right-of-way of 150 feet wide within a siting corridor that is 1,000 feet wide for the south half of the gen-tie project and 2,134 feet wide in the north half. The requested gen-tie

corridor will allow for adjustments to the location of the structures to achieve site-specific mitigation objectives or to meet site-specific engineering requirements.

The applicant will present a panel of witnesses who will provide significant additional detail regarding the gen-tie project. The application includes each of the environmental evaluations and documentation relevant to the gen-tie project as specified in Arizona Administrative Code Rule R14-3-219. The various environmental studies will be discussed in detail during the presentation of evidence.

The applicant will demonstrate that it has completed a robust public outreach program including contacting affected jurisdictions, stakeholders, and landowners within the study area for the project. The affected jurisdictions in this case are Pinal County, the City of Coolidge, the Arizona Department of Transportation, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, and the Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District.

Notice of this hearing was provided to each of these entities via certified mail, and none has elected to participate in this case. In addition, no other person or entity has sought to intervene in this

case.

Following a review of the application by the Arizona Corporation Commission's Utilities Division Staff, co-directors filed a letter in the docket on October 16, 2024, concluding as follows, and I quote: "Based on Staff's review of the application, the applicant's response to a Staff-issued data request as well as the Salt River Project's Transitional System Impact Study Staff believes the proposed project could improve the reliability and safety of the grid and the delivery of power in Arizona."

The evidence in this case will show based upon the factors outlined in A.R.S. Section 40-360.01 that the Selma Energy Center Interconnection Project is environmentally compatible with the surrounding area. Specifically the evidence will show that the interconnection project, one, will disturb only the minimal amount of land which is either already disturbed and vacant or being used for agricultural activities; two, will be compatible with existing plans in the vicinity of the proposed site; three, will not disturb any areas of unique biological wealth and will not impact special status species; four, will have a minimal visual effect and will not disturb any known archaeological or historical sites of significance; five, will be sited

adjacent to State Route 87 and located near other utility infrastructure thereby reducing the impacts from constructing the new line; and, six, will not result in significant impacts associated with noise or signal interference.

The applicant will present four witnesses: Ashley Johnson, Lori Browne, Phil Givens, and Colin Agner, who will provide their testimony as a panel using a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation will include a virtual tour of the proposed gen-tie route and the alternative routes.

At the conclusion of the proceeding, the applicant will ask this committee to approve a CEC for the Selma Energy Center Interconnection Project. Exhibit SEC-5 is a proposed form of CEC including Exhibit A to that -- that CEC, which is the proposed gen-tie route and corridor.

The applicant has 11 exhibits which include the application itself and the PowerPoint presentation. The exhibits have been loaded on to the electronic notebooks that are before you.

In addition, you each have a place mat for easy reference that shows the proposed gen-tie route and corridor on one side and the existing land uses in the area on the other side.

I would note that we have prepared to do an actual site tour. If the committee elects to do that, that would happen tomorrow morning. But we hope that after you've seen the virtual presentation, that will answer your questions and we may not need to do an actual site tour.

And so with that, again, we appreciate you being here and allowing us to make this presentation today.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

Is there anything we need to address before you call your panel?

MR. CROCKETT: I am not aware of anything we need to address before we get on to evidence.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

And if you would call your panel, and then I'll swear them in.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you, Chairman Stafford. Would you like me to call each of them or shall we do it one by one as a group or one by one?

What's your preference?

CHMN STAFFORD: I'll swear them in one by one, but you can call them all as group.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. So as I indicated, we've got kind of moving left to right we've got Ashley

Johnson, Lori Browne, Colin Agner, and Phil Givens.

Colin is with SWCA, and the other three are with NextEra Energy Resources.

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

MS. JOHNSON: Oath is fine.

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

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. Browne, oath or affirmation?

MS. BROWNE: Affirmation.

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

MS. BROWNE: I do.

CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Agner, oath or affirmation?

MR. AGNER: Affirmation, please, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Do you affirm the testimony you will give in this matter will be the truth, the whole

truth, and nothing but the truth taking into consideration the penalty for perjury in Arizona?

MR. AGNER: I do.

CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Givens, oath or affirmation?

MR. GIVENS: Oath.

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

MR. GIVENS: I do.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

Mr. Crockett, please proceed.

ASHLEY JOHNSON, LORI BROWNE, COLIN AGNER, and PHIL GIVENS,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. (Ms. Johnson) My name is Ashley Johnson.

My business address is 700 Universe Boulevard,

Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

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

A. (Ms. Johnson) I am a lead project manager of development at NextEra Energy Resources. And I am the project manager on the Selma Interconnection Project.

Q. Would you please describe for the committee your educational and professional background.

A. (Ms. Johnson) My background is in urban and regional planning. I received my master's in urban and regional planning from the Florida State University.

While earning my degree, I worked in the GIS department at the Leon County property appraisers.

Shortly after graduation I started working at NextEra Energy Resources and have been with the company for five years and in my current role for two years.

Q. Have you testified previously before this committee?

A. (Ms. Johnson) No.

Q. Ms. Johnson, what is the purpose of your testimony today?

A. (Ms. Johnson) I will provide an overview of the application and describe the Selma Energy Center Interconnection Project, the purpose and the need for the interconnection project, the coordination and planning that has occurred to date, the proposed routes for the

interconnection project, the requested corridor within which the interconnection project may be located, and describe our public outreach efforts.

Q. Ms. Johnson, have you prepared a summary of your testimony?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Do you have before you an exhibit that's been marked as Exhibit SEC-4?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Does Exhibit SEC-4 contain a true and correct copy of your witness summary?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Ms. Johnson, are you familiar with the application for a certificate of environmental compatibility that was filed by Selma Energy Center in this docket?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Is Exhibit SEC-1 a true and correct -- well, let me back up.

That application was filed in the docket on September 4, 2024?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. And was that application prepared under your supervision?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. And is Exhibit SEC-1 a copy of the first page of that application?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. But a full copy of the application is available in the docket?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Ms. Johnson, before we continue further, are there any corrections to the CEC application that you would like to note at this time?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

There are three changes to the CEC application that we would like to note.

The first change is the structure height. In the CEC application we noted that the maximum height of the structures would be 110 feet. After additional design review, we now know that the maximum height of the structures will be 146 feet.

The second change is to the span length between the structures. In the application, we noted that the maximum span distance would be 1,000 feet. Based on additional design, we now know that the anticipated maximum span distance will be 1,400 feet.

The final change is the addition of the riser and dead-end structure. In the CEC application, we had contemplated an underground installation through the

Saint Solar Energy Facility, but this may need to be an overhead installation requiring a narrower profile and dead-end steel monopole structures.

These changes will be described in more detail during Mr. Givens' testimony later on in the hearing.

Q. Ms. Johnson, are there any other changes that we need to make to the CEC application?

A. (Ms. Johnson) No.

Q. Thank you.

Mr. Givens, turning to you next, would you please state your name and business address.

A. (Mr. Givens) My name is Phil Givens. My business address is 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

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

A. (Mr. Givens) I'm employed by NextEra Energy Resources as a manager of transmission line project engineering, and I serve as the transmission line subject matter expert for the Selma Energy Center interconnection project.

Q. Mr. Givens, would you please describe your educational and professional background.

A. (Mr. Givens) I have a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering from the University of Florida and a master's degree in transmission and

distribution engineering from Gonzaga University.

I'm a licensed professional engineer in Florida, in Texas. And I'm currently serving as manager of transmission line engineering for NextEra Energy Resources. I have 40 years of experience in transmission line design, standards and specifications, and structure selection.

Q. Have you testified previously before this committee?

A. (Mr. Givens) No.

Q. Mr. Givens, would you please describe your duties as the transmission line subject matter expert for the Selma Energy Center Interconnection Project?

A. (Mr. Givens) As transmission line subject matter expert, I assist with the structure and conductor selection, interpretation of standards and specifications, and resolution of technical areas -- issues with respect to the transmission line design.

I also assist with resolution of supply chain, permitting, and construction issues and general technical support for the project engineering team.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony today?

A. (Mr. Givens) I will discuss the structure types and design that will be used for the interconnection project.

Q. And, Mr. Givens, have you prepared a summary of your testimony?

A. (Mr. Givens) No.

Q. Does Exhibit SEC-4 include a copy of your witness summary?

A. (Mr. Givens) Yes.

Q. Thank you.

Ms. Browne, would you please state your name and address for the record.

A. (Ms. Browne) My name is Lori Browne.

My business address is 700 Universe Boulevard in Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

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

A. (Ms. Browne) I'm employed by NextEra Energy Resources as a senior environmental specialist. I'm the environmental lead for the Selma Energy Center Interconnection Project.

Q. And would you please describe your educational and professional background for the committee.

A. (Ms. Browne) I have a bachelor of science degree in geology from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and a master of science in vertebrate paleontology from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.

I've worked in environmental consulting as a paleontologist and project manager supporting

environmental permitting for a variety of large-scale infrastructure development projects.

I've also managed environmental permitting internally for both conventional and renewable energy companies for a combined 19 years of experience in environmental permitting and compliance.

Q. Ms. Browne, have you previously testified before this committee?

A. (Ms. Browne) No.

Q. Would you please describe your role with regard to the interconnection project in the CEC application.

A. (Ms. Browne) I'm the environmental lead for the interconnection project and coordinated the environmental resource studies performed by SWCA, assured the project is in compliance with all applicable federal and state environmental regulations and assisted in the application preparation and public outreach.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony today?

A. (Ms. Browne) The purpose of my testimony is to provide the siting committee with information on some of the environmental studies completed in support of the application, which include biological resources, application Exhibit C and D; cultural resources, application Exhibit E; and recreation purposes and aspects, application Exhibit F.

Q. Ms. Browne, have you prepared a summary of your testimony?

A. (Ms. Browne) No.

Q. Does Exhibit SEC-4 include a summary of your testimony?

A. (Ms. Browne) No.

Q. Okay. Mr. Agner, next would you please state your name and business address.

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. My name is Colin Agner.

And my business address is 343 West Franklin Street, Tucson, Arizona 85701.

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

A. (Mr. Agner) I'm an environmental planner and project manager for SWCA Environmental Consultants, and I was the project manager for this case.

Q. Mr. Agner, would you please describe your educational and professional background.

A. (Mr. Agner) So I have a bachelor of science degree in environmental science from Westminister College in New Wilmington, Pennsylvania. And I have a master of science degree in planning from the University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona.

I have over 12 years of environmental consulting experience, and that has ranged from environmental surveys, environmental permitting, and environmental

planning.

And I'm currently a project manager for SWCA Environmental Consultants.

Q. And I know this committee is generally familiar with SWCA's work in other line siting cases, but would you briefly describe the business of SWCA.

A. (Mr. Agner) Sure. So to refresh everyone's memory, SWCA is a national environmental consulting firm, and we do environmental surveys, environmental permitting, environmental compliance, and we do that here in Arizona, and we do that in other locations across the United States.

Q. Was SWCA engaged by the applicant in this case to assist with the preparation of the CEC application and the environmental studies that support that application?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. Would you please describe SWCA's role with respect to the interconnection project and the application.

A. (Mr. Agner) Sure. So SWCA was retained by the applicant to assist in the compilation of the CEC application, and we were also retained to conduct some of the resource studies to support the CEC application itself.

Q. So specifically would you describe how SWCA

assisted the applicant in the preparation of the application.

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. So SWCA collected data and completed the resource studies that were necessary to include in Exhibits A through J of the CEC application. As the project manager, I personally coordinated and compiled this information for the CEC application.

Q. Mr. Agner, have you testified previously before this committee?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. I have testified in two cases. I've testified before the line siting committee in Case Number 219 and 229.

Q. Would you please describe the purpose of your testimony today.

A. (Mr. Agner) Sure. So the purpose of my testimony is to go over some of the exhibits that are in the CEC application. Specifically the exhibits I will go over is existing and planned land uses, which is Exhibits A and B; visual resources, which is Exhibit E; existing plans, which is Exhibit H; noise, which is Exhibit I; and then I'll also go over the virtual tour; and I'll also discuss the CEC noticing requirements that we undertook.

Q. Mr. Agner, have you prepared a summary of your testimony?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. Is that summary include as part of Exhibit SEC-4?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. Okay. I would like to have a little bit of discussion regarding the applicant.

So, Ms. Johnson, this question is directed to you.

Would you please provide some background regarding Selma Energy Center, LLC, and specifically how it fits into the corporate structure of NextEra Energy Resources?

CHMN STAFFORD: One moment before you answer. Let the record reflect that chairman -- chairman -- Member Richins has joined us virtually. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Selma Energy Center, LLC, is an indirect subsidiary of NextEra Energy Resources, LLC.

NextEra Energy Resources is an American owned and operated company with more than 37,000 megawatts of total net generating capacity.

In the U.S., NextEra Energy Resources is one of the largest wholesale generators of renewable energy from the wind and the sun and is a leader in energy storage.

//

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Besides Selma Energy Center does NextEra Energy Resources have other projects in Arizona?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. As you can see on the map on the right-hand side, NextEra affiliates have wind, utility-scale solar, and energy storage projects in various phases of development, including 12 operational projects.

These projects are distributed across Arizona. These projects and their associated investments have provided numerous job opportunities, landowner payments, and property taxes.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Would you please ask them to put the previous slide back up.

What does an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary mean?

What does "indirect" mean?

Selma Energy Center, LLC, an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary.

What does "indirect" mean?

MS. JOHNSON: Selma Energy Center, LLC, is its own entity under --

MEMBER GOLD: I'm sorry. Is what?

MS. JOHNSON: Its own LLC. Selma Energy Center is its own entity.

MEMBER GOLD: So what does an "indirect" mean?

MS. JOHNSON: It means that it is an affiliate of NextEra Energy Resources, LLC.

MEMBER GOLD: But it's wholly owned by NextEra Energy Resources; correct?

MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman Stafford, Member Gold --

MEMBER GOLD: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: -- if I could maybe provide a little illumination there.

An indirect, wholly owned subsidiary means Selma is downstream from NextEra. NextEra is upstream. Selma is downstream, but it's not directly below NextEra Energy. There's layers in the corporate structure.

And so it is an indirect subsidiary meaning it's further down the chain, but it is still wholly owned by NextEra Energy Resources.

CHMN STAFFORD: There's just a few stepping stones in between. So NextEra Energy Resources owns, say, entity X, which owns entity Y, which is the only member manager of Selma Energy Center, LLC.

Does that -- I'm just going to fill in the blanks a little bit. That's what you mean by "indirect" is it means there's multiple entities between the ultimate parent company and this subsidiary?

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman Stafford, Member Gold, that's exactly right. And I don't have an organizational chart here to show this. These companies have a fairly complicated structure.

But the point we're trying to make is that Selma Energy Center, the applicant, as you probably noticed, as these cases come before you, there's been a number of NextEra energy cases that have come in, but they all have separately incorporated entities that are the applicants that are applying for the CEC.

So this applicant, Selma Energy Center, LLC, is within the direct line below NextEra Energy Resources, but it is not directly below. So there's some intervening steps between NextEra Energy Resources and the applicant.

MEMBER GOLD: So earlier when you said next energy -- NextEra Energy, Inc., is the top level.

MR. CROCKETT: That is above NextEra Energy Resources. That's correct.

And so, for example, NextEra Resources, Inc., is the owner -- and I'm going to let Anna correct

me if I'm wrong -- but is the owner of Florida Power & Light.

No?

MS. GALANIS: No. Florida Power & Light is a separate entity but under NextEra Energy, Inc.

So Florida Power & Light is an affiliate of NextEra Energy Resources. They would be across from each other.

MEMBER GOLD: So they would also be an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary?

MS. GALANIS: No. So the way to look at it as you see on the chart here --

MEMBER KRYDER: Into your microphone, please.

MS. GALANIS: Sure. So the way to look at it is you see on the chart NextEra Energy would be the top layer. There is a layer in between there that's not shown in this chart. NextEra Energy Resources is the side of the chart that we're talking about here with Selma Energy. On the other side of the organizational chart would be Florida Power & Light, and that is Florida based. That is wholly Florida.

