

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT LS-499

2 AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE

3 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION) DOCKET NO.
 4 OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER, IN) L-00000C-26-0125-00261
 5 CONFORMANCE WITH THE)
 6 REQUIREMENTS OF A.R.S. § 40-360,) Case No. 261
 7 ET SEQ., FOR A CERTIFICATE OF)
 8 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY)
 9 AUTHORIZING THE SANTA RITA)
 10 CONNECTION 138 KILOVOLT (KV))
 11 TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT, WHICH)
 12 INCLUDES THE CONSTRUCTION OF A)
 13 NEW 138 KV TRANSMISSION LINE)
 14 ORIGINATING AT THE EXISTING)
 15 SONORAN SUBSTATION (SECTION 2,)
 16 TOWNSHIP 16 S, RANGE 14 E), AND)
 17 TERMINATING AT THE PLANNED SANTA)
 18 RITA SUBSTATION (SECTION 29,)
 19 TOWNSHIP 17 S, RANGE 14 E), EACH)
 20 LOCATED WITHIN PIMA COUNTY,)
 21 ARIZONA.) EVIDENTIARY
 22) HEARING

15 At: Tucson, Arizona

16 Date: May 26, 2026

17 Filed: June 1, 2026

18 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

19 VOLUME I
20 (Pages 1 through 167)

21
22 GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
23 Court Reporting, Video & Videoconferencing
24 1555 East Orangewood Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85020
602.266.6535 admin@glennie-reporting.com

25 By: MICHELE E. BALMER, RPR
Arizona CR No. 50489

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

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

I N D E X

	PAGE
Opening Statement by the Applicant	8
Virtual Tour	69
Public Comment	155
Closing Statement of the Applicant	198
Deliberation	200
Voting	239

INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS

WITNESS PANEL	PAGE
CHRIS ORTIZ Y PINO, CLARK BRYNER	
Direct Examination by Ms. Grabel	16
Direct Examination by Ms. Grabel (Cont'd)	174

1	INDEX TO EXHIBITS			
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	ID'd	ADMITTED
3	TEP-1	Application for Certificate of Environmental	19	150
4		Compatibility for TEP (Santa Rita Connection Project)		
5	TEP-2	Map of Proposed Project	20	150
6	TEP-3	Testimony Summary of Chris Ortiz y Pino	21	150
7				
8	TEP-4	Testimony Summary of Clark Bryner	22	150
9	TEP-5	Witness Powerpoint Presentation	23	150
10				
11	TEP-6	Virtual Tour	69	150
12	TEP-7	Tour Itinerary/Script/ Protocol	139	150
13	TEP-8	Summary of Pubic Outreach	137	150
14	TEP-9	Excerpt from TEP Ten-Year Plan for 2026 (Jan. 31, 2026)	144	150
15				
16	TEP-10A	Notice of Hearing	144	150
17	TEP-10B	Tear Sheets for Arizona Daily Star	145	150
18	TEP-10C	Letters to Public Facilities re Copies of Application for Public Viewing	145	150
19				
20	TEP-10D	Map of Notice of Hearing Sign Locations	146	150
21				
22	TEP-10E	Photographs of Sign Placement	146	150
23	TEP-10F	Example of Sign Contents	147	150
24	TEP-10G	Letters to Affected Jurisdictions with Notice of Hearing	147	150
25				

1	INDEX TO EXHIBITS (Cont'd)			
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	ID'd	ADMITTED
3	TEP-11	Receipt of Filing Fee	147	150
4	TEP-12	Proposed Certificate of Environmental Compatibility	58	150
5	TEP-13	Project Evaluation Request to Arizona Game and Fish Department	57	150
6				
7	TEP-14	Response from Arizona Game and Fish Department	58	150
8				
9	TEP-15	Letter to State Historic Preservation Office	63	150
10				
11	TEP-16	Response from State Historic Preservation Office	63	150
12	TEP-17	Amendments to Application	19	150
13	TEP-18	Addition to Witness Presentation	23	150
14				
15	TEP-19	Supplemental Outreach Summary	138	150
16	TEP-20	Arizona Corporation Commission Staff Letter	149	150
17	CHMN-1	Proposed CEC (PDF version)	200	For Reference
18				
19	CHMN-2	Proposed CEC (Word version)	200	For Reference
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and
2 numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before the
3 Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting
4 Committee at the Desert Diamond Casino Conference
5 Center, 7350 South Nogales Highway, Tucson, Arizona,
6 commencing at 1:03 p.m. on the 26th day of May, 2026.

7

8 BEFORE: ADAM STAFFORD, Committee Chair

9 MICHAEL COMSTOCK, Arizona Corporation Commission
10 DOUGLAS FANT, General Public
11 SAL DICICCIO, Cities and Towns
12 MARGARET "TOBY" LITTLE, PE, General Public (via Zoom)
13 ROMAN FONTES, Counties (via Zoom)
14 GABBY SAUCEDO MERCER, General Public
15 LANEY MEEKER, Arizona Department of Water Resources
16 (Via Zoom)

17 APPEARANCES:

18 For the Applicant:

19 OSBORN MALEDON
20 By: Meghan H. Grabel
21 Elias Ancharski
22 2929 North Central Avenue, 21st Floor
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

24 - and -

25 TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER
By: Samantha Egan
Megan C. Hill
88 East Broadway Boulevard
MS HQE910
Tucson, Arizona 85701

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go on the record.

2 Now is the time set for the hearing on the
3 application of Tucson Electric Power Company for a
4 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility, Docket
5 No. L-00000C-26-0125-00261, or Line Siting Case 261.

6 Let's take a roll call of the members.

7 Member Comstock.

8 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Present.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Mercer.

10 MEMBER MERCER: Present.

11 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Fant.

12 MEMBER FANT: Here.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member DiCiccio.

14 MEMBER DICICCIO: Here.

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And online we have Member

16 Little.

17 MEMBER LITTLE: Present.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Fontes.

19 MEMBER FONTES: Present.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And I would like to welcome

21 Member Laney Meeker from Arizona Department of Water

22 Resources. Member Meeker.

23 MEMBER MEEKER: Present. Thank you, Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

25 All right. We have the exhibits on the tablets

1 in front of the members. Do the members online have the
2 exhibits?

3 I think they were all filed in the docket; is
4 that correct?

5 MS. GRABEL: That's correct.

6 MEMBER LITTLE: I do.

7 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's take the appearance
8 of the Applicant.

9 MS. GRABEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Meghan
10 Grabel from the law firm Osborn Maledon for the
11 Applicant, Tucson Electric Power Company.

12 With me from my firm at counsel table is my
13 colleague Elias Ancharski. With me at counsel table
14 from the company is Ms. Sam Egan, Samantha Egan. And
15 most of you know Megan Hill. She's in the peanut
16 gallery for this one.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

18 Is there any -- there have been no requests for
19 intervention in this matter; is that correct?

20 MS. GRABEL: That is correct.

21 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Nor have there been any
22 limited appearance statements filed?

23 MS. GRABEL: Correct.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: With that, are there any
25 preliminary matters we need to address before you give

1 your opening statement, Ms. Grabel?

2 MS. GRABEL: No, sir.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Please proceed.

4 MS. GRABEL: All right. Thank you very much.

5 Chairman, Committee Members, in this matter,
6 TEP seeks a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility,
7 or a CEC, to authorize the construction of the Santa
8 Rita Connection Project in Pima County, Arizona. You'll
9 hear this project referred to as "Santa Rita Connection"
10 or, more generally, just "the project."

11 The primary purpose of the project is to
12 upgrade the reliability of TEP's transmission system
13 that serves southeastern Pima County and to provide
14 additional capacity to serve the town of Sahuarita and
15 surrounding communities.

16 By way of a brief summary, TEP proposes to
17 construct an approximately 13- to 17-mile 138kV
18 transmission line that will connect its existing Sonoran
19 Substation in Pima County to TEP's planned Santa Rita
20 Substation in Pima County.

21 The project will be located, as I've said twice
22 now, in Pima County and will cross private and state
23 land. And while not jurisdictional and, therefore, not
24 a part of our CEC application, TEP also plans to
25 construct the Santa Rita Substation. That substation

1 will be located on approximately 16 acres of land that
2 was granted to TEP by the Arizona State Land Department.

3 So this map, which has been marked as TEP
4 Exhibit 2, provides an overview of the project location.
5 It identifies the two proposed routes. Route 1 is shown
6 in green and Route 3 is shown in purple.

7 You may be wondering why we didn't label these
8 Routes 1 and 2. I know I did when I was first reading
9 the CEC application.

10 So just for background, 1 and 3 were the
11 numbers used to identify these two routes during the
12 public outreach, and Route 2 was eliminated from
13 consideration. And, therefore, TEP chose to consider
14 using the original monikers to avoid confusion with the
15 ongoing public messaging.

16 This map also shows both interconnection points
17 for the project. The northern connection is TEP's
18 existing Sonoran Substation, and the southern connection
19 is the planned Santa Rita Substation, both in Pima
20 County.

21 The length of Route 1 is approximately
22 17.4 miles. The length of Route 3 is approximately
23 13.3 miles.

24 TEP plans to obtain 100-foot rights-of-way and
25 easements for the line and up to 1,500-foot wide

1 corridors, although that 1,500 large corridor is really
2 only in one discrete location to accommodate
3 transmission line crossings, which our witnesses will
4 explain.

5 Notably, TEP is asking that the CEC grant
6 approval to construct both routes, with the condition
7 that only one route will actually be built.

8 Route 1 contemplates co-locating a portion of
9 the project with a line that is owned by UNS Electric
10 Company, or UNSE, and that UNSE line and related
11 structures are being considered for funding through a
12 grant from the U.S. Department of Energy, which is
13 currently under review by the Department of Energy.

14 And at this time, UNSE doesn't know if the
15 terms of the grant would allow for co-location, and so
16 we want both lines. In case the grant won't allow for
17 the co-location on the one project, we would choose the
18 additional -- or the other line. Therefore, TEP
19 requests that both routes be approved in the CEC so that
20 it may meet its in-service date regardless of whether
21 the grant funds are compromised.

22 So purpose and need. The project will provide
23 a new 138kV transmission path that provides greater
24 reliability, power quality, and capacity to existing and
25 future customers south of the city of Tucson. The

1 project will upgrade the reliability of TEP's
2 transmission system that serves southeastern Pima County
3 and, coupled with the planned Santa Rita Substation,
4 will provide additional capacity to serve the town of
5 Sahuarita and surrounding communities.

6 The project will also expand transmission
7 capacity to meet both current and future energy demand,
8 and it will also aid in times of peak demand during high
9 temperatures and other extreme weather events. Together
10 with the planned Santa Rita Substation, the project will
11 also facilitate the retirement of portions of the
12 existing and aging 46kV subtransmission infrastructure
13 in the area.

14 One of the reasons why I love my job is that I
15 seem to learn something new with each case, and in this
16 case it was about what the North American Electric
17 Reliability Corp., or NERC, calls a P6 planning event.
18 So the need for this project was identified when the
19 Santa Cruz Reliability North Project was approved, as
20 you may remember, late last year.

21 Prior to that, the Vail to Kantor line that
22 supplied UNSE's customers with power was a radial line.
23 It was not interconnected to the bulk electric system,
24 and, because of that, it was not subject to NERC's
25 reliability requirements.

1 When we brought on the addition of the Canoa
2 Ranch to Kantor project, which was the SCR North
3 Project, that did bring the Vail to Kantor line into the
4 bulk electric system and now it is subject to NERC's
5 studies and reliability requirements.

6 That's a good thing. It's good to be part of
7 the bulk electric systems because you have redundancy.
8 You have the system planning.

9 And in doing so, the study identified what NERC
10 calls a P6 transmission planning event in this case, and
11 the line that we're bringing to you today for approval
12 is the mitigation solution for this P6 event.

13 So to briefly explain, NERC requires that the
14 TEP transmission engineers analyze what happens when two
15 lines in the bulk electric system go down at once.
16 That's the P6 event. For example, the picture on the
17 left on this slide shows a diagram of TEP's planned
18 electric system in 2028. That's when the SCR North line
19 will be placed in service.

20 If you look at the middle picture, this assumes
21 that the Vail to Kantor segment goes down, say, for
22 scheduled maintenance and an outage and, during that
23 outage, TEP also loses the TEP South Loop to Green
24 Valley line unexpectedly.

25 When these two outages happen, there could be

1 an overload on the third remaining circuit, and that
2 overload could result in significant operational
3 limitations that have to be resolved.

4 So this project, as shown to the right,
5 introduces a TEP to Santa Rita Substation and a line
6 that connects that substation to the Sonoran Substation.
7 And in doing so, there's now a fourth element to the
8 bulk electric system that provides redundancy to protect
9 what would otherwise be overloaded circuits. And,
10 again, that solution is depicted on the right.

11 So these facts will be supported and explained,
12 probably better than a lawyer would do, by the testimony
13 of two witnesses that will be presented in three panels,
14 Mr. Chris Ortiz y Pino is a siting, outreach, and
15 engagement project manager for UNSE and TEP; and
16 Mr. Clark Bryner is the manager of siting, outreach, and
17 engagement for TEP.

18 Both witnesses will appear in each panel. And
19 while Chris will do most of the talking on the first two
20 panels, Clark will be sworn in and available to answer
21 your questions as they arise.

22 During the first panel, Mr. Ortiz y Pino will
23 introduce TEP and the project, including the proposed
24 routes and describe their general characteristics. He
25 will also describe the project's purpose and benefits,

1 as well as the need for the project.

2 Our second panel will describe how the routes
3 fair under the factors this committee is required to
4 consider under 40-360.06. It will also present the
5 virtual tour and discuss the visual aspects of the
6 project.

7 Finally, our third panel will discuss the
8 project siting process and the public outreach performed
9 for the project and legal compliance items.

10 So moving on to some administrative items, each
11 of the committee members present today should have the
12 binders with all of the exhibits and materials that the
13 TEP team intends to use through the hearing.

14 (Fire alarm sounding.)

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go off the record.

16 (A recess was taken from 1:13 p.m. to
17 1:21 p.m.)

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the
19 record.

20 Now that the excitement is over, Ms. Grabel, I
21 believe you were wrapping up your opening.

22 MS. GRABEL: Indeed. So the only thing I'll
23 add to the exhibits is that -- what I wanted to point
24 out is in addition to the exhibit binders, you should
25 have four kind of loose supplemental exhibits that we'll

1 be introducing in the record today. I believe they were
2 docketed on Friday.

3 And then, in conclusion, based on the evidence
4 we will present, we are confident that you will conclude
5 that the Santa Rita Connection Project will help meet
6 Arizona's need for an adequate, economical, and reliable
7 supply of power with minimal impacts to the environment
8 and ecology of the state and will ask that you approve
9 both routes in the requested CEC.

10 And with that, we're ready to begin our
11 evidentiary presentation.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

13 I see Member Fontes' hand raised.

14 MEMBER LITTLE: He went to fill his water
15 glass. I texted him. He should be back shortly.

16 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Now, online members, you
17 have access to the exhibits? They should all be
18 available on the Commission's website in the docket.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: I do, Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. I'm seeing nods from
21 Member Meeker.

22 MEMBER MEEKER: Yes.

23 MEMBER LITTLE: And I think Member Fontes had
24 his thumbs up when you asked before. One thumb up.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. Excellent.

1 Member Fant, you had a question?

2 MEMBER FANT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 Just a really basic question for the panel.

4 Can you explain the relationship --

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: They haven't been sworn in
6 yet, so don't ask any questions. Witnesses have to be
7 called and sworn. So a little ahead of the gun there.

8 MEMBER FANT: Sorry.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. Ms. Grabel,
10 would you like to call your two witnesses?

11 MS. GRABEL: Thank you. I call Mr. Chris
12 Ortiz y Pino and Mr. Clark Bryner.

13

14 CHRIS ORTIZ Y PINO AND CLARK BRYNER,
15 called as witnesses as a panel on behalf of Applicant,
16 having been previously affirmed by the Chairman to speak
17 the truth and nothing but the truth, were examined and
18 testified as follows:

19

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you. Please proceed
21 Ms. Grabel.

