

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

BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT  
AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE

In the matter of the Application of )  
Tucson Electric Power Company, in ) DOCKET NO.  
conformance with the requirements of ) L-00000C-21-0288-  
A.R.S. § 40-360, et seq., for a ) 00192  
Certificate of Environmental )  
Compatibility authorizing the Kino to )  
DeMoss-Petrie 138 kilovolt (kV) ) CASE NO. 192  
Transmission Line Project, which )  
includes the construction of a new )  
138 kV transmission line originating )  
at the existing Kino Substation )  
(Section 30, Township 14 South, )  
Range 14 East), with an )  
interconnection at the planned Vine )  
Substation (Section 06, Township 14 )  
South, Range 14 East), and )  
terminating at the existing )  
DeMoss-Petrie Substation (Section 35, )  
Township 13 South, Range 13 East), )  
each located within the City of )  
Tucson, Pima County, Arizona. ) PREFILING  
CONFERENCE

At: Phoenix, Arizona  
Date: July 22, 2021  
Filed: August 18, 2021

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

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

By: Colette E. Ross, CR  
Certified Reporter  
Certificate No. 50658

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

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED
1	Slide Deck Presentation of Project	6

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and  
2 numbered matter came on regularly to be heard via  
3 videoconference before the Arizona Power Plant and  
4 Transmission Line Siting Committee, 1200 West Washington  
5 Street, Phoenix, Arizona, commencing at 3:05 p.m. on the  
6 22nd of July, 2021.

7  
8 BEFORE: THOMAS K. CHENAL, Chairman

9 APPEARANCES:

10 For the Applicant:

11 SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.  
12 By Mr. Matt Derstine  
13 One Arizona Center  
14 400 East Van Buren, Suite 1900  
15 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

16 and

17 TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY  
18 By Ms. Megan Hendrickson  
19 88 East Broadway Boulevard  
20 Tucson, Arizona 85701

21 ALSO PRESENT:

22 Mr. Eric Raatz, Manager, Operations Planning, TEP  
23 Ms. Renee Darling, Transmission and Distribution  
24 Supervisor, Land Resources, TEP  
25 Mr. Ed Beck, Consulting General, Energy Resources  
Ms. Gourjia Odisho, Paralegal  
Mr. Max Carpinelli, Arizona Corporation Commission,  
Legal Division  
Ms. Kate Kane, Arizona Corporation Commission,  
Legal Division  
Mr. Tod Brewer, Assistant to Chairman Chenal

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Good afternoon, everyone. This  
2 is the time set for the prefiling conference in the Kino  
3 to DeMoss-Petrie project.

4 May we have appearances, please.

5 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah. Matt Derstine, Snell &  
6 Wilmer, appearing on behalf of Tucson Electric Power  
7 Company. And with me is Gourjia Odisho, also, a  
8 paralegal, on behalf of Tucson Electric Power.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Nice to see you again,  
10 Ms. Odisho.

11 Still on mute, Ms. Hendrickson.

12 MS. HENDRICKSON: Sorry. Megan Hendrickson on  
13 behalf of Tucson Electric.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you.

15 And I see the normal -- thank you, Colette, for  
16 being at this one. I see Mr. Beck is here. I see  
17 Mr. Raatz and Ms. Darling of the normal crew for these  
18 hearings.

19 Just a quick question. We have been meeting  
20 remotely, or by Zoom if you will, virtually for these  
21 hearings that lead up to, you know, the actual hearing  
22 itself. I am perfectly happy to continue doing that. I  
23 think it is probably more convenient for you. But I  
24 would like someone just to confirm that, if you prefer  
25 to meet in person. Mr. Beck can drive to Phoenix; we

1 can do that. But I assume you and Ms. Hendrickson and  
2 your other team there would prefer to be able to do it  
3 like this. Is that true?

4 MR. BECK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think from our  
5 perspective it is much more efficient for us to do this  
6 via Zoom.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: I know, I mean, a little about  
8 this case. So I am going to ask you, let's think about  
9 it as this hearing goes on, and if I forget to,  
10 remind -- you know, please ask me to cover it with you.

11 But certainly the prefiling, we are doing this  
12 by Zoom. If you think there is a benefit to some, not  
13 necessarily all, but some appearing here in person, you  
14 know, given the level possibly of interest in this case,  
15 maybe that's something we should think about. I am not  
16 suggesting that people in Tucson need to come up, but  
17 maybe the people that are already here in Phoenix, you  
18 know, we have a, you know, a very large conference  
19 room -- this room expands to another room the same  
20 size -- if we are going to have a lot of intervenors,  
21 that just might be easier to handle in person than, you  
22 know, by Zoom. I throw that out. We can just chat  
23 about that before the hearing is over when we talk about  
24 dates for the prehearing conference.

25 MR. DERSTINE: Sure.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. So let's, let's talk  
2 about the applicant and the project description, and  
3 then we will get into the level of interest, if you  
4 will, about the project.

5 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah. I think, I think you have  
6 before you, we have some, a slide deck that was  
7 prepared. I don't -- I think Mr. Raatz is prepared to  
8 kind of walk you through kind of an overview or project  
9 description and some of the background and information,  
10 if that's a good place to start.

11 And if you want to, I don't know if for the  
12 court reporter, want to mark that entire deck as an  
13 exhibit, that covers some of the topics in your outline  
14 but it is all collected there in one, in one document.  
15 We can break it up, whatever your preference.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's mark it, Colette, let's  
17 make this Exhibit 1 to the prefiling conference.

18 THE REPORTER: Okay.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you.

20 Mr. Raatz.

21 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Would you like  
22 me to share my screen as well or just kind of walk you  
23 through it?

24 CHMN. CHENAL: I have a very nice color printout  
25 of it. So I would rather look at the people than --

1 MR. RAATZ: Got you.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: -- the screen with a document on  
3 it.

4 MR. RAATZ: Understood.

5 So looking at Slide 2, page 2, you can see the  
6 purple block, the purple line that represents the study  
7 area that was developed for this project. And just to  
8 note, kind of in the center of the study area is where  
9 the University of Arizona is located, just to give you a  
10 frame of reference where we are in Tucson. You can see  
11 on the western edge of that study area is the  
12 Interstate 10.

13 So towards the bottom of the project is the  
14 existing Kino Substation. And this project is the  
15 design and construction of a 138kV single circuit  
16 transmission line connecting the existing Kino  
17 Substation.

18 And then if you will, go to Slide 3, to the  
19 planned Vine Substation shown in the yellow triangle.  
20 And then Slide 4 will take you to the planned  
21 terminating at the, excuse me, existing DeMoss-Petrie  
22 Substation.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Not so fast,  
24 Mr. Raatz.

25 MR. RAATZ: Yep, sorry.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: You just covered three slides  
2 there and I am still looking at the, you know, map and  
3 seeing the U of A and seeing the purple line and trying  
4 to get my bearings how far east and west it extends, and  
5 you are already at the Slide No. 3.

6 MR. RAATZ: Understood. Yes, sir.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Or 4, you are actually at Slide  
8 No. 4.

9 MR. RAATZ: At Slide 4, yes, sir. Understood.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's go back to 2.

11 MS. KANE: Excuse me, Eric. This is Kate Kane.  
12 Max and I don't have a copy of the PowerPoint. It would  
13 be so helpful if we could review it while you are going  
14 over it, if that's possible.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: It is possible. And, I am sorry,  
16 I wasn't aware you did not have that. So let's put it  
17 up on the screen.

18 MR. KANE: No, no, that's okay. Thank you.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: You didn't miss anything. He  
20 went through it so fast, it will be good just to pick it  
21 up slower of round two here.

22 MR. CARPINELLI: I can put my email in chat if  
23 you want.

24 MR. RAATZ: I am trying to figure out how to  
25 share my screen here. And if you could, let me know if

1 you can see the screen okay.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: We have it.

3 MR. RAATZ: Okay. I think I will just start  
4 over again.

5 The purple line represents the study area that  
6 was developed for the project. And just to get a frame  
7 of reference here, right here towards the center of the  
8 study area is the University of Arizona. And the  
9 western edge of the study area, this follows I-10. And  
10 you can see right around down here towards the southern  
11 boundary is the I-10/I-19 interchange. And then this, a  
12 portion of the western boundary, also follows Aviation  
13 Highway located within Tucson. And just about right  
14 here is Campbell Avenue. It is a main thoroughfare in  
15 Tucson, north-south thoroughfare.