MEMBER GOLD: So what are we missing between NextEra Energy, Inc., and NextEra Energy Resources, LLC? What's the layer in between?

I'm just curious.

MS. GALANIS: It's a separate company in between there.

MEMBER GOLD: What's it called?

MS. GALANIS: I don't know that I can say right now, but I can get back to you. I don't have the organizational chart memorized totally.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Just out of curiosity sake, you know, I take a look and I know all this is for limited liability. Just the one we're dealing with today is Selma Energy, LLC; is that correct?

MS. GALANIS: Selma Energy Center, LLC, yes.

MR. CROCKETT: That's correct. And it's -- it is, I think, to limit liability, but it also has to do with getting these projects financed as well. So there's a variety of reasons why these structures are set up this way.

But it's all part of the family, if I can say that.

MEMBER GOLD: Gotcha. Gotcha. So the buck stops here for all intents and purposes?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, yeah, for the purpose of this committee the buck stops with Selma Energy Center, LLC. That's the applicant. That's one that

would be getting and holding the CEC.

MEMBER GOLD: Are they the same ones that own the solar field?

MS. GALANIS: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Gotcha. Thank you.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Could I ask the applicant to expand a little bit on what these 32 distributed energy resources are that are in operation?

MS. JOHNSON: Distributed, that's the -- that's the total of our facilities that are operational or in development.

MEMBER LITTLE: Well, if you add all those numbers together, you don't get 32.

MS. JOHNSON: My apologies. I'm -- I'm a little nervous.

MEMBER LITTLE: Just relax. We're all friends here.

Are they things like --

MS. JOHNSON: You are correct. I misspoke. The 32 distributed energy resources that are in operation, those are smaller scale distributed generation projects. So those consist of 4 megawatts or less

essentially. So those are not utility scale.

MEMBER LITTLE: Those would be like on a school or a hospital or something like that?

MS. JOHNSON: For -- for most likely smaller scale industrial facilities. However, that's not my main field, and I'd love to reach out to that team to answer any additional questions.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. Well, I just was curious because actually utility-scale solar is also distributed energy, but so I figured there was a difference there, but I was just curious. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Fair point.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Following up, Attorney Crockett, to Member Gold's questions, I'm not sure whether this should go to you or your colleague there.

LLC is always an exciting thing.

From our perspective, what we're looking for is the 30 to 50 years up the road, who's going to be paying the bill to restore this to its natural habitat? That's kind of the short version I'd like to see.

And when I see LLC, as you said, Mr. Crockett, as the entity we're talking about, LLC always tells me that these guys can bail. And basically

the fact that they're wholly owned by the next level up is interesting, but tell me is it not pretty much irrelevant?

Is it not true that the LLC that we're dealing with could, in fact, disappear or collapse or whatever and nobody would be around unless there is a bond set somewhere to restore the thing?

Help me -- just talk in that whole area for me, please.

MR. CROCKETT: Let me sort of take a whack at that and then I'll ask. I don't know if one of your experts is able to speak to the closure of these projects when you get to the end of the 30 years.

But in answer to your question, Member Kryder, I think that the reason we go through this in this discussion about the family and who you're dealing with here, I think if this was a limited liability company not affiliated with any other entity, I think you would have a larger concern than you do knowing that it's part of the NextEra Energy Resources family.

This is a Fortune 200 company, NextEra Resources, Inc., and they're not going to -- chances are they're not going to let a project crater and basically take down the name of the company.

So there's a lot of -- there's a lot of

capital standing behind these projects. There's a lot of corporate responsibility that stands behind these projects.

And so, you know, with any limited liability company there is a risk that you could have a bankruptcy, but you could also have a bankruptcy with an incorporated entity too.

MEMBER KRYDER: Certainly.

MR. CROCKETT: But I understand the question.

Now, I'll see if Anna has anything to add, or does anyone on the panel able to speak to the closure of these projects and how that gets -- how that gets handled and funded at the end of the PPA?

MS. JOHNSON: Certainly I can speak a little bit to how we handle that. First and foremost, we will devise a decommissioning plan with the respective jurisdictions. So in the case of Selma Energy Center, we will work with Pinal County as well as the City of Coolidge in preparing a decommissioning plan to ensure that the solar facility is brought back to the state in which it was prior to construction.

And you are correct, there's also a bond in place that will help take care of that decommissioning plan.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much, Ms. Johnson.

What's the size of the bond?

MS. JOHNSON: I cannot answer that for you right now, but I would be happy to get that answer for you.

MEMBER KRYDER: And if you could, that would be great. The size of the bond and to whom it's payable and under what circumstances.

So that, again, from our perspective, we want to assure that somebody's there with a seriously big checkbook at the end of 35 or 50 years or whatever the number is or whenever the technology is so out of date that something else replaces it. So if you could address that for us, maybe tomorrow or whenever it's convenient would be very helpful. Thanks so much.

MS. JOHNSON: Absolutely. Yep.

MR. CROCKETT: We'll see if we can get that information on the break and report it back.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Ms. Johnson, Mr. Crockett, and Member Kryder, thank you very much. That's the direction I was heading.

Is it too much to ask in the future, not

this time, that people include an organization chart so we know who we're dealing with?

I mean it's very nice to say an indirect, but it would be much nicer to say who's chairman of the board of the top company because ultimately that name is going to be the one that ensures everything else is done properly.

MR. CROCKETT: We will take that note, and we will work on complying with that in the future.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

Member Kryder, did you want to add anything to that?

MEMBER KRYDER: I'll talk with you on the side later.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

Okay. Mr. Crockett, please proceed.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you, Chairman Stafford.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. So, Ms. Johnson, let's talk now the solar generating project itself to provide a little background for the committee here.

Would you please describe that?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Certainly. The Selma Energy

Center project will be located in the City of Coolidge and unincorporated Pinal County.

Colin, if you're able to progress to the next slide. Thank you.

As you'll see on the slide on the left, the energy facility project itself is split by East Cornman Road. The northern portion of the project is located in the City of Coolidge. And the southern portion of the project is located within unincorporated Pinal County.

In entirety the project -- the energy facility project area is 1,053 acres on privately owned land and is roughly adjacent to State Route 87.

The facility is proposed for 150-megawatt solar and 150-megawatt battery energy storage.

The energy facility will consist of panels, inverter stations, collection lines, transformers, a substation, access roads, and the battery system.

We anticipate construction to start sometime in late 2026 with an anticipated commercial operation date in late 2027.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Who owns the property? Is it leased or does it belong to NextEra?

MS. JOHNSON: So Selma Energy Center, LLC,

currently owns the northern portion in the City of Coolidge.

The southern portion is currently under an option to purchase, and we anticipate exercising that option in January 2025.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: I don't see any structures other than the solar panel fields.

How far is the nearest habitable structure from what you're proposing?

MR. CROCKETT: And if I could, Chairman Stafford, Member Gold, are you referring to how close is it to the solar generating facility or to the gen-tie line?

MEMBER GOLD: Either.

MR. CROCKETT: Either one?

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Ms. Johnson, we've looked at that I know with regard to gen-tie line.

Are you able to answer that with regard to the solar generating project?

A. (Ms. Johnson) So if I'm understanding your question correctly, Councilmember, the energy facility

where the solar panels will be, which is the area that we're looking at on the left slide, is approximately two miles from the existing Salt River Project Vah Ki Substation in which our interconnection project will connect into.

MEMBER GOLD: What I was referring to, Ms. Johnson, is any houses, any people, any residential areas, any ranches, any people living within a mile, two miles, three miles of this?

There doesn't appear to be because I don't see anything. I'm just asking you.

MS. JOHNSON: I see. Oh, okay. Sorry. There's actually -- if you look at the aerial imagery a little close, there are a few houses. It looks like there is a horse ranch potentially, but that's the closest residence to the energy facility.

MEMBER GOLD: So a golf course is the closest to the energy facility?

MS. JOHNSON: Not a golf course, but some residences.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

MEMBER GOLD: Have you got a pointer? Could you just --

MR. AGNER: I'm trying to make it work right now.

MEMBER GOLD: Where do you think they'd be? Are they even on the map of this scale?

MS. JOHNSON: It looks like the pointer for the left screen might not be working, but if you see those yellow arrows, do you see the yellow arrow pointing south?

MEMBER GOLD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSON: It's in that general location.

MEMBER GOLD: And that's a long ways from your tie-line.

MS. JOHNSON: Correct. You can see that our tie-line is the red line connecting into the northeast corner of our project area.

MEMBER GOLD: I see that. There's no scale on that, but I'm guessing each of those -- there you go. I see it. I saw it. So down where that red dot is are some houses. And each of those squares between the main roads is a half a mile, a tenth of a mile?

There's no scale on this, so I'm asking you for rough distances.

MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. And that was an oversight on our part. We should include a scale on this map for the future.

I'll confirm that distance for you during

our next break and let you know.

MEMBER GOLD: But it looks like it's in excess of a mile from your tie-line. It looks like.

MS. JOHNSON: I think that's a fair assessment.

MEMBER GOLD: Member Kryder, you have a better eye for this than I do.

Does that look like it's in excess of a mile from their red tie-line on the upper right corner down to the lower left yellow arrow?

MEMBER KRYDER: I'm unable to speak to that. The short version is how many people live within one mile, within two miles, within three miles of a gen-tie line, which is what we're discussing today.

Can you get that for us, Ms. Johnson?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah. I think it will also be covered as we get into the presentation when they talk about land uses current and future plans and then the outreach efforts. And they'll talk about who all the landowners are, with whom they've spoken, and just I think they'll get more into that as they go along.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay.

//

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Okay. Ms. Johnson, you were explaining that this is private land.

Would you provide a little additional context regarding the land ownership and also the status of permitting with regard to the power generating facility itself.

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. The energy facility itself is on entirely private land within two jurisdictions. One being the City of Coolidge, the other being unincorporated Pinal County.

For the City of Coolidge portion, we have an approved conditional use permit. For the portion in Pinal County, we are currently pursuing a minor comprehensive plan amendment, a PAD amendment, and a zone change.

Q. And, Ms. Johnson, for the record a PAD amendment is a planned area development amendment?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Would you please discuss now an overview of the proposed interconnection project, which is the gen-tie line.

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

MEMBER RICHINS: Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Richins.

MEMBER RICHINS: Before we go on, I have a question related to zoning. We see a lot of these cases from the counties in particular prior to their zoning being granted to the applicant. I was curious as to why we continue to deal with that condition.

Is it that the counties are waiting for us to approve a CEC before they grant zoning, or is it just a matter of timing?

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman Stafford, Member Richins, I'll take a swing at that one first. And then we can if there's someone on the panel that has something to add to that.

I think these projects involve lots of different permitting. I guess the first thing I would say is the solar facility -- the solar generating facility that we're talking about now, as you know, is not subject to the jurisdiction of this line siting committee.

So the information we provide on the solar project itself is really for background information for the committee. And then the focus of these proceeding is on the gen-tie itself.

Now, with regard to the solar generating project, again, there's different permits that have to be obtained. These all move along together. Some move more

quickly than others do. Again, the zoning is in place for that portion that is in the City of Coolidge. And we're working on that part of it that is in Pinal County.

And we will have that completed -- before this project can come out of the ground, of course, we have to have that zoning completed.

MEMBER RICHINS: Mr. Crockett, with all due respect there's no need for a gen-tie if there's no need for the solar project. And we're supposed to grant compatibility for the gen-tie to a project that is neither zoned or -- and that we don't have jurisdiction over. And so obviously we're not going to create a gen-tie in the air to nothing, you know. So these two things are a little bit co-dependent on each other.

How often is it occurring in Pinal County or other jurisdictions that these projects are not getting approval?

Because I hear from Pinal County members of the boards of supervisors that are reluctant to grant some of this zoning for some of these solar projects.

How often is it occurring that we're granting a CEC for a gen-tie and then the rest of the project doesn't go forward?

Does anybody know what that -- is that occurring?

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman Stafford, Member Richins, I'm not aware -- I mean, I'm aware of political pushback on some projects down in the area. I'm not aware that NextEra has had a project approved that did not get across the finish line yet.

I will ask Ms. Johnson, I guess, specifically to speak to the Pinal County zoning entitlements exactly where you are on that and if, in fact, you anticipate any problem getting that approval from the county?

MS. JOHNSON: Certainly. I'd like to first add that 792 acres of the 1,053 acres of the project have an approved conditional use permit to construct and operate a green -- a renewable energy generating facility.

On the 792 acres, we can produce a facility that would generate approximately 115 megawatts of solar. So there is a clear path forward in the events that we did not receive approval for the Pinal County portion.

But if I could add some more color on the Pinal County piece, I'd like to state that we are in the process of preparing our application. We had a preapplication meeting with county staff in which the county staff recommended approval of this project.

We plan on submitting our application this

month, actually the beginning of November, and anticipate going in front of the county supervisors no later than summer of 2025.

MEMBER RICHINS: Okay. That's helpful that you have a project on balance without zoning. So that satisfies my question about the gen-tie to the project and zoning.

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Thank you, Ms. Johnson.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Richins.

Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I have a couple questions recognizing that the energy facility itself is nonjurisdictional.

The first question is do you know at this point where on that footprint for the energy facility the battery storage units will be?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. It will be located in the northeast portion of the project next to the project substation.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. And the second question is what, if any, public notification has been required for the energy facility itself?

We often have people come and make comments

that they had no idea that the solar project was going in until they received notification about this hearing.

MS. JOHNSON: So the northern portion, the portion of the project within the City of Coolidge, we had purchased that land already with the conditional use permit, so we were not involved in the permitting of that portion.

However, the portion in Pinal County that we are preparing the applications for we hosted a neighborhood meeting and provided mailing notices to residents -- or landowners, rather, within a 1200-foot radius of the project area.

We also created a project website and Facebook page where the public is able to access project information.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: And, Mr. Crockett, refresh my recollection, but you don't require a permit from either the city or the county for the gen-tie line itself, do you?

MR. CROCKETT: That's correct. The gen-tie line itself will either be in an approved solar facility overlay that the City of Coolidge has or in Pinal County where it is not required to obtain any kind of a use permit from the county.

So I think -- and, Ms. Johnson, you can correct me if I'm wrong on this, but my understanding is that the gen-tie itself, we have all the authority we need today to construct that.

MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Everything short of the CEC.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, yes, everything short of the CEC. I don't want to get ahead of myself.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

Please proceed, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: All right.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. So, Ms. Johnson, let's talk now about the interconnection project, the gen-tie line.

Would you please provide an overview of that project for the committee.

A. (Ms. Johnson) The interconnection project is a proposed 2.3 to 2.9-mile-long 230kV alternating-current transmission line that is planned to connect the energy facility project substation to the point of interconnection, which is the operating Salt River Project Vah Ki Substation.

Selma may build up to approximately 1.1 miles of the interconnection project underground based on design

and engineering considerations as the interconnection project advances.

The interconnection project has largely been sited adjacent to existing transmission lines, a railroad, roadways, and the nearby existing energy facilities.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Underground in a rural area, is that more expensive or less expensive than putting poles up and stringing lines?

MS. JOHNSON: So we do go into greater detail later on regarding the underground portions.

However, I can touch very briefly on it if you'd like.

We are considering portions of the interconnection project to be underground as it crosses existing transmission lines and enters the existing Saint Solar facility.

So the underground portion would be in the areas where there is existing solar -- solar infrastructure as well as transmission lines and not necessarily in a rural agricultural field.

MEMBER GOLD: So back to my question, in this type of area is it less expensive to go underground

than to have poles with wires?

MS. JOHNSON: No, it is more expensive.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. What would be the determination to go underground?

There's somebody else's line taking up the space you would want to use aboveground?

MS. JOHNSON: Exactly. We do not want to impact the existing infrastructure. So the existing transmission lines to not interfere with those, it would likely be ideal to cross underground.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Just a follow-up question here to Member Gold about the undergrounding.