22 MS. GRABEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And then, Member Fant, do
24 you have a quick question?

25 MEMBER FANT: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

1 Could either of you explain the relationship
2 between UNSE and Tucson Electric?

3 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Sure. I'll take that one. So
4 UNS Electric and TEP are both subsidiaries of UNS Energy
5 Corporation, which is a subsidiary of Fortis Energy. So
6 we're all part of the same corporate family.

7 MEMBER FANT: But UNSE has its own management
8 structure just like TEPCO?

9 A. BY MR. BRYNER: So a lot of the management is
10 shared, but, yes, it has its own management structure.
11 So UNS Electric is actually part of UniSource Energy
12 Services, which also has a gas entity.

13 But, yes, we have leadership structures within
14 each, but they all report up to the same UNS Energy
15 leadership.

16 MEMBER FANT: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And I believe UNS Gas and
18 UNS Energy are both -- used to be Citizens Utilities,
19 didn't they?

20 A. BY MR. BRYNER: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Fontes, you had your
22 hand raised?

23 MEMBER FONTES: I did.

24 I just want to know if that DOE grant is
25 subject to NEPA that the Line 1 is looking at, just for

1 our awareness as we consider those for you.

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, Member Fontes. The
3 DOE grant is subject to NEPA compliance, and it did
4 receive its conditional approval and has a categorical
5 exclusion for it.

6 MEMBER FONTES: Thanks. That's useful.
7 Appreciate it.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Ms. Grabel.

9 MS. GRABEL: Thank you. And just to clarify
10 for the record, UNSE and TEP, while affiliated, are
11 separate companies.

12

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION.

14

15 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Okay. Mr. Ortiz y Pino,
16 please state your name and business address for the
17 record.

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: My name is Chris Ortiz y
19 Pino. And my business address is 88 East Broadway,
20 Tucson, Arizona.

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

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I'm employed by Tucson
23 Electric Power in the capacity of a project manager of
24 siting, outreach, and engagement.

25 Q. What is your role in this matter?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I'm the lead project
2 manager for the Santa Rita connection.

3 Q. Do you have a book of exhibits in front of you?

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I do.

5 Q. Will you please turn to Exhibit TEP-1, which
6 identifies the CEC application that was submitted.

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

8 Q. Have you seen this document before?

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I have.

10 Q. Was it prepared by you or under your direction
11 and control?

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It was.

13 Q. Are the statements contained within TEP-1 true
14 and correct to the best of your knowledge?

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

16 Q. And do you have any corrections you would like
17 to make to TEP-1?

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, we have three.

19 Q. And, in fact, those are identified in
20 Exhibit TEP-17; correct?

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

22 MS. GRABEL: And, Members, you should have
23 TEP-17 as a loose exhibit in front of you.

24 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Mr. Ortiz y Pino, please
25 briefly walk through the corrections that we submitted

1 in Exhibit TEP-17.

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay. Thank you,
3 Ms. Grabel.

4 So on Page 17, we have a correction in a place
5 there was a typo where we wanted to say 100-foot-wide
6 corridors -- or we ended up saying 100-foot-wide
7 corridors, when what we really wanted to say was
8 1,500-foot-wide corridors. So we confused right-of-way
9 and corridor there.

10 Q. And the next?

11 A. On Page 19 and Page 30, for the maximum height
12 of proposed poles, we said "up to 125 feet," and that
13 has been replaced with "up to 150 feet."

14 And the final one is on Page 371. It was
15 reference to Key Observation Point No. 4. And in the
16 Key Observation Point No. 4, which we'll see on our
17 placemats as well as in the presentation, what was
18 missing was the existing single-circuit, UniSource-owned
19 138-kilovolt transmission line.

20 Q. Thank you.

21 Please turn to Exhibit TEP-2, which is the map
22 of the proposed project.

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

24 Q. Was TEP-2 prepared by you or under your
25 direction and control?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, it was.

2 Q. And is TEP-2 substantially the same as the map
3 that is on the placemat in front of the committee
4 members?

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, it is.

6 Q. And I would normally ask you to describe the
7 placemat, but you do have a slide later in your
8 presentation that goes through that in pretty specific
9 detail, so we can just skip that for now.

10 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

11 Q. Please turn to Exhibit TEP-3, which is the
12 testimony summary of Chris Ortiz y Pino.

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

14 Q. Was TEP-3 prepared by you or under your
15 direction and control?

16 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, it was.

17 Q. Are the contents true and correct to the best
18 of your knowledge?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: They are.

20 Q. And do you have any changes you would like to
21 make to TEP-3?

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: No.

23 Q. All right. Thank you.

24 Mr. Bryner, I'm going to turn to you for a
25 moment. Please state your name and business address for

1 the record.

2 A. BY MR. BRYNER: My name is Clark Bryner. My
3 business address is 88 East Broadway, Tucson, Arizona.

4 Q. And by whom are you employed and in what
5 capacity?

6 A. BY MR. BRYNER: I'm employed by Tucson Electric
7 Power as the manager of siting, outreach, and
8 engagement.

9 Q. What is your role in this matter?

10 A. BY MR. BRYNER: In this particular project,
11 I've been -- I've provided senior level oversight over
12 the project. And, in particular, I've been involved in
13 providing assistance on the siting and the outreach
14 efforts.

15 Q. Will you please turn to TEP-4, which is the
16 testimony summary of Clark Bryner.

17 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Okay.

18 Q. Are you there?

19 Was TEP-4 prepared by you or under your
20 direction and control?

21 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yes, it was.

22 Q. Are the contents true and correct to the best
23 of your knowledge?

24 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yes, they are.

25 Q. Do you have any changes you would like to make

1 to TEP-4?

2 A. BY MR. BRYNER: No.

3 Q. Back to you, Mr. Ortiz y Pino. If you could
4 please turn to Exhibit TEP-5, which is the PowerPoint
5 presentation for the hearing.

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

7 Q. Was TEP-5 prepared by you or under your
8 direction and control?

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, it was.

10 Q. Are the contents true and correct to the best
11 of your knowledge?

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: They are.

13 Q. Do you have any changes you would make to
14 TEP-5?

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes. We do have one
16 addition of a slide.

17 Q. Okay. And I believe that is reflected in
18 Exhibit TEP-18; correct?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

20 Q. Can you turn to TEP-18 and describe for the
21 committee members what the change is.

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: All right. So it is a
23 summary slide of our purpose and need statement, so it's
24 just bullet points of our -- key points of our purpose
25 and need.

1 Q. And you'll go over that slide when we get to it
2 in the presentation.

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. With that, I may interrupt your presentation a
5 couple of times, but please begin your remarks.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Before you get started,
7 just a threshold issue.

8 The amendments to the application and the
9 accompanying documents do not constitute a substantial
10 deviation from what was previously noticed to the
11 public, so there was no additional need for additional
12 publication or notice under the rules.

13 I'm looking to my colleagues to confirm
14 agreement with my assessment. I'm seeing nods.

15 All right. Please carry on.

16 MS. GRABEL: Thank you.

17 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Mr. Ortiz y Pino.

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: All right. Thank you
19 very much.

20 All right. So my name, as I mentioned
21 previously, is Chris Ortiz y Pino. As a project manager
22 of siting, outreach, and engagement, my roles and
23 responsibilities with the company is to assist in the
24 obtaining of the CEC for transmission and thermal
25 generation facilities for both TEP and UNSE.

1 I oversee the planning, siting, external
2 outreach and engagement processes and plans in the
3 preparation of the application and the supporting
4 exhibits for a certificate of environmental
5 compatibility application.

6 My education is most recently I have a master's
7 of science in planning from the University of Arizona.
8 I have a bachelor of arts in fine arts and a double
9 major in Spanish literature from the University of New
10 Mexico. I'm an active member of the American Planning
11 Association.

12 And I have six years of experience in the
13 electric utility industry, most recently as a Project
14 Manager II and, to date, as a -- for the past year and a
15 half, I've been working in this capacity as a project
16 manager. For the previous four and a half years, I had
17 been working as an environmental and land use planner
18 for the company, working in entitlements and other land
19 issues.

20 Prior to coming to TEP, I worked as a planning
21 consultant with a private engineering firm, The WLB
22 Group, and prior to that as a policy aid to former City
23 of Tucson Councilmember Steven Kozachik.

24 A. BY MR. BRYNER: So my name is Clark Bryner.
25 I've testified before this committee on several past

1 occasions.

2 And I already covered my role and
3 responsibilities, but just a little bit about my
4 education and experience. I have a bachelor of arts in
5 geography and a master's of science in bioregional
6 planning, both from Utah State University.

7 I also am an active member of the American
8 Planning Association and I'm a certified planner, which
9 is a certification that I've held since 2011.

10 I have 20 years of experience in the electric
11 utility industry, primarily with TEP and UNS Electric
12 working in a variety of different roles. And over the
13 past four years, I've overseen siting, while I spent the
14 previous 10 years in maintenance planning and asset
15 management with direct responsibility for maintenance of
16 the transmission system.

17 And then I have an additional six years of
18 experience in environmental planning and permitting
19 roles, both with the company and as an outside
20 consultant.

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: All right. So now, as
22 many of you may know and others may be less familiar
23 with, Tucson Electric Power has transmission and
24 generation facilities throughout Arizona and New Mexico.

25 We see in this slide our extra high voltage

1 transmission lines serving the Tucson Electric Power
2 service territory and various general -- generation
3 systems.

4 In Slide 6, we have a map of the Tucson service
5 territory, TEP service territory, in dark gray.

6 And in Slide 5, we have some information here
7 about this area. Our service territory is approximately
8 1,155 square miles. We serve 455,000 customers in a
9 total population of approximately 1.2 million people.
10 We have nearly 2,200 miles of transmission lines and
11 over 100 substations and switchyards serving this
12 territory.

13 On Slide 6, I would like to draw your attention
14 to the orange line crossing the service territory from
15 left to right. This is our 345-kilovolt transmission
16 line that's more or less the spine of the regional
17 transmission system in Tucson. Additionally, the red
18 rectangle in the center portion, this is the rough area
19 in which our project study area is going to be looking
20 at today.

21 Getting started with our project overview and
22 our purpose and need statements, this graphic is a
23 simplification of the transmission system south of
24 Tucson. The thick black line crossing the screen from
25 left to right is the 345 line I just mentioned in our

1 previous slide.

2 The thinner black lines represent the
3 138-kilovolt transmission lines that serve the area
4 south of Tucson and Santa Cruz County.

5 The transmission lines highlighted in yellow
6 are what I will be calling the South Loop. The South
7 Loop is a redundant system and is interconnected into
8 the regional electric system serving Sahuarita, Green
9 Valley, and other large load customers. This line is a
10 part of the bulk electrical system and is included in
11 annual NERC compliance studies.

12 This line highlighted in yellow is the radial
13 138-kilovolt transmission line serving Santa Cruz
14 County. As it exists today, this radial line is
15 exempted from NERC reliability studies.

16 Q. Before you leave the slide, Mr. Ortiz y Pino,
17 what is a radial transmission line?

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: A radial transmission
19 line is a single line serving a community. So it's not
20 connected with a redundant source of power.

21 Q. And not connected to the bulk electric grid;
22 correct?

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

24 Q. Thank you. Please continue.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And so for purposes of

1 reliability, if that line goes down, there's no way to
2 move power to the customers at the end of the line;
3 correct?

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Hence, we like the looped
6 systems much better, then, don't we?

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Very much so.

8 So you may recall this line from the recent
9 hearing before the committee in November of 2025. It
10 was heard under Case 252. This was the first phase of
11 the larger three-phase Santa Cruz Reliability Project.
12 It was also known as the Santa Cruz Reliability Project
13 North.

14 This line between the Canoa Ranch Substation
15 and the Kantor Substation in Santa Cruz County will
16 connect the Vail to Kantor transmission line to the
17 South Loop and into the bulk electrical system. With
18 this connection, the South Loop and the Vail to Kantor
19 transmission line will form a loop system with three
20 pathways into the Kantor Substation.

21 By bringing the formerly radial line into the
22 bulk electrical system, it improves the system for both
23 TEP and UNSE customers, creating a more redundant system
24 and improving reliability for everyone.

25 In connecting the South Loop to the Kantor

1 Substation, it brings in the Vail to Kantor transmission
2 line into the bulk electrical system. This in itself
3 requires compliance with NERC reliability standards.

4 As a result of NERC -- annual NERC-mandated
5 studies, TEP identified that the system in this area is
6 at risk of a P6 planning event, which is a multiple
7 contingency event consisting of the loss of one element,
8 followed by system adjustments, and then the loss of a
9 second element of the system.

10 I realize that this is kind of heavy utility
11 jargon, so I'm about to go into an example of what that
12 means and what that may look like for a P6 event.

13 So we have a hypothetical scenario in which one
14 transmission line pathway is removed from service to
15 conduct needed maintenance. In this situation, there
16 are system adjustments and power is served from the
17 remaining two transmission pathways that feed into
18 Kantor Substation.

19 Continuing in this hypothetical scenario, an
20 unplanned fault occurs on one of the two remaining
21 transmission line pathways. It is at this point that
22 all of the power that had previously been served through
23 three lines is now being served through just one. In
24 this contingency, the remaining transmission pathway
25 begins to see an overloading condition.

1 During transmission studies of the P6 event,
2 loading of the remaining circuit reaches 90 percent,
3 which is the threshold TEP has for looking at additional
4 resources. And in 2029, the circuit reaches 96 percent
5 of its load-carrying capacity.

6 To avoid this risk of overloading the remaining
7 circuit as presented by this hypothetical planning
8 scenario, TEP is proposing the Santa Rita Connection
9 Project, a new 138-kilovolt line connecting the Sonoran
10 Substation to the planned Santa Rita Substation.

11 This solution provides the necessary redundant
12 support to the transmission system, mitigating a circuit
13 overload by providing a fourth path to reroute power in
14 the event of an outage. Two elements, an outage of two
15 elements.

16 This plan -- this project is planned for an
17 in-service date in 2029. In addition, the Santa Rita
18 connection project, coupled with the planned Santa Rita
19 Substation, will provide additional capacity to serve
20 the town of Sahuarita and the surrounding communities.

21 So to summarize, the important facts in
22 discussing the purpose and need of this project, as it
23 exists today, the Vail to Kantor line is exempted from
24 NERC compliance studies because it is a radial line. By
25 definition, a radial line is not part of the bulk

1 electrical system.

2 The transmission line connecting the Canoa
3 Ranch and the Kantor substations brings this Vail to
4 Kantor transmission line into the bulk electrical
5 system, and, thus, subject to NERC compliance studies.
6 Tying the Vail to Kantor transmission line into the bulk
7 electrical system is a good thing for both TEP and UNSE
8 customers because it creates a more reliable system for
9 everyone.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. And this slide
11 that we're looking at on the screen, 17B, that was the
12 additional slide that was included in TEP-18; correct?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

14 When the new transmission line between Canoa
15 Ranch and the Kantor Substation becomes online, annual
16 NERC compliance studies identified the potential
17 overload condition, the P6 event as described in our
18 hypothetical scenario. The Santa Rita Connection
19 Project alleviates this potential overload by providing
20 a fourth pathway to Kantor Substation.

21 So I would now like to go ahead and get into
22 our proposed routes and environmental compatibility.

23 Before I do that, I would like to bring
24 everybody's attention to the placemat that we have
25 before us to quickly orient you to the placemats and

1 some of the information on there that we'll be seeing.
2 It will be a good resource throughout the presentation,
3 so I don't want to spend too much time on it now as I'll
4 be explaining much of it later. However, for context, I
5 would like to point out a few key landmarks on this map.

6 And, again, this map you will be seeing
7 throughout the presentation on all the map slides. So
8 it's very similar information, different data layers
9 corresponding to the evaluation criteria that's outlined
10 by statute.

11 So from left to -- on the left-hand side of the
12 screen going from north to south is Interstate 19.
13 About a mile to the east or to the right we have the
14 Santa Cruz River. And about two miles to the east of
15 the Santa Cruz River, we have our Route 3 in the project
16 study area.