16 So located at the bottom of Slide 2 is, the blue  
17 triangle is the existing Kino 138kV substation. So this  
18 project will consist of the design and construction of a  
19 new single circuit 138kV transmission line connecting  
20 the existing Kino Substation, shown here at the bottom  
21 of the study area, and then interconnecting into the  
22 planned Vine Substation located towards the University  
23 of Arizona, and finally terminating at the existing  
24 DeMoss-Petrie Substation located towards the  
25 northwestern portion of the study area.

1            So this project is a continuation of a case that  
2 we had before you, Case No. 178. It was the Irvington  
3 to Kino project. And that will, this project will  
4 provide Kino a looped system. So it will be served from  
5 more than one transmission source, as well as the Vine  
6 Substation will be served from more than one  
7 transmission source.

8            We have an estimated in-service date of 2024.  
9 And the distance, the total project distance is  
10 estimated between seven and eight miles, approximately,  
11 depending upon what route is selected.

12            CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Raatz, can you remind me  
13 where the Irvington was?

14            MR. RAATZ: So the Irvington, Mr. Chairman,  
15 Irvington Substation is located right towards the  
16 bottom, the lower right-hand corner here of the, of the  
17 picture shown.

18            CHMN. CHENAL: All right.

19            MR. RAATZ: And just to also point out some  
20 things, the black and orange dotted line is the existing  
21 Western 115kV system. And then the red lines here are  
22 the existing TEP 138kV transmission system, and the pink  
23 lines are the existing TEP 46kV subtransmission system.

24            MR. BECK: So, Eric, just to maybe touch on that  
25 point, Mr. Chairman, the 115 line that Eric pointed out,

1 that black and yellow slashed line, is the Vail to  
2 Tortolita project that we recently went through with the  
3 Committee.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: Right.

5 MR. RAATZ: In December, yep. Thank you, Ed.

6 So moving on to Slide 5, we will be considering  
7 seven routes in our application.

8 Just to note, the green route here, combining  
9 with the purple route, is Route 5A that was removed from  
10 consideration and announced to the public in October of  
11 2020. It has been added back into the application due  
12 to concerns with Gateway corridor zoning.

13 So the routes that follow from the Kino  
14 Substation --

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Let me stop you there, Mr. Raatz,  
16 just so we have context.

17 MR. RAATZ: Yep.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: First question, why was the  
19 Route 5A -- which is the green and the purple, is that  
20 correct?

21 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Why was it removed from  
23 consideration?

24 MR. RAATZ: After a thorough analysis and  
25 evaluation, it was determined that Route 5 had the most

1 negatives against it as far as when compared with the  
2 other routes. So Route 5A has a more narrow  
3 right-of-way so it makes it more difficult to construct.  
4 There are a lot more conflicts with existing utilities.  
5 There is existing residential properties on both sides  
6 of Route 5A. So after the analysis, it was decided, you  
7 know, it would be best to remove that from consideration  
8 to be included in the application. And it also received  
9 the most negative comments.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: And so, and I want to hear more  
11 about the Gateway corridor zoning and that issue, but  
12 the 5A was added back in because you wanted to have a  
13 certain number of options, is that the reason?

14 MR. RAATZ: Not necessarily, not necessarily a  
15 certain number of options, Mr. Chairman.

16 So the Gateway corridor zoning has, it is an  
17 overlay zone within the Unified, or Uniform Development  
18 Code within the City of Tucson. And it has requirements  
19 that may cause our preferred route, which is Route 1B  
20 shown in the blue line, to be underground. And so we  
21 wanted to offer another option that would not have  
22 undergrounding associated with it.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. So the, your Route 1B is  
24 your preferred route. And that's the one in light blue?

25 MR. RAATZ: Yes, sir, light blue from the Kino

1 Substation, and then it is, I guess, like a reddish  
2 color.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. And that's the,  
4 that's the preferred route. And that -- so where is the  
5 Gateway corridor in relation to Route 1B?

6 MR. RAATZ: Well, Route 1B, the Gateway  
7 corridor, is all along Kino and extending all the way up  
8 to Campbell Avenue. So it would go from Kino all the  
9 way to Campbell Avenue.

10 Route B, itself, the B portion, is not in a  
11 Gateway corridor. However, if we wanted to avoid the  
12 other routing on Route 5, we would not be able to put  
13 two circuits on this portion. So, therefore, we chose A  
14 in order to avoid the Gateway corridor entirely.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. So let's stay with the  
16 Gateway for a minute.

17 MR. RAATZ: Yep.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: The Gateway includes what? Which  
19 of those routes, which of the routes that are listed on  
20 this Slide 5 are impacted by the Gateway corridor?

21 MR. RAATZ: So, Mr. Chairman, it would be  
22 Route 1, which --

23 CHMN. CHENAL: 1A and 1B?

24 MR. RAATZ: Well, yes, sir. Yes, sir, 1A and  
25 1B.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: All right.

2 MR. RAATZ: And also 2A and 2B, and also 1D and  
3 2D.

4 MR. BECK: Mr. Chairman just for clarity, the  
5 Gateway route designation applies to Campbell Avenue,  
6 which is that portion that he is showing you right now  
7 with the hand, and then Kino Boulevard, which was the  
8 portion, the southern portion of this. So those two  
9 segments are what are identified as Gateway routes  
10 within the City of Tucson planning process.

11 And just for your information, and you will hear  
12 lots about it, lots about it in the case, the issue of a  
13 Gateway route corridor designation is something that  
14 came out very recently between us and the City of  
15 Tucson, a couple individuals in the City. So it is kind  
16 of an obscure rule within the Uniform Development Code  
17 of the City. And it wasn't brought to our attention  
18 until recently. And throughout the process we had been  
19 having meetings with city personnel, and none of them  
20 had raised this issue. So it is relatively new. There  
21 is at least one council member who has raised it in  
22 public sessions.

23 And so now it is something that this, the public  
24 is seeing as a potential avenue to slow the project  
25 down, if not move it or cause it to go underground. And

1 because we didn't have options that were -- that didn't  
2 include the Gateway corridor, that's why we added back  
3 5A into the process.

4 One of the reasons it was eliminated, you had  
5 asked the question why it was eliminated early on, that  
6 was part of our public outreach process. We had a  
7 community working group as well as our public meetings  
8 where we were getting a lot of feedback from the  
9 neighborhoods and people that lived along that 5A  
10 routing. And because there were so many negatives for  
11 the project from a construction perspective and  
12 right-of-way and so on, that's why we had dropped it.  
13 And of course when it got dropped, that portion of the  
14 public kind of backed away or dropped out of the  
15 project -- the discussions regarding the project,  
16 because they felt they didn't need to worry about it.

17 So we are bringing it back in. We know that  
18 public is not going to be real happy with it, but we are  
19 trying to be sure they are fully aware of that through  
20 our continuing public process so that they can provide  
21 comment and/or show up at the hearings to voice their  
22 opinions.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: And 5A, Mr. Beck, still does,  
24 still lies within the corridor, at least some of the  
25 portion of it, is that correct?

1 MR. BECK: There is actually only a short  
2 segment along Broadway that is in a Gateway corridor  
3 designation because Broadway also is a designated  
4 Gateway corridor, or route. So it is that --

5 MS. DARLING: Can I jump in for a sec?

6 The portion between Thirty -- or Silverbell and  
7 just north of Aviation where you are seeing all three  
8 colors, blue, orange, and green, together, that's  
9 actually coming up Cherrybell Stravenue to Cherry and  
10 then crossing over Aviation. So it is actually not, I  
11 know the lines are just so close together, it is not  
12 actually in the Kino or Campbell corridor. It is one  
13 street to the east of that corridor.