Comparatively, Ms. Johnson, back of the envelope sort of a number for me, what's the comparative cost per mile or per foot or whatever for the underground and the aboveground?

I recognize this committee does not have jurisdiction over an underground section. I'm just trying to build my understanding of how life goes on over there. Thanks.

MS. JOHNSON: Councilmember, I don't know if I'm able to answer that question. I'm not sure if

Mr. Givens is able to.

MR. GIVENS: We can get you an estimate of those two costs if you want it in dollars.

I can tell you that in general underground transmission is five to ten times the cost of overhead.

MEMBER KRYDER: I appreciate that. But five to ten is a pretty broad span.

Okay. I know we're getting into an area where we don't have jurisdiction, but that's like saying it costs me either $5 or $10 for the next bottle of beer I buy. You get what I'm meaning?

Can you focus a little bit more on that?

MR. CROCKETT: And, Chairman Stafford, Member Kryder, we are in our presentation intending to get to that.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: And Mr. Givens is going to be our witness on that, and he will explain some of the engineering challenges that we face with existing transmission lines and the reason why we may need to underground a portion of this line.

So we'll be getting to that here shortly.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: And, I mean, I would note as you pointed out, the underground portion is not

jurisdictional to this line siting committee. We have not completed final engineering design on this line.

And so for that reason we are asking for a CEC from the substation on the project all the way to the SRP Vah Ki Substation because we're not 100 percent sure exactly where we will be undergrounding, so we wanted that flexibility.

But we'll get to that here shortly.

MEMBER KRYDER: Wonderful. Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHMN STAFFORD: And, Members, I'd just like to point out that the applicant is not a public service corporation, so there's not the issue of whether these additional costs will be passed through to ratepayers through rates because they don't have retail customers.

MEMBER KRYDER: I was trying to build my understanding of the situations that we're working in.

Thanks very much, Jeff.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Ms. Johnson, did Selma Energy Center docket a 10-year plan for this project?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. Selma Energy Center filed its 10-year plan on January 31, 2024.

Q. And on the right-hand screen, do we see a copy of my transmittal letter by which we filed that 10-year

plan in the docket?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Now, you've talked about a preferred route and a couple of options on the line. I want to get into more detail now.

Would you please describe for the committee the preferred route, the sub route option, and options A and B.

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. The Selma interconnection project is proposing a preferred route, a sub route, and two alternative routes to enter into the Vah Ki Substation.

MR. CROCKETT: We may need to get -- there we go.

CHMN STAFFORD: And this is on the place mat, too, Members, so --

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. It's on the front side of the place mat, which is Figure 2. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: So you can follow along on your place mat. And if you're able to see my red pointer on the right-hand screen, you will see generally in the northeast corner of the energy facility is where the project substation will be.

At this point, we are proposing our one single preferred gen-tie route that exits the project

substation and travels east on the south end of Selma Highway.

Once it reaches State Route 87, it will cross at an approximate 45-degree angle in which we've begun design conversations with the Arizona Department of Transportation.

After it crosses the highway, it will travel north along the east side of State Route 87.

When the preferred route reaches Earley Road, you will see the sub route branches out and heads east on the southern end of Earley Road.

It then -- before it reaches the existing railroad station, it will head north and enter into the existing Saint Solar project area and travel northwest at a 45-degree angle to meet back up with the preferred gen-tie route.

It will travel for about a quarter of a mile north along the east side of State Route 87 where it reaches Laughlin Road. Once the preferred route reaches Laughlin Road, you will see our two alternative route options A and B to enter into the Vah Ki Substation.

The alternative route A will cross Laughlin Road and continue north along State Route 87 and then turn east into the Saint Solar project area and enter the Vah Ki Substation heading south.

Alternative option B will cross Laughlin Road at a north -- at a northeast angle, enter into the solar field east, and then travel north and then east to get into the existing Vah Ki Substation.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Okay. So, Ms. Johnson, let me just ask you a couple of things on the place mat here.

The preferred route, the red line that goes all the way up to almost Laughlin Road, that's your preference to be able to use that route all the way to Laughlin Road where it connects to options A and B; correct?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Correct. That's the most direct route, would use the least amount of structures, and therefore cause the least amount of disturbance.

Q. Okay. And on this map, the -- so when you get to the north end of the red line, the preferred route, the yellow line that continues north and then east and then south that is option A; correct?

A. Yes. Correct.

Q. And then the line in blue that goes east and then north to the Vah Ki Substation that is option B?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. And that property that those two routes cross is Saint Solar solar project; correct?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Correct.
Q. Which belongs to an affiliate of Selma Energy Center?
A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.
Q. And then back down south where we have the sub route option, that's shown by the dotted black and white line; correct?
It goes east and then north and then northwest back to the gen-tie; correct?
A. (Ms. Johnson) Correct.
Q. All right. That's the sub route option.
Okay. So explain why Selma is requesting or considering the sub route option?
A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. So between Earley Road and Laughlin Road, our proposed gen-tie will intersect an existing Tucson Electric Power 500kV transmission line as well as the SunZia transmission line that has recently been constructed along the portion of our proposed gen-tie route.
Should it be determined that we cannot reasonably cross these existing transmission lines with our preferred route, we are proposing the sub route option.
I'd like to note that our preferred route is the preferred route because it's the most direct path and

crosses these rights-of-ways at a perpendicular and would require fewer structures and less disturbance.

Selma has received permission from SunZia to cross its right-of-way, and we are in discussions currently with TEP as well as -- I'm sorry, we are currently in discussions with TEP regarding the crossing of their existing transmission line.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Regarding that intersection on Earley Road and 287 with TEP, your line is 230kV?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: What is TEP's line?

MS. JOHNSON: 500.

MEMBER GOLD: So you would have to go under theirs?

MS. JOHNSON: We are proposing to go under -- to cross their existing transmission line underground.

MEMBER GOLD: But you would have to go under because they're a higher voltage?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. And it would cause the least amount of disturbance, yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Is there any other lines there that would preclude you from going under it,

another 230 line?

MS. JOHNSON: Underground? There's no --

MEMBER GOLD: No, no, no, not underground. Is there another line in the air in addition to their 250 line?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. So if you can see my pointer on the right-hand screen.

MEMBER GOLD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSON: You'll see roughly around this area is where the existing TEP line is, and you can see it on your place mat as well and south adjacent to the TEP line is the 500kV SunZia line.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. So, Ms. Johnson, if I could direct the committee to the backside of your place mat, the one that says Exhibit A-2, existing land use.

So if you look there just north of Earley Road between Earley and Laughlin, you see the dotted line which is the existing TEP 500kV line; correct?

MEMBER GOLD: Yes. That's light blue with vertical stripes in it?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, no, that's the -- that's the -- kind of looks a little bit like a railroad track. It's the black line with the dots on it.

MEMBER GOLD: Yes, I see that now.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Do you see that?

The blue line you're referring to, Member Gold, with the cross -- well, actually that looks more like a railroad track. Sorry to confuse you there.

But the blue with the black lines through it, that's the SunZia right-of-way. And what you don't see there is that SunZia line has recently been constructed.

So there are two lines adjacent to one another running east and west there across State Route 87, and the preferred route -- well, either the preferred route or the sub route option both would cross those two existing transmission lines.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. And, Ms. Johnson, is this the area where you were considering undergrounding a portion of the gen-tie?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Now, you would consider that if the TEP 250 line and the SunZia, is that a 250kV line also?

MS. JOHNSON: They're both 500kV.

MEMBER GOLD: Oh, I'm sorry, 500kV lines.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: So right now they run parallel to each other and they cross each other. So you

would -- but they're both 500kV lines. You're a 230. Is there not enough room underneath or is it politics?

MR. CROCKETT: Let me direct this to Mr. Givens. And it may be I'll ask you, Mr. Givens, to explain the engineering challenge of crossing the TEP 500kV and the SunZia 500kV line using an aerial line.

MR. GIVENS: Regardless of whether our crossing -- our new generation tie-line was going to be aboveground or underground, we're crossing under the SunZia 500kV direct current line and under the TEP 500kV AC line. We would not be crossing over either of those.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. And, Mr. Givens, does the -- just comment, if you would, for the committee about the engineering, the size of the span that would be required to go under those two lines, why it is you would be considering undergrounding there.

A. (Mr. Givens) These two 500kV lines have a significant amount of right-of-way. It's almost 400 feet, I think, across those two rights-of-way.

And it's -- it would be very difficult to have an overhead crossing of those lines and still be far enough beneath their conductors and high enough above the ground to be a safe -- a safe line to the public and not

interfere with the operation and maintenance of their two -- the two lines that we're talking about.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. So if I understand you correctly, it's a physical limitation, not a political limitation?

MR. GIVENS: Yes, sir.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Just following up on that, and I think this is a question to Mr. Givens, how does coming in at an angle manage those problems where going perpendicular to those lines doesn't? I don't understand that.

MR. CROCKETT: And, Chairman Stafford, Member Kryder, that might be a better question for Ms. Johnson who's dealing with the right-of-way issues there.

MS. JOHNSON: So you are correct the preferred route is our preferred route because it crosses those at a perpendicular. And from an engineering perspective, at least our experts have told me crossing existing transmission lines at a perpendicular is ideal.

In terms of our rights-of-ways, we are proposing the sub route option crossing those lines at an

angle due to our ability to get right-of-way agreements with landowners and in terms of our existing site control.

It begins to -- the sub route begins to cross at an angle on land that is owned by Saint Solar. So we have a little more flexibility there and can work -- and can work with the existing TEP and SunZia transmission line in designing an ideal crossing if it came down to us needing to utilize the sub route option.

MEMBER KRYDER: I get it that you've got a problem.

What I don't understand is how coming at it as an angle, assuming you're going to be underground, is an easier solution than coming at it perpendicularly. That just doesn't make any sense to me.

Is there something else here that I'm not seeing, or am I just plain dull?

MR. GIVENS: Member Kryder, if I could, in my opinion one is not more difficult than the other. They're both feasible unless there's some underlying land issue or --

MEMBER KRYDER: Right. That's what I was asking.

MR. CROCKETT: And, again, Chairman Stafford, Member Kryder, the preferred option would cross

perpendicular.

I believe what Ms. Johnson is testifying is that Selma Energy or its affiliate Saint Solar controls that land where we would cross diagonally.

And so presumably we can get an arrangement to cross -- with our own -- with our own affiliate easier than we could with an unrelated landowner.

So if we're unable to get right-of-way for the preferred route all the way north to the -- to where we would tie into the Vah Ki Substation, then we would consider that sub route option.

I think today we don't believe we will end up using the sub route option, but we want the flexibility in the event we have an issue with the right-of-way along State Route 87 and we would need to come in from that angled approach.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Ms. Johnson, did I say anything there that was not accurate?

A. (Ms. Johnson) That was accurate.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So but I'm not trying to be difficult, but it is not clear to me where -- you're moving underground from here to here; is that right?

You said about a mile underground is one of

your proposals?

And it would go all the way from -- what is that -- I don't know the street names here -- halfway up between Earley and Laughlin Road all the way to Laughlin Road?

Or what is the proposed -- what is the area of the proposed underground piece?

Is that from here up to here, or where is it?

MS. JOHNSON: That's correct. And we do go into it a little bit more.

However, you're accurate. We would cross -- we are proposing to cross the existing TEP and SunZia transmission lines starting underground approximately where my red dot is for either route, the sub route option or our proposed route option.

And it would continue to be underground until it reaches the northwest corner of option A, or if we were to go with option B, it would continue to be underground until it reaches approximately Laughlin Road.

This is due to the existing transmission lines and the solar array to cause the least amount of disturbance to the existing infrastructure.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So it's a good deal more than just crossing that 500kV whoever owned that

one. Okay.

Thank you.

I'm not -- it's not our jurisdiction. I was just trying to learn and understand why coming at it from an angle, you gave a good answer on that -- okay. I'll stop for a moment and listen longer. Thank you very much.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Along those lines, just for my sake of understanding, if you go with your option B, the blue and white dotted lines, instead of going northwest at a 45-degree angle, why not just continue to go north and enter your -- your substation?

It's a much shorter route. Why not just do that?

I mean, it's an option if you're going to zigzag, take out a couple of the zags and just zig straight up.

MS. JOHNSON: Absolutely, Councilmember. We had considered that at the early stages of designing our route, and, unfortunately, because of the existing railroad that travels north-south and because of the existing solar array there is not enough space between the existing array and the railroad to continue north.

MEMBER GOLD: Where's the railroad?

MS. JOHNSON: If you look on your place mat, Exhibit A-2, you'll see a dark gray line traveling northwest.

And I'll mirror it with my red pointer on the right screen. If I can keep my hand still. It's roughly traveling north-south where my red pointer is.

MEMBER GOLD: Oh, I see that. That's the railroad?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. It's not marked on your key, but, okay, I see.

So you have a railroad there, and you're trying not to cross the railroad.

MR. AGNER: It's marked as transportation, Member Gold. It's the gray line on Exhibit A-2.

MEMBER GOLD: Oh, I see that.

MR. AGNER: It's currently called transportation, but that's the railroad.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. So we have a railroad line that goes -- it's a very short railroad.

CHMN STAFFORD: Well, it looks like the segment runs north-south through the entire study area if you look at the A-2.

MEMBER GOLD: Oh, so that thick gray line

actually thins out and continues. So the railroad runs straight north-south. I gotcha.

Okay. So that's why you're going at an angle -- you don't want to cross the railroad as well.

Is that a correct assumption, you do not wish to cross the railroad?

MS. JOHNSON: That's correct.

MEMBER GOLD: That's just getting another entity involved.

Okay. I hope your red line Route 1 works out. It seems to be the most common sense.

And if you have to do it underground, does right-of-way go underground as well as aboveground?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. The underground right-of-way when operational would be approximately 75 feet in width, so not as wide as the 150-foot right-of-way. But there would still be a right-of-way.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay.

MEMBER KRYDER: How deep?

MEMBER GOLD: That is -- well, 10 feet deep is the correct depth for underground if you're going through a city?

MS. JOHNSON: I'm not sure. Mr. Givens, are you able --

MR. GIVENS: Well, we haven't done any

detail design on the underground portion of the project. But the duct bank would likely -- the bottom of the duct bank would be somewhere around six or seven feet deep.

MEMBER GOLD: And there's nothing in that right-of-way right now? It's just earth?

MR. GIVENS: That's my understanding.

Now, if we had to go under -- not that there's one on this project, but if we were having to go under a pipeline or under a railroad or some other obstacle, then we might not be able to use a duct bank configuration. It might have to be a jack and bore --

MEMBER GOLD: Understood. But there's nothing there now?

MR. GIVENS: -- or a directional drill.

Not that I'm aware of.

MEMBER GOLD: So the straight shot, you know, so if there's enough room beneath it to go aboveground there's an option. If not, to go belowground. And if that doesn't work out, you go at an angle belowground.

But one of those three you're pretty much 99 percent sure you can get?

MR. GIVENS: Yes, sir.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: This is a question for Attorney Crockett.

How deep does the right-of-way go?

You've got a 200-foot right-of-way. Do you go 10 feet or do you go 50 feet deep or whatever until somebody growls or what?

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman Stafford, Member Kryder, I don't know the answer to how deep a right-of-way goes.

We've got a right-of-way of -- we're proposing a right-of-way of 150 feet for the aerial. If we go underground, it would be 75 feet.

Under either scenario does anyone on my panel know how deep you're entitled to go with the right-of-way?

I assume it's as deep as you would need to go, but does anyone know the answer to that?

MR. GIVENS: To my knowledge, there's no height or depth limitation on a typical easement that we would get.

MEMBER KRYDER: That's -- as you know a great detail about mineral rights, there's a whole series of questions here when you get one inch belowground.

And to say it would go infinitely down

raises a serious question for the next guy that has to go under you.

So is that something that's been adjudicated, or is it in the statute, or where is this?