17 Okay. So over the past eight months, TEP has
18 conducted a comprehensive siting, outreach, and
19 engagement process that's resulted in the identification
20 of two routes that we've included in our application.

21 The two project endpoints are from the existing
22 TEP-owned Sonoran Substation approximately one quarter
23 mile east of Swan Road, and about five and a half miles
24 south of Interstate 10.

25 The second endpoint is the planned Santa Rita

1 Substation, which will be located on a 16-acre parcel
2 leased to the company by the Arizona State Land
3 Department. This substation will be located about
4 three quarters of a mile south of the Santa Rita Road
5 and Country Club Road intersection.

6 Route 1, illustrated in the green line on this
7 map and on all future maps, is roughly 17.4 miles and
8 has an estimated cost to construct of \$16.5 million.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Fant, you had a
10 question?

11 MEMBER FANT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 Could you just clarify for us the land
13 designations, the blue-colored land, the light-grayish
14 colored land, what the land status is on the map?

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Of course.

16 So in light blue we have lands held by Arizona
17 State Land Trust, and in gray we have privately held
18 lands. On the left-hand side of the project study area,
19 in tan, we have the San Xavier District of the Tohono
20 O'odham Nation.

21 MEMBER FANT: Thank you.

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Absolutely.

23 So TEP is requesting a 500-foot wide corridor
24 as part of the CEC to allow flexibility and final
25 engineering to work with landowners in mitigating any

1 environmental or other concerns.

2 For Route 1, approximately 60 percent of the
3 land that Route 1 covers is on state land. The
4 remaining nearly 40 percent is on private land.

5 There are three jurisdictions that this -- that
6 both routes cross through. Route 1 is in the city of
7 Tucson for approximately 21 percent of the time; Pima
8 County for 77 percent; and within the Town of Sahuarita
9 for just 1.4 percent of the line.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Say that one more time. So
11 you said Route 1 is what percentage on State Trust Land?

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: 60.5 percent on State
13 Trust Land, and the remaining 39.5 percent on privately
14 held lands.

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

16 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Uh-huh.

17 So Route 3, illustrated in purple on this map
18 and on all other maps, is 13.3 miles long and has an
19 approximate cost to construct of \$18 million. For this
20 route, TEP is requesting a corridor of varying widths
21 between 500 feet and 1,500 feet wide.

22 The land ownership for Route 3 is a different
23 mix. It's about 86.3 percent on state land and just
24 13.7 percent on private land. There's a more equitable
25 distribution of split between jurisdictions for Route 3,

1 with 52.7 percent from the city of Tucson, 45.8 percent
2 in Pima County, and, again, 1.5 percent in the town of
3 Sahuarita.

4 So with just one last slide before we get into
5 more detailed discussion of the routes, I want to make
6 it known, as Ms. Grabel mentioned earlier, that TEP will
7 be requesting both routes -- approval of both routes
8 that we propose in this application.

9 Our reasoning for this is because, as
10 contemplated in our siting process, Route 1 requires
11 co-locating on the existing UniSource/UNSE 138-kilovolt
12 transmission line which is due for funding from the
13 Department of Energy. That grant would be to fund
14 reconstruction from the Nogales Tap Substation down to
15 the Kantor Substation.

16 Although the grant has been conditionally
17 awarded, the terms, conditions, and restrictions of the
18 use of that grant funds are currently under review by
19 the grant -- by the DOE and by UniSource. UNSE does not
20 know if the terms and conditions of the grant would
21 permit co-location of the project with the UNSE line,
22 and, thus, cannot assure TEP that those terms will be
23 known in time for TEP to go through the procurement and
24 design phases.

25 Therefore, the company requests approval of

1 both routes so that TEP may meet its in-service date for
2 the project. In the event that the grant would not
3 permit co-location, it would be the company's preference
4 to construct Route 1 unless it becomes known that the
5 co-location of the facilities would put at risk the DOE
6 funding benefiting UNSE customers.

7 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Hang on. I'm confused. It
8 looks like both lines are co-located for long stretches.
9 Why is that?

10 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That's correct.

11 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: What's the difference
12 between the grant for Line 1 as opposed to Line 3?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So the grant is only
14 funding Phase 2 of the Santa Cruz Reliability Project,
15 which is to rebuild the UniSource-owned or the
16 UNSE-owned Vail to Kantor line from the Nogales Tap
17 switchyard to the Kantor switchyard. So that rebuild
18 there is the only place that is utilizing grant funding.

19 MS. GRABEL: So I can maybe clarify,
20 Mr. Chairman, because I was also confused.

21 The grant is not for this project. The grant
22 is for the other project, the one that's the Nogales Tap
23 to Kantor. Did I get that right? And so the question
24 is -- so no matter what, we would use the grant to build
25 that other project.

1 In this case, we either co-locate on that
2 project or we do Route 3, and we don't know if the grant
3 terms will allow the co-location on the line that's
4 already been authorized for approval and would be funded
5 by the grant.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. All right. So it's
7 because of the specific other line it's being co-located
8 with is the issue for Route 1, then.

9 MS. GRABEL: That's right.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And then 3 you're
11 co-locating with -- let's see -- your own existing 138kV
12 line.

13 MS. GRABEL: Correct. And that's -- it doesn't
14 matter. That's not applicable to that.

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. That has nothing to
16 do with grant money, then.

17 MS. GRABEL: Correct.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. Great.

19 Member Fant.

20 MEMBER FANT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21 One minor question. Is Sahuarita an
22 incorporated town or just an unincorporated area called
23 Sahuarita?

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Sahuarita is an
25 incorporated town.

1 MEMBER FANT: Thank you.

2 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Please continue.

3 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay. So in this slide
4 we'll begin discussing our existing land uses found
5 within the project study area.

6 However, before we do that, I would like to
7 orient us a little bit further. In general, we've
8 buffered the proposed routes by one mile, described as
9 the project area. This is illustrated by the pronounced
10 dark shadow that you see on Slide 22, with the areas
11 outside of this project area illustrated with more
12 subdued colors. The project area is the area of
13 analysis for resources and impacts that I'll be
14 discussing.

15 So looking at the land uses that are found
16 throughout the project study area, a significant portion
17 which is described in that light brown color throughout
18 the center portion of the project area, is vacant,
19 undisturbed land.

20 Criss-crossing the project area in the yellow
21 dashed lines from north, south, east, and west are
22 existing transmission facilities. These facilities
23 range in voltages from 138 kilovolts to 345 kilovolts.
24 There's also a large solar generation site to the north
25 central section of the project area shown in blue.

1 There are several pockets of existing
2 residential land uses on the northern edge and southern
3 half of the project area. These residential areas range
4 in density from low density rural to medium density
5 rural. The southern tip of the project area in light
6 green is our Santa Rita Experimental Range. This is
7 land held in state trust and is co-managed -- and is
8 managed by the University of Arizona.

9 In addition, there are two black and green
10 squares that represent FCC-licensed communication sites.
11 These communication site owners received project notice
12 and no anticipated impacts -- there are no anticipated
13 impacts.

14 I also want to draw your attention to the blue
15 pentagon illustrating the Walden Grove High School,
16 which as I now see in our legend is spelled correctly
17 when discussing the high school, but I do have a typo
18 when discussing the athletic facilities. Walden is
19 definitely spelled with an "e".

20 Now that we have established these existing
21 contexts for our project study area, I would like to now
22 get into the details of the routes, starting with
23 Route 1.

24 Route 1 begins at the Sonoran Substation and
25 exits the substation to the south, proceeding west

1 towards Swan Road.

2 At Swan Road, it heads south and crosses
3 beneath the TEP/WAPA 230-kilovolt, 115-kilovolt
4 double-circuit line.

5 After crossing this TEP/WAPA line, the route
6 turns east-southeast and continues parallel and south of
7 the TEP/WAPA line for approximately two miles until
8 Wilmot Road.

9 On Slide 24, we have Key Observation Point
10 No. 2 taken from a residential area just south of the
11 Sonoran Substation. Within this residential area, we
12 received -- there's about 18 homes within a 500-foot --
13 within 500 feet of this proposed line. In this
14 community, we did get some participation from our public
15 outreach opportunities and our open houses, with no
16 significant opposition from this community.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Is that 500 feet from the
18 centerline or 500 feet from the corridor?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: 500 feet from the
20 centerline.

21 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay.

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So on the top image of
23 Slide 24 on the right, we have a simulated baseline
24 condition. And this is a little bit different than what
25 we normally do because we are showing the TEP/WAPA

1 230/115-kilovolt line. This line doesn't actually exist
2 there today. If we were to go on our tour tomorrow,
3 what we would see there today are 65-foot, wooden
4 H-frame structures holding a single 115-kilovolt
5 transmission line.

6 Next year, in 2027, this line will be
7 reconstructed to the 230-115 double circuit. These
8 structures are approximately 145-foot tall, galvanized
9 structures.

10 So we thought it was important to make sure
11 that we were simulating the condition of our line in
12 relation to what will exist at the time that it's
13 constructed.

14 So in the simulated condition on the bottom
15 screen, on the bottom image, you can again see the
16 larger, galvanized structures crossing from left to
17 right. And roughly mid-span between these structures
18 you can see the smaller, approximately 83-foot tall,
19 self-weathering colored structures for this project for
20 Route 1.

21 So getting into KOP No. 4, this is taken from
22 Wilmot Road looking north. You can see in the distance
23 in the background the Santa Catalina Mountains. Again,
24 we have a simulated baseline condition showing the
25 TEP/WAPA line crossing the landscape from left to right.

1 In the simulated condition, you can again see
2 the structures from Route 1 roughly at the mid-span
3 location on the horizon.

4 On the -- let's see if I can do this. I knew I
5 was going to do that. Sorry.

6 So right about here, at this structure there,
7 the Route 1 begins its co-location on the UNSE Vail to
8 Kantor transmission line.

9 At that structure it crosses the road onto
10 these structures here. You can see on these structures
11 this is coming towards the viewer. There are two
12 circuits on that line.

13 Continuing south along Wilmot Road, Route 1
14 crosses underneath an extra high voltage transmission
15 corridor described and illustrated in the yellow
16 dash-dot lines.

17 In this corridor is a TEP-owned 345-kilovolt
18 transmission line, an AEPCO-owned 345 kilovolt
19 transmission line, and a third AEPCO-owned 230-kilovolt
20 line. Did I say that right? A 345 and a 230.

21 As I will point out again and again over the
22 course of my presentation, the line Route 1 proposes as
23 a double circuit exists there today and across largely
24 undeveloped land.

25 Getting into Key Observation Point No. 7 is

1 located on Sahuarita Road approximately a half mile to
2 the east of the intersection with Wilmot Road. You can
3 see in the existing condition there is an existing line,
4 a 138-kilovolt line, crossing perpendicularly to
5 Sahuarita Road. In the distance you can see we have the
6 Sierrita Mountains.

7 The bottom image on Slide 28 illustrates the
8 simulated condition. Again, Route 1 is just adding a
9 second circuit to this line, so it will be rebuilt to a
10 double-circuit capable structure. As you can see, it's
11 a little bit more robust in that simulation.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Will there be a height
13 difference between the single-circuit and the
14 double-circuit structures?

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Not a noteworthy -- not a
16 significant increase, no.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: They're roughly
19 83-and-a-half feet tall.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: After passing Sahuarita
22 Road, the route continues south along Wilmot for another
23 three miles before reaching the end of the road in the
24 northern boundary of the Santa Rita Experimental Range.

25 And I want to take a moment here to discuss

1 this existing residential area. The homes in this area
2 are considered low density rural, which means, roughly,
3 there's one home for every four acres of land in this
4 area. There are 83 homes, 83 properties, within
5 500 feet of this transmission line as it exists today.
6 On that line, there's 33 existing easements to UniSource
7 for that line.

8 We have received two comments from residents in
9 this area that we know of. Both comments were opposed
10 to another line across their property. Responding to
11 those comments, I explained that we were proposing a
12 second circuit on an existing line, that no additional
13 lines would be -- that we weren't proposing an
14 additional line but a second circuit. After that
15 clarification, we didn't receive any further comments
16 from the public in this area.

17 I want to take a minute to note, actually, that
18 while we were on our break outside, we had a member of
19 the public here with us, and she took a moment to ask a
20 question. It was pertinent to Route 3, but, again, it
21 was asking about if there was going to be an additional
22 line behind her home. When I clarified that it was a
23 co-located line, that we weren't proposing a second
24 line, she said, "Okay. Thank you," and then she left.

25 So that's kind of been the theme of the

1 opposition towards this project. When they -- when I
2 had the opportunity to clarify that it's a second
3 circuit and not an additional line, there's not been
4 much additional feedback.

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Well, I guess additional
6 structure is more --

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Additional structures,
8 yes. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Little.

10 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 As long as we're discussing the comments from
12 that area or people that live in that area, I notice
13 that there was somebody who said they were representing
14 the homeowners association or some association for that
15 area, and they were definitely in favor of 3 or 3A and a
16 hard "no" to Route 1.

17 Do you recall whether their comments were prior
18 to knowing that there would be no additional structures?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: If I'm not mistaken, I
20 believe the comments you're referring to is with -- it
21 was from the Sahuarita Highlands neighborhood in the
22 southeast corner of the project study area, so just to
23 the northeast of the Santa Rita Substation.

24 We received six comments from members of this
25 neighborhood. And I do recall that there was -- the

1 majority of people were in favor Route 3. If I recall
2 correctly, the opposition was to Route 2. There was
3 staunch opposition to Route 2, which would have passed
4 on the Alvernon Way alignment, which is on the eastern
5 section boundary of their neighborhood.

6 There was some preference towards -- of those
7 six comments, there was preference given to Route 3.
8 And if Route 3 wasn't, they would prefer Route 1 when
9 compared to the other two that were being proposed.

10 MEMBER LITTLE: Well, we can discuss these in
11 more detail when we get to the discussion of outreach.
12 Thank you.

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Sure.

14 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

16 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Sir, can you tell me the
17 vertical separation between the new construction and the
18 in-place 345kV line, what that will be at the end of
19 build?

20 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Can I ask you to clarify?
21 Which 345kV line are you talking about?

22 MEMBER COMSTOCK: The one that goes -- is it
23 east to west up towards Sonora where it's crossing
24 under? I believe you said it was crossing under; is
25 that correct?

1 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Correct. We would cross under.
2 So you're wanting to know the separation?

3 MEMBER COMSTOCK: What is going to be the final
4 separation between the two lines?

5 A. BY MR. BRYNER: We'll have to get back to you
6 on that, Member Comstock. We'll have to check with
7 engineering on what the clearance will be.

8 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

9 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Please continue, Mr. Ortiz y
10 Pino.

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So, again, when we had a
12 chance to clarify that there was a co-located circuit
13 and not an additional transmission line and structures,
14 we more or less stopped receiving feedback at that
15 point.

16 South of this residential area, the route
17 continues for another 1.6 miles, reaching Santa Rita
18 Road. This is across the Santa Rita Experimental Range.

19 And this -- at Santa Rita Road, Route 1 would
20 then co-locate onto the approved transmission line from
21 Case 164. It's also represented in the dash-dot red
22 line in the map.

23 So now looking at Slide 30, we can see a key
24 observation point taken from the southeasternmost corner
25 of the Sahuarita Highland subdivision. From this point,

1 in the current condition, we're looking at a view of the
2 Santa Rita Mountains. We can see Santa Rita Road on the
3 left-hand side of the image going off towards the
4 mountains and the desert open space of the Santa Rita
5 Experimental Range.

6 The simulated condition here, we can see again
7 that there is a transmission line coming from the left
8 side of Santa Rita Road. At that point it starts
9 heading west towards the planned Santa Rita Substation.

10 At that turning structure on the road is taken
11 -- there's approximately a 1,000-foot distance between
12 that structure and the nearest home in the subdivision.

13 As the line heads west or to the right across
14 the image, the middle structure is the closest structure
15 to the homes in that area at 600 feet.

16 As I mentioned in the last slide, the line
17 being simulated here was approved -- this line being
18 co-located in the simulated was part of Case 164.