14 So I think that's what you were asking about,  
15 Mr. Chairman.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, it is, because I guess I  
17 misunderstood where -- I see to the north where the  
18 corridor extends, but I guess I wasn't clear how far  
19 south it extended and whether --

20 MS. DARLING: Yes, it extends all the way from  
21 Benson Highway, which is on the other side of I-10, to  
22 River Road. So all the way Kino and Campbell is  
23 considered a Gateway route.

24 And then Ed just mentioned Broadway. Broadway  
25 Boulevard is also a Gateway route running east-west.

1 And we are on Broadway for 1400 feet. So if 5A were  
2 selected, we would have to possibly, you know,  
3 underground that 1400 feet. But it is a lot less than  
4 four miles.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: I got that. Now let's go south  
6 again to the south portion.

7 MS. DARLING: Yes.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: So the blue line is within the --  
9 it is hard for me to see --

10 MS. DARLING: I know.

11 CHMN. CHENAL: -- the color and then the number.  
12 So I am going to look at the colors.

13 From Kino Substation north, the blue line is  
14 within the Gateway corridor, is that correct?

15 MS. DARLING: Entirely between 36th Street and  
16 Elm, yes.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: I just don't know where Elm and  
18 32nd Street split.

19 MS. DARLING: Elm is where it is turning to go  
20 west into the Vine Substation and 36th is at Kino sub.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: So, yes, it is within the  
22 corridor.

23 MS. DARLING: Yes --

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay.

25 MS. DARLING: -- entirely.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: So, yes, the blue line is in the  
2 corridor.

3 Now let's move a little east of the orange line,  
4 if that's the orange line. Is the orange line from Kino  
5 north -- what part of that is in the Gateway?

6 MS. DARLING: From where it is parallel to the  
7 green where the green line takes off to the west, both  
8 the orange -- the orange line is in the corridor from  
9 that north.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Got it.

11 And then so here is my question. Then the green  
12 line comes north and --

13 MS. DARLING: It is not at all, yeah, it is not  
14 at all in the corridor, the Gateway route corridor in  
15 this area, but it is on Broadway.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: I understand that. But stay with  
17 the -- it seems like all those lines converge at the  
18 same place where I thought you had said that's where the  
19 corridor existed the entire blue line was in it, and --

20 MS. DARLING: I understand. Where the three are  
21 parallel to each other, it is just that the map scale is  
22 so bad that the blue line is actually on Kino, but the  
23 green and orange lines are one street east of Kino.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Got it. Okay.

25 MS. DARLING: Okay.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Now I am clear. I got it. You  
2 can understand why it is a little confusing. But I  
3 understand.

4 MS. DARLING: I understand. We should have it  
5 zoomed in on that for you.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: The bottom line, the lime green  
7 line is only within the corridor 1400 feet of the  
8 northern section around Broadway.

9 MR. RAATZ: That's correct.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. All right. Good. Thank  
11 you.

12 MS. DARLING: And you are circling Helen, by the  
13 way, Eric. It's, the one south of there is Broadway.  
14 That's Helen. Broadway is the next jiggy-jog down  
15 south. But, anyway, yeah.

16 MR. BECK: Mr. Chairman, one other thing you  
17 will hear during the hearing is that we have a couple  
18 other 138kV lines that were built on the so-called  
19 Gateway routes in other areas of the City, that the City  
20 never raised the issue of undergrounding on those  
21 projects, even one relatively recent, our Irvington to  
22 Eastwood.

23 So, while it is, again, I say it was kind of an  
24 obscure thing that we didn't realize until just recently  
25 when somebody at the City brought it up, the City in the

1 past hasn't raised this for previous projects either.  
2 It is just this one has such a large view from the  
3 public that they have taken, I think, a much closer look  
4 at the issues.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, I know it is going to be an  
6 issue in our case.

7 MR. BECK: Yes.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: I know we are going to have to  
9 probably -- I don't know what impact it is going to  
10 have. I, honestly, I just know that it is an issue. It  
11 is probably a complicated issue. And I am not exactly  
12 sure what impact it has.

13 MR. BECK: Well --

14 CHMN. CHENAL: I have to process that through.

15 MR. BECK: -- Mr. Chairman, just so you are  
16 aware of this, and not to get into testimony, but we  
17 have asked the City for a determination on the  
18 applicability of that particular zoning requirement. So  
19 prior to the hearings occurring, we expect to have some  
20 kind of a response back from the City that is their  
21 official position.

22 At this point it is more or less hearsay within  
23 the media where the issue has been raised. We haven't  
24 had a direct response from the City taking a position.  
25 So we requested that in writing, and we expect to get

1 some kind of a position from them prior to our open  
2 meeting -- or our hearings.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, I wasn't going to ask for  
4 an opinion or comment on it today. I am just alerting  
5 you I can see it as a potential issue. We will probably  
6 have to have some briefing on it and, you know, and take  
7 it from there. And I guess that's all there is to say  
8 about it at this time. It would be unfair to address it  
9 substantively at this point, but it is out there and we  
10 will have to look at it.

11 So, okay. So, Mr. Raatz, let's go ahead with  
12 your presentation. You slowed it down sufficiently but  
13 I understand what we covered, which is important.

14 MR. RAATZ: Yeah, very important. Thank you.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: You know, a good lesson to learn  
16 when you live with this for as long as you have, it is  
17 second nature and everything is so obvious and clear to  
18 you, but there are people like us looking at it for the  
19 first time. You have got to kind of lead us by the  
20 hand.

21 MR. RAATZ: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. Is it okay  
22 to move on from this?

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure.

24 MR. RAATZ: Okay. So as stated from Slide 5,  
25 moving onto Slide 6, our preferred route is 1B, shown in

1 the blue and black line interconnecting the Kino  
2 Substation to the Vine Substation and terminating at  
3 the -- whoops, excuse me -- the DeMoss-Petrie  
4 Substation. This route seemed to balance input from the  
5 neighborhoods. It seemed to receive the most liked and  
6 least disliked comments. And it uses the greatest  
7 amount of existing TEP utility corridors.

8 One thing that this project is going to do if  
9 our preferred route is selected, we do have existing  
10 distribution and existing 46kV infrastructure along this  
11 preferred route -- so, for instance, from the turning  
12 point here on Route 1 south to Broadway, we have an  
13 existing distribution line -- TEP will be undergrounding  
14 that distribution line should this route get preferred.  
15 So in a sense it will clean up the area there.

16 And then from the Vine Substation, there is an  
17 existing 46 and existing distribution line that runs  
18 west along the brown line. And then north, continuing  
19 north on the brown line, the existing 46 will be retired  
20 along this area and the distribution and associated  
21 residential service drops will be placed underground,  
22 having the effect -- and we will be doing the same thing  
23 with the communications, working with the communications  
24 companies to make sure we can relocate those utilities  
25 as well.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Just to be clear, you are  
2 undergrounding the distribution, but in its place will  
3 be a 138kV line?

4 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Why wouldn't you just collocate  
6 it? Or is that not possible, transmission/distribution?

7 MR. RAATZ: It is possible. If you collocate it  
8 you open up the -- you have to allow communication  
9 attachments onto the transmission structures. So then  
10 your transmission structures just get a lot larger in  
11 diameter, a lot more costly overall project. And then  
12 it takes out some of the reliability.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: And the undergrounding, is, just  
14 because I know it has always been an issue, is that  
15 being, the cost of that being covered by TEP or is it  
16 going to be by individual -- the neighborhoods, you  
17 know?

18 MR. RAATZ: That cost would be covered by TEP,  
19 Mr. Chairman. It is one of the things that TEP has  
20 offered to help move this project along and provide a  
21 positive impact to the neighborhoods, what TEP feels is  
22 a positive impact to the neighborhoods.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. I understand. Thank you.

24 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Chairman, I guess I just want  
25 to add an overlay to the bullet points that Eric spoke

1 to on the preferred route reasoning. All that being  
2 true, the Sam Hughes neighborhood and a coalition of  
3 other neighborhoods position from the very beginning has  
4 been to push TEP to underground not just the  
5 distribution but the 138kV overhead line. And, so, long  
6 before the issue of whether or not the Gateway ordinance  
7 does or does not require undergrounding of the  
8 transmission line along the Gateway routes, the  
9 neighborhoods have been pushing to have TEP cover the  
10 cost, which is a significant increase in cost, to  
11 underground this project and not build it as an overhead  
12 project. And so that is where we are.