MR. CROCKETT: And I don't know the answer to that question. We haven't focused too much on the legal questions associated with the undergrounding because of the jurisdictional limitations.

But I don't know if there's any mineral reservations in the area there. I don't know that anyone on the panel would know the answer to that question either.

If we strike gold, we just might change the nature of the project.

MR. GIVENS: I'm not aware of that, but I haven't had a lot of experience with transmission lines.

We're getting an easement, so we're not -- in most cases we're not buying right-of-way in fee. So we're getting an easement from the property owner. We negotiate the rights within that easement to protect our facility.

So mineral rights, I've seen where those are negotiated in the contract. We wouldn't -- you know, a landowner could restrict us from so that they retain their mineral rights.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I'm still a little confused about why the jog. It's difficult to tell even from the place mat, which is pretty expanded here.

It looks like using the option your line would cross -- whether it's overhead or underground, would cross the SunZia line at an angle within the property that is east of whatever that road is, or is that even a road?

But it looks like it would still cross the 500kV line that belongs to TEP in the same right-of-way as the preferred route.

I know that was kind of a convoluted explanation.

Did that make sense?

MEMBER GOLD: That's what it looks like, though.

MEMBER LITTLE: It looks like it comes back to the right-of-way for the preferred route before it crosses the 500kV line.

Would it, in fact, cross both those two lines at an angle east of the preferred route?

MR. AGNER: I think -- I know this may not

be for me, but, Member Little, I mean, we kind of -- we 3D render a couple of the TEP structures and the SunZia right-of-way structures, and then we show the preferred route and the sub route and how they kind of go towards those facilities.

So maybe the virtual tour as you kind of see the structures laid out and how the structures are kind of moving through the landscape it may --

MEMBER LITTLE: Definitely.

MR. AGNER: -- you can see kind of how it makes a 45-degree and then how the preferred makes a 90-degree, so I don't know.

MEMBER LITTLE: That's very helpful.

So but let me get it straight.

It is -- the reason for doing the option and the reason for going underground, if that -- if either or both of those are chosen is not a problem with getting right-of-way on the preferred route, it's a problem of how to get underneath all of that transmission that crosses; is that correct?

MS. JOHNSON: I would say that it's still both. It's a matter of the right-of-way as well as the engineering design of that crossing, right.

We're currently in discussions with the landowner that would be needed for the preferred route.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay.

MS. JOHNSON: So it's, one, landowner interest, and, two, engineering.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. That's helpful.

And that whole little section where the alternative route goes, that belongs to the subsidiary or the --

MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. And are there solar panels in that portion --

MS. JOHNSON: No.

MEMBER LITTLE: -- right now? Okay.

Because I remember we had a -- we had a case where SunZia was crossing over somebody else's.

CHMN STAFFORD: It wasn't SunZia, but there was the applicant in that case had an intervened in the prior applicant's CEC case to get an easement across two edges of another applicant's solar array.

MEMBER LITTLE: Right. Okay. That was not here, though?

CHMN STAFFORD: No.

MEMBER LITTLE: It was different.

CHMN STAFFORD: It was in Pinal County, but it was a different --

MEMBER LITTLE: There's so much going on

out there that --

CHMN STAFFORD: Yep.

MEMBER LITTLE: I think we need a tour in the morning. My opinion.

CHMN STAFFORD: Any other questions?

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Any other questions from members?

MEMBER GOLD: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Looking at that little square -- okay. Let me point to that little square if I can find it. Hang on a second. Little square right there. Okay?

I'll just call that the little square. You have SunZia line running east-west. It appears to be crossing Tucson's line and then stopping at the place where, I guess, all the lines are merging. There's some line there right now going north-south.

I'm referring to right there, your preferred route north-south.

Is there any another line, transmission line there?

MS. JOHNSON: So the SunZia right-of-way, I understand that in the place mat A-2 the right-of-way

looks as if it stops there. However, it does continue onward. This is just showing the SunZia right-of-way as it exists on the Saint Solar project area.

MEMBER GOLD: Oh, so it really does continue?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Now, SunZia crosses TEP's line probably for some political reason of ownership.

I see the yellow you have listed as utility. I see the green you have listed as agricultural. But the area where your choice B goes northwest-southeast seems to be tan.

Who owns that land?

MS. JOHNSON: Sorry. To make sure I'm certain of what -- I'm aware of what you're --

MEMBER GOLD: I'll show you.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay.

MEMBER GOLD: Right there, who owns that?

MS. JOHNSON: Saint Solar.

MEMBER GOLD: Who?

MS. JOHNSON: Saint Solar, an affiliate of the Selma Energy Center project owns that land.

MEMBER GOLD: So that's not your company?

MS. JOHNSON: It is. It's an affiliate, yes.

MEMBER GOLD: So they are your company.

So you really own the land?

CHMN STAFFORD: Well, it depends on who your company is.

The applicant is Selma Energy Center, LLC. It has no ownership over that land. Its ultimate parent company owns another subsidiary Saint Solar, I believe, that owns this land. So they're more like cousins.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. So let's put it this way: They're friendly relatives who own the land, and you should have no problem with the landowner?

MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay.

CHMN STAFFORD: Now, I believe that was their whole purpose of having that sub route option. Because if there was difficulty with the right-of-way along the 87, they could use -- they could take that sub route because their cousin controls the land, and they would be able to get -- make a deal with that cousin easily to traverse it.

MEMBER GOLD: I understand. Now it's becoming a little clearer.

So TEP can give you a hard time. SunZia can give you a hard time. But ultimately you have a solution?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I have one last question, I think.

The canal.

MEMBER GOLD: The canal?

MEMBER LITTLE: The canal is shown in yellow on our place mat except through the square as Member Gold called it.

The option would require crossing the canal twice or just once?

MS. JOHNSON: Ms. Browne, do you want to?

MS. BROWNE: Just once --

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay.

MS. BROWNE: -- either way.

MEMBER LITTLE: But it would be on the eastside --

MS. BROWNE: Right.

MEMBER LITTLE: -- of the square?

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

We've been going for approximately an hour and a half. I think the court reporter is ready for a

break as perhaps we all are.

So I think it's a good stopping point for now. So let's take an approximately 15-minute recess.

We stand in recess.

(Recess from 2:36 p.m. to 2:55 p.m.)

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

Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you, Chairman Stafford.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Ms. Johnson, let's go back and talk for a moment about options A and B.

Why does Selma Energy Center need two options when you get to the north end of the project where you're tying into the Vah Ki Substation?

A. (Ms. Johnson) We are proposing two options because Selma has not yet made a final determination regarding the best way to safely navigate through the Saint Solar field with minimal disturbance. Depending on final engineering design, the preferred route or the subject route option could utilize either option A or B, but not both.

Q. Let's talk now about the corridor that you're requesting the right-of-way.

Let's start there.

A. (Ms. Johnson) The CEC corridor is the spatial limits of where the interconnection project could be sited. The requested CEC corridor accommodates the preferred route and the alternative routes I previously described.

The requested CEC corridor is approximately 418 acres and consists entirely of private property.

The CEC corridor is 1,000 feet wide in the southern portion of the interconnection project with 500 feet on either side of the gen-tie center line.

However, the CEC corridor expands to approximately 2,134 feet in the northern portion of the interconnection project to accommodate the sub route option and options A and B.

I'd like to also discuss the interconnection project right-of-way. The interconnection project right-of-way is the limits of the physical footprint of the interconnection project itself.

The right-of-way for this interconnection project will be a maximum of 150 feet and will be sited entirely within the CEC corridor. So while the CEC corridor is relatively large, the interconnection project itself, once constructed and operational, will be limited to only a maximum of 150 feet wide.

Q. And Ms. Johnson, we've had a fair bit of discussion about undergrounding. Is there anything additional that we need to bring up about undergrounding that we haven't covered?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. The Selma Energy Center presently anticipates that the portion of the transmission line crossing the TEP Pinal Central to Tortolita 500kV line will be constructed belowground.

In the event the Selma Energy Center gen-tie is built aboveground at that crossing, Selma Energy Center commits to both working with TEP to devise a mutually agreeable design configuration and ensuring that neither TEP nor its customers will be responsible for funding costs associated with the crossing.

Whether built above or belowground, Selma Energy Center commits to reimbursing TEP in whole for costs that TEP incurs because of the Selma Energy Center project.

Q. Okay. And so the record is clear on this point, you've engaged with both TEP and SunZia regarding crossing their 500kV lines?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Ms. Johnson, Exhibit SEC-5 is a copy of the proposed certificate of environmental compatibility; correct?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. And attached to that draft CEC is an Exhibit A that shows the preferred gen-tie route, the sub route option, and options A and B for connecting into the Vah Ki Substation; correct?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Okay. And also shows the requested corridor?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. And that is the -- that is the map that Selma Energy Center would like to be approved as part of the CEC if the committee votes to approve a CEC in this case?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Next, Ms. Johnson, would you please explain the status of the large generator interconnection agreement and associated studies that go along with that agreement?

A. (Ms. Johnson) To interconnect to the regional electric grid, we will execute a large generator interconnection agreement with SRP.

As part of the interconnection agreement process, SRP completed a system impact study to assess the need for transmission system upgrades triggered by the interconnection project. A copy of that system impact study was provided to utilities division Staff in response to a data request.

In addition, a facilities study is anticipated to be completed by November 2024, but no later than

May 2025.

Selma filed an interconnection request with SRP in December 2023. The large generator interconnection agreement would require the project to support an appropriate share of system upgrades identified through the system impact study and facility study.

Any new equipment and other upgrades required at the Vah Ki Substation will be addressed in accordance with applicable utility standards.

Q. What is the purpose and need for the Selma Energy Center interconnection project?

A. (Ms. Johnson) The interconnection project is needed to deliver renewable energy from the energy facility to the regional electric transmission grid.

The purpose of the CEC application is to secure approval for the interconnection project that will connect the energy facility to the regional transmission system via the Vah Ki Substation.

Renewable energy projects help meet several objectives of the local, state, and federal levels, including the need for additional renewable energy supplies to serve the region.

For example, SRP has committed to being 100 percent carbon free by 2050 and needs to procure more than 8 gigawatts of additional renewables by 2035 to

achieve their interim renewable energy goal.

SRP's 2023 RFP allocated 500 megawatts of capacity resources to be online as early as 2026 and as late as 2027.

The energy facility will satisfy 30 percent of SRP's 2027 carbon-free goals.

Q. Ms. Johnson, is the location that you've proposed for the gen-tie a good location for the gen-tie?

A. (Ms. Johnson) The interconnection project is an ideal location based on the recognized need to connect renewable energy to the local utilities as well as the existence of compatible, adjacent and nearby land uses, and it's proximate to the Vah Ki Substation.

In addition to its proximity to the operating Vah Ki Substation, the interconnection facility is located within Coolidge's industrial solar overlay, demonstrating continuity with the surrounding land uses.

Q. Now that you've provided an overview of the project, both the interconnection project and the energy facility, will you provide the status of the key permits that you'll need?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Certainly.

The interconnection project as well as the energy facility are located on entirely private property. For the energy facility, the portion of the project

located within the city of Coolidge, we have an approved conditional use permit to construct and operate a renewable energy facility.

For the portion of the energy facility located within Pinal County, we are currently pursuing a minor comprehensive plan amendment, a planned area development amendment, and a rezone.

For the portion of the interconnection project that is in the city of Coolidge, the project route as currently planned is wholly within the city's industrial solar overlay and is permitted use through the approved conditional use permits I previously mentioned.

For the portion of the interconnection project in Pinal County, we have determined that it is a permitted use as discussed in the Pinal County development services code.

Q. Okay. The next series of questions I have are for you, Mr. Givens.

Earlier, Ms. Johnson discussed some changes in the interconnection project from what was represented in the application.

Would you please, again, review for the committee and provide some additional detail regarding what those changes are and why they are needed?

A. (Mr. Givens) Yes, there were three changes.

The first design change has to do with the interconnection project structure height. The CEC application stated that the maximum height would be 110 feet. The maximum height for structures will now be 146 feet. The majority of the structures will have heights less than 110 feet.

This new information was obtained for the Saint Solar energy facility regarding the influence of an underground transmission line on their underground collection cables.

A new overhead option was developed that would require taller structures with a vertical phase configuration with an anticipated height of less than 140 feet.

Given that the design is not final and to allow flexibility, the maximum anticipated height increased to 146 feet. Based on data for structures in the area, 146 feet is a reasonable limit.

The second design change has to do with the interconnection project span length between structures. The CEC application stated that the maximum span would be 1,000 feet. The maximum span distance anticipated between structures would now be 1400 feet.

The majority of the interconnection project will have spans less than 1,000 feet.

This new information was obtained for the Saint Solar energy facility regarding the influence of the underground transmission line on their underground collection cables.

A new overhead option was developed that would require a long span. Currently anticipated to be 1100 feet. Given that the design is not final and to allow flexibility, the maximum anticipated span length was increased to 1400 feet.

The third and final design change has to do with the interconnection project riser and dead-end structure. The CEC application contemplated a triangular phased configuration for dead end to -- and for overground to underground transition structures on the line that would be used on the Vah Ki Substation.

We're now contemplating a new riser and dead-end steel monopole structure. The new structure type is needed to reduce the shading on the Saint Solar facility solar panels, and to reduce the width of the structure and the span on the Saint Solar energy facility.

The vertical phase configuration places phases each over the other, requiring additional height and narrowing the width that the interconnection project occupies in this space.

Q. Mr. Givens, are there any other changes that are

being proposed to what was presented in the CEC application?

A. (Mr. Givens) No.

Q. Now, we see on this slide the different structures that are being contemplated. We've discussed these earlier. Is there anything -- is there anything additional to be added regarding the discussion you provided earlier on the different types of structures?

A. (Mr. Givens) I can go through these in a little bit of detail.

Starting from the left -- there we go -- typical tangent structure. This will be -- make up the majority of the structures on the line. This would be the kind of structure that we use where the line is straight or near straight. And it has a triangular phase configuration so there's a phase on each side of the pole and one up above, so you can see this makes a triangle.

Then we have a typical angle and dead-end monopole structure. Again, the triangular phase configuration.

These structures would be used where the line takes a strong change of direction, like let's say a 90-degree angle.

Then we have the overhead-to-underground transition structure. These would be used where we're

going overhead to underground or vice versa. So the overhead conductors come into the pole, the underground line would come up the pole to these special terminations that are put on the cable. And then there's a conductor that ties them together over -- underground to overhead.

These A-frame dead-end structures would be used inside the substation fences.

And then this is the new structure, the typical riser and dead-end structure, and you get all the phases in the same vertical plane. We call that a vertical phase configuration to narrow the profile.

Q. And that last structure, that one did not appear in the application; correct?

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

Q. And the reason you're including that now is because the current thinking among the engineering group is that you're probably going to go aerial on the -- to cross the Saint Solar project, whereas before you were thinking that was probably going to be underground?

A. (Mr. Givens) Yes.

Q. And this last structure is one that's needed to fit the somewhat tighter configuration within the Saint Solar project?

A. (Mr. Givens) Yes.

Q. And Mr. Givens, we've discussed a fair bit this

afternoon about undergrounding the line and what portions may be undergrounded.

Have there been any final decisions yet made regarding the length of any portions that would be undergrounded?

A. (Mr. Givens) No, we have not made those decisions. We have a strong feeling on where the line would need to go underground and specifically associated with some crossings.

But the decision whether to be underground between crossings, that's not been made.

Q. And we've had some discussions about this, but I guess I'd like you to just summarize so that we have it here succinctly on the record.

What are the key project design specifications for the Selma gen-tie?

A. (Mr. Givens) The majority of the interconnection project structures themselves will be from 60 to 110 feet in height, with no structure exceeding 146 feet in height.

Each structure will be placed somewhere between 100 and 1400 feet apart and will have a minimum ground clearance of 28 feet.

Based on the interconnection project final design, we may end up needing up to 30 structures. As

mentioned previously, this interconnection project will be designed within a 150-foot easement, or right-of-way.