19 Similar to our first two KOPs, we could have
20 had a simulated baseline condition here as our current
21 condition. That is because this line is the same -- in
22 the same location as the already approved Case 164. So
23 we were proposing to co-locate on that existing line,
24 the difference being would be the addition of three more
25 conductors in the simulated condition.

1 Q. So just to clarify that, Mr. Ortiz y Pino, the
2 current condition would look almost exactly like the
3 simulated condition because, no matter what, you're
4 going to see the poles. It's just the additional three
5 conductors; correct?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That's correct.

7 Q. Thank you. Please continue.

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So from this point,
9 Route 1 continues approximately another one and a
10 quarter miles west towards the southern boundary of --
11 towards the Santa Rita Substation.

12 At the Santa Rita Substation, the structures
13 will require coordination with the Arizona Electric
14 Power Cooperative, or AEPCO, in order to raise an
15 existing 230-kilovolt transmission line that crosses in
16 this area as well.

17 So this would allow the safety clearances that
18 Member Comstock was asking about earlier as the 138 line
19 crosses below and drops into our substation.

20 We have been in communication with AEPCO
21 regarding the coordination to raise these structures,
22 and those conversations are ongoing and going well.

23 So now that I've described the existing land
24 uses surrounding the -- so having described the existing
25 land uses surrounding Route 1, I would now like to

1 discuss the general plan uses and the future land uses
2 with respect to Route 1.

3 Within the City of Tucson's general plan, we
4 have two future land uses described in their planned
5 Tucson, their general plan. We have an industrial area
6 to the north surrounding the Sonoran Substation, and
7 then a gray area kind of surrounding that other blue
8 area, which is called south lands. The south lands is a
9 large plot of vacant land that is owned by Arizona State
10 Land, and it's discussed in the general plan as an area
11 that has the potential to accommodate future housing and
12 employment growth for a region but lacks infrastructure
13 and is largely disconnected from the city. So they're
14 anticipating growth here much further down in the
15 planning horizon.

16 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Which area is that? Can
17 you show it on the map again?

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So this gray area that
19 Clark is pointing to here.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay.

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I'll also point out that
22 the city of Tucson and Pima County boundaries get very
23 confusing in this area. There's kind of some peninsular
24 jurisdictional boundaries here.

25 So Pima County in this area, that blue,

1 U-shaped piece is actually in Pima County, as well as
2 the low density residential, that is in Pima County.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Wait. That's -- the blue
4 industrial area around Sonora, that's the county, not
5 the city?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So I apologize for
7 confusing you there. The colors are a little bit too
8 close.

9 The blue area around the Sonoran Substation is
10 city of Tucson.

11 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: To the north?

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: To the north.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And then to the south
14 it's --

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: And to the south -- so at
16 the yellow lines, right there where he is, from there
17 south is Pima County.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. You're right. The
19 lines do get confusing.

20 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah. And it's just a
21 maze in this area.

22 So in Pima County, there is, essentially, the
23 same future planned used as the existing land uses.
24 There are a spatter of different residential
25 designations, including low intensity rural, medium

1 intensity rural, and low intensity urban.

2 However, the predominant land use designation
3 within Pima County is another grayed out area, which
4 they call the Arizona State Land Future Growth Area.
5 This is land all held in state trust and is set aside
6 for a future annexation area of the town of Sahuarita.
7 So there is no planning area here. There's a set aside.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So you're looking -- it's
9 looking to be annexed by Sahuarita? So they're in talks
10 with ASLD about acquiring the property?

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It is, like, a long-term
12 planning notion. It is the future annexation areas of
13 the Town of Sahuarita. They have been in conversations
14 with ASLD. ASLD is aware of this as a conceptual land
15 use in the future.

16 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So State Land knows that
17 the Town of Sahuarita has designs on this portion of its
18 property.

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That's correct.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I guess it's unclear now
21 what they would end up doing with that. It could be
22 industrial. It could be residential.

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: There is a very high
24 level conceptual land use plan that is not enforced by
25 any -- or not really stated in any of the general plans

1 and comprehensive plans. It is a very long-term,
2 far-horizon planning concept.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So it's a concept of a
4 plan.

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. So that's
6 actually why we didn't get too far into it here is
7 because what the plans say today is future growth area.
8 And in the general plan for the Town of Sahuarita, they
9 identify it as a future annexation area.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But it doesn't say what
11 they're going to do with it, though.

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Again, there's concepts,
13 and we can guess at what it is. They have some
14 residential. They have some commercial. They have some
15 business. It's kind of a mixed area.

16 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. All right. Thank
17 you.

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So another important land
19 use designation from Pima County in this area is the
20 resource sensitive, which is the Santa Rita Experimental
21 Range. Also of note again is the Town of Sahuarita land
22 use, which they set aside as specific plan.

23 The project Route 1 complies with each
24 jurisdiction's comprehensive and general plan's
25 policies.

1 So across all three jurisdictions, Route 1 is
2 within the Rural Homestead zone. It crosses adjacent to
3 an Industrial II in the City of Tucson but is wholly
4 within Rural Homestead. This zoning designation is used
5 as a base zoning district for large tracts of
6 undeveloped land, mostly to limit the demand on
7 municipal services in rural areas. The key takeaway
8 here is that the project does not conflict with any
9 applicable zoning ordinances.

10 So looking at the Sonoran Desert Conservation
11 Plan, which is an integrated piece of Pima County's Pima
12 Prospers Comprehensive Plan, we have the conservation
13 land systems which is encouraging the conservation of
14 biological resources.

15 Route 1 intersects all three of these
16 designations. However, because the project does not
17 require any discretionary land use changes, the policies
18 of the plan do not apply to this project. However,
19 because Route 1 would be co-located on an existing or
20 approved lines, the project aligns with the goals of the
21 plan to conserve environmental resources.

22 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And we're looking at the
23 map on Slide 33; correct?

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That's correct.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Now, those purple areas,

1 those are -- I'm assuming those are washes?

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Do they flow into the --
4 what's that river called?

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Santa Cruz River.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Santa Cruz. Do they flow
7 into that or out of that? Which way are they going
8 typically?

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes. So, generally, all
10 water conveyance in this area flows from the southeast
11 to the northwest and into tributaries to the Santa Cruz
12 River.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So now looking at
15 biological resources, there are two biotic communities
16 found in the project area. We have the Arizona upland
17 subdivision of the Sonoran Desert scrub and the
18 semidesert grasslands. These biotic communities are
19 host to a variety of wildlife that reflect the diversity
20 of the region found throughout the area.

21 Now, while there's no designated critical
22 habitat in the vicinity of Route 1, there are three
23 special-status species with the potential to occur.
24 They include the Cactus ferruginous pigmy-owl. I
25 apologize. I cannot pronounce that word and it will be

1 pronounced differently every time I say it. So I
2 apologize there. But this owl species is listed as
3 threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act.

4 We have the potential for the Monarch butterfly
5 to occur, which is proposed threatened. And we also
6 have the potential for the Pima pineapple cactus to
7 occur, which is a listed endangered species.

8 Because there's suitable habitat for each of
9 these species to occur, TEP, in accordance with the
10 recommendations from the Arizona Game and Fish
11 Department, would conduct preconstruction surveys to
12 determine the species' presence within the construction
13 right-of-way area to inform appropriate conservation
14 measures. Now, these recommendations will be
15 incorporated into Exhibit B of the CEC, which we'll be
16 discussing shortly.

17 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) So, Mr. Ortiz y Pino, did TEP
18 send a project evaluation request to the Arizona Game
19 and Fish Department?

20 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: We did.

21 Q. And is a copy of that document marked as
22 Exhibit TEP-13?

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I believe so, yes. Yes.

24 Q. Did TEP receive a response from the Arizona
25 Game and Fish Department?

1 A. We did.

2 Q. And is a copy of that document marked as
3 Exhibit TEP-14?

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It is.

5 Q. And will you please summarize the response from
6 the Game and Fish Department.

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So they concurred with
8 our biological report and the species that were -- had
9 the potential to occur in the area. And they also
10 recommended several environmental protection measures to
11 add to our list of proposed environmental protection
12 measures.

13 Q. And I know that you've already mentioned that
14 Exhibit B to the proposed CEC is a list of all of the
15 environmental protection measures found in the CEC
16 application; correct?

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

18 Q. And that list includes the measures proposed by
19 the Arizona Game and Fish Department?

20 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

21 Q. And we might as well, as long as we're on this,
22 turn to Exhibit TEP-12, which is the proposed
23 certificate of environmental compatibility, and turn to
24 Exhibit B, which follows Exhibit A, which is the map of
25 the proposed project.

1 So Exhibit B is the proposed environmental
2 protection measures. Will you briefly discuss Exhibit B
3 with the committee and talk about how the exhibit was
4 derived.

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Absolutely.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: One second.

7 Member Fontes, did you have a question?

8 MEMBER FONTES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 I was just wondering if Fish and Wildlife came
10 back with any observation during the -- I will attempt
11 here, Mr. Ortiz y Pino -- the ferruginous pigmy-owl.
12 Their breeding season is from June 15th to August 15th.
13 That is not a good time to construct in Arizona.

14 And I'm just looking for you to see if there
15 was any feedback from them and if your construction
16 schedule falls outside of that time period for
17 assurances as a practical mitigation measure.

18 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you. I guess that's
20 probably a nice segue to Exhibit B, which I think is
21 going to address that, is it not?

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes. So, Member Fontes,
23 we do have a list of -- so first to answer your
24 question.

25 In our biological resources report that was

1 published as part of this application, there were no
2 documented occurrences of the Cactus ferruginous
3 pigmy-owl, and so we don't have any documented
4 occurrences. That doesn't mean that they don't exist or
5 that there's not suitable habitat. They've just not
6 been documented.

7 So, again, with that point, we do have
8 environmental protection measures to do preconstruction
9 surveys to determine the presence of these species
10 within the right-of-way.

11 Now, speaking to Exhibit B, we have a list of
12 the company's standard environmental protection measures
13 that we do for almost any project, basically all
14 projects. These are best management practices. They
15 range from APLIC guidelines, to compliance with the
16 Clean Water Act and obtaining a storm water pollution
17 prevention plan.

18 They also go into the specific environmental
19 protection measures for the Cactus ferruginous
20 pigmy-owl, the Western burrowing owl, migratory birds
21 generally, the Sonoran desert tortoise, the Monarch
22 butterfly, and the Pima pineapple cactus.

23 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) And specific to Member Fontes'
24 question, Mr. Ortiz y Pino, when you're looking at the
25 Cactus ferruginous pigmy-owl, the second bullet actually

1 does suggest that if the -- and I love this. There's an
2 acronym for it -- CFPO is present, avoid construction in
3 suitable or occupied habitat during their breeding
4 season; correct?

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

6 Q. And the company has committed to abide by that
7 recommendation?

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

9 Q. Thank you. Please continue. Unless there are
10 any other questions.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

13 MEMBER LITTLE: Tell me again where to find
14 Exhibit B. Is it at the end of the proposed CEC?

15 It's hard when I have thousands of pages here
16 in that exhibit to go back and forth. So I'm still a
17 little behind you here.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes. They're Exhibit 12.
19 That's the proposed CEC. It has the Exhibit A and the
20 Exhibit B attached to it.

21 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. All right. I'm just
22 there now. Thank you.

23 MS. GRABEL: Do we want to wait for Member
24 Little to look at it in case she has any other questions
25 or to just continue?

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Are you ready, Member
2 Little?

3 MEMBER LITTLE: You can go ahead. Thank you.

4 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Please continue, Mr. Ortiz y
5 Pino.

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: All right. So in our
7 next slide, Slide 35, we are looking at biological
8 wealth. This is the higher landscape perspective of the
9 ecosystems.

10 Route 1 is located within the
11 San Xavier-Sierrita-Santa Rita wildlife corridor. And
12 this is connecting two habitat blocks from the Santa
13 Rita Mountains in the lower right of the slide -- of the
14 map, and the San Xavier District of the Tohono O'odham
15 Nation in the top left portion of the map.

16 It's also important to note that the Santa Rita
17 Mountains are an important bird area.

18 And as Route 1 would be co-located with
19 existing and approved lines, it would not impact the
20 movement of any wildlife or important bird areas. It
21 wouldn't impact these areas.

22 So we just mentioned Exhibit B here.

23 Q. Yes. So let's talk really quickly about SHPO,
24 which you just mentioned.

25 Did TEP send a letter to the State Historic

1 Preservation Office, or to SHPO?

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: We did.

3 Q. And is a copy of that letter marked as TEP-15?

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It is.

5 Q. Has TEP received a response from SHPO?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: We did.

7 Q. Is that response marked as Exhibit TEP-16?

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

9 Q. And is SHPO's recommendation found in the red
10 font on TEP-16, specifically, the third and fourth
11 sentences?

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It is.

13 Q. What does SHPO recommend?

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So as I'll mention in a
15 few more slides, SHPO concurs with TEP's intent to
16 complete a Class 3 pedestrian survey of cultural
17 resources on areas that have not been previously
18 surveyed or surveyed to current standards. We also
19 support TEP's intent to avoid placement of structures
20 and any ground disturbance within historic properties.

21 Q. I just realized I asked you that question three
22 slides too early. So my apologies. I won't ask them
23 again in three slides.

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: We'll get there.

25 Okay. So as you mentioned, Chairman Stafford,

1 there's a lot of riparian areas within this project
2 study area. These are also regulated riparian areas
3 within Pima County and the city of Tucson.

4 What is important to note is that they are all
5 ephemeral washes, meaning that they only flow as a
6 result of significant storm events. Impact to these
7 areas are minimized by co-locating Route 1 on the
8 existing Vail to Kantor transmission line which spans
9 these washes already.

10 Where new portions or new-build portions of
11 Route 1 will be required, they are in proximity to
12 regulated riparian areas. So the area from the Sonoran
13 Substation to Wilmot, that diagonal section of new build
14 will be in proximity to a regulated riparian area and
15 will be required to comply with erosion hazard setbacks
16 as well as other floodplain use requirements.

17 Moving on into scenic and recreation resources.
18 As you can see in Slide 38, there are two Pima County
19 designated scenic routes in the project area.

20 Sahuarita Road is a designated scenic major
21 road and Santa Rita Road is a designated scenic nonmajor
22 road. There are no scenic road policies that would
23 apply to this project.

24 So now getting to cultural resources. There
25 have been many cultural resources studies in this area

1 which have contributed to our understanding of the
2 culturally very significant areas in proximity to the
3 Santa Cruz River.

4 The areas where previous studies have been
5 completed are described and illustrated in blue and
6 beige colors, where beige represents the areas where
7 cultural resource studies are older than 10 years, and
8 blue for more recent studies in the past 10 years.

9 So TEP has been coordinating, like Ms. Grabel
10 mentioned, with the State Historic Preservation Office
11 throughout our siting and outreach efforts, and we've
12 requested the SHPO to review our Class 1 that was
13 conducted for the entire project study area -- again, a
14 Class 1 is a cultural resources inventory of the studies
15 that have been completed -- and also to make comments on
16 each of the proposed routes, and they provided those
17 comments in a letter to us.

18 So with that, we can get into --

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Quick question. Looking at
20 the SHPO letter, Exhibit 16, they recommended a Class 3
21 survey of all areas that are previously unsurveyed to
22 adequate standards. Do they -- it's unclear to me
23 whether they're talking about the final right-of-way or
24 the corridor itself.

25 And does it make a difference if you're on the

1 State Trust Land? Because typically you guys only do
2 the survey for the final right-of-way, but I have seen
3 State Trust Land require surveys of the entire corridor.

4 What is your expectation for this project?

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So in our letter, we
6 clarified that it would be the right-of-way, the final
7 right-of-way corridor. I just made that even more
8 confusing.

9 So the 100-foot right-of-way where the line
10 would be constructed would be surveyed with a Class 3
11 pedestrian survey.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And that's going to be
13 regardless of where it's located?

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So in areas that have not
15 been previously surveyed within the last 10 years that
16 do not have an adequate survey, we would resurvey those
17 areas.

18 And with respect to Arizona State Land
19 Department and their leases, they do require a full
20 Class 3 pedestrian survey of new construction on their
21 land.