13           And then the issue about the city ordinance and  
14 the Gateway routes and what it requires and doesn't  
15 require is a new development. Certainly it is not the  
16 case that TEP isn't aware of the Gateway ordinance and  
17 isn't aware of Gateway routes. It is and has been. But  
18 this, this position that the UDC, the Uniformed -- the  
19 city ordinance requires undergrounding on Gateway  
20 routes, that is a new development separate and apart or  
21 in addition to the neighborhoods' position that TEP  
22 should simply just cover the cost of the undergrounding  
23 of the project along Kino and Campbell.

24           CHMN. CHENAL: I assume that the cost of the  
25 undergrounding of the distribution system is quite a bit

1 different than the cost of undergrounding the  
2 transmission, the 138kV line.

3 MR. RAATZ: That is correct, Mr. Chairman,  
4 substantially different. The cost for undergrounding  
5 transmission, the biggest cost is in the conductor  
6 itself. And it is a lot more robust of a conductor than  
7 what is required for distribution.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Just, Mr. Derstine's comment, can  
9 you show me on the map? I see where the letter Sam  
10 Hughes and I know the Sam Hughes neighborhood -- well,  
11 maybe it is easier on -- but is that -- tell me again  
12 what road that is on, the blue line, it is located on.

13 MR. RAATZ: That's Campbell Avenue,  
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Campbell. And then Sam Hughes is  
16 to the east of that?

17 MR. RAATZ: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: So this is Campbell that kind of  
19 bisects Sam Hughes on the east side and the University  
20 of Arizona on the west side, is that --

21 MR. RAATZ: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Am I --

23 MR. RAATZ: Yep.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: And the swimming pool, the  
25 swimming pool for the U of A is on the west side of

1 Campbell, and on the east side is the Sam Hughes  
2 neighborhood, correct?

3 MR. RAATZ: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. I know it.

5 MS. DARLING: The plan is to have the line on  
6 the west side.

7 MR. RAATZ: So continuing on, some of the  
8 project benefits --

9 CHMN. CHENAL: One question before you begin  
10 with the benefits. Has the University of Arizona Board  
11 of Regents taken a position with respect to this project  
12 going along Campbell?

13 MR. RAATZ: Mr. Chairman, they are in support of  
14 the project. And they have remained silent as far as  
15 route preference, and they would defer to the process to  
16 determine what route is best to suit the project.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. BECK: Mr. Chairman, just to be clear,  
19 that's the position of the University of Arizona  
20 leadership. I don't know what discussions they have  
21 actually had with the --

22 MS. DARLING: Board of Regents.

23 MR. BECK: -- Board of Regents. But we have had  
24 discussions with the vice -- several vice presidents at  
25 the university.

1           Their initial position was they didn't want the  
2 project on their property. They kind of now conceded  
3 that, if it is going to get built and that's the route  
4 selected, it will need to be on the west side, and they  
5 will live with that.

6           They, of course, have concerns for their campus  
7 and the viewshed and so on. But they also have a vested  
8 interest in getting the project built because it is part  
9 of their longer term goals to get to 100 percent  
10 renewable offsets for their campus.

11           CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Thank you.

12           Go ahead, Mr. Raatz. I am sorry. I interrupted  
13 you with a question. You were about to talk about the  
14 benefits.

15           MR. RAATZ: Thank you. And Mr. Beck just spoke  
16 to one of the benefits. The project has the support of  
17 the University of Arizona and Banner University Medical  
18 Center in support of their growth efforts.

19           This project will mitigate the requirement for  
20 the replacement of aging infrastructure. Currently we  
21 have identified several pieces of equipment on the 46kV  
22 system that need replacement. With this project we  
23 won't have to replace those pieces of equipment and they  
24 will be retired. And as many as up to six to 46 kV  
25 substations would be retired as well.

1           This will provide service for growing midtown  
2 energy needs as well as stable voltage and shorter  
3 outages. Creating that looped system will help provide  
4 a more reliable system.

5           So I think we have a break in the presentation,  
6 Mr. Chairman. I wasn't sure. I do have -- the next  
7 slide following this is the signage, if you would like  
8 to go over that. I don't want --

9           CHMN. CHENAL: I have one question. What,  
10 again, is along Campbell in terms of lines? Are there  
11 distribution lines now? I think that's what you said.

12           MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. From out row  
13 here, just where the Vine Substation is located, at that  
14 intersection of Elm and Campbell, if you travel south on  
15 that to Broadway, I can't remember the distance off the  
16 top of my head, I think it is like a mile and a half,  
17 there is a distribution on the east side --

18           MR. BECK: Just --

19           MR. RAATZ: -- adjacent to the Sam Hughes  
20 neighborhood.

21           MR. BECK: Just for reference purposes, that  
22 turn that Eric pointed to at Elm, that is the  
23 university -- the hospital, the old U of A, now Banner  
24 hospital location.

25           CHMN. CHENAL: All right, okay. Right. Okay,

1 thank you. That clarifies that.

2 So on the east side of Campbell, the area around  
3 Sam Hughes, there is also -- is it a 69kV distribution  
4 system or --

5 MR. RAATZ: It is actually a 4kV distribution  
6 system. And this project, with the addition of the Vine  
7 Substation, will upgrade it from 4kV to 13.8kV. But it  
8 would be placed underground if the preferred route is  
9 selected.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. And then right now the  
11 tops of the poles for the existing distribution system  
12 versus the probable pole height for this, the 138kV,  
13 what would be the relevant difference with the heights?

14 MR. RAATZ: The heights for the distribution --

15 CHMN. CHENAL: The existing.

16 MR. DERSTINE: Pardon me?

17 CHMN. CHENAL: The existing right now.

18 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the heights, I am  
19 just ballparking, I would say would be 40 feet, 35 to 40  
20 feet above grade. And for the planned transmission will  
21 range between 75 and 120 feet above grade. But the  
22 average height above grade would be roughly around 92  
23 and a half feet. The 120 feet, there is only several  
24 locations where we have to maintain clearance  
25 requirements, and so we would require taller structures

1 at those locations.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. So rough rule of thumb, a  
3 little more than double the existing height.

4 MR. RAATZ: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Or a little over 90. Well --

6 MR. RAATZ: Yeah.

7 MR. BECK: By the same token, Mr. Chairman, the  
8 number of poles will be approximately half the number of  
9 the distribution poles because our spans are longer on  
10 transmission. So, while the structures are going to be  
11 taller, there will be less of them. So the visual  
12 impact, at least in my eyes, the visual impact for the  
13 removed distribution greatly outweighs the fact that you  
14 are adding in a transmission line. And we will have, of  
15 course, all the visuals to show that in the hearing.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Thank you.

17 MS. KANE: Mr. Chairman, this is Kate Kane --

18 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, sir.

19 MS. KANE: -- with the Commission. I just want  
20 to clarify because I have heard it both ways. Is it  
21 138kV or is it 13.8kV? Because if it is starting at 4,  
22 I just want to know how much of a greater amount we are  
23 dealing with.

24 MR. RAATZ: So the, the existing distribution is  
25 4kV and this project will upgrade it to 13.8kV. And

1 that's a distribution. And so the overall project,  
2 though, what we are going to be constructing and getting  
3 sited, is the 138kV, 138 kilovolt transmission line.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: So the distribution system --

5 MS. KANE: So it is just like the --

6 CHMN. CHENAL: So the distribution system that's  
7 now 4kV will be increased to 13.8kV and undergrounded.  
8 And then this transmission line connecting Kino to  
9 Petrie, DeMoss-Petrie Substation will be a 138kV  
10 transmission line that will have poles approximately  
11 average 90 feet in the area?

12 MR. RAATZ: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: Sorry, Ms. Kane. Go ahead if you  
14 have a question. Ms. Kane, if you have --

15 MS. KANE: Okay. So from Kino to Vine is going  
16 to be 13.8, but the entirety of it is going to be 138?

17 MR. RAATZ: Yep. The entire, the whole project  
18 is 138 kilovolts. And there is an existing distribution  
19 system that we are going to be replacing and upgrading  
20 is all. But that's just an aside. The whole project  
21 that the CEC will cover would be the 138kV transmission  
22 line for the entire length from Kino Substation to the  
23 planned Vine Substation to the existing DeMoss-Petrie  
24 Substation.