I'll note that the specifications with ranges will be finalized as we get closer to construction and the engineering information required to make these decisions is confirmed. However, we will stay within these specified ranges.

Q. Mr. Givens, would you now describe what engagement you have had with the companies who have lines that you will cross?

A. (Mr. Givens) The two that I've been involved with are TEP and San Carlos IDD. And we had discussions with the two teams.

TEP has a crossing process, and they specify the information that they need to evaluate the crossings. We discussed that our -- that we were intending to have an underground transmission crossing across their right-of-way, and they were -- they were satisfied with that.

They were concerned that if it were overhead that it might impact their transmission line and, you know, so we reached an agreement on that.

The San Carlos IDD, they don't have a process for crossings. Once we explained to them the nature of our crossing at where we transition from Selma to

Highway 87 and we cross their distribution line, once we explained that crossing they were satisfied that it wasn't going to be a problem for them.

CHMN STAFFORD: Is that the diagonal portion?

MR. GIVENS: On the very southern end, yes, sir.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So that diagonal portion was to address the distribution lines?

MR. GIVEN: Yes, Chairman Stafford.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GIVEN: That -- well, that's not the only reason.

CHMN STAFFORD: That's where you're talking about now, that's the location?

MR. GIVENS: Right. Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. So, Chairman Stafford, we've kind of finished up now with our presentation on the gen-tie and some of the technical aspects of that.

We have a virtual tour to present now. And then after that we're going to be moving on to public involvement and then environmental studies.

So if there's nothing further on sort of the more technical issues of the project, I'll turn to

Mr. Agner for a virtual tour.

And, by the way, please feel free, as I know you will, to stop the tour if you have questions and want to ask about things. We want to make sure that all your questions get answered here.

MR. AGNER: Okay. So we're about to load in here on the virtual tour.

And what we're going to see -- let's make it full screen. Apologies.

What we're going to see initially is a zoomed-out view of the entire energy itself, along with the interconnection project, the CEC corridor, the sub route option and options A and B.

But as it finishes loading in here, I'll highlight some things for the committee.

So the Selma Energy Center project itself that they've been describing as the energy facility is the dark red outlined area.

As you can see, the project substation is called out in the northeast corner and we'll see that kind of as we get closer on the ground we'll see a little bit of a rendering of the substation itself.

You can then see the interconnection project itself start to head east along East Selma Highway. That's the red -- solid red line.

You can also see further north as we get closer to the Vah Ki Substation, you can see the sub route option and options A and B.

Option A is the yellow line and option B is the blue line. I'll describe all this in greater detail as we get closer to these options, but for now I just wanted to highlight those to the committee.

The dark blue line is the interconnection project right-of-way, which they've described as that 150-foot right-of-way.

And then that dark yellow line is the CEC corridor itself.

We'll also have some of the road names called out, and they will also visible as we move along the virtual tour itself, but for now I'll go ahead and advance it to get us to a more on-the-ground view.

And like I said, we're going to start near the project substation near the northeast corner of the energy facility. It's going to start at that location and then we're going to start to head east along East Selma Highway once we get a little bit closer on the ground.

And once we get closer on the ground I'll pause it real briefly just to call out some things as well.

So I'll go ahead and stop it here real briefly.

So as you can see, the project substation as I described is in the northeast corner. You can see that first structure there is that kind of weathered steel brownish color. Those will continue to be in the virtual tour as those structures.

The solid red line is the interconnection project preferred route. The blue line is the right-of-way. And the yellow line is the CEC corridor.

So the legend will continue to be available in the upper right-hand portion period of time screen as we move through the virtual tour except when we're going into the KOPs themselves, but that legend will always be there to help you identify what lines are representing which portions of the interconnection project.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Which substation are we talking about? Are we talking about the Vah Ki Substation or your proposed substation?

MR. AGNER: Member Gold and Chairman Stafford, this is the emergency facility project substation, so this is where the interconnection project is going to start to exit the energy facility and head

east along East Selma Highway.

MEMBER GOLD: So this is the southeast portion of our place mats?

MR. AGNER: Southwest, kind of.

MEMBER GOLD: Southwest portion. I'm sorry.

MR. AGNER: Yes. Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: Gotcha.

MR. AGNER: And if you want to follow along, maybe Figure 2 might be a little bit cleaner to look at, just so you don't have all the existing land uses in the background.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

MR. AGNER: Figure 2 kind of has more focus on the interconnection project itself. So might be a little bit easier to follow along that way.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

MR. AGNER: No problem.

So I'll go ahead and advance it, and we're going to start by heading east along East Selma Highway here. And you can see the structures superimposed into the landscape.

And actually going to pause here. And so this is where the interconnection project is going to cross State Route 87, and this angle was chosen based on

the applicant's coordination with the Arizona Department of Transportation.

Their preliminary discussions have determined that this would be a more appropriate angle to kind of make that crossing. And as Mr. Givens testified to earlier, the San Carlos Irrigation Power District also wanted more of angular approach. So that is why we're crossing State Route 87 at this type of angle.

We're now about to head into KOP-4, which is south of East Selma Highway, and it's going to be along State Route 87.

All of the KOPs are going to show the simulated conditions at each of the KOP locations and I'll briefly describe them. But we'll also get into them in greater detail when we get to the visual resource discussion.

So here we're looking at KOP-4, the simulated condition of the interconnection project. And as you can see, there is a structure on the west side of State Route 87, it's starting to cross east along State Route 87, and then you can see some structures in the background there as it continues to move north along State Route 87.

So like I said, we'll describe the visual impacts of these structures when we get to the visual

resource section. But for now I wanted to give the committee a preview of the KOP locations as well as briefly describe the simulated conditions at each KOP so that you can get a preview of what we're going to discuss in greater detail when we get to the visual resource section.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. --

MR. AGNER: Agner.

MEMBER KRYDER: -- Agner.

MR. AGNER: Yes.

MEMBER KRYDER: Looking up on the screen here, what are these lines?

MR. AGNER: So what you're looking at are the tangent structures that Mr. Givens testified to earlier. Those are the structures that are used when the interconnection project is going to continue to head more or less on a straight trajectory. The lines themselves are the wires that are being strung between individual structures.

So there are wires that are placed between each structure for these types of projects.

MEMBER KRYDER: So these are projected, they're not currently existent; correct?

MR. AGNER: That is correct.

MEMBER KRYDER: And likewise with these? These are --

MR. AGNER: Those are actually existing electrical infrastructure within the landscape.

I think when we get to the actual visual resource section, we'll actually have the existing condition on the left-hand side of the screen and then we'll have simulated conditions on the right-hand screen.

So there'll be a little bit better of a contrast that I can describe when we get to that section.

But, yes, those are existing electrical infrastructure that's in the landscape.

MEMBER KRYDER: And that would include these bad boys, too?

MR. AGNER: Yes, it would.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Thanks. I look forward to that so we can see existent compared with projected. Thank you.

MR. AGNER: No problem.

CHMN STAFFORD: Those are the distribution lines that Mr. Givens mentioned earlier; correct?

MR. AGNER: Yeah. It could be. I can't say for a hundred percent sure those are San Carlos Power District distribution lines, but they are existing

distribution lines.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. AGNER: So we'll go ahead and step out of KOP-4, and we'll start to head north along State Route 87.

And as we are moving north you can continue to see the structures rendered in the landscape. And I'll stop here in just a moment to describe this in greater detail. And hopefully this illustrates some of what we've been touching upon previously, but I want to kind of point out a couple things.

So the interconnection project preferred route, the red line that we've seen up to this point, would be constructed regardless if the preferred route, the sub route, or option A or option B would be constructed. So that red line that we've seen up to this point needs to be constructed because we need to get up to this point along State Route 87.

This is where we kind of have our first deviation in the interconnection project.

So as was testified to earlier, we have the interconnection project preferred route. And the preferred route continues to advance north along State Route 87.

And as you can kind of see in this visual

virtual tour, the preferred route would have the interconnection project cross the existing SunZia right-of-way as well as the TEP right-of-way at that perpendicular angle that they were describing previously.

So you can see the SunZia right-of-way is this green boundary. And the structures that we've imposed in the landscape are what we believe are the SunZia structures that they'll look like on the ground today.

We also have the existing TEP structure here.

And, again, the purpose of putting these structures in the landscape was to help demonstrate that if the applicant constructed the preferred route, it would continue to move north and then it would cross both the SunZia right-of-way and the TEP right-of-way at a perpendicular angle. If it were aboveground.

MEMBER KRYDER: And you're going to tell us when it goes -- potentially goes underground; correct?

MR. AGNER: Well, so to what Mr. Givens testified to, the final exact locations of whether it's going to be underground are not yet known.

However, my understanding is that this is an area where it is a strong possibility that they may need to go underground in order to still build the

interconnection project while still safely crossing the TEP and the SunZia right-of-ways.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: And Mr. Agner and Mr. Givens, before we move on, is it safe to say that you would go underground at or before the point where you hit the green right-of-way line?

MR. GIVENS: Yes, we would -- our structures, if we're going to have those transition structures, would be outside of the right-of-way of SunZia or TEP.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So -- but it's been TEP that's the one that's kind of driving the undergrounding conversation, not SunZia; correct? Because I'm just looking at the map and the SunZia is a 500kV DC line and those structures look pretty tall. I think the maximum height is like 200 feet for that line.

But I'm looking at the picture of the TEP line and I'm seeing three smaller poles side by side. Is that --

MR. GIVENS: The TEP line by itself is challenging because they're going from a monopole structure, the phases are rolling down lower to a lower position in that three-pole structure.

CHMN STAFFORD: Right. I thought that was

like -- that's what I was getting to. Because if it's on a single structure, the conductors will be higher up, but this is a structure where instead of being vertical to each other, the phases are horizontal and at a lower height; correct?

MR. GIVENS: Right.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. GIVENS: But --

CHMN STAFFORD: Let him finish his answer and then you can ask your question. Yes, Mr. Givens.

MR. GIVENS: Yes, Chairman Stafford, the problem is not only the TEP line, but these two wide corridors right next to each other with an assumed prohibition to put any of our structures in their right-of-way. It's very likely that the only way to make that crossing work is underground.

CHMN STAFFORD: Right, because you have to span both the right-of-ways.

MR. GIVENS: Yes, sir.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. That was -- that's another issue. All right. Member Little, you had a question.

MEMBER LITTLE: It was answered. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Please continue,

Mr. Agner.

CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, wait. Mr. Gold -- Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Another quick question. This structure here, snaking through, that is a water canal?

MR. AGNER: Yes, and that is where they would need a canal crossing.

MEMBER GOLD: But you would go over the canal, not under the canal.

MR. GIVENS: Ideally.

MEMBER GOLD: That would make sense.

MR. GIVENS: Yes.

MEMBER GOLD: And you would go under on your property here to get underneath TEP. Okay. That's clearer now. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: But I think, again, to interject, I think it shows the complexity of the preferred route and why we need the flexibility of that sub route option in the event we can't get everything worked out that we need to on the preferred route.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Well, I can see the issue you're having because over here where the canal crosses the whole thing, how are you going to go under the canal?

You may have no choice but to go on this other route, even if TEP agrees with you, would you go under the canal at this junction?

MR. GIVENS: Well, we believe we can put a structure on the north side of that canal so that we can cross the canal overhead, transition to underground across the SunZia and TEP rights-of-way.

MEMBER GOLD: And is this corridor wide enough? Would you need to go further inland to cross?

MR. GIVENS: Based on the information we have right now, we believe that that corridor is wide enough.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. And so you could do the underground crossing under the TEP and SunZia lines from either the preferred route or your sub route option; correct?

MR. GIVENS: Yes, Chairman Stafford.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Agner. Please continue.

MR. AGNER: Okay. So the other option that we've been describing and has been discussed is the sub route option. And that's represented in the solid black line that you can see on the screen.

And as it's been described, the deviation

would occur by the interconnection project heading east along East Earley Road. It would then head north, and then it would head northwest to connect back to the interconnection project.

And hopefully as you can see on the screen, the sub route option allows the interconnection project to cross the existing TEP and the SunZia right-of-way at more of a 45-degree angle rather than at a perpendicular angle.

So the next spot that we're going to head into is KOP-3 itself. And this is along Earley Road and State Route 87. We'll go ahead and go into this KOP.

I'll pause it here. And what you can see here is the sub route option being simulated within the landscape. As you can see here, the sub route option would continue to head east along East Earley Road, and then you can see it start to head a little bit north along -- before it starts to head northwest.

Now, you can't actually see the interconnection project starting to head northwest in this simulation just because of the extent of the viewshed, but you can see it head east and head north and then start to head a little bit northwest.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: What are the guy wires for, and I see some --

MR. GIVENS: I think those are guys from an existing distribution structure.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay.

MR. GIVENS: You can't see it in the picture --

MEMBER LITTLE: And the distribution line is --

CHMN STAFFORD: One at a time, please.

MR. GIVENS: You can't see the pole in the picture, but I'm -- I believe there's a distribution pole just to the left of the screen and those guy wires.

MEMBER LITTLE: And the distribution in that area is San Carlos, not ED-2?

MR. GIVENS: I don't know, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: San Carlos Irrigation District.

CHMN STAFFORD: And just to confirm, this picture is looking east down Earley Road; correct?

MR. AGNER: Correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

MR. AGNER: So we'll start to head out of this KOP and we'll start to actually head more towards the northern extent of the interconnection project which

is near the Vah Ki Substation.

And we're going to come out of this KOP and we're going to slow down a little bit just to give the committee some time to understand where we're headed.

So we're starting as I mentioned to head near the Vah Ki Substation. And it's also including the Saint Solar project. And I'm going to pause right here and I'm going to point a couple things out.

So you can see at the far left, you can see that solid black line which was the sub route option connect back into the red line. And then you can see a brief segment of the red line going from where the black line connects a little north until options A and B deviate from that red line.

CHMN STAFFORD: Which direction are we looking in this picture?

MR. AGNER: We are looking west.

I would say, I guess to kind of give it some perspective, we're currently east of Vah Ki Substation. We're kind of at an aerial above Vah Ki and we're kind of looking down west.

CHMN STAFFORD: I see it. I just had to rotate the map to make sure I'm looking at it the right way. Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: And would this be the rail?

MR. AGNER: Correct.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So that's coming along the side of that. Thank you very much.

MR. AGNER: No problem.

So that small red segment that you can see between the black line and then the red deviating from options A and B, that portion of the interconnection project, again, would be constructed regardless if the preferred route, sub route, or option A or option B were constructed because, again, the interconnection project needs to continue to move north along State Route 87 before either option A or option B are constructed.

And so I'll for a moment highlight the options A and B now that we kind of have a good view of both options.

So option A is the yellow line. And as you can see here, it continues to head north along State Route 87 as has been described. It'll then turn east into the Saint Solar project, and then it will move south before it connects into the Vah Ki Substation.

Option B would start by going more of at a north to northeast angle. It's the blue line. It will head east and then it will head north before it connects into the Vah Ki Substation.

And as has been testified previously, the

reason that they need both options is because the applicant needs to continue to work with its affiliate, Saint Solar, to identify the best way to navigate through the Saint Solar project. And, again, either option A or option B would be constructed, but not both.

CHMN STAFFORD: Now, Saint Solar, is that already interconnected to this substation?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: And do we see the interconnection on this map?

MR. AGNER: It would be -- I'm not sure, personally. The Vah Ki Substation infrastructure as we best know it is simulated in this image, but the interconnection of Saint Solar, I'm not sure a hundred percent if it's simulated.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Yeah. Because it looks like you're either going to approach the substation from the west coming east, or from the north heading south. I'm assuming that you want the options because -- to find a place to fit it in there that doesn't conflict with the Saint tie-in.

I'm just curious as to is the Saint Solar array, is that operational or is it still under construction?

MS. JOHNSON: The Saint Solar array is

operational and you are correct, Chairman Stafford, ultimately the route option that we choose will need to take into consideration the existing transmission and collection lines.

CHMN STAFFORD: But we don't see the Saint tie line on this.