22 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I'm still not clear whether
23 it's the corridor or just the final right-of-way.

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It would be the final
25 right-of-way. Sorry.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So it's -- I guess you need
2 to decide where you're going to put it and then you do
3 the survey, as opposed to surveying the whole area and
4 then deciding where to put it.

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah. So within that
6 final 100-foot right-of-way, and we know where all the
7 resources may be, engineers can microsite and can avoid.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. And looking at
9 your -- at Slide 39, it looks like there's a big chunk
10 of it for Route 1 that was surveyed. I can't tell
11 because -- I can see it's next to it.

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But it's next to where the
14 existing and planned lines are. And I'm assuming that
15 in connection with the planned line, you had some
16 surveys done that were more recent.

17 Is that what we're looking at here on this
18 slide?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So I believe what we're
20 seeing in the blue areas in this slide to the right of
21 Route 1, I believe what we're seeing there is going to
22 be the Wilmot Energy Center II. So a lot of the data
23 that we have did not see that. It's a brand new
24 facility, recently constructed. So those studies were
25 done likely for that project. So there's a new

1 transmission line in that corridor for that generation
2 site.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But you'll have to survey
4 next to it where you're going to put your line, though.

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Now, if they had done the
7 whole corridor, you would already be done where you're
8 going to put your line, then, wouldn't it?

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: You know, we should talk
10 to them next time we see them.

11 A. BY MR. BRYNER: They would probably send us a
12 bill.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. Thanks. Please
14 proceed.

15 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Chairman Stafford, would now be
16 an okay time for me to answer Member Comstock's question
17 about the clearance?

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Please do.

19 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Okay. So on the 345 crossing
20 there along Wilmot Road, the clearance between the 138kV
21 line and the 345kV line is 12.3 feet.

22 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. I believe up
24 next we had the virtual tour coming.

25 MS. GRABEL: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Well, normally by this time
2 we would have been going about 90 minutes, but we did
3 have sort of an unscheduled break there early on, but I
4 think it's appropriate to take a break now, give our
5 court reporter a rest before we start with the virtual
6 tour.

7 With that, we'll take a 10-minute recess.

8 (A recess was taken from 2:28 p.m. to
9 2:43 p.m.)

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the
11 record.

12 I believe you were about to take a virtual tour
13 of Route 1.

14 MS. GRABEL: Yes. And before I do that, I
15 would like to admit TEP Exhibit 6.

16 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) So, Mr. Ortiz y Pino, can you
17 please turn to TEP-6.

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

19 Q. TEP-6 is the virtual tour of this project;
20 correct?

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It is.

22 Q. Was the tour prepared by you or under your
23 direction and control?

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, it was.

25 Q. How was the tour prepared?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: The tour was prepared
2 using three-dimensional models from PLS-CADD and
3 overlaid in GoogleEarth.

4 Q. And does the tour present a realistic view of
5 the landscape?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: To the best of our power.

7 Q. Thank you. Go ahead and please begin the tour.

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Starting off with a broad
9 context in southeast Arizona, the project area.

10 So Route 1 exits the Sonoran Substation to the
11 south and proceeds west towards Swan Road.

12 At Swan Road, Route 1 crosses below the
13 TEP/WAPA line. It then doubles back to the southeast
14 towards Wilmot Road.

15 Again, these are KOPs that we looked at
16 previously from the low density residential neighborhood
17 to the south.

18 You can see in the green lines we have our
19 500-foot corridor.

20 And to the north of this line we have the
21 Arizona State Penitentiary.

22 Now, for a portion of this line in this area,
23 we worked with the Tucson Airport Authority and have
24 come to a general agreement on the location of the line
25 on their property south of the TEP/WAPA line.

1 We are approaching Wilmot Road. Route 1 joins
2 onto the UNSE Vail to Kantor line and continues here
3 going south on this line for the next approximately
4 11 miles.

5 Again, we can see our simulated baseline
6 condition. Existing single circuit coming towards us
7 now has double circuit.

8 Q. So, Mr. Ortiz y Pino, if we're co-locating on a
9 line that already exists, why do we need a 500-foot
10 corridor in this area?

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So the 500-foot corridor
12 that we're requesting as part of this project is the
13 same 500-foot corridor that was requested as part of
14 Case 176 to rebuild the existing UNSE-owned line.

15 It's to provide the company with the
16 flexibility to locate on either side of Wilmot Road in
17 order to work with landowners in the area.

18 Q. Thank you.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Little.

21 MEMBER LITTLE: Does the UNSE line exist right
22 now or is it going to be built?

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Member Little, Chairman
24 Stafford, yes, the UNSE line exists today.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But it's going to get

1 rebuilt, though; right?

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It's going to be rebuilt
3 to a double-circuit standard, correct.

4 MEMBER LITTLE: So the poles will remain the
5 same or they will be replaced?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: The poles will be
7 replaced with slightly more robust structures to support
8 a second circuit.

9 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

10 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Is this the Vail to Kantor
11 radial line we were talking about earlier?

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, it is.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So coming up, we're
15 approaching the residential area on the left side of
16 Wilmot Road, and here we see the low density rural
17 character of this neighborhood. Again, it's roughly one
18 home for every 4 acres.

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Can you pause it a second.

20 So if we're looking at the placemat, this is in
21 the area that has the B.

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes. This is Section B
23 on the placemat.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

25 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So coming up to cross

1 Sahuarita Road and KOP-7. Again, looking at the
2 existing line, a slightly more robust line capable of
3 supporting two circuits.

4 So, again, as I mentioned earlier in this
5 testimony, this residential area there are 83 homes
6 within 500 feet of the existing transmission line.
7 33 of these properties have current easements to UNSE
8 for the existing line.

9 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Will TEP need to pay UNSE
12 something for the use of their -- I don't know. I guess
13 they're going to rebuild it anyway, so --

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Sure.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: I'm just wondering whether
16 money will change hands.

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Would you mind pausing
18 the thing? Thank you.

19 So again, this is part of the question with
20 respect to the DOE grant funds, and there's still some
21 uncertainty as to how that will proceed.

22 In order to build this line, TEP would need to
23 obtain their own easements in TEP's name. Currently,
24 the easements over these properties are in UNSE's name,
25 and we would need to require -- we would be required to

1 have TEP easements for the same right-of-way.

2 With respect to the changing of -- of
3 money changing hands between TEP and UNSE, TEP would
4 likely take a 50 percent stake in this line from Nogales
5 Tap to the Santa Rita Road, so we would own 50 percent
6 of that line if this line were built.

7 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

9 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Sir, through this area, are
10 any of those homes in this area served with natural gas?

11 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Member Comstock, TEP or UNS Gas
12 does not provide service to this area for gas, so we
13 wouldn't be in a position to answer that question.

14 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Did anybody check?

15 A. BY MR. BRYNER: No.

16 MS. GRABEL: Are you wondering if there are gas
17 lines around this area?

18 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Yes, ma'am.

19 A. BY MR. BRYNER: There are no high pressure
20 transmission lines in this area. Whether there's
21 distribution lines, that's something we didn't look
22 into. It's not something we normally look into.

23 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Mr. Bryner, does the typical
24 condition that talks about the studies that TEP will do
25 with regard to gas lines apply to distribution lines?

1 A. BY MR. BRYNER: No, it does not. It's strictly
2 for transmission lines. For distribution lines related
3 to gas, those are -- those are in typically with plastic
4 PVC pipe versus steel pipe that has the potential to
5 corrode or carry a current.

6 MS. GRABEL: Thank you.

7 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member DiCiccio.

9 MEMBER DICICCIO: And the reason Mr. Comstock
10 asked that question -- and we've been asking that of
11 every applicant and every applicant has been pretty
12 accommodating of it -- we're trying to provide a map for
13 future growth of what's going to happen in the state of
14 Arizona, and we would like to get an idea of the
15 infrastructure that's already out there.

16 So in that area where you're at, if there
17 aren't any gas lines -- I'm just explaining why the
18 question is going to come up at every meeting. And
19 we've asked others just to go ahead and map it out, as
20 well, to contact the gas companies that are there.

21 But it gives us the idea -- well, not the idea.
22 It gives us the information that we need going forward
23 if people are going to be able to tap into other lines
24 that are there and to see if there's any other type of
25 infrastructure that's going to be needed for future

1 growth. So that's why the question was asked.

2 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Understood.

3 MEMBER DICICCIO: All right. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: While we're on the subject
5 of that neighborhood, you say that TEP -- neither TEP
6 nor UniSource serve that neighborhood?

7 A. BY MR. BRYNER: For gas service, correct.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: How about electric?

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So, actually, this is the
10 boundary of our TEP service territory. So west -- east
11 of Wilmot Road is Trico service territory.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Trico?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So TEP does serve that area
15 that's outside the city and Pima County that's right
16 there that we're passing by with this route.

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah. We're literally
18 looking at the boundary of our service territory. On
19 the right-hand side of this dirt road is TEP. On the
20 left side where these homes are is Trico.

21 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. I had it backwards,
22 because I'm looking at the map. And we're looking south
23 in this picture; right?

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. Now it makes more

1 sense. Thanks.

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So we're now approaching
3 the end of the Wilmot Road, the end of this dirt road,
4 and it also marks the beginning -- the northern boundary
5 of the Santa Rita Experimental Range.

6 Route 1 proceeds for another 1.6 miles across
7 the Santa Rita Experimental Range, again, on an existing
8 line and an existing right-of-way, and it will continue
9 there until Santa Rita Road.

10 So in the distance here you can see the
11 transmission line approved under Case 164 intersecting
12 Route 1 from right to left.

13 At Santa Rita Road, which is -- we'll see it
14 right here -- at Santa Rita Road, Route 1 co-locates on
15 this line and heads to the northwest and on the north
16 side of the road right-of-way.

17 The 500-foot CEC corridor that we've requested
18 along this stretch of the road is the same 500-foot
19 corridor that was approved under Case 164 for that
20 transmission line.

21 So as we approach the Sahuarita Highlands
22 subdivision, which is this grouping of homes to the top
23 right of the map, Route 1 turns to the west or to the
24 left towards the planned Santa Rita Substation.

25 Again, in this current condition, we could have

1 simulated the approved 164. The line we see here
2 turning to the left, that turning structure is
3 1,000 feet from the nearest home on the corner of that
4 subdivision.

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So you're saying the 138kV,
6 164, is approved but not constructed; correct?

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And then the 176, it
9 exists -- that one is already built or is -- it says a
10 rebuild under the Case 176. So there's something else
11 there that's going to be replaced by the 138kV under
12 176?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So the UNSE-owned Vail to
14 Kantor line exists there today as a single-circuit 138kV
15 line. Case 176 approves the rebuild of that line.

16 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: A rebuild to what?

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It will be to a
18 double-circuit standard.

19 It was a larger structure; right?

20 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yeah. So it's to rebuild it to
21 a double-circuit standard, but that's not the purpose
22 for the rebuild. The rebuild is because it's -- the
23 conductor is underrated.

24 If you go back to our Case 252 last fall,
25 you'll remember the second phase of the Santa Cruz

1 Reliability Project was actually Case 176. That's,
2 essentially, a straw on our system, and we need to
3 replace that conductor so that we can get our full
4 capacity in Santa Cruz County, but those existing
5 structures can't support the heavier conductor.

6 So that's the purpose, but our standard is to
7 do double-circuit structures, so it happens to be the
8 perfect opportunity to co-locate.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. So it approved
10 the rebuild with double-circuit capable structures? Is
11 that what it was?

12 A. BY MR. BRYNER: That's correct.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And so now this is for the
14 second circuit, then.

15 A. BY MR. BRYNER: So, yeah, now we're essentially
16 just taking advantage of the fact that that's already
17 there to place that second circuit.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

21 MEMBER LITTLE: Before we get started again, so
22 in that KOP -- what is it? I think it's 12.

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Uh-huh.

24 MEMBER LITTLE: The poles will be there
25 regardless of whether -- even if we chose -- or even if

1 you decided to build Option 3 as opposed to Option 1,
2 the poles would still be there because of the other
3 circuit; right?

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

5 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So as Route 1 proceeds
7 towards the planned Santa Rita Substation in the black
8 boundary there, you can see it's on the left side or
9 south of another transmission line that we've simulated
10 here. This is the AEPCO 230-kilovolt transmission line.
11 We will need to coordinate with AEPCO to raise these
12 structures up higher to maintain safety clearances as
13 the 138 crosses below and drops into the substation. We
14 have had good conversations with AEPCO and anticipate
15 that not being a problem.

16 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So they're going to have to
17 raise their lines, you said?

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

20 MEMBER LITTLE: Does AEPCO provide power to
21 Trico down there?

22 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Member Little, that's correct.

23 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

24 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) I think we're ready to move on
25 to Route 3.

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah.

2 Okay. So moving on to Route 3, we again start
3 at the Sonoran Substation. The interesting land uses
4 surrounding this area are very similar to those found
5 surrounding Route 1 in terms of both the residential
6 uses, the majority vacant and undeveloped land, and the
7 transmission lines corridors found throughout the
8 project area.

9 Similar to Route 1, Route 3 exits from a bay on
10 the south side of the substation and proceeds west
11 toward Swan Road and then crossing beneath the TEP/WAPA
12 line.

13 So again we see in this KOP-1 a simulated
14 baseline condition where we have a transmission line on
15 the right-hand side of Swan Road here, crossing below
16 the TEP/WAPA line.

17 On the left side of Swan, we have an existing
18 46-kilovolt line. Again, I should note that the
19 46-kilovolt is built to the same standard as the 138kV
20 standard in TEP's system.

21 So in our simulated condition, Route 3 is
22 co-located on the transmission lines on the east side of
23 Swan on the right side of the image, and cross over onto
24 the left side of Swan Road and co-locate onto an
25 existing 46-kilovolt line before heading west.

1 So Route 3 co-locates on this existing
2 46-kilovolt transmission line for approximately one mile
3 adjacent to a residential area. There are approximately
4 18 homes along this one-mile stretch.

5 The woman that I spoke with earlier who left
6 who was in the audience, she lives in this area along
7 Singing Cactus Road.

8 We received three comments from the residents
9 of this area who were concerned about another power line
10 in their backyards, as well as the potential health
11 risks and the impacts to the views from their homes.
12 Again, when it was explained that we're not proposing a
13 new line but co-locating a second circuit on the
14 existing line, following this clarification, we didn't
15 receive further input.

16 So west of this residential area, we continue
17 west and proceed for another mile across vacant state
18 land.

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: That section marked as D is
20 the co-locate on the placemat. So that's -- all that's
21 there now is an existing 46kV line?

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So you're going to have to
24 replace those poles and have a single-circuit 138kV with
25 a 46kV underbuild, or is the 46kV getting eliminated?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So as I mentioned in the
2 previous slide, our 46kV system is built to the same
3 standard as our 138 system.

4 So it would be the exact same as co-locating on
5 a 138kV line except in this instance there will be 46 on
6 one side and 138 on the other side. So they'll exist at
7 different voltages on the same line.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. So the 46kV poles
9 are roughly the same height as the 138kV poles, then.

10 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That's correct.

11 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. That makes it a
12 much easier transition. Thank you.

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay. So here at Key
14 Observation Point No. 3, this is an image taken from the
15 southeastern most corner of the Summit neighborhood. It
16 is also the intersection of where Route 3, co-located on
17 the 46-kilovolt line, jumps onto and transfers to
18 co-locate on the 138kV line that is also existing there
19 today.

20 So, again, on the simulated image, we just show
21 a second circuit coming in on the left. One jumps up to
22 the 138, and the 46 continues to the right and to the
23 west.

24 So Route 3 continues to the south for another
25 2 miles, co-located on this existing transmission line.

1 In Slide 41, you can see on the map that
2 Route 3 is joined in this corridor by an extra high
3 voltage transmission corridor. This is the same two
4 345kV lines and 230kV lines that Route 1 crossed over
5 along Wilmot.

6 In this section right here, those lines turn to
7 the south and are co-located in a corridor with our
8 proposed Route 3.

9 So at this point the existing line on which
10 Route 3 is co-located -- where Clark is pointing -- this
11 existing line turns to the left off the screen and to
12 the west towards the town of Sahuarita.