25 MS. KANE: Okay, thank you. Thank you so much

1 for clarifying.

2 MR. RAATZ: Yes. Sorry.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Go ahead, Mr. --

4 MR. RAATZ: So, yes, Mr. Chairman, so we are at  
5 a break in here. And I do have, the next slide after,  
6 following this, is the signage --

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay.

8 MR. RAATZ: -- if you would like to go on with  
9 that, if that would be okay.

10 So, Mr. Chairman, we have 25 total signs to be  
11 placed as indicated by the stars here. And, to the  
12 extent possible, we are going to place these on existing  
13 structures to help -- you know, there is always the  
14 issue with procuring the permits. So we have located  
15 and identified existing several transmission poles or  
16 the walls of existing substations where we will be  
17 placing the signage.

18 Signs will be typical from what we have used in  
19 the standard. I think it is three-foot by four foot  
20 signs.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: That will contain what  
22 information?

23 MR. RAATZ: It will contain the, all of the  
24 Notice of Hearing information, how to -- the dates of  
25 the hearing, the location of the hearing, as well as how

1 to attend virtually, and the docket number assigned to  
2 the case.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: And a link for online  
4 information?

5 MR. RAATZ: That is correct, yes, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Good. Sounds good.

7 While we are on the topic, what about  
8 publishing? It will be in the Tucson Daily Star?

9 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have two  
10 dates selected so far. And I believe those dates, the  
11 first publishing would be August 18th. And I believe  
12 that it falls within the 10-day window. And the second  
13 would be August, Sunday, August 22nd. And that does  
14 fall outside of the 10-day window. And I just wanted to  
15 confirm if that would be acceptable with you,  
16 Mr. Chairman, as long as we were to get one of the  
17 publishings within that 10-day window.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: I mean we have allowed it in the  
19 past where it had to be done like that. But we are so  
20 far from the hearing, is there not a way to do it to  
21 have both within the 10-day period? I mean we will turn  
22 around the Notice of Hearing the day we get it certainly  
23 for this project.

24 I raise it only because I don't want to have  
25 someone try to make an argument later that somehow, you

1 know, the notice was not adequate. It is more of an  
2 issue for you than it is for me. I just -- I mean a  
3 project of this size, if you could get them both within  
4 the 10-day period I think would be less risky.

5 MS. HENDRICKSON: Chairman, this is Megan. Can  
6 you hear me?

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

8 MS. HENDRICKSON: Sorry. I have been having  
9 issues with my phone and my laptop.

10 But we can get it in the 10-day window. We, you  
11 know -- thank you for clarifying that. And I agree  
12 about the being cautiousness situation.

13 If we provide you a draft early, would there be  
14 a way to work on the language and then have a, you know,  
15 most of the language solidified prior? Because I think  
16 that's our issue. Our gentleman who works at the  
17 newspaper said that the latest really we could get it in  
18 by the 18th is if we would be able to have close to  
19 final language by the 8th of August.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: We can do that. And we did  
21 recently --

22 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: -- in another case where we  
24 actually worked out the language. And it actually, I  
25 think we were filed but it had a -- we postdated it. I

1 think we postdated it, and it worked fine.

2 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay. We have a draft ready.

3 MS. DARLING: I am sorry to ask this during this  
4 call, but I thought, I thought that he needed the  
5 language by the 8th to get it in on the 18th. So if we  
6 are having to do two in 10 days, then there would be one  
7 prior to the 18th, which would be the Sunday prior to  
8 the 18th. And because Arizona Daily Star requires so  
9 much prenotice, I don't think we can do two in 10 days,  
10 honestly, because he was saying he needed the language  
11 on the 8th for the 18th. Am I wrong on that?

12 MR. RAATZ: He said actually on the 6th, Renee.  
13 He needs close to --

14 MS. DARLING: 6th. I read it wrong.

15 MR. RAATZ: -- final wordage by the 6th. And  
16 so --

17 MS. DARLING: For the 18th is my point.

18 MR. RAATZ: Yes, that is correct.

19 MS. DARLING: Yeah.

20 MR. RAATZ: Yes, that is correct.

21 So one, one way as well that we are going to  
22 notice this, we are creating Facebook ads as well as  
23 Instagram ads, and an email blaster for notice of  
24 hearing. So we are going to obtain all of the email  
25 addresses for all the people within the study area that

1 have it on record on our -- on their billing record, and  
2 then create a email blaster notifying people of the  
3 hearing.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, we will get to that. But we  
5 are talking about the legal notice the statutes require.  
6 And so I guess the next question I have is: Is there  
7 another newspaper of general circulation in the Tucson  
8 area that would qualify like we have up here?

9 MS. DARLING: I don't think we, I don't think we  
10 have any others anymore.

11 MS. HENDRICKSON: No. And, Chairman, I think  
12 what we always try to do is do it on a Wednesday and  
13 then on Sunday for the widest circulation.

14 So to the extent we are running up on a time  
15 frame issue and getting that to them on time, again, we  
16 have, like you were saying, enough time now and we have  
17 the draft ready, so I don't know if it is possible to  
18 get, you know, a version that's acceptable to you, you  
19 know, to them maybe early next week or by the end of  
20 next week. I think that would allow for enough time.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: I can do that. I have to say I  
22 have a hearing next week. But it is not a burden on me.

23 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: We can, by the end of next week,  
25 we can get it back to you. I mean I don't think next

1 week's hearing is going to go all week. It might. But  
2 certainly by next Friday I could definitely have it to  
3 you if you get it to me a few days before that. And if  
4 that, if that would -- you know, that's not a problem.

5 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay. And we actually have it  
6 ready for you today. It is still in draft form, so if  
7 you wanted to look at it.

8 And may I talk about that? I had two questions  
9 for the notice.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure.

11 MS. HENDRICKSON: And it is a little bit  
12 different. I used APS's Notice of Hearing that you  
13 recently did. I think it was Case 190. And I -- you  
14 know, TEP likes to be a little different. So if you  
15 have reasons for doing it a specific way, you will just  
16 notice a listing of the libraries and the project  
17 website is bulleted, and it is a little bit different.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: No problem.

19 MS. HENDRICKSON: And I just wanted to make sure  
20 it was okay. All right.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Form over substance is never a  
22 problem.

23 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay. Well, and then that's  
24 our question. So I can submit that to you today.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. And, actually, if we could

1 at the proper time, Mr. Raatz, after we finish the, talk  
2 about the publishing of it, and then let's talk about  
3 social media. I want to hear a little bit more about  
4 that and develop it. And then let's come back to the  
5 hearing venue and talk about that. We will just -- and  
6 let's talk about the Notice of Hearing itself then,  
7 Ms. Hendrickson, and let's just talk about, you know,  
8 the substance of what it says, you know, the hearing  
9 dates, the location. And I am sure that language would  
10 be fine. And I can, I can postdate that or I can send  
11 it back without a date and let you date it.

12 I guess we need the -- I mean it will be done --  
13 I am thinking out loud for a second, which is a problem.  
14 But we can't really file it until you file the  
15 application because there is no docket until you file  
16 the application. So we are going to have to file it  
17 after the application is filed. But you will already  
18 have it maybe before the application is filed. We will  
19 talk about the dates here, but if you need to get it to  
20 the publishing company, the paper, you know, tell me.  
21 But you might be getting it to them before the  
22 application is filed. Is that a possibility?

23 MS. HENDRICKSON: Eric, correct me when we need  
24 to get it to them by.

25 But, again, if I wasn't clear, I think they just

1 need most of the language finalized to see how big of a  
2 space we will need. So to the extent we are adding, you  
3 know, in your signature and then the docket and date, I  
4 think those are small enough changes that we can do  
5 after we filed and when you actually file it. But to  
6 the extent we have these, you know, the bulk of it done  
7 and finalized, I think that's what they are needing  
8 ahead of time.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: That will not be a problem. And  
10 we will get it back to you.