MR. GIVENS: Chairman Stafford, I can show you where it is.

So the cursor right now is on the Saint Solar collection substation.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

MR. GIVENS: You can't really see it but there's a -- I think it's a single span between that substation and the Vah Ki Substation. So either way we're going to have to cross over that line at some point.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: So it looks like the Vah Ki Substation is the one on the left side of the screen and the other one is the collection substation for the Saint Solar arrays?

MR. GIVENS: This is Vah Ki.

MEMBER LITTLE: And so it looks like you're going to come in from the north into Vah Ki?

MR. GIVENS: Yes.
MEMBER LITTLE: Okay.
MR. CROCKETT: From the north under option A.
MR. AGNER: Yes. Option B would head south into Vah Ki.
CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little, you were talking about the Saint project; right? Or this one.
MEMBER LITTLE: I'm -- no, I'm looking, this project will tie into the Vah Ki Substation. Looks to me like they both come in on the north side of the Vah Ki Substation, both the blue and the yellow.
MR. CROCKETT: Oh, I see what you're saying, Member Little. It does look -- it does look like from that illustration that both option A and option B would enter from the north side of Vah Ki.
Mr. Givens, are you able to confirm that one way or the other, or Ms. Johnson?
MR. GIVENS: Ashley, help me out here, but I believe that the actual point of interconnection is on the north side of that Vah Ki Substation.
MS. JOHNSON: That's correct. Our initial conversations with SRP, the owners of the Vah Ki Substation, they had expressed a preference to enter the Vah Ki Substation from the northern end. But those

conversations are ongoing, which is why we still have options A and B as well.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Which substation are we talking about? This one or this one?

CHMN STAFFORD: The one on the left is the Vah Ki. That's the one that SRP owns that this project would tie into. The one on the right is the Saint Solar array substation that ties into the SRP substation.

MEMBER GOLD: From the north.

CHMN STAFFORD: Right. And the one on the left, that's the Vah Ki Substation.

MEMBER GOLD: That's the one we're tying into.

CHMN STAFFORD: Right. Correct.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

MR. AGNER: Okay. If there's no other questions, I'll proceed.

So we're now going to go into KOP-1, which is along East Steele Road. And we're going to show you three simulated conditions at this KOP.

CHMN STAFFORD: And this is looking south

from the north?

MR. AGNER: It's looking southwest towards Vah Ki Substation.

So as you can see here, the first option that we're presenting to you, it says "Preferred route," but what we actually mean is underground. And so what you're seeing in the simulated condition is if the interconnection project were to go underground in this particular portion of the interconnection project.

And what you can actually see here in this simulated condition is there are a couple structures near the Vah Ki Substation, and they're that weatherized steel material that's brown.

And the reason that there are still a couple structures visible within the landscape is because as was testified to previously, they need to transition from underground to aboveground and they'll connect into the Vah Ki Substation as an aboveground connection.

So while there are not structures visible around Vah Ki Substation, and that's to reflect the fact that that portion would go underground, there are still structures visible near Vah Ki to reflect the fact that it needs to come back aboveground before it connects into the Vah Ki Substation.

CHMN STAFFORD: Can you use the pointer to

point out the structures that you're talking about?

MR. AGNER: They're these two structures here.

CHMN STAFFORD: And those are the ones that bring it -- those are the transitional structures from above to belowground; correct?

MR. AGNER: One of them is a transitional structure and the other I believe is an angle structure to connect it into the Vah Ki Substation.

We'll actually get a little bit of a better view of both structures when we get to KOP-2. But I believe those are two structures that are visible, yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And now I'm kind of confused here because I thought -- I thought the undergrounding you're talking about was going to be back over there under the TEP line. This one looks like you're -- the undergrounding is much closer to where the sub -- the Vah Ki Substation is.

MR. AGNER: Correct. And I'll just speak briefly and either Phil or Ashley, feel free to chime in.

Another potential area for undergrounding is near the Saint Solar project. And that's, again, it was contemplated as going underground because of the existing Saint Solar project.

There's a lot of infrastructure around

there. There's a lot of solar panels. It could be difficult to navigate that particular project as an aboveground facility.

And so the applicant has contemplated going underground for this portion, too, to help navigate some of those challenges of the existing infrastructure.

CHMN STAFFORD: Now, would that be option A or B that would be undergrounded? Or either? Is it -- are you looking specifically at one of them to be underground and one not or both potentially underground?

MS. JOHNSON: Both potentially underground.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So everything -- so in addition to the section down where you cross the TEP and SunZia lines north of Earley Road, when you get -- this is up by Laughlin Road going into the substation.

So at what point would it go underground here? Where the red ends and you split into the two option A and B project routes? Or would it be you would go underground further along the routes where on the map Figure 2 it's shaded blue or yellow as opposed to red?

MS. JOHNSON: We're still determining where exactly along the northern portion of the route it will be undergrounded. We need some additional geotechnical surveys to determine where there's existing underground infrastructure, whether the soil can support an

underground transmission line there.

So I'd like to preface first that it's not confirmed yet where exactly the northern portion of the gen-tie route could be underground.

However, we have been exploring the possibility of the proposed gen-tie route when it enters or transitions to be underground before crossing the SunZia and TEP transmission line. It would remain underground before entering into the Vah Ki Substation.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So the rest of the portion of the route between the TEP and SunZia lines up to Laughlin Road would all be underground, then.

MS. JOHNSON: Potentially.

CHMN STAFFORD: Potentially.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Agner.

MR. AGNER: Okay. So next we'll move into option A.

And so the simulated condition here from KOP-1 is, like I said, again, simulating option A which as a reminder to the committee is the option that continues to move north along State Route 87 before it heads east into the Saint Solar project, and then it goes south to connect into the Vah Ki Substation.

And so you can see here there are a couple more structures visible in the landscape to reflect that fact that there's a little more coming aboveground and navigating through the Saint Solar project.

But it is somewhat difficult to discern because there is the existing Saint Solar project and there's also numerous other electrical transmission and distribution lines visible within the landscape.

And so it's fairly common to see these types of structures within the landscape that we're seeing now.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: This is a very complicated landscape with a lot of 500-kilovolt lines and 230-kilovolt lines.

Isn't there electromagnet fields that can also come into play here when you have so much power going into one small area? And have you considered that?

MR. AGNER: I will say unless Phil or Ashley want to provide any additional context, we do describe electromagnetic fields in Exhibit I. There is a section dedicated to electromagnetic fields, and so we can maybe discuss the compatibility of the project as it relates to EMF when we get to Exhibit I. But that is

addressed in the CEC application.

MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

MR. AGNER: So the next one we're going to see here is option B.

And option B from this KOP, again, is the option that moves at a north to northeast angle before it heads east and then it heads north into the Vah Ki Substation.

And so, again, it's a little bit difficult to discern, but the simulated structures are actually further back in the landscape, and that's to reflect the fact that it's further away from the Vah Ki Substation at this particular location. It doesn't get as far north along the Saint Solar project before it needs to head east. And so the structures are actually simulated a little bit further back in the background to reflect the fact that it remains a little bit further south of Vah Ki Substation before it heads north and connects into Vah Ki Substation.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Are the tallest structures there, is that the TEP 500kV line?

MR. GIVENS: I believe that's an SRP double-circuit structure --

MEMBER LITTLE: Coming out of --
MR. GIVENS: -- 230kV and 115kV, I believe.
MEMBER LITTLE: That makes sense. Thank you.
CHMN STAFFORD: On the Figure 2 map, it shows a 230kV and a 500kV line running along Laughlin Road.
MEMBER LITTLE: Right. Thank you.
CHMN STAFFORD: Is that the ones that we're seeing here?
MEMBER LITTLE: That makes sense.
CHMN STAFFORD: Is that what it is?
MR. AGNER: I believe, yeah.
CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.
MR. AGNER: That would be what we would be seeing.
CHMN STAFFORD: And those are both SRP lines, aren't they?
MR. AGNER: I can't confirm one way or another.
MR. GIVENS: Don't know.
MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.
MR. AGNER: We'll now head to our last KOP which is KOP-2, and that's at Laughlin Road and State

Route 87.

But before we get there, I actually do want to pause here because I think this provides a nice angle of the two options that we've been discussing.

So, again, I think it's worth emphasizing again that option A is the yellow line. That's going to continue to head north along State Route 87 here before it heads east to connect into the Saint Solar, and then it's going to head south before it connects into Vah Ki Substation. So you can see those structures there simulated in the landscape.

And then option B, which is the blue line, is going to head east, then it's going to head north, and then it's going to connect into the Vah Ki Substation.

So I just wanted to pause there because I think it gives a nice angle and overview of the two options.

Now we'll go into KOP-2, which like I said is at the intersection of Laughlin Road and State Route 87. And we'll pause here.

And we'll go over each of the three options again.

So the first one that we'll go over is the undergrounding of the interconnection project.

And again, you can kind of see in the

background it's the weatherized steel structures, I'll point them out there, these are the same structures we saw for the undergrounding portion at KOP-1, but now they're being shown at KOP-2.

This is a different angle and it's also a little bit closer to the Vah Ki Substation, which is why you can see them a little bit better from this particular angle is because we're just a little bit closer to the Vah Ki Substation at this particular KOP.

Now we'll move on to option A.

So KOP-2 option A, as you can see, there are a couple of new additional structures visible, and that's to, again, reflect the fact that it needs to continue to head north along State Route 87 before it turns east into the Saint Solar project and move south.

So that's why there's a couple different structures visible in the background is to reflect it navigating through the Saint Solar project from this particular angle.

And actually this is one of my favorite simulations is because there are actually some simulated wires in front of you to reflect the fact that the KOP has structures that are going to continue to move north along State Route 87, and so there actually are some simulated wires that are close to us to reflect the fact

that there are going to be additional spans of wires moving along State Route 87.

But as you can see, they're a little bit difficult to discern given the fact that there's already wires spanning this wire, so there are new wires in that particular simulation.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: And there's not an issue going under that 230 or 500kV line?

MS. JOHNSON: No. However, we are considering this portion of the proposed route to be underground.

MEMBER LITTLE: I realize that, yeah. Thank you.

MR. AGNER: Yes. And I should say that these are representative, and so it's not meant to show you the exact way an engineering of how they would make these crossings work. It's just to help give you a depiction of what they may look like.

MEMBER LITTLE: Right.

MR. AGNER: So we'll now move on to option B. And so option B, as you can see here, there's actually a simulated structure here in the landscape, and that's to reflect the fact that it needs to move at that

northeast angle, head east, and then go north towards the Vah Ki Substation.

And there are structures simulated near the Vah Ki Substation as well to continue to reflect the fact that it needs to connect into the Vah Ki Substation as an aboveground connection.

And also there's actually no longer any wires simulated along State Route 87, and that's because it needs to continue to move away from State Route 87 at more of a north to northeast angle, head east, and then head north closer to Vah Ki Substation.

So there's no longer any wires strung along State Route 87 because that would not be the path it would take.

So with that we've visited all four KOPs virtually, we're about to head out to the original extent of the virtual tour that showed you the original extent of the energy facility, the interconnection project, the sub route option, options A and B.

I'm happy to answer any questions the committee may have, or if you would like to go back to particular parts of the virtual tour or see the simulated conditions, again, at each KOP, I'm happy to go back to those and discuss those in greater detail.

But like I said the specific visual impacts

at each KOP will be described in greater detail once we get to the visual resource section.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. And I think, Mr. Agner, I think this illustrates really the lack of much -- many residences in the area of this project generally. Do you agree?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. There's not a ton of residences as you can see -- I'll back out kind of to that original extent because I think it helps.

A lot of the land use that is being crossed by the interconnection project and the surrounding area is existing agriculture. As you can see particularly in this zoomed-out view a lot of this is actively agricultural fields.

There's also near the north end near the Vah Ki Substation as we've mentioned, it is the existing Saint Solar project which is a solar field that is energy infrastructure that has solar panels. So there is a lot of existing infrastructure in the landscape that is similar to what is being proposed by this interconnection project.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Crockett -- or Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: A question I think to

Mr. Crockett or I'm not sure who of your witnesses.

Are there any houses -- any dwellings of any people within one mile of the proposed routes?

MR. CROCKETT: We have that information in the application.

Ms. Johnson or Mr. Agner, do you remember what the closest residence is to the gen-tie?

MR. AGNER: Yes, the nearest residence is approximately 210 feet north of the interconnection project. I'll go ahead and loosely --

MEMBER KRYDER: Up here.

MR. AGNER: I'll point it out loosely. It's actually here.

I will say it -- it isn't from what we can tell the best-maintained residential area. It's a single structure. We haven't been able to confirm whether or not it is an active dwelling. But for the purposes of the CEC application we're just going to go ahead and assume it is an active dwelling. But it's hard to confirm that it is an active, ongoing residential structure.

Within the wider landscape of the one-mile buffer around the interconnection project, the residential -- the residential areas are kind of scattered throughout the study area. But they're not

necessarily super high densities, I would say. So scattered residential structures.

MEMBER KRYDER: Let me go back to this one. I thought I understood that your sister company, whatever its name is, owned that property and so they -- is that correct? Do they? Is this owned by Saint Power or whatever?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. Councilmember, I'd like to add a little more clarity.

So the portion within that zigzagged area where your pointer is right now, it is owned by Saint Solar. There is a smaller parcel south of our project area just north of East Earley Road --

MEMBER KRYDER: Put -- put your marker on it, please.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. So if you can see the mouse south of our sub route option, Saint Solar owns this land.

However, north of Earley Road and south of the canal, there is one private parcel with a structure on it. We do have a right-of-way easement with this landowner and have confirmed that that structure is uninhabited.

MEMBER KRYDER: It is uninhabited and will continue to be uninhabited?

MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

MEMBER KRYDER: And that's a part of your contract with that private property owner; correct?

MS. JOHNSON: We have a 150-foot right-of-way easement along the western edge of their parcel boundary. However, if the landowner wanted to construct anything that was habitable, they are -- they can do so because it's outside.

MEMBER KRYDER: I can't hear you. I'm sorry.

MS. JOHNSON: The current structure is uninhabitable. However, if the landowner wanted to construct something outside of the right-of-way, they are allowed to do so. That's not within our jurisdiction.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So potentially, then, correct me if I'm wrong, I hear you saying potentially there's a dwelling right at the point of your cursor there. Is that about right?

MS. JOHNSON: There is a structure there but nobody is living in it.

MEMBER KRYDER: And your contract says no one can come in it? That's what I didn't understand.

CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, no, Member Kryder. The property owner, they have an easement I think on the west end of his property, when it gets near the road, the 87.

But no landowner is going to give away their rights to occupy their property just because it was developed -- there's a nearby solar development. I don't think there's -- have you ever heard a case where a developer, an energy developer required someone to cede rights to do anything with their property that they weren't purchasing from the property owner?

Is that -- typically you guys would never require to someone not occupy their land just because you cross near it, would you?

MEMBER KRYDER: Yeah, that's typically called selling.

Okay. So there's one potential habitation. And I heard Mr. Ag --

MR. AGNER: Agner.

MEMBER KRYDER: Say there were some others but I didn't hear where they were relating to the proposal.

CHMN STAFFORD: If I could.

MEMBER KRYDER: Can you point them out for me?

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Kryder, if you would look at your place mat, if you look at the back one, Exhibit A-2.

MEMBER KRYDER: I've got the place mat.

CHMN STAFFORD: All the little orange areas that you see are zoned residential and could potentially have residences on them.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. And so they could potentially have it. But are there any now? I mean -- okay.

MR. AGNER: So as part of our existing land use inventory, we go out and we verify the existing land uses within the study area.

MEMBER KRYDER: Right.

MR. AGNER: And so if it's shown as residential, it's very likely that we feel more or less that there is some sort of habitable structure there.

Now, of course because it's private property and for the safety of our field crew, we can't just go knock on everyone's door asking if they live there or, you know, verify for certain that it's an active structure. But we do our best with what we can see on public roadways.