13 Here, Route 3 must turn to the right, or east,
14 in a section of new build and underneath the extra high
15 voltage lines to the outside of the corridor.

16 The extra high voltage lines continue on this
17 path south for another three quarters of a mile before
18 turning west towards Sahuarita themselves.

19 At this point another existing TEP 138kV line
20 comes from the west and joins into this corridor.
21 Route 3 will then co-locate on that line, continuing
22 south.

23 The transmission line coming in from the west
24 is currently only able to support a single circuit. If
25 Route 3 were to be constructed, the line from this point

1 all the way to the Santa Rita Substation would need to
2 be rebuilt to support that second circuit of Route 3.
3 So this corresponds to Section G on the placemat.

4 In Key Observation Point 6, we have an image
5 taken from the Sahuarita Acres subdivision. This is
6 about two miles south of that, that jut out of new build
7 around the extra high voltage corridor.

8 Along this stretch from this neighborhood,
9 there are approximately 18 homes within 500 feet of the
10 existing 138kV line.

11 Looking at the current condition in the top
12 image, we have -- we're pointing to an existing
13 distribution line in this corridor, and this is a
14 TEP-owned 14kV distribution line.

15 Continuing to the right in the corridor is the
16 AEPCO-owned 230-kilovolt transmission line on H-frames.

17 Continuing to the right, we have TEP's tan
18 monopoles. This is the structure on which Route 3 would
19 co-locate. As you can see, it's a pretty minor
20 structure and is only able to hold one circuit.

21 Again, following to the right, we have a Trico
22 owned double-circuit distribution line in this corridor.

23 In the simulated condition, we can see that the
24 tan monopole is replaced with a self-weathering steel,
25 rust-colored, double-circuit transmission line.

1 So on Slide 48 on the left screen, we have a
2 Key Observation Point 8. This has representative views
3 of Route 3 from a residential community along El Toro
4 Road just to the east of Country Club Road.

5 On Slide 49 in the Key Observation Point 8, on
6 the top image we can see that the distant tan monopole
7 on the right-hand side of the screen spans to a shorter
8 U-shaped pole on the far left of the screen. Meanwhile,
9 the 230-kilovolt line spans from the H-frame structures
10 to a much taller H-frame replacement structure monopole.

11 This is so that both lines, as they cross
12 Country Club and Toro Road intersection, can cross over
13 each other. They switch sides in the corridor at this
14 intersection. So the 138 line goes underneath the 230,
15 the 230 continues over the top, and they switch sides.

16 So in the current condition, we are on the east
17 side of the 230. South of this intersection, we will be
18 on the west side of the 230.

19 So in the simulated condition, the structures
20 follow the exact same path except they're on slightly
21 larger, taller structures. So each of those structures
22 would need to be replaced to accommodate for the
23 additional safety clearances between conductors.

24 Continuing south along the west side of Country
25 Club Road, Route 3 passes the Sahuarita Highlands

1 subdivision. There are four homes within 500 feet of
2 the existing line as well as Route 3.

3 In the top image, this is a representative view
4 from the entrance into that community which is along
5 Santa Rita Road. It looks towards the south-southwest
6 at this utility corridor for about three quarters of a
7 mile until it turns to the west. You can see
8 significant vegetation concealing a portion of these
9 lines.

10 The bottom image is the simulated condition.
11 Again, we see that the tan, single-circuit monopoles are
12 replaced with slightly larger double-circuit monopoles.

13 So Route 3 traverses a very similar mix of
14 planned land uses compared to Route 1, passing along the
15 outer edges of low intensity rural, low intensity urban,
16 and medium intensity rural designations.

17 By co-locating Route 3 on existing transmission
18 lines within existing utility corridors, Route 3 does
19 not substantially affect the planned land uses. This
20 project in Route 3 complies with the jurisdictions'
21 comprehensive and general plans and their policies.

22 Again, similar to Route 1, Route 3 crosses all
23 three jurisdictions within the Rural Homestead zone. As
24 I mentioned previously, this is the base zoning
25 designation for rural areas, and this project in Route 3

1 does not conflict with any applicable zones.

2 Route 3 crosses perpendicularly to several
3 important riparian designated areas by the Conservation
4 Land System and does not intersect with any of the other
5 categories designated by the system.

6 As I mentioned previously for Route 1, these
7 Conservation Land System guidelines and categories are
8 only applied to private developments that need rezoning
9 or other discretionary land use changes for the project.
10 So the plan -- the goals and policies of the Sonoran
11 Desert Conservation Plan do not apply necessarily to
12 this project.

13 Again, looking at biological resources and
14 impacts for Route 3 would be very similar to those of
15 Route 1. Route 3 passes through roughly an identical
16 proportion of the two biotic communities found in the
17 project area.

18 There is no designated critical habitat within
19 this project area and the same three special status
20 species have the potential to occur. As a way of
21 reminder, that's the Cactus ferruginous pigmy-owl or the
22 CFPO. I might just call it the CFPO from now on if
23 that's okay. I probably won't mention it another time.
24 We also have the Monarch butterfly which is proposed
25 threatened, and the Pima pineapple cactus.

1 Again, TEP would be conducting preconstruction
2 surveys to determine if the species were present and
3 inform any conservation measures required for
4 construction.

5 Looking at biological wealth at the higher
6 landscape ecosystem level, Route 3 is located within the
7 same wildlife corridor as Route 1 and in the vicinity of
8 the same habitat blocks and important bird areas of
9 Route 1. And, similarly, Route 3 would not impact
10 wildlife movement or the important bird area.

11 By co-locating the majority of Route 3 on
12 existing facilities, TEP is limiting additional
13 disturbances to these regulated riparian areas, spanning
14 washes to the maximum extent possible, and minimizing
15 vegetation management. Route 3 will not impact any
16 regulated riparian areas.

17 Route 3 crosses perpendicularly to both the
18 Sahuarita Road scenic major road designation, as well as
19 the Santa Rita Road which is a scenic nonmajor road
20 designated. There are no policies within the scenic
21 road policies that apply to this project.

22 There is a single recreational facility located
23 within the project area, the Walden Grove Athletic
24 Facilities, which is also on the same property as the
25 Walden Grove High School. This is -- the nearest point

1 is within 500 feet of the existing transmission lines.
2 So that nearest point is actually on the track-and-field
3 track, so it's on the very far perimeter of these
4 facilities.

5 So there would be no impact to scenic or
6 recreational resources in this area.

7 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

9 MEMBER LITTLE: How close is the KOP that is in
10 that area to the school and the recreational facility?

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So KOP-6 is taken from
12 this Sahuarita Acres subdivision. I'm going to have to
13 get a quick count for the exact distance from KOP-6 to
14 those recreational facilities.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

16 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: And, again, we're talking
17 KOP-6 is taken from here, and the Walden Grove
18 Recreational Facilities is here. So they're pretty
19 close.

20 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah.

22 So, again, the areas where previous studies
23 have been completed for cultural resources are
24 illustrated on this map in beige and blue, with beige
25 representing studies older than 10 years, and blue

1 representing studies from the more recent past within
2 10 years.

3 Although you can't tell by looking at this map,
4 there is actually a pretty significant portion of
5 Route 3 that has been surveyed within the last 10 years.
6 These surveys have been taking place within the
7 transmission line right-of-way, so within that 100 feet.
8 So the purple line is actually concealing those surveys
9 in this point.

10 And as a matter of practice and in accordance
11 with SHPO recommendations, TEP plans to complete
12 additional Class 3 pedestrian surveys for all cultural
13 resources of the proposed transmission line right-of-way
14 in these areas that have not been studied in the last
15 10 years.

16 Okay. So we're ready for route -- virtual tour
17 of Route 3. Let me see if we have an answer to your
18 question, Member Little.

19 We're looking at just over a half of a mile
20 from KOP-6 to Walden Grove.

21 Okay. So similar to Route 1, Route 3 exits the
22 Sonoran Substation to the south and proceeds towards the
23 west at Swan Road.

24 You can see Route 3 on the right-hand side of
25 the screen transferring to the left-hand side and onto

1 the 46kV system.

2 Route 3 crosses below the TEP/WAPA line east of
3 Swan and co-locates onto the existing 46.

4 You can see for the next mile there's a
5 residential area just to the left of the line here.
6 There are 18 homes co-located on the -- co-located on
7 this existing 46kV line.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Can you pause it a second?

9 It looks like -- looking at the map, it looks
10 like that whole -- even the area north of the line is
11 zoned for residential, but I only see stuff to the
12 south.

13 There's no development? There's no houses
14 north of the line for this section?

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So that's correct. So
16 this area here, this is land owned by the Tucson Airport
17 Authority. And although it's zoned Rural Homestead like
18 I mentioned, that's the base zoning designation, there's
19 no residential areas in that area.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Now, base zoning
21 designation, is that tantamount to the default zoning?

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. It's what
23 jurisdictions use for areas in rural areas that are
24 separated from the majority of the municipal
25 infrastructure such as water and electric and other --

1 and sewer and so on and so forth.

2 So by limiting the density that's allowed in
3 those areas, it allows jurisdictions time, as those
4 developments grow, to bring those resources, that
5 infrastructure to them as it densifies.

6 So it's to limit the -- yeah. It limits the
7 densification of these rural areas so that municipal
8 infrastructure can catch up.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

10 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So at this point at this
11 last home, the line kind of proceeds diagonally to the
12 right. This is now on vacant state land.

13 So Route 3, co-located on this existing
14 46-kilovolt line, is now approaching the Summit
15 neighborhood and turns to the left, or south,
16 paralleling an existing 138-kilovolt line.

17 Within the Summit neighborhood, there are eight
18 homes, eight properties, that are within 500 feet of
19 this -- of Route 3.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Pause a second.

21 So we're at the section marked E on the
22 placemat or Slide 61.

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So we are about to
24 co-locate onto Section E on the placemat. That's
25 correct.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. So is it going to
2 co-locate and there's an additional line that's going to
3 be parallel?

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: No. So as we see in this
5 image here, this is the existing condition. The more
6 robust structure on the far left, that is the existing
7 46kV line.

8 In the simulated condition, it transfers onto
9 the taller 138kV line and it co-locates on that line
10 going south. That is Section E on your placemat.
11 There's no additional line being proposed there.

12 A. BY MR. BRYNER: If I could jump in, Chairman
13 Stafford. So there are two parallel lines for a little
14 bit in that case. Today, there's a 46kV line and a
15 138kV line that run parallel for just a short stretch.

16 We will co-locate with that 46kV line, but
17 then, like Mr. Ortiz y Pino is saying, we're going to
18 swap and we're going to co-locate with the 138kV line,
19 and from that point south there will be a single line.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. So you're looking at
21 the transition from Section D to Section E? Is that
22 what we're talking about?

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah. It's in the top
24 corner there.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right. But the Section E,

1 that's going to be two 138kV lines on the same pole;
2 right.

3 A. BY MR. BRYNER: That's correct, yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But it's Section D where
5 you have the 46kV on the same pole with the 138.

6 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Correct, but it will be two
7 parallel lines.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Oh, it would be two
9 parallel lines?

10 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Because the 138 exists there
11 today, but we wouldn't co-locate on that yet.

12 MS. GRABEL: So put another way, we're not
13 building any new poles. We're just co-locating on one
14 at one stretch and then co-locating on the other at
15 another stretch.

16 A. BY MR. BRYNER: That's correct.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right. Because your 46kV
18 line continues west; right?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So you're co-locating with
21 that till you get to the turning point near KOP-3, and
22 then you switch to the 138kV line that's heading south
23 and co-locate on that line. Okay.

24 A. BY MR. BRYNER: It's not confusing at all;
25 right?

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I'm getting it. Sometimes
2 I've got to ask -- I've got to hear it a couple of times
3 to make sure it sinks into my head. So thank you. I
4 appreciate that.

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So as we continue south
6 on this 138kV line, this existing 138kV line, it is a
7 double-circuit capable line.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So you just have to string
9 the conductor, then, for this section?

10 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That's correct.

11 So I want to point out that the purple lines in
12 this section represent the 500-foot corridor that we
13 will be requesting.

14 And coming up on your left, you can see coming
15 into the screen from the left and continuing in the
16 direction of our line, the ground scars here and now
17 continuing this way. These are the ground scars for the
18 extra high voltage transmission line corridors that we
19 have, the two 345s and the 230 in this area. We
20 continue in that corridor for a mile and a half.

21 At this point where you see the line taking a
22 left, the existing transmission line on which Route 3 is
23 co-located turns to the right or to the west towards
24 Sahuarita.

25 Route 3 must turn to the left or to the east

1 underneath the existing extra high voltage transmission
2 lines and to the outside of this corridor. This is a
3 section of new build. And in this section, TEP is
4 requesting a corridor width of 1,500 feet. This is to
5 allow flexibility in siting this new build section
6 within the extra high voltage corridor.

7 The extra high voltage lines turn to the west
8 towards Sahuarita and another TEP 138 line comes into
9 this corridor from the west. Route 3 will co-locate on
10 this existing 138-kilovolt line.

11 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: That one is currently just
12 a single circuit, so you'll have to rebuild it; correct?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. At this point
14 we co-locate on an existing line, but it is not built to
15 a double-circuit standard.

16 So as this line straightens out, you can see
17 that the corridor width returns to 500 feet.

18 Here you also get a good idea of the Walden
19 Grove Athletic Facilities and their proximity to both
20 the transmission lines and the residential area of the
21 Sahuarita Acres subdivision.

22 So within the Sahuarita Acres subdivision,
23 Route 3 is within 500 feet of 18 homes.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And, again, that's an
25 existing 138kV line.

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

2 In this section, you can see that we've gotten
3 a little bit more dense residential area. This is along
4 Country Club Road. In this section, there are 67 homes
5 within 500 feet of the existing line.

6 So here you can see the corridor crossing
7 diagonally across the intersection. As a reminder,
8 Route 3 and the existing line cross below the 230 and
9 switch sides in the corridor.

10 The 230 is on the left side closest to Country
11 Club Road. And the TEP existing 138 line, Route 3, is
12 on the outside.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Wait. So here you'll
14 have -- there will be two 138kV lines, one single, one
15 double-circuit, parallel to each other?

16 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So this is a corridor
17 here. So we have on the inside track closest to the
18 road is the 230-kilovolt AEPCO line.

19 And on the -- we have our Route 3 transmission
20 line -- the existing transmission line on which Route 3
21 would be co-located on the west side of that 230 line.
22 There's two lines parallel.

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Currently.

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Currently.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. And that's from --

1 is that all the way from -- for Section G or is it just
2 south of Sahuarita Road?

3 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So all of Section G,
4 there's two --

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Existing lines.

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: -- existing lines.

7 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And you're going to turn
8 one of them into a double circuit.

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay.

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So as we approach the
12 Santa Rita Substation, you can see -- I'm a little bit
13 late on this -- but there was a subdivision off in the
14 background there. That is the Quail Creek development
15 in Green Valley. The nearest homes to the line and the
16 substation are one mile away.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Can you show us that on the
18 map with the pointer?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Do I just not know how to
20 do this?

21 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I see you aiming your
22 hands. I'm not seeing a blip on the screen.

23 There you go.

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay. So that
25 subdivision to the south is the Quail Creek residential

1 development. It is one mile.

2 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Where is the cursor?

3 Okay. So it's outside the study area.

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is outside the study
5 area.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: What's that area just to
7 the northeast, that square there? Northeast of the
8 Santa Rita Substation.

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: In blue or beige?

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Beige. Because it looks
11 like there's a neighborhood that's surrounded by, like,
12 scenic area space or something?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. So that is the
14 Sahuarita Highlands subdivision.

15 And I believe what you're talking about,
16 surrounded by that green conservation area, that is a --
17 for subdivisions in this area within a half mile of the
18 Santa Rita Experimental Range, developments would be
19 required to have a -- let's see if I can remember what
20 it's called -- but it's essentially an open-space buffer
21 for their subdivisions. So that's just their land held
22 in conservation for that subdivision specifically.

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. And that can't be
24 developed, then.