11 Do you need it signed when we get it back to you  
12 next week or not?

13 MS. HENDRICKSON: No. I will just -- I believe  
14 what we have done in the past is the electronic  
15 signature indication for the newspaper.

16 Ed, you can correct me if I'm wrong.

17 MR. BECK: I believe that's correct. I think  
18 all we need to do is block it out for the newspaper so  
19 they can get it set up and reserve the space. And then,  
20 you know, if we need to get a signature, we can always  
21 get it --

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

23 MR. BECK: -- after next week.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: We will commit to getting it back  
25 to you next Friday if you get it to us by next Wednesday

1 or Thursday --

2 MS. HENDRICKSON: Absolutely. Thank you.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: -- and then get it back to you.

4 And then we will follow the normal protocols in terms of  
5 filing the notices and the other items that you file.

6 If you need a signature before then, let us know.

7 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: So, Mr. Raatz, if you could --  
9 just summarize what we discussed. The signage, we  
10 discussed the publication. You have addressed the issue  
11 of social media.

12 Can you just tell me what forms of social media  
13 and what will be the area that the social media will  
14 cover in Tucson? Will it be specific to the study area,  
15 for example, or will it be more general?

16 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We will be using  
17 social media to announce the hearing. And it will be  
18 specific to the project study area -- and let me get a  
19 better -- as shown in the purple line on Slide 4. We  
20 will be using a Facebook ad, a targeted Facebook ad, as  
21 well as it will go to Instagram. Every time you buy a  
22 Facebook ad it goes to Instagram. We will be noticing  
23 via the Nextdoor app. And, as well, we are working to  
24 get the email blaster, I know that's not social media,  
25 but the email blaster created for notification of the

1 hearing.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Very good.

3 And then will there be mail, a mailer to the  
4 residents within the study group, notice of hearing?

5 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there will be a  
6 mailer for the residents within the study area.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, good. All right, good.  
8 Anything to add on that?

9 MR. RAATZ: Just, if I may, Mr. Chairman, one  
10 thing to touch on. With the addition of that Route 5  
11 that we spoke to previously, we will be conducting an  
12 additional public and community working group meeting  
13 just to make sure that the public is aware of our  
14 intentions of adding that back. And we will be noticing  
15 that via postcard for everyone within the project study  
16 area.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Thank you.

18 Let's talk about affected jurisdictions. Would  
19 that be the City of Tucson and Pima County?

20 MR. RAATZ: That is correct.

21 MS. HENDRICKSON: Correct.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Any other affected jurisdictions?  
23 Are there any other affected jurisdictions?

24 MS. HENDRICKSON: No.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: No, okay.

1           The evidentiary hearing will be, again, at the  
2 Double Tree on Alvernon by Reid Park.

3           MS. HENDRICKSON: That is correct.

4           CHMN. CHENAL: And we will notice it for two  
5 weeks.

6           Let me ask counsel. Do you believe that's an  
7 adequate period of time for the hearing.

8           MS. HENDRICKSON: Yes. I think it is going to  
9 depend on, you know, intervenors and public comment.  
10 But I think what we were planning definitely needs to  
11 schedule it for both weeks, but to the extent that we go  
12 through the second week, I think it will depend.

13           And that was one of my questions on the Notice  
14 of Hearing, how we want to word it. I think we  
15 anticipate going to Friday on the first week. So then,  
16 you know, the language "as necessary" the following  
17 week.

18           CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

19           MS. HENDRICKSON: And the other question we had,  
20 on the second week, since I haven't had a two-week  
21 hearing with you, and the pleasure of having a two-week  
22 hearing, do you like starting at 1:00 on the Monday for  
23 travel that second week?

24           CHMN. CHENAL: Good question. I think the  
25 answer is yes, because I think a number of people will

1 go home for the weekend and come back, and I think it  
2 will just be difficult if we don't start at 1:00 on the  
3 second Monday as well.

4 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: We will make up that additional  
6 time by going later if we have to in the evenings to  
7 make sure we finish in two weeks.

8 MS. HENDRICKSON: Okay. That sounds good.

9 MR. BECK: And, Mr. Chairman, at this point we  
10 are anticipating only an evening public comment session  
11 the first day of the hearings, not the, like in the  
12 second week; you will just do it as needed during the  
13 hearings?

14 CHMN. CHENAL: That's correct. That's correct.

15 All right. Let me -- well, just a couple of  
16 basic things. The applicant will cover the cost of the  
17 lodging for the Committee members, is that correct?

18 MS. HENDRICKSON: Correct.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: And the applicant will confer  
20 with counsel or Staff at the Corporation Commission to  
21 guarantee the costs associated with the hearing to the  
22 extent the costs are more than the statutory costs,  
23 correct?

24 MS. HENDRICKSON: That's correct.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, good.

1           Let's talk about a tour very quickly. I know we  
2 have not -- we have suspended tours, but I think on this  
3 case it would be important we have a tour, a live tour.  
4 And I think, you know, there will be enough Committee  
5 members who will feel confident, you know, given  
6 vaccines and masks if they want it, but that's something  
7 I think we should do for this case.

8           I just think this is the case to get back to  
9 tours. And I wanted to discuss it with you, but, again,  
10 this is a case where seeing these alternative routes  
11 would be important. And I just don't think a Google  
12 flyover would do it justice. But I want to get the  
13 applicant's thoughts on it.

14           MR. RAATZ: I think a live tour would be great,  
15 Mr. Chairman. I think it will show all the Committee  
16 members the existing infrastructure that's out there and  
17 will give them an opportunity to see, you know, all the  
18 routes --

19           CHMN. CHENAL: Okay.

20           MR. RAATZ: -- as presented, so...

21           CHMN. CHENAL: Well, as we used to do, we would  
22 like, you know, kind of a plan put together for the  
23 tour. And, you know, I am not sure what day we have the  
24 tour. I don't think it would make sense to do it the  
25 second day of the hearing because I think it is going to

1 be important to hear a little bit about the project to  
2 really get a feel for what we are looking at.

3 So I would like a little assistance from you or  
4 advice on when do you think would be the appropriate  
5 time to do the hearing -- it usually takes, you know, a  
6 half day. It might take a little longer. So what would  
7 your thoughts be?

8 Mr. Beck, let me ask you that. You have the  
9 most experience with tours.

10 MR. BECK: Well, I agree with you, Mr. Chairman,  
11 that it would good to get some of the record in place  
12 before the field trip. So, you know, you could  
13 potentially do it as early as like the Wednesday. So we  
14 start Monday afternoon, get what we can on the record on  
15 Tuesday, definitely get the flyover in in that first day  
16 and a half, and then potentially go out on the field on  
17 Wednesday morning.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: That sounds perfect. I was  
19 thinking the same thing. Let's assume that's the case.

20 And you will put together the tour or plan and  
21 figure out how long it is going to take. And then we  
22 will just set aside that amount of time. And, as we  
23 always used to, it might take longer than just the  
24 morning, however long it takes, and then we will resume  
25 the hearing for the rest of the day.

1 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: I assume we will have breakfast  
3 and lunches for the Committee, which is standard fare  
4 for these hearings.

5 MS. DARLING: Do you want dinner on that first  
6 meeting when there is the public meeting?

7 CHMN. CHENAL: I don't think so, Ms. Darling.  
8 You know, for one thing, 5:00 is cocktail hour. It is  
9 not a reasonable dinner hour. And I --

10 MS. DARLING: Do you want breakfast on that  
11 first -- on that Monday morning for those that come in  
12 on the day before?

13 CHMN. CHENAL: I think that would be a good idea  
14 because I think a lot of people would be there on the  
15 evening before. And I think that would just be a nice  
16 gesture.

17 MS. DARLING: Okay.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: Cookies for Member Haenichen.

19 MS. DARLING: Of course. Nobody else, just him,  
20 right?

21 CHMN. CHENAL: That's true.

22 All right. And I think we have covered the  
23 Notice of Hearing. You know, whatever you need, we will  
24 assist and have that ready to go at least for next week  
25 for publication.

1 Do we need security?

2 MS. DARLING: I think we will be talking to our  
3 security about that to decide whether they want to or  
4 not, unless you want to say that we need it. Then we  
5 will just have it.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, I know this is  
7 controversial. I have never had a hearing where we have  
8 had security. But again, then again, you know, perhaps  
9 one other exception, if there were a case, this might be  
10 the case. I know feelings might be running high, from  
11 what I gauge.