And so if it's marked as residential on the figure, we feel there's a pretty good chance that it's an active residential area.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. And then you're going to address this, then, in your, what do you call it, where you try to reach out to the public, you'll

count all of those and talk about all of those? I'm glad to shut up and get it later if you've got it forthcoming. But I would like to know whether we're talking about two properties or 20 properties or 200.

MR. AGNER: So Member Kryder and Chairman Stafford, I'll do my best to answer your question now just because I think it will maybe help --

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay.

MR. AGNER: -- ease some concern.

All property owners were notified of our in-person open house within one mile of the CEC corridor, which is that study area that you can see on Exhibit A-2.

MEMBER KRYDER: Great.

MR. AGNER: So anyone that was within that area was sent a letter about our in-person open house.

And additionally they were also sent a letter announcing this CEC hearing, and they were given the details not only where it was going to be, the date, the time. They were also given the information about how to participate remotely if they wished to do so.

So any property owners including residences were given several letters about this project, and we invited them to provide comments within a 30-day window of sending them the letter.

And so we tried our best to get as much

feedback as we could.

MEMBER KRYDER: And how many of such letters were sent?

MR. AGNER: I would have to go dig into the exact number. But without looking I would say it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 2- to 300 letters, I believe. But I would need to check and verify that.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Okay.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Looking at this map, this is an aerial map.

MR. AGNER: Correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: You're looking at Exhibit A-2.

MEMBER GOLD: I'm looking at Exhibit A-2. We're looking at aerial map, and in those residential areas on this aerial map, did you blot out what's under there when you put in the orange and the yellow? Or are we looking through it? Because I don't see any structures.

MR. AGNER: Right. So the field verification -- and I can speak to this because I've actually done it -- it consists of going to these areas and looking at what's on the ground and seeing if our

desktop data matches the on-the-ground conditions of that area.

And so for instance if it was showing agricultural and we felt it actually was more of a residential or industrial use, we would in realtime update that data to say, "Hey, this is an agricultural, this is industrial."

And then you would see that on your map here.

The reason you may not be seeing those structures right now on this aerial imagery is because it may be outdated or could be incomplete. It could be maybe a couple years old. It could not show everything completely.

It's also at kind of a zoomed-out scale so if the structure is smaller or if it's a minor, you know, one-acre lot, it's going to be really hard to see a structure at this scale.

MEMBER GOLD: When were these photographs taken? How long ago, this aerial photograph that I'm looking at in Exhibit A-2?

MR. AGNER: The information is not available on that exhibit, but I will talk to our GIS department to see what the date is of this aerial imagery and I'll get back to you on that.

MEMBER GOLD: I'm asking is this within five years?

MR. AGNER: Without knowing the date for certain I would say more than likely. The oldest that I can recall us using aerial imagery on our maps is probably two to three years old. It usually is not much older than that. But, again, I would need to get with our GIS department to verify when it was used. Because it also can depend upon when the satellites flew around that area, so if it's been a while since the satellites have captured that aerial imagery around there, it could be older than that.

MEMBER GOLD: Okay. So here's my question: It's a residential area. There are power lines that are already going through that there are existent now. How long have those power lines been in existence, the TEP and the -- who's the other one -- the SunZia and anybody else who's in there?

MR. AGNER: I -- I don't know the dates of the power lines.

What I can say is that a lot of the power lines within the study area as we describe in Exhibits A and B are actually associated with the residential structures, especially the distribution lines because you need to have power come to your house.

So I think it's fair to say that at least the distribution lines for that area are probably at least as old as the residential structures themselves, because they have power to the residence.

MEMBER GOLD: -- transmission lines that run right -- that border that area.

MR. AGNER: I'm sorry, Member Gold. I didn't get your full question.

MEMBER GOLD: If you look at the SunZia transmission line, if you look at the SunZia transmission line running from east to west, there is a 500-kilovolt transmission line going straight through that that I'm guessing is the SunZia line.

If I look a little to the north of that, I have both on Laughlin Road a 230 and a 500-kilovolt line. And they seem to be sandwiching in that residential area between Carter Lane and Burton Avenue.

What I'm asking is are those residential areas existent? How I do phrase that. Did these people build those houses after those lines were there, or were those houses there and then they put the lines in and the people just moved, that's why you're not getting any response? Are there people living there now?

MR. AGNER: Again, our field efforts, we do our best to look at the structures on the ground and if

we feel reasonably confident that they're active residential areas, we will mark them as residential.

And so if they are residential areas on this map, we feel reasonably confident that these areas are currently occupied. Like I mentioned, we don't knock on people's doors, we don't get into their property to respect private property rights. So we can only verify that from the local roadways.

But more -- we can say with some degree of confidence that they are active residential areas.

Now, whether in terms of whether the TEP right-of-way was in existence before or after those residential structures, you know, we can try to look and see if when the TEP line was built and maybe when the SRP lines are built. But that information is not always readily available.

But -- but we can try if you want us to look to see when those were constructed.

MEMBER GOLD: Not necessary.

The point I'm getting at is your line, your preferred route, is farther away from these residential areas than both the TEP line and the SunZia line. So if those people were comfortable with those and didn't put up a big fuss, you're farther away, it doesn't seem to be an issue for your lines is all I'm trying to get at.

MR. AGNER: Oh, okay. Yeah, I mean there are existing high-voltage transmission lines within our study area. There's also the distribution lines that cross the residential areas that also carry, you know, electricity.

We also have the Vah Ki Substation that's been there. And we have the Saint Solar project as well as the Storey Energy Center that are marked as the utility on the existing land use maps. Those have been there.

So, yes, I feel like it is reasonable to say that the residences around that area have seen electrical infrastructure and have it within their landscape, yes.

MEMBER GOLD: And that would explain why you didn't get responses to your letters, because you're farther away than the ones that already concern them. Is that a correct assumption in your opinion?

MR. AGNER: It's hard to say why people will or will not respond to a letter. So I don't necessarily want to speak for the people that received that letter.

They, you know, you could not want to respond to it because you're fine with it. You could not respond maybe because, you know, you just -- you don't

feel there's anything to discuss with the applicant. So it's hard to say why someone will or will not respond to a letter.

All I can say is that, you know, of all the letters we sent out, both for the in-person open house, well in advance of the in-person open house, and four weeks prior to this hearing we sent out the CEC hearing letter, I believe we received a total of nine comments, two of which were just unsolicited requests to, you know, use their services for the solar project. One was from the Arizona Game & Fish Department, which we've included, and there's just been a couple other minor comments.

So what I can say is all the letters that we've sent out, we've received nine responses to date.

MEMBER GOLD: And of the nine responses that you received, none didn't like your project, none even said anything detrimental about your project; is that a correct statement?

MR. AGNER: I would say one letter that we received near the end of the project did say that they had some concerns about the interconnection project as it relates to wildlife and visual resources.

The applicant did respond and say, you know, they will comply with any applicable laws related to wildlife and visual resources. And thankfully both of

those resources are addressed in the CEC application.

So you'll be able to hear our findings regarding biology and visual resources through our testimony.

MEMBER GOLD: But I'm trying to ascertain, Mr. Agner, is nobody is complaining about your primary route; is that correct?

MR. AGNER: Correct.

MEMBER GOLD: That's what I wanted to know. Thank you so much.

MR. AGNER: I just wanted to give you additional context, Member Gold, to provide you what may have led up to there being no major opposition to this project.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Agner, I absolutely appreciate your attention to detail. But all I wanted to know is I represent the people of the State of Arizona, other people here represent the wildlife, other people represent the water.

What I wanted to know is did any people complain about this? It didn't make sense that they should, and the confirmation I was looking for you just gave. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I'm finished.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: We're going to take the win

and move on.

We'll -- that's a nice segue, Member Gold, because we're now going to public outreach, what was done. And then we'll get into the noticing of this proceeding and then we'll see at five o'clock today whether there's additional public comment, folks that want to come out and make public comment.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. But let's turn to you, Ms. Johnson, and would you please for the committee provide an overview of the public outreach activities that were completed in connection with this gen-tie project?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. With the assistance of SWCA, the interconnection project engaged in a community outreach initiative that allowed the public and stakeholders the opportunity to ask questions, provide comments and provide input on the interconnection project.

Those various involvement activities consisted of establishing points of contact including an e-mail address, a telephone line with voicemail and a mailing address, setting up a website, informational letters, newspaper advertisement, a Facebook page, an in-person open house and a virtual open house.

Q. Ms. Johnson, did Selma Energy Center set up

dedicated points of contact for this project?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. We had a dedicated project e-mail address, phone number with voicemail. And a mailing address.

CHMN STAFFORD: And I assume there was a human being responsible for monitoring those. Is that the question you asked is who was responsible for that aspect?

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. Yes. Yes?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. SWCA helped monitor the voicemail and I monitored the e-mail.

Q. Did you have a project website?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Or do you have a project website, I should ask.

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. We have an active project website that provides all interested parties and visitors to that website with the project information, opportunities for public comments. The website address was included in all -- all communication materials. And a copy of the application, the notice of hearing, the prefiling conference transcript and other documents are also made available on the website.

Q. Did Selma send out informational letters to landowners and interested stakeholders in the area?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. As you heard Mr. Agner testify earlier on, we had provided informational letters within a mile radius of the interconnection project.

Q. And what we're seeing on the right-hand screen, is that an image of the informational letter that went out to the landowners and interested stakeholders?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Did Selma also place newspaper advertisements and use social media to publicize the project?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. Newspaper advertisements were published in the Casa Grande and Tri-City Dispatch on June 4, 6, 11 and 13. Both newspapers are in general circulation in the area of the interconnection project.

Additionally, a Facebook page was created to provide project information and opportunities for public comment.

The project also purchased boosts for the project Facebook page during June 3 through June 19 in order to increase the audience reach of the notice of the project's in-person open house.

The boosting area including three ZIP Codes that intersect the study area. During this time the project Facebook page netted 247,847 total impressions and reached 77,131 accounts.

For clarity impressions are the number of times

any content from the project Facebook page or about the project Facebook page entered a person's screen.

Reach is the number of people who saw any content from the Facebook page or about the Facebook page. So for example, if one person saw a page three times, the page had three impressions and a reach of one.

Q. Ms. Johnson, to clarify, the number of impressions that you mapped were 247,847?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Did you also set up and hold an in-person meeting for the public?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Please talk about that for the committee if you would.

A. (Ms. Johnson) An in-person public open house meeting was held for the project on June 19, 2024, at the Pinal County Fairgrounds, a community-based venue. The format of the meeting was an informal open house arrangement, allowing community members to attend, review the maps and informational displays and communicate with the project team.

One person attended the open house and no formal comments were received during the in-person open house. This person did provide informal feedback and expressed overall support of the project, but they did not sign in.

Q. And to supplement the in-person open house did you also hold a virtual open house?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. Would you please describe that virtual open house?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. The virtual open house for the project provided an online resource for interested parties to review display boards presenting project information, maps and exhibits describing the interconnection project.

The virtual open house also informed viewers of how to provide input, ask questions, and submit a comment.

The virtual open house also included a sign-in sheet and comment form. There was a one-month comment period where the virtual open house had 36 views. No comments were submitted through the formal comment period.

Q. Does the virtual open house remain live today?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. So Ms. Johnson, getting back to the questions that Member Gold asked, would you please describe the public comments that have been received to date regarding this project?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. A total of nine comments

were received about the project. Five of the comments were received through the project e-mail. And one comment was received informally at the in-person open house.

Two of the comments were unsolicited requests which we did not respond to those comments.

A third comment was from the Arizona Game & Fish Department providing their comment letter which we have included in Exhibit H.

We responded by thanking the Game & Fish Department for their letter.

A fourth comment was asking about the specific energy facility design. We let the commenter know that the energy facility was still in conceptual phase of the design and directed them to the project website for additional information.

A fifth commenter asked how to stay updated about the project, so we directed them to the project website and Facebook page to stay updated.

We also provided them with the virtual open house link.

Two of the comments had to do with the utility coordination for the interconnection project, which Mr. Givens testified about previously.

Another comment had to do with the

interconnection project's potential for visual impacts and wildlife impacts, and was opposed to the interconnection project.

We informed the commenter that we will adhere to all local regulations that address visual impacts and that we are committed to avoiding and minimizing impacts to cultural and biological resources.

Q. Ms. Johnson, are the public outreach efforts that you have described more fully laid out in what has been marked as Exhibit SEC-3?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes.

Q. And are you aware was SEC-3 previously filed in the docket?

A. (Ms. Johnson) Yes. It was a requirement by the Procedural Order in this case.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I'm curious the two commenters that wanted information about -- one wanted information, more detailed information about the project, I guess they both did.

And to whom you responded that you gave them the website information and particularly the one that you said was still in conceptual phase, I'm sure they were curious as to where it was relative to their

house or to their property.

Did you get any responses back from them after you responded to their initial question? It would be like number 3 in table J-1.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I don't believe that we received any responses back after we responded to their initial outreach.

I know that Mr. Agner had included copies of those correspondences in the application, and it looks like he may be checking right now.

MEMBER LITTLE: Yeah, there are six included here. And I don't think the one from the Game & Fish was in here. So that would be seven.

MR. AGNER: So Member Little, if I could clarify. Between the CEC application and this hearing, we did receive some additional comments that Ms. Johnson just described. So I would recommend taking a look at Exhibit SEC-3 to see all of the comments.

From my recollection when the applicant did provide that additional information, there was no follow-up by either of the commenters.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

I also have a question, and I think I asked this question before. But what public involvement or outreach was conducted for the solar generation facility

portion that we do not have any authority over?

MS. JOHNSON: I can speak to the public outreach that we currently underwent for the Pinal County portion, because the northern portion of the project in the city of Coolidge, when we purchased that land, it already had an approved conditional use permit.

So in accordance with Pinal County and our minor comprehensive plan amendment, we have conducted community engagement that consisted of mailing informational letters and invitations to our neighborhood meeting within a 1200-foot radius of the project area.

And we also have our project website that includes the interconnection project information as well for -- for any visitor to go to and learn additional information about the project.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. And Chairman Stafford, Member Little, there is -- there is as part of Exhibit SEC-3 as Ms. Johnson mentioned, there is a spreadsheet that shows the nine comments that we received, what the comments were specifically, and what the company's response was to -- it's kind of back -- it's back about five or six page where that spreadsheet starts if you want to take an additional look at that.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. So let me turn to you now, Mr. Agner. Let's talk specifically about the public noticing processes that were followed for purposes of this hearing today.

Has Selma Energy Center provided public notice of the application as required by Chairman Stafford's procedural order dated September 10, 2024?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. So just to refresh everyone's memory, the CEC application was filed on September 4, 2024. Shortly after the CEC application was filed, we coordinated with two local newspapers that are in the vicinity of the interconnection project, the Casa Grande Dispatch and the Tri-Valley Dispatch.

The notice of hearing was published in the Casa Grande Dispatch on September 10, 2024, and the Tri-Valley Dispatch on September 12, 2024. And those publications were legal advertisements.

Q. Mr. Agner, did you receive affidavits of publication from those newspapers?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, and both affidavits are shown on the right-hand screen.

Q. And are copies of the affidavits themselves included as part of Exhibit SEC-3?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. And Mr. Agner, what is Exhibit SEC-3? Would you

just briefly explain what that exhibit is?

A. (Mr. Agner) So SEC-3 is required as part of the Chairman's procedural order, and we have to summarize all public outreach efforts that have occurred to date for the interconnection project.

So typically we divide it into two sections. We describe the public outreach efforts that were taken place as part of the open house itself that occurs prior to filing the CEC application. And then we talk about the CEC notice of hearing outreach efforts that we conduct as part of the interconnection project.

So we describe both efforts in that single exhibit.

Q. Mr. Agner, back to the newspaper publications, are the Casa Grande Dispatch and the Tri-Valley Dispatch newspapers of general circulation where the interconnection project is located?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, they are.

Q. Did Selma Energy Center make a copy of the application available to the public?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, they did. And it was made available at a couple of locations.