25 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That cannot be developed.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. And then so what was
2 the nearest house to the line from that neighborhood?

3 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So there were four homes
4 within 500 feet of Route 3.

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. And they're 500 feet
6 from the existing two lines as it is.

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. That's correct.
8 Actually, they're a little bit closer to the AEPCO line
9 because we're on the outside.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. Excellent. Thank
11 you.

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay. So now that we've
13 had a chance to discuss both routes and their broad
14 environmental context, I want to bring us back to the
15 map on your placemats that we've created to help the
16 committee understand the various ways in which we've
17 pieced together each route to site the most
18 environmentally compatible transmission line that we
19 can.

20 On the table to the left, I want to point you
21 to the map code. I guess we're pretty familiar with it
22 at this point. But that corresponds to the color of new
23 build and the section in the map.

24 So starting with Route 1 on the -- at the
25 Sonoran Substation, we're looking at Section A in the

1 tan color. This represents a portion of the route that
2 will require new build infrastructure. There's about
3 two miles of new transmission line within Section A,
4 from Swan Road to Wilmot.

5 Following Route 1, we have Section B in purple
6 representing a portion of Route 1 that will be
7 co-located on the existing UNSE-owned Vail to Kantor
8 transmission line.

9 The third and final section of Route 1,
10 Section C in purple, represents the portion of the route
11 that will be co-located on the approved line from
12 Case 164.

13 Continuing along Route 3, again from the
14 Sonoran Substation, Section D is a -- in purple is a
15 section co-located on an existing 46-kilovolt
16 transmission line. Subtransmission line. Excuse me.

17 Section E, also in purple, is co-located on an
18 existing 138-kilovolt transmission line.

19 Section F, in tan, is a new build section in
20 order to get underneath and outside of the extra high
21 voltage corridor.

22 And then Section G in green is a section that
23 will require rebuild to accommodate and support the
24 extra circuit from Route 3.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: Can we go back to -- yes.

3 Thank you.

4 So the only place -- correct me if I'm wrong --
5 but the only place that will need to have poles replaced
6 in order to co-locate the existing circuit and the new
7 circuit is G; is that correct?

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct. There's
9 6 miles of that 138-kilovolt line that will require to
10 be rebuilt.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. And all of B, then,
12 and C, those poles are currently capable of having --
13 well, I guess that is yet to be built; right?

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. So Section B --

15 MEMBER LITTLE: Or it will just be built.

16 Okay.

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Section B will be rebuilt
18 as part of a separate project, and Route 1 will
19 co-locate on those lines -- on that line.

20 MEMBER LITTLE: Oh, okay. All right. Okay. I
21 think I got it. Thank you.

22 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) And, Mr. Ortiz y Pino, on the
23 rebuild in Section G, how different are the poles to
24 accommodate a different double circuit compared to
25 what's there today?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So they're slightly more
2 robust poles. The height is roughly similar. You will
3 have insulators on both sides of the pole holding three
4 additional conductor.

5 Q. Do you anticipate that there would be many more
6 poles than currently exist?

7 A. It would be rebuilt mostly in place and within
8 the existing footprint and right-of-way.

9 Q. Thank you.

10 MEMBER LITTLE: How much bigger are the bases
11 of the new ones compared to the old ones?

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Are you talking about going
13 from a single circuit to a double circuit, what's the --

14 MEMBER LITTLE: Yeah. Yeah.

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I think we're going to
16 have to get on the horn with our civil transmission
17 engineer and ask that question and we'll follow up.

18 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So in our next slide, on
20 slide 62, we have a side-by-side comparison summary of
21 Routes 1 and 3. So comparing the factors that we've
22 been describing, it uses green smiley faces to
23 illustrate factors that would have no concern or little
24 impact, and yellow "meh" faces to illustrate moderate
25 concerns or impacts.

1 As you can see, the majority of the factors
2 that we have are in green smiley faces.

3 Route 3 we have given a "meh" face for the
4 constructability due to the requirement to coordinate
5 construction through the extra high voltage corridor, as
6 well as to rebuild the 6-mile section of existing line
7 to support Route 3.

8 Route 1 received a "meh" face for the
9 right-of-way factor due to a large portion of the
10 private easements that would be required along Wilmot
11 Road.

12 With respect to the line length, Route 1 gets
13 the "meh" face because it is longer at 17.4 miles, while
14 Route 3 gets the green face for a shorter line.
15 However, due to the length of the route, due to the
16 route cost, Route 1 gets the green smiley face, while
17 Route 3 gets the yellow "meh" face.

18 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) Mr. Ortiz y Pino, just to
19 clarify, most of the faces on this are green; correct?

20 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: That is correct.

21 Q. And is that primarily due to the fact that both
22 routes take advantage of existing transmission
23 infrastructure?

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

25 Q. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I'm interested to hear why
2 the shorter line costs more when it has -- is it the --
3 the only yellow face it's got is the constructability
4 because you've got to pass under the existing high
5 voltage line. Is that what really makes the cost
6 difference?

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So the cost difference is
8 found mostly in that rebuild section. So within
9 Section G, we'll be required to, essentially, demolish
10 the line -- take an outage, demolish the line, and
11 rebuild in place. So that's 6 miles of new structures,
12 new conductor, new insulator for that section. Whereas,
13 the remaining of Route 1 is primarily co-located on
14 lines that will -- that exist or will exist.

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And that's the one that's
16 got the grant hang-up, then.

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct.

18 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yeah, Chairman Stafford, I
19 would just add to that that for Route 3, that rebuild
20 part, that's wholly borne by TEP. Whereas, along Wilmot
21 Road for Route 1, that's going to be -- we're looking at
22 split costs between two companies, and so you're only
23 bearing half the cost.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. And how much is
25 the grant?

1 A. BY MR. BRYNER: The full grant award that's
2 contemplated is 75 million.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And how much of that is
4 applicable to the line that is going to be co-located
5 for this one?

6 A. BY MR. BRYNER: It's not -- sorry. I didn't
7 mean to speak over you.

8 It's not divided by sections, as you have heard
9 us talk about. That particular project has three
10 different phases. So that portion of the project is
11 roughly 50 percent of that overall project, but there
12 are some stations that are also included in the grant.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. So I guess -- so
14 without the grant, that's what makes -- losing the grant
15 would make Route 1 unacceptable? I mean, because the
16 grant is to UniSource; right?

17 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Correct. And so the grant
18 money actually has nothing to do with the cost on here.
19 Either way, TEP will be responsible for their share of
20 the costs. The grant is just whether or not it will --
21 precludes us from being able to have a second attacher
22 or a second company on those poles.

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And that's just -- in terms
24 of the grant, then, it wouldn't --

25 A. BY MR. BRYNER: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. But because the
2 grant covers the whole -- there's, like, three different
3 lines that are getting built under the grant; correct?

4 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yeah, more or less, yes.

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. And UniSource is
6 going to rely on that grant for that -- the three-ish
7 projects that it's going to do?

8 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Correct.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Because they can't really
10 do it without the grant, then.

11 A. BY MR. BRYNER: I don't know that I would say
12 that. It makes it a lot more affordable for our
13 customers.

14 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Well, \$75 million is a lot
15 to put into rate base.

16 A. BY MR. BRYNER: It's a lot of money, yes.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So I guess TEP is willing
18 to forgo Route 1 to take one for the team, then, if it
19 can't -- if that's going to affect the grant for
20 UniSource, even though that's the cheaper route.

21 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Certainly, as a company, we
22 don't want to put that grant in jeopardy.

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right. Okay. That's a lot
24 of money.

25 So, yeah, Member DiCiccio.

1 MEMBER DICICCIO: Quick question just as a
2 follow-up on that.

3 The costs that you exhibited up here, they
4 would stay the same regardless of whether the grant was
5 there? Is that what I'm hearing? Or would the costs go
6 up if you were not going to be able to co-locate,
7 especially regarding the Line 1?

8 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Again, these costs represent
9 TEP's costs regardless of the grant.

10 MEMBER DICICCIO: Okay.

11 A. BY MR. BRYNER: You could say -- and this maybe
12 is extra information -- that UniSource's costs would go
13 up without TEP participating, because now they would be
14 paying 100 percent of that line along Wilmot Road. So I
15 think it's a win/win.

16 MEMBER DICICCIO: Yeah. And so that was a
17 little bit of confusion, I think, amongst -- at least
18 with me, too, that these are the costs no matter what,
19 and then the grant is just additional icing on the cake,
20 basically.

21 A. BY MR. BRYNER: It's icing on the cake for
22 UniSource. TEP's costs don't change.

23 MEMBER DICICCIO: Right. Got it.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Well, it's just UniSource
25 has got a bunch of other projects it's got to get done

1 that it needs the grant for. So if they say you can't
2 do Route 1 because we won't allow -- we're not going to
3 give you this money if you let TEP use your poles for
4 this section, UniSource has to get that money; correct?

5 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yeah. Because the
7 difference is -- what? -- less than \$2 million?

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah.

9 MS. GRABEL: That was the point I was going to
10 make.

11 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So, I mean, it seems, oh,
13 you've got to do the -- you've got to spend an extra
14 2 million on this project to get the 75 million to do a
15 bunch of upgrades that UniSource really needs for its
16 reliability. That's a pretty decent bargain.

17 MS. GRABEL: Mr. Chairman, I guess I just want
18 to clarify that the two projects are not related. The
19 SCR Reliability Project is going to be built. We've
20 received the grant. The terms are being worked out.
21 That's going to happen.

22 And so the question is just will the federal
23 government allow us to co-locate on that line.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right.

25 MS. GRABEL: And if they won't, then we don't

1 have any choice but to build Route 3, even though it
2 only costs another \$1.4 million.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right. But if you did say,
4 well, you have already given us the money, we're going
5 to build Route 1, they can recall the money, can't they?

6 MS. GRABEL: I mean, I suppose that's true,
7 but --

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right. I mean, it's, like,
9 if they're going to say you can't do this, you can't do
10 it. And I assume that even after you've got the money,
11 the federal government, if you don't follow its
12 conditions, they'll take it back from you one way or
13 another.

14 MS. GRABEL: The terms and conditions of the
15 grant aren't yet finalized, so I don't -- I'm not
16 comfortable speculating what the government would or
17 would not do. But that's the choice that TEP has right
18 now is don't try to jeopardize the grant.

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right. So, yeah, so I
20 guess it's going to be -- and that's why you want to
21 have both routes approved, because I think "1" is the
22 superior route based on cost and distance and the -- I
23 think it has less new disturbance because it's mostly
24 co-located. I guess the big caveat is that it may
25 jeopardize the grant. And if they say you can't do it,

1 they can prohibit you from taking that option.

2 MS. GRABEL: Well, and the other thing is we
3 need to get this project in service in time to meet our
4 reliability requirements because SCR North is going to
5 be built. And with that, we have to get the P6 event
6 mitigated, and so this line then has to go into effect
7 to do that.

8 So even if we -- we may not know what's going
9 to happen with the grant and we'll still have to build
10 the line, in which case we would choose Route 3.

11 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But you'll -- I mean,
12 ideally, you'll find out what's going on with the
13 grant, and then if they say you can build Route 1, you
14 can build Route 1 instead of Route 3 and that will solve
15 the problem; right?

16 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Correct.

17 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Mercer.

19 MEMBER MERCER: On this same subject, I'm kind
20 of -- I just want to make sure that I understand that
21 only one of the routes, in this case Route 3, is the one
22 attached to the grant?

23 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: It's 1.

24 MEMBER MERCER: Route 1. Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: It's not attached. It's

1 just -- well, it may be forbidden by the terms of the
2 grant.

3 MEMBER MERCER: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Right? That's what I'm --

5 MS. GRABEL: Well, so -- yes. So UNSE and TEP
6 are two separate companies, of course, and so TEP needs
7 UNSE's permission to attach. And if UNSE's grant is
8 jeopardized if TEP attaches, UNS can say "We're not
9 willing to do that because our smaller customer base
10 doesn't want to absorb \$75 million."

11 MEMBER MERCER: Okay. So TEP has nothing to do
12 with the grant. TEP has not applied for the grant.
13 Okay. That's what I wanted to make sure. Okay.

14 So in this case, is this other company that
15 they're waiting for the grant or they're waiting for
16 permission to do this, to allow you to co-locate?

17 A. BY MR. BRYNER: So UNS Electric has been
18 awarded the grant, but the terms and conditions have not
19 been worked out yet. And so we don't expect there will
20 be a problem, but we just don't know yet, and we want to
21 make sure that this project can happen regardless of how
22 those terms and conditions shake out.

23 MEMBER MERCER: Okay. So there are time
24 requirements and the construction deadlines and all of
25 that stuff that TEP is looking at before you decide

1 which route you're going to go.

2 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yes. So, again, we like
3 Route 1. If we can do Route 1 and it leaves UNS
4 Electric whole with their grant, then we would build
5 Route 1. But if there's an issue there, then we would
6 build Route 3 because we have timing requirements to
7 meet our reliability standards.

8 MEMBER MERCER: Okay. And so it's also my
9 understanding that Route 3 is the most controversial in
10 terms of the public?

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I guess it depends on
12 which neighborhood you're speaking from. However,
13 again, when we've had the opportunity to clarify that
14 we're proposing two circuits on one line, we're not
15 proposing a second line in these areas, most of the
16 comments have -- there's been no follow-up comments.

17 MEMBER MERCER: Okay. Thank you. Just wanted
18 to understand. Thank you.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

21 MEMBER LITTLE: At what point will you need to
22 make a decision between 1 and 3? If the government is
23 still twiddling their thumbs, continues to twiddle their
24 thumbs, at what point will you say, "Well, we're going
25 to give up on 1 and go with 3"?

1 A. BY MR. BRYNER: I'm going to do just a little
2 bit of speculation here, Member Little.

3 It takes us about a year to complete our
4 engineering and about two years in order to get our
5 equipment -- make our material purchases and get those
6 in, and then about a year to construct.

7 So when you back that up to where we're at
8 today, we need to make a decision soon. We do expect
9 that we'll hear back on the terms and conditions in the
10 next few months, so I think it will line up.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So I guess my question is
13 has UniSource received -- they've been awarded the
14 grant, but when will they receive the funds? I assume
15 that won't be until the terms and conditions are
16 finalized?

17 MS. GRABEL: Yes. They've been conditionally
18 awarded the grant, and I think they still have to work
19 out the remainder of the details, which is why we are
20 not certain which route we need to take.

21 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I do need you to
22 slow down a bit.

23 MS. GRABEL: I apologize.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So you have to finalize --
25 say that again. I didn't catch the last part of it.

1 MS. GRABEL: I said UNSE has been conditionally
2 awarded the grant and they're still working out the
3 terms and conditions. And according to Mr. Bryner, we
4 should know within the next few months, but I think that
5 that's one of the items that needs to be buttoned up.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay.

7 MS. GRABEL: Mr. Bryner should correct me if
8 I'm wrong.

9 A. BY MR. BRYNER: That sounds correct.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I guess when we get to the
11 CEC, Members, we can see if we want to have any wording
12 that says that we like Route 1 better.

13 But with the waiting on the, you know, terms of
14 the grant to be -- we're going to keep 3 as an option on
15 the table until such time as we find out what they're
16 going to do with that.

17 Because either way, I guess I'm understanding
18 that TEP has to have this line. It's got to go in one
19 of these places and it's -- the weak link, what they're
20 waiting on, is the terms and conditions of the grant.

21 So I don't know. Maybe, maybe not. I'm just
22 throwing it out there in case we want to talk about it,
23 so -- something we want to add. I don't know. Just to
24 think about.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: One more question.

3 Did the company consider just building another
4 circuit, another pole line, in the same -- I don't
5 know -- the same corridor for Route 1 if they're not
6 allowed to co-locate it?

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So we did look at that as
8 part of our siting studies; however, when we get into
9 the Santa Rita Experimental Range, there is a
10 prohibition of additional rights-of-way for utility
11 power lines in that area, so we couldn't get to where we
12 needed to get to, to co-locate at the Case 164.

13 If we were to continue west at the northern
14 boundary, that was considerable environmental impacts
15 and viewshed impacts that the community was definitely
16 not in favor of.