12 So let's do this. Let's have you confer with  
13 your security and decide what they think, and let's talk  
14 about it again at the prehearing conference, but maybe  
15 be prepared to have it when we make a decision at the  
16 prehearing conference.

17 MS. DARLING: Okay.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: So we don't spring it on you and  
19 say let's have it, you know, let's be prepared for that  
20 if we decide to do it. And certainly, certainly, if  
21 your security department believes that we should have  
22 it, we will have it. That's not a question. The only  
23 question is if they don't think it is really needed, you  
24 know, then we still should talk about it.

25 MS. DARLING: Okay.

1 MR. BECK: Mr. Chairman, just for your  
2 information, I mean it is a controversial project and we  
3 will have -- but the public has very strong opinions of  
4 what they want to see, but they have been, I guess you  
5 could say, generally cordial in their meetings. I mean  
6 they raise their voice and they want their answers, but  
7 they have not -- at least I have not felt threatened in  
8 any way, just so you know that.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Thank you for that.  
10 And I didn't mean to suggest that that was the case. I  
11 just know this is a -- you know, people feel pretty  
12 strongly about the project, and I just wanted to be  
13 prepared for anything.

14 So let's talk about the format. I think, I  
15 think things have changed because of COVID. I think one  
16 of them is, you know, maybe going forward we are always  
17 going to have hybrid hearings. But I think this is  
18 still one to have that hybrid format because it is  
19 easier for some to attend that way, even if it is  
20 potentially some of your witnesses, the public, and I  
21 mean potentially some of the Committee members.

22 So I think we do it as we have done it in a lot  
23 of past hearings, where we have kind of a format of both  
24 live and by Zoom, or whatever format you want. And I  
25 assume that's not a surprise to you and that's not going

1 to cause a problem.

2 MS. DARLING: No problem.

3 MR. RAATZ: Chairman, we were working with that  
4 Peak's Audio as well that did the Golden Valley.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, good group, yeah, very good  
6 group.

7 Do we expect some intervenors in this case?

8 MR. BECK: We have indication that at least a  
9 group of the neighborhoods have banded together to  
10 likely hire an attorney. And so we expect there may be  
11 an intervenor when we have our prehearing conference.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Please notify them or keep  
13 them in the loop on like the Notice of Hearing, the  
14 procedural order, when the prehearing conference will be  
15 held and the dates just so they are -- you know, to the  
16 extent you can so there is no unfair surprise to the  
17 potential intervenors.

18 I know you have been very good about that in the  
19 past and cooperated with counsel and with groups. So I  
20 don't think that's -- you know, I think that's -- you  
21 would do that anyway, but I will just mention that, make  
22 sure that they are.

23 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Chairman, this is Matt. I  
24 apologize. I dropped off on the computer. I was having  
25 some issues. So you are not going to -- Colette can't

1 see my face but hopefully she can hear me okay.

2 I guess on the issue of intervenors, and you  
3 touched on the issue of it in terms of will there be any  
4 sort of -- well, what will be the legal arguments, what  
5 are the legal issues that are being carried by the  
6 intervenors, will the neighborhood association be the  
7 only likely intervenor, will the City intervene, I guess  
8 thinking out loud, I would suggest that maybe we have a  
9 procedural conference ahead of the prehearing  
10 conference.

11 I know that's not the standard procedure, but my  
12 sense is that, for this case, to try to get the parties  
13 who may intend to participate to, you know, maybe get on  
14 the same page, and maybe we come up with an early  
15 briefing schedule on legal issues, so these sorts of  
16 things, the parties have time to think about them and to  
17 brief them and the Committee, you and the members of the  
18 Committee have an opportunity to look at those papers if  
19 in fact we have to brief certain issues, it would seem  
20 to me to make sense to maybe have an early procedural  
21 conference ahead of the prehearing conference. And I  
22 can tee that up with just a filing, a motion for some  
23 sort of a scheduling prehearing conference ahead of the  
24 standard prehearing conference that you will include in  
25 your procedural order. But it seems to me there is

1 probably some value in that.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, I agree. I think that's a  
3 great idea, Mr. Derstine. And I think that's a  
4 beautiful way to do it. I was going to suggest we have  
5 maybe two prehearing conferences, but that's really, I  
6 think, even what you suggested, similar but maybe even  
7 better. So why don't we do that.

8 And I am not prepared to give you the date. We  
9 have so many hearings coming up, I just apologize, I  
10 don't have a date for that. We will have to work on  
11 that. And it might be a fair amount of time before the  
12 prehearing conference. It is just, I was trying to look  
13 at my, you know, my phone here, and it is not going to  
14 give me what I need it to do.

15 The week of August 9th I am out of town. The  
16 week after that I am here; it is busy. The week after  
17 that we have a hearing.

18 MR. DERSTINE: We don't have to schedule it now.  
19 If I do a short filing and request a procedural  
20 conference ahead of the prehearing conference, then you  
21 and Tod can get together and maybe, you know, float --  
22 Tod can advise of some possible dates. And we will need  
23 to coordinate with, you know, if the neighborhoods have  
24 a lawyer and whoever else may be involved.

25 So it is probably, it may be a bit premature to

1 find a date. But we can tee it up with the filing of an  
2 application or motion and you can set it up from there.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: I think that's good.

4 Let's pick a day for the prehearing conference.  
5 Monday the 6th -- wait a second. Let me make sure I am  
6 on the right month.

7 Is the 8th, September the 8th at 2:00, is that,  
8 is that too late? The week before we are in hearings on  
9 another case in Parker. I don't know how long it is  
10 going to last. But coming back, the Monday,  
11 September 6th is Labor Day, so September 7th or  
12 September 8th. I picked the 8th because it is free on  
13 my calendar. Does that work for everybody?

14 MS. HENDRICKSON: That works for me.

15 MS. DARLING: Yes.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Or is that too close to the  
17 hearing?

18 Mr. Derstine, let me ask you that. Is that too  
19 close to the hearing?

20 MR. DERSTINE: Well, is this for the prehearing  
21 conference or is this this interim procedural conference  
22 that you are looking for the date?

23 CHMN. CHENAL: No, no, the prehearing  
24 conference.

25 MR. DERSTINE: Oh, I think that's fine.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. So the 8th at, say, 1:30,  
2 just to give ourselves more time if we need it?

3 MR. CARPINELLI: Excuse me. This is Max  
4 Carpinelli. Is this going to be virtual again or will  
5 this be in person?

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Good point. I think these  
7 hearings, the one Mr. Derstine mentioned, the scheduling  
8 conference, and then maybe the prehearing conference, I  
9 guess we can make it virtual for those who want to  
10 attend, but I kind of think I would like to see at least  
11 Mr. Derstine here.

12 I just think these are hearings where, depending  
13 how many people are here, the intervenors, it just might  
14 be easier to have some -- to do some of it live than  
15 just by virtual. It just -- I sense this is the case  
16 where that might be helpful.

17 Mr. Derstine, do you care to weigh in? I don't  
18 want to ask Mr. Beck and the Tucson folks to come up for  
19 it, appearing virtually is fine, but my sense is it  
20 might be important to be face to face for at least the  
21 prehearing conference, if not the other one as well.  
22 What do you think?

23 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, I think you are right. My  
24 sense is that it is probably better to be face to face.  
25 So in person certainly for counsel who are appearing on

1 behalf of the parties, and then if, you know, Staff or  
2 others want to appear virtually, that would be fine,  
3 too.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah. Ms. Hendrickson, you don't  
5 have to come up to Phoenix for that. If you want to,  
6 you are more than invited. I don't want to make this  
7 difficult. I just think having somebody here just  
8 depending on, you know, what comes up, depending how  
9 many people are here, it might be helpful. So let's  
10 plan on that.

11 And probably, probably for the other one as  
12 well, Mr. Derstine, if that's not going to inconvenience  
13 you too much. I just, I just think there is going to be  
14 some legal issues we are going to have to work through.