It was made available at the Eloy Public Library, which confirmed receipt on September 16, 2024. And at the Coolidge Public Library, which confirmed

receipt on September 10, 2024.

An electronic copy of the CEC application was also made available on the project website and it was also made available on the Arizona Corporation Commission docket control website.

Q. Mr. Agner, does Exhibit SEC-3 include copies of correspondence from the two libraries acknowledging receipt of the application?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, the correspondence includes confirmation and receipt, and it also confirms that the documents are available for the public to review.

Q. Mr. Agner, was a copy of the transcript from the prefiling conference made available to the public at the city of Eloy public library and the city of Coolidge public library?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. And they were also posted on the project website.

Q. What affected jurisdictions did Selma Energy Center identify in this case?

A. (Mr. Agner) So I believe we touched upon this a little bit earlier, but to refresh everyone's memory, the affected jurisdictions include Pima County, the city of Coolidge, the Arizona Department of Transportation, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, and the Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District.

CHMN STAFFORD: Which county?

MR. AGNER: Pinal County.

CHMN STAFFORD: I could have sworn you said Pima County.

MR. AGNER: Maybe. It's starting to get a little bit later in the day, so very well could have, but I meant Pinal County.

BY MR. CROCKETT:

Q. All right. And was the notice of this hearing provided to the entities on the list of affected jurisdictions as required by the chairman's procedural order?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. The affected jurisdictions were provided copies of the notice of hearing via certified mail and those were mailed out on September 4, 2024.

Q. Mr. Agner, is Exhibit SEC-11 a copy of the notice of service to affected jurisdictions that was filed in this docket on October 4, 2024?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. And does that filing include the signed green card that came back from each of those affected jurisdictions?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. Has Selma Energy Center received any opposition

to its application from any of the affected jurisdictions?

A. (Mr. Agner) No, they have not.

Q. Did Selma Energy Center provide a copy of the application and the notice of hearing and related documents to Tucson Electric Power and SunZia Transmission, LLC?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. A copy of the CEC application and the notice of hearing were provided to the attorneys for Tucson Electric Power and SunZia Transmission.

Q. To your knowledge, Mr. Agner, has any person or entity sought to intervene in this proceeding?

A. (Mr. Agner) No. But I will note that Tucson Electric Power did attend the prehearing conference.

Q. Do you know whether or not Tucson Electric Power subsequently made a decision not to appear today at this hearing?

A. (Mr. Agner) They chose not to intervene. And that's evident by the fact that they did not provide any intervention prior to us giving this testimony.

Q. Did Selma Energy Center also send a newsletter announcing this CEC hearing?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. So the applicant did send a newsletter announcing the CEC hearing. And that letter included some project description information. It

included the CEC docket and case number. It provided detailed CEC hearing information. It provided the project website. And it also included the CEC corridor map.

And that letter was mailed out on September 17, 2024, and it was mailed out to the same mailing list that was used for the open house invitation mailing list.

Q. Mr. Agner, did representatives of Selma Energy Center attend a prefiling conference with Chairman Stafford on August 29, 2024?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. Was one of the topics covered at that prefiling conference the location of signs that would be posted along the proposed gen-tie route notifying the public of the project and the hearing?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. Was a map of that -- of those proposed sign locations prepared and presented to Chairman Stafford at that prefiling conference?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, it was.

Q. Okay. How did you -- and the slide we see on the screen now, is that a photo of the signs that were placed for this project?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. So each of the three signs installed, you can see on the right-hand screen there

were three signs installed, and they correspond to the map that's all the way to the left that calls out each sign location. And these signs were installed on September 13, 2024.

Q. And Mr. Agner, how were the sign locations selected?

A. (Mr. Agner) So we chose these sign locations to maximize the visibility to the public of seeing the signs. So these sign locations are near well-traveled roadways within the interconnection project vicinity.

Q. And are these sign locations consistent with what was approved by Chairman Stafford at the prefiling conference?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, these are the same locations.

Q. Does Exhibit SEC-3 include photos of the signs as they were posted along the interconnection route?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, it does.

Q. Mr. Agner, could you please describe the social media efforts that Selma Energy Center undertook as part of this CEC hearing process?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes. So as was described previously, the applicant created a Facebook page for this project. As part of the CEC hearing, they created an additional announcement on the Facebook page to announce the CEC hearing that included a link to the

project website to get more information.

This announcement and the Facebook page was boosted to the three ZIP Codes that intersect the study area for the interconnection project. And just for the committee's benefit, the three areas of the ZIP Codes that intersect the study area are Eloy, Coolidge and Casa Grande, so all three of those zip code areas had this advertisement boosted to that area.

And just to give you some metrics for that. It was boosted from October 1 to October 14. And during this boosting period, there were 90,528 accounts reached. There were 260,273 impressions. And there were 21 clicks on the prehearing Facebook post.

Q. Mr. Agner, has the applicant kept its project website updated throughout the progression of this case?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes, it has. As part of the project website update the applicant created a dedicated CEC page. And on that CEC hearing page, there was a number of different documents and information available.

It included the CEC application, the prefiling transcript and exhibits, the notice of hearing, the route tour and itinerary map, and it also provided detailed information about the CEC hearing itself, how to view the CEC hearing, and provided the call-in information for the public comment period, as well as the Zoom information

for that public comment period.

Q. Mr. Agner, from your perspective, has the public outreach process and then the subsequent public notification process with regard to this hearing been comprehensive and robust?

A. (Mr. Agner) Yes.

Q. Anything else to -- I'll ask Ms. Johnson and Mr. Agner, anything else to add on public outreach before we wrap this section up?

A. (Mr. Agner) Nothing from me unless there's any questions from the committee.

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman Stafford, that completes the public outreach part of our presentation today. We're next ready to move into the environmental studies that support the application.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Let's see, we've been going for approximately 90 minutes. Let's take a short 10 to 15-minute recess. And then I think it's a good stopping point for the day in terms of your direct presentation. I think when we come back from the break we'll need to discuss the proposed tour itinerary and route and discuss amongst the members whether they think a tour would be beneficial to us or not.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay.

CHMN STAFFORD: That will be a decision we

must reach prior to breaking around five p.m. and then coming back at 5:30 for the public comment.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. And Chairman Stafford, for the benefit of the committee members, the route tour map and proposed itinerary for the tour are Exhibit SEC-8.

MR. AGNER: And there's also hard copies of the binder on each side of the table. They're the unmarked binders and you can get hard copies through those binders.

MR. CROCKETT: These right here.

CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent. We stand in recess.

(Recess from 4:40 p.m. to 4:52 p.m.)

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

Mr. Crockett, I believe SEC-8 is the proposed route tour and itinerary.

MR. CROCKETT: Correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Did you want to talk us through it a little bit?

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. Actually, I will be happy to do that.

We had provided a copy of this as one of the prehearing exhibits that you had seen previously, but

what we have is a proposed route tour itinerary that would take us from the hotel here at 9 a.m. down to the site where I think there's three stops that would be planned. We estimate that roundtrip we're probably looking something around three hours to do the tour.

There's -- we have a tour itinerary and then a route map that shows the stops.

It's pretty much straight up and down State Route 87. We've seen a lot of that today on the maps and on the virtual tour. So we're prepared; we've got a bus that's available to take the committee members and the applicant on the tour tomorrow. But don't know necessarily that we need to take a tour unless, of course, the committee believes they'd benefit from seeing this live and in person.

CHMN STAFFORD: Members, what are your thoughts on an actual tour?

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: I would like to -- there's really a lot to see, it appears, and I would like to have a tour.

CHMN STAFFORD: Any other member with thoughts on a tour?

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I feel the

same way. I could drive out there tomorrow on my lunch hour if it's voted down, but --

CHMN STAFFORD: Would you like to take a tour as well?

MEMBER LITTLE: Yes.

MEMBER MERCER: Me too.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. I think there's enough support on the committee to do an actual physical tour, so the plan will be to meet in here at nine o'clock. We'll go on the record, establish that we're going on the tour, and then we'll load up on the bus. I assume it will be out front here or will it be out at the other building where we were.

MR. CROCKETT: I don't know for sure. Mr. Agner, do we have that detail at the moment?

MR. AGNER: No. We only told the bus to be here around I believe 8 to 8:30. Where exactly it's going to be, I don't think we gave them that detail, but they will be here at the Francisco Grande Hotel.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. And Chairman Stafford, I don't know that there's a need for us to come over to this building first. So perhaps we could have the bus meet at the -- outside the front doors of the lobby where you checked in at nine a.m.

CHMN STAFFORD: That'll work. I guess

we'll need to set up the court reporter in that lobby, go on the record, establish we're going on the tour and then get on the bus. That'll work fine. So we'll plan, we'll meet at nine a.m. in the lobby to the hotel building where we check in at. And then we'll start the tour from there.

MR. CROCKETT: And we'll have extra copies of the tour itinerary and the map in the event that anyone from the public is interested in following along.

CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

MEMBER GOLD: Having looked at the tour route, we don't seem to be going to the residential area. That's a couple streets away. Is there a possibility since we're going on this tour that we could divert to that residential area?

MR. CROCKETT: I think that as you go on the tour, you can see -- it's pretty wide, open area. I think you'll be able to see what you want to see. I'd be a little concerned about the fact that we have a route map and itinerary that we've published and the public to the extent they want to follow along might get lost if we stray from the proposed route. That's my thinking on it.

MEMBER GOLD: I would just suggest that we

give them a little extra so they don't have to worry about straying because there is a residential area and I read that one individual's comments.

And I would like to see what it might look like from his residential area, right now looking at the area he seems to have a concern about. And if he shows up tonight, that would be nice. I'll ask him if he wouldn't mind. But if he doesn't show up tonight I'm perfectly happy actually sleeping through it, but of course I will go along with this.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, we'll accommodate the committee's wishes, of course. That's up to the chairman in terms of whether we add a stop or something.

I don't recall if we know the person with the comment. Do we know the address of that person where they're located? Mr. Agner, do you recall?

MR. AGNER: I would have to do a little bit of digging to see if that person left their address. But I can try to look and see if they left their address when they left their comment. Or if they -- if they left their name, and we know that we have their mailing address from the mailing list that we used. It might be possible, but I would have to look into it.

MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, my comment would be that if he doesn't show up tonight I have no

desire to see what his house looks like. I just -- it seems to be off the beaten path far enough away from your project. But if he does come tonight I would like to see if there's possible impact. If he doesn't come tonight I have no desire to look.

CHMN STAFFORD: Where do you think -- which residence are you speaking about, the top?

MEMBER GOLD: That seems to be the only residential area that I see any possibility of a home, a ranch, a something, just something there.

CHMN STAFFORD: Well, I think --

MEMBER GOLD: But if he doesn't show up, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't care less. If he comes tonight and expresses an interest that he has a problem with the view from his house, I would be curious, because from what I see here, there are power transmission lines bordering -- almost bordering his property, which is at least a half a mile away or a mile away from this project.

CHMN STAFFORD: Well, looking at the map, it looks like we'll drive past that if it's to the north because that's how we're --

MEMBER GOLD: Well, if we're going down State Route 87, it's going to be one, two -- two square -- I'm guessing they're grid squares, I'm

guessing, you know, 1,000 meters. But it's going to be, you know, almost a mile away if my -- let me look at that. 1,000 feet. 1,000 feet. 2,000. 1,000, 2,000 could be 2 to 3,000 feet away from where they're going to run their proposed line. You know, that's almost half a mile.

But, again --

CHMN STAFFORD: I think we're stuck with the route and the stops we've already noticed. So I think -- but I'm looking at the -- if you look at the tour itinerary, we'll drive pretty close to that area because we'll be going down Steele Road, wouldn't we, Mr. Crockett?

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman, I don't know. Let me ask Ms. Johnson. Do you know as we're going from the hotel as we go east, we're on 287 according to this map here.

CHMN STAFFORD: And that'll drive right past the area you're talking about, Member Gold.

MR. CROCKETT: It seems like it would.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

MEMBER GOLD: Oh, I see.

CHMN STAFFORD: Right, as you can see --

MEMBER GOLD: This was the area I --

CHMN STAFFORD: We'll drive right past it.

MEMBER GOLD: If we go down Laughlin Road, we will, Mr. Chairman, but not if we go down State Route 287.

CHMN STAFFORD: I thought you were talking about the area near Sunset Lane.

MEMBER GOLD: No, I'm talking the area by Carter Lane and Laughlin Road. That would correspond to what I see on the map on this side, Carter Lane and Laughlin Road. That appears to be an area that could be, you know, somebody living there. The other areas don't.

MR. CROCKETT: I see what Member Gold is talking about. I mean, on the existing land use map, figure A-2, it does show that State Route 287 is north of Laughlin.

Maybe, I might suggest we see whether someone shows up tonight to speak to that. And then we can see if anyone from the public shows up tomorrow to go on the tour. If no one from the public is following us, then I don't know why we couldn't add a stop or two at the committee -- at the chairman's discretion.

CHMN STAFFORD: Right. I think if we're going to do to that, we should probably announce that at the beginning if we're going to add a -- I guess what we would do on the way back instead of coming all the way to SR 287, we could take a detour from stop 3 down Laughlin

Road and back up to the 287. That would drive us right past the area that Member Gold's asking about. Because we'd take the 287 out there and then turn south and then that's how I'm interpreting the lines on the map of the route.

MR. CROCKETT: Can I, Mr. Agner --

MR. AGNER: If I can -- maybe this will help provide some clarity. So the commenter that provided concerns about the visual and the wildlife impacts, they did leave their address. It is approximately 200 feet north of the intersection of State Route 87 and East Earley Road. We'll be stopping at East Earley Road and State Route 87. So we should be able to see that individual's residential structure from that stop as it's proposed now.

MEMBER GOLD: That would be fine. And, again, my request was conditional upon somebody showing up tonight to voice their opinion.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I would like to respectfully request that we not make it conditional upon that person showing up. They might have something else going on. They might have an emergency. It's a ways to drive over here from Coolidge. He did express a concern

in his comment and that needs to be considered in my opinion.

CHMN STAFFORD: Right, but that's --

MEMBER GOLD: Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: -- but his residence will be visible from stop number 3?

MEMBER LITTLE: Correct.

MR. AGNER: Stop number 2, Mr. Chairman, yes, his residence is approximately 200 to 250 feet north of that stop.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So we'll be able to see from his perspective on this tour.

MR. AGNER: Yes. Because it's -- it's open view from that stop. We should be able to see his residence.

MEMBER GOLD: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I defer to Toby's request and I would go along with that.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So we won't need to add any additional stops or routes then, because that was the point you wanted to see most and that's -- we will be going there. So, all right. Anything further before we recess until public comment? Mr. Crockett, anything else we need to address before we break?

MR. CROCKETT: Nothing at this time.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And you have the

public comment signup sheets in the lobby here?

MR. CROCKETT: They're already in place over here on this table.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. All right. With that, let's stand in recess until 5:30.

(Recess from 5:06 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.)

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

Now is the time set for public comment on the application of Selma Solar, line siting case 237.

Currently, there are no members of the public in person to make comment, and there are no members of the public on the Webex.

So we will go off the record and wait for someone to show up to make public comment. If they do, we will go back on the record and take their comment. Otherwise, we will be here till six o'clock to allow people the opportunity to make public comment.

Let's go off the record.

(Recess from 5:30 p.m. to 6:01 p.m.)

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

It is now 6:01, and no members of the public have shown up to give public comment or called in or come in on the Webex.

So with that, we will recess the hearing until tomorrow morning at nine. We will convene in the lobby of the hotel, the one where the check-in desk is at, the nine-story building. And the bus will be out front, and we load up from there to take the tour.

With that, we stand in recess until the morning.

(Proceedings recessed at 6:01 p.m.)

STATE OF ARIZONA )
)
COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

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

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

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

Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, October 25, 2024.

JENNIFER HONN, RPR
Arizona Certified Reporter
No. 50885

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

GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
Arizona Registered Firm
No. R1035