17 MEMBER LITTLE: Good to know. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And to follow up on that,
19 you're saying the conservation area, that's the bottom
20 section of B where it jogs southwest?

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. So Route 1
22 continues past that residential area and then jogs to
23 the southwest a little bit. South of that residential
24 area is in the Santa Rita Experimental Range.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay. And that's -- you

1 are required to co-locate for that portion of the route.

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct. That's the only
3 way that that segment works.

4 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

5 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yes, Member DiCiccio.

7 MEMBER DICICCIO: Quick question to Chris.

8 So is there any reason why the federal
9 government would not allow you to co-locate? It just
10 sounds like such a logical thing to do. Not that
11 government is always logical.

12 But, I mean, I cannot think of a single reason
13 why they would not allow you to do that.

14 MS. GRABEL: Mr. Chair and Mr. DiCiccio, the
15 grant is a really sensitive subject with the company,
16 which -- we're not trying to not give you information
17 but so many of the discussions and the terms of it are
18 confidential.

19 And so I don't know that we know the answer to
20 that question, and so we don't want to speculate with
21 anything because we don't want to put something in the
22 record here that might jeopardize something somewhere
23 else. And for the same reason, I think, we're a little
24 reluctant to have anything in the CEC about it.

25 So I just -- I guess I'm respectfully

1 requesting that we don't try to drill too deep into
2 questions about the grant because I think my clients are
3 not sure of what they can and cannot say because we're
4 not involved in the grant side.

5 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And my thought is not to
6 say -- necessarily mention the grant in the CEC. I'm
7 just talking about how we approve that they can build
8 1 or 3, and at some point they'll have to make a
9 decision. And then when they do, include that in your
10 filing and let the Commission Staff know that this is
11 the one -- this is the route we're going. And so the
12 other one would be off the table at that point.

13 MEMBER DICICCIO: And then from my end, too, I
14 understand the whole idea of, you know, wanting to -- if
15 you don't -- if you have certain words even when you're
16 getting a loan on things, it changes everything and the
17 lenders just generally walk away sometimes if you don't
18 get it done right. I get that.

19 But I'm just talking about defying logic here,
20 why someone would not want you to -- not allow you to
21 co-locate. And so I don't see it as a sensitive thing.
22 I don't buy into -- I'm sorry about that, Meghan, but I
23 just don't buy into that it's going to change the world
24 and you're going to lose the grant and all that.

25 I'm just asking a simple question of why would

1 someone turn down a co-location on a line? I just don't
2 buy it. I mean, I think -- I don't see the sensitivity
3 beyond that.

4 MS. GRABEL: I agree that it's logical, but we
5 just don't know whether they would approve it or not.
6 And TEP isn't the Applicant for the grant. It's UNSE.
7 And there are nondisclosure obligations there as well.

8 MEMBER DICICCIO: Or not even not approve it, I
9 mean, not allow it. You know what I mean? Approval
10 means you want to go through with it. They would not --
11 they would be basically saying "We don't want you to do
12 that." I just don't see it.

13 MS. GRABEL: I mean, I agree with you. It's
14 rational. But because I'm not a party to the
15 discussions about the grant and neither are these
16 witnesses, I guess we just don't want to speculate.
17 That's all I'm saying.

18 MEMBER DICICCIO: Okay. Good enough. Thank
19 you.

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But enough has been said to
21 raise the prospect of wait. If you only approve one, it
22 may come back and bite us later.

23 MS. GRABEL: Correct.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Member Fontes, you had a
25 question?

1 I thought he had his hand up.

2 MEMBER FONTES: During my tenure at DOE, it was
3 often gotten back to the description in the use of
4 funds. You can't use the same funds for the same
5 rebuild, oftentimes, on grants. And then it's the use
6 of funds in terms of are they being used for an
7 operational redundant project.

8 So there's a lot of the layers to that, Member
9 DiCiccio. I hope that helps. I don't know the
10 particulars of this grant, but it does get into the
11 nature of the project commercially, technically,
12 duration, and reliability.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

14 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) If there are no more further
15 questions, I think we can move on to -- are we on siting
16 and outreach already?

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yeah.

18 Q. Excellent. So, Mr. Bryner, I think that you're
19 up for this one.

20 A. BY MR. BRYNER: All right. It was really nice
21 to hear from Mr. Ortiz y Pino.

22 So as a company, we follow a comprehensive
23 sitings process, and I think you're probably familiar
24 with this process. We've shared it a number of times
25 with you.

1 We integrate this process with robust public
2 and stakeholder outreach and engagement that allows us
3 to really learn what community values are specific to
4 that project area so that we can then let those values
5 really shape the siting of our project and, ultimately,
6 whatever routes come out of that project, so in this
7 case the two routes that we proposed in our CEC
8 application.

9 So that approach I've got shown on Slide 64 in
10 a basic format is what we followed to develop the two
11 routes for this hearing.

12 Mr. Ortiz y Pino and I will now walk you
13 through each phase of this process including what we did
14 and what we learned through our outreach and engagement
15 effort.

16 So the first phase of the siting process we
17 call our pre-analysis phase. During this phase, we
18 conducted field visits and high-level desktop analysis
19 so that we could characterize the area.

20 We then looked at the project endpoints, which
21 in this case are the existing Sonoran and planned Santa
22 Rita substations along with high-level opportunities for
23 a transmission line, and we defined the boundaries of a
24 siting study area.

25 That siting study area is illustrated with the

1 little thin black line within the highlighted project
2 area on maps -- or on Slide 65. This study area
3 represents the area within which we were considering a
4 route for a proposed transmission line.

5 Then within the siting study area, the internal
6 project team identified opportunities. These
7 represented areas where it seemed to make the most sense
8 to construct a new transmission line. So that included
9 co-location with other major utility lines. It also
10 looked at major roads. And in the rural undeveloped
11 areas, it looked at kind of just any road. It also
12 looked at section lines and large property boundaries.
13 We even looked at major washes.

14 And these opportunities that were identified by
15 the project team are illustrated with the green lines on
16 slide 66.

17 And at the same time, we also looked at
18 constraints to constructing a transmission line. The
19 constraint doesn't necessarily mean that we can't build
20 the new transmission line in that area. It simply means
21 that some type of obstacle or restriction exists in that
22 area that will make it more challenging for us to build
23 a transmission line.

24 The constraints are identified with the red
25 hatching on Slide 67, and these included residential

1 areas; resource sensitive areas, which was the Santa
2 Rita Experimental Range in this case; the airport
3 environs overlay zone that's in the northern part.
4 That's basically some height restrictions and noise
5 restrictions associated with the Tucson International
6 Airport; and it also included major developments such as
7 the large solar generation sites that are kind of that
8 large oval in the top portion.

9 And then each of the opportunities that we
10 identified were reviewed by a transmission line
11 engineer. And if it was reasonable from an engineering
12 perspective to construct a transmission line in that
13 location, we made it what we call a preliminary segment,
14 and then it would be subject to further scrutiny and
15 analysis. So these preliminary segments were simply
16 sections of a line that we could then piece together to
17 form a complete route between Point A and Point B.

18 The result of the first phase of our siting
19 process was the identification of 154 preliminary
20 segments. The opportunities and constraints, along with
21 the preliminary segments, were then shared with
22 stakeholders and the public for their review and their
23 opportunity to add any additional opportunities and
24 constraints that they were aware of.

25 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So our first engagement

1 opportunity with the public and agency stakeholders was
2 in November of 2025. This was the public's first
3 introduction to the project where they could learn about
4 the purpose and need and the process to determine the
5 routes that we would eventually propose as part of our
6 application.

7 These meetings were also the first look at what
8 Mr. Bryner just outlined in our pre-analysis phase,
9 getting the public's input on the study area,
10 opportunities and constraints, and the preliminary
11 segments which would inform our decisions as the project
12 progressed.

13 We held a virtual agency briefing on
14 November 12th and an in-person public open house the
15 next day. The public was notified of the open house by
16 way of postcards, mail to residents and property owners
17 in the notification area. A total of 2,545 recipients
18 of the postcards.

19 An e-mail campaign was also sent out to 1,896
20 customers within the TEP service territory. A little
21 over 500 phone -- or there are a little over 500 homes
22 and businesses within the Trico area which account for
23 the difference between the mailed postcards and the
24 e-mails that we sent out.

25 Additional open house notification methods

1 included newspaper ads, social media campaigns on
2 Facebook and Instagram, as well as street signs.

3 All of the notifications directed people back
4 to our project webpage that contained the project
5 information and the various methods to provide comments,
6 including the online comment form, e-mail to the project
7 e-mail address, voicemail number, and the physical
8 address if you wanted to submit a written comment by
9 mail.

10 At the same time as we introduced the project
11 to the public, we also began an independent outreach
12 effort to introduce the project to the 11 Native
13 American tribes with an ancestral affiliation to the
14 land within our study area. We used the Arizona
15 government-to-government consultation tool kit to
16 identify these tribal nations as well as to inform our
17 engagement efforts with them.

18 Physical letters were sent by TEP's tribal
19 liaison along with follow-up e-mails to those tribal
20 contacts inviting them to individual one-on-one meetings
21 to discuss the project. Two tribes responded with
22 requests for these meetings which were held in January
23 of this year.

24 The results of our first outreach efforts
25 included participation from 19 stakeholder agencies as

1 well as 13 members of the public at our open house.
2 From the public at our open house, we learned from
3 conversations and in written comments that people were
4 primarily concerned with their mountain views. They
5 wanted to see co-locating with existing facilities, as
6 well as there was a general preference for the line to
7 exist on the east side of the study area.

8 A. BY MR. BRYNER: So through some of the
9 discussions that we had at the public open house as well
10 as discussions we had with stakeholders regarding the
11 use of existing facilities, there were two opportunities
12 that were identified that extended just outside of the
13 siting study area that we had previously considered.

14 So one of these opportunities was the UNS
15 Electric Vail to Kantor 138kV line as it cuts diagonally
16 across state land through the Santa Rita Experimental
17 Range south of Wilmot Road, and the other was along
18 Santa Rita Road and the future site of the 138kV line
19 approved by this committee as Case 164.

20 Both of these opportunities were looked at and
21 were found to be viable. As a result, and since they
22 only affected State Trust lands, we made the decision to
23 extend the siting study area to take advantage of these
24 additional opportunities. So the study area was
25 expanded to the southeast and two additional preliminary

1 segments were added, resulting in a total of 156
2 preliminary segments.

3 Phase two of the siting process consisted of
4 gathering data, both spatial data as well as written
5 reports, that we would use as the basis for further
6 analysis of the preliminary segments.

7 We then moved into Phase 3 of the siting study
8 where we began to evaluate route segments based on
9 suitability and practicability instead of simply
10 engineering feasibility. We did this by conducting what
11 we call a suitability assessment. The purpose of the
12 suitability assessment is to identify segments that
13 minimize environmental and land use impacts while being
14 responsive to local community values.

15 This process included geospatial analysis,
16 field work, and the identification of a refined set of
17 segments representing the most suitable routes which was
18 then shared with the public and project stakeholders.

19 To conduct the suitability assessment, we first
20 created eight different criteria models using geographic
21 information systems, or GIS, to represent spatial
22 evaluation criteria. These included biological
23 resources, noise and communication, total environment,
24 existing and future residential properties, cultural
25 resources, scenic and visual resources, construction and

1 maintenance, and existing plans.

2 Each of these criteria models were then
3 combined and weighted differently to create four
4 separate composite suitability models. Each of these
5 composite models represents a different perspective
6 depending on which factors were considered most
7 important.

8 We created one model that was balanced. In
9 other words, every criteria model was equally weighted.
10 We created one model that gave extra weight to
11 environmental factors, one model that was slanted
12 towards constructability factors, and a fourth model
13 that weighed the criteria that had been expressed by the
14 public and stakeholders to be of primary importance.

15 The 156 preliminary segments that were
16 identified during Phase 1 were then evaluated through
17 each of these composite models. And as a result, 79
18 segments with lower suitability were removed from
19 further consideration in the siting study, and those
20 segments are shown on the map with a red dashed line on
21 slide 78, and that resulted in 75 segments that were
22 carried forward for detailed evaluation. These segments
23 are shown in blue lines on the map.

24 Each of these remaining segments was then
25 reviewed in the field to confirm the results of the

1 suitability assessment and were then shared with
2 stakeholders and the public so that we could receive
3 their opportunity and comment -- or hear -- give them an
4 opportunity on comment.

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So the objective of our
6 second outreach effort was to inform the public of the
7 revised study area and the additional preliminary
8 segments that stemmed from the last outreach. We also
9 wanted to provide information on the suitability
10 assessment that was completed and the resulting refined
11 segments that we carried forward.

12 TEP mailed nearly 3,000 postcards with project
13 status updates directing people to the project webpage
14 and issuing a blanket invitation to individuals for
15 conversations to discuss the project, ask questions,
16 provide comments directly.

17 We also had another e-mail campaign with a
18 similar message was sent out, which, again, to 1,854
19 recipients. These were customers within the TEP service
20 territory.

21 We held an agency briefing on February 2nd
22 presenting the Phase 3 results, and we also posted a
23 video of the presentation on the project webpage walking
24 the viewer through the suitability assessments
25 Mr. Bryner just covered.

1 Our Phase 3 outreach efforts, we, again, had 19
2 participating stakeholders agencies. There were three
3 follow-up meetings that we had with the State Land
4 Department right-of-way section, the Tucson Airport
5 Authority, and the Town of Sahuarita and the Development
6 Services Department.

7 Our discussions with the State Land Department
8 revolved around rights-of-way, acquisitions, lease
9 applications, and anticipated timelines.

10 With the Tucson Airport Authority, they shared
11 that they were in negotiations with a developer for the
12 land surrounding the Sonoran Substation. They had
13 stated that their preference was that for Route 1 to be
14 south of the existing or the TEP/WAPA transmission line.
15 They stated that this would optimize the development
16 envelope for the developer with whom they were in
17 negotiations.

18 With the Town of Sahuarita, our discussions
19 focused primarily on outreach specifically to the
20 communities in their town and how the project would
21 benefit their town. This meeting also led to a briefing
22 with town council during a study session on
23 January 26th.

24 Additionally, because of the blanket invitation
25 to the public for direct conversations to discuss the

1 project, we had four phone calls, which was a noted
2 increase from zero previously.

3 Also, at the end of March, the suitability
4 assessment video that we had posted to our webpage had
5 83 views, so basically viral.

6 MS. GRABEL: (Laughing.) I'm sorry.

7 A. BY MR. BRYNER: I'll be getting his autograph
8 later.

9 So then we moved into Phase 4, which was a
10 detailed analysis that was conducted by subject matter
11 experts who reviewed each of the 75 route segments that
12 were still under consideration with respect to the
13 evaluation criteria that had been developed through
14 public outreach to reflect the communities' values.

15 The compatibility analysis resulted in the
16 identification of four route alternatives and the
17 elimination of 19 route segments from further
18 consideration.

19 The four alternative routes are illustrated
20 with solid lines of differing colors on Slide 82. One
21 of the routes, Route 3A which is shown in pink, was
22 essentially a subroute to Route 3 and involved building
23 a parallel line instead of co-locating the existing
24 facilities. Each of these routes were reviewed and
25 verified in the field to confirm their viability and

1 then shared with stakeholders and the public.

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: The second round of
3 outreach with tribes spanned both Phases 4 and 5. On
4 February 19th, a project status update letter was sent
5 to the 11 Native American tribes informing them of the
6 detailed analysis and our four routes -- our four
7 alternative routes that had been identified.

8 In the letter, TEP invited representatives to
9 individual briefings to discuss the project and answer
10 any questions. We received no requests for these
11 meetings from the tribes this time.

12 On March 11th, TEP sent follow-up e-mails to
13 the tribes indicating that of the four alternative
14 routes, Routes 1 and Route 3 had been decided to be
15 carried forward as part of our application for the CEC.
16 Two tribes responded requesting review of the Class 1
17 cultural resources report when available.

18 As we did our first round -- as we did with our
19 first round of engagement, TEP sent out postcard mailers