15 I think Mr. Derstine just fell off.

16 MS. DARLING: Volunteer him for everything.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: We are just about finished, and I  
18 actually have another hearing at 4:30. This has just  
19 been bananas.

20 So a couple easy things. We will have electric,  
21 or electronic tablets or iPads with the documents and  
22 exhibits and summaries loaded? Okay, good.

23 MS. DARLING: Yes.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: May I ask the attorneys from the  
25 Corporation Commission, are you intending potentially to

1 intervene in this case, or what will your role be in the  
2 hearings?

3 MR. CARPINELLI: That's undecided at this time.  
4 We are not quite sure yet.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. We will take public  
6 comment. And just because of the nature of this  
7 hearing, we will probably, I will probably be a little  
8 more formalistic on when to take public comment. It  
9 will certainly be the first evening, and it might be at  
10 designated times and not kind of more free-lance like we  
11 have done with hearings where one person shows up and we  
12 take them. I think we might need to be a little more  
13 strict on when we have public comment.

14 The procedural order will probably be very  
15 similar, although probably ask for briefing based on the  
16 motion that Mr. Derstine will file. I wish he was on  
17 the line. But, Ms. Hendrickson -- it is going to be  
18 hard for me to say Ms. Hendrickson, Mrs. Hendrickson,  
19 Ms. Hendrickson.

20 But I think, I think we are going to need -- I  
21 don't know what the opinion is going to be and I don't  
22 know of the City of Tucson and I don't know how big an  
23 issue it is going to be, but if, if their opinion comes  
24 back and suggests that in some way it is not -- it is a  
25 violation of zoning ordinances to place, you know, this

1 project in the corridor, Gateway corridor, I think  
2 absolutely we will have briefing on that. And, you  
3 know, that could be a legal issue that has to be decided  
4 beforehand, these hearings we have just been talking  
5 about, at the prehearing conference. I just think, you  
6 know, that's a legal issue. And, I don't know, there  
7 may be other legal issues. But depending on, on that  
8 issue, it may be something we, you know, we have to look  
9 at.

10 MS. HENDRICKSON: And, Renee, you know, in terms  
11 of timing, we sent the letter, the request. So I don't  
12 think there is any legal requirement for them to get,  
13 you know, a determination back in the time frame we  
14 have. They are aware of our hearing and filing and the  
15 need to have it prior to actually going to hearing. And  
16 so we can keep you and the parties updated on that.

17 And it sounds like Matt is back.

18 MS. DARLING: They do have a standard timeline,  
19 five to 45 days, but they aren't required to respond  
20 within 45 days.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Derstine, are you back on the  
22 line?

23 MR. DERSTINE: I am.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. We are going to have to  
25 kind of -- I think we are at the end of my list, but the

1 only thing we are still discussing is potential legal  
2 issues, or legal issue, regarding the corridor and the  
3 position that Tucson is going to take. And I don't want  
4 to have that issue hanging over our heads as we start  
5 the hearing.

6           You know, I don't -- it is a question of the  
7 Committee's and my jurisdiction vis-à-vis, you know,  
8 Tucson's position. But to the extent there are legal  
9 issues that are raised by Tucson's position with regard  
10 to placement of this project in the corridor, I would at  
11 least like to have the opportunity to have that briefed  
12 and decided before the hearing starts.

13           You know, I just don't think we want to plow  
14 into that without having some, you know, some rulings or  
15 understanding of the impact of whatever position Tucson  
16 takes. And I am -- I don't know what it is going to be.  
17 I don't know, you know, the jurisdiction we have over  
18 something like that. I don't know, you know, the impact  
19 of what position they take will have on the hearings or  
20 the decision. I don't know any of that. I just don't  
21 want to start the hearing and have that hanging over our  
22 heads and just flounder. I would rather have -- you  
23 know, think that through beforehand so we have a clear  
24 plan when the hearing starts.

25           MR. DERSTINE: Yeah. And, no, that was the

1 reason I suggested this scheduling conference or  
2 interim, this procedural conference, was to -- I think  
3 it is an opportunity for, you know, for us to, I guess,  
4 hear from the intervenors in terms of their positions.  
5 And then we can, you know, be ready to respond.

6 I mean the application will set out, and fairly  
7 detailed, in terms of TEP's position with regard to the  
8 urgings of the neighborhoods to underground the line so  
9 there won't be a secret that, you know, we don't believe  
10 it is appropriate to incur the cost for all of our  
11 ratepayers to underground this transmission line.

12 Now, it is a separate issue about the impact of  
13 the city ordinance and whether it requires that the line  
14 be undergrounded. As Mr. Raatz indicated, that's why we  
15 included the additional route as an addition to the  
16 overhead route that is not on the Gateway route, to give  
17 the Committee options in the event the City comes back  
18 and says that their interpretation of this ordinance is  
19 that it requires the route be underground.

20 So I think those are all issues that, you know,  
21 we are not going to fully discuss here and certainly not  
22 in a vacuum without the City or the neighborhood  
23 association at the table. But I agree with you. I  
24 think we ought to set some sort of an early briefing  
25 schedule on legal issues relating to undergrounding.

1           It will be helpful to get the City's position  
2 early on. The City comes back and responds to our  
3 formal request and says that they agree with our  
4 interpretation that their Uniform Development Code does  
5 not apply to require that we underground this 138kV  
6 line, despite, you know, some informal comments from  
7 city council members or others, then that, the legal  
8 issue about the application of the city ordinance, goes  
9 away and we are left just with the residents' position  
10 that they don't want to see an overhead transmission  
11 line and they are worried about the impacts on their  
12 property values. I think those are issues the  
13 Committee, those are arguments and issues the Committee  
14 has heard and dealt with before. And I am not concerned  
15 with those. If it is the Committee wants briefing on  
16 those issues, then certainly we are happy to do that.

17           But I think those will be, you know, these  
18 potential legal issues, whatever they may be, you know,  
19 that are going to be raised by others, I think that that  
20 procedural conference will be an opportunity for us to  
21 kind of at least get those on the table. And then you  
22 can give us some direction in terms of a briefing  
23 schedule for the parties to lay out their positions.

24           CHMN. CHENAL: Very good.

25           All right. Mr. Derstine, I think I mentioned to

1 the others that I have another hearing at 4:30, so I am  
2 running out of time here. But likely I think we have  
3 covered everything that I wanted to cover. And unless  
4 there is something that you think we should still cover,  
5 I have it.

6 MR. DERSTINE: No. I appreciate it. I'm sorry  
7 for the technical difficulties on my end.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: No problem. Although the fact  
9 you are at APS's office and having technical  
10 difficulties is of concern, but other than that...

11 MR. DERSTINE: Running interference or  
12 something, I am not sure.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: I think it is Tucson Electric  
14 Power that's sabotaging your, jamming your participation  
15 today. Just kidding.

16 MR. DERSTINE: Right. If I am not ready on  
17 Monday, it will come up with a blank.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Well, everyone go.  
19 Again, if there is anything we need to discuss, let me  
20 know. Even though we are in hearings, I will make  
21 myself available. I know this is an important project,  
22 and we are going to do it right. So whatever time I  
23 need to devote, I will. I just have to, you know,  
24 figure out when I can do it, but I will do it.

25 So we will -- I'm looking forward to this one.

1 And I look forward to working with all of you, as I  
2 always do on these cases. So if there is nothing else,  
3 let's adjourn. Again, if something comes up, let me  
4 know and we will reconvene.

5 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. Appreciate it.

6 (The proceeding concluded at 4:26 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA )  
2 COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

3

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

10

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

14

15 I CERTIFY that I have complied with the  
16 ethical obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(F)(3) and  
17 ACJA 7-206 (J)(1)(g)(1) and (2). Dated at Phoenix,  
18 Arizona, this 24th day of July, 2021.

19

20



21

---

22 COLETTE E. ROSS  
23 Certified Reporter  
24 Certificate No. 50658

25

26

27 I CERTIFY that Coash & Coash, Inc., has complied  
28 with the ethical obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206  
29 (J)(1)(g)(1) through (6).

30

31

32

33

34

35

36



37

---

38 COASH & COASH, INC.  
39 Registered Reporting Firm  
40 Arizona RRF No. R1036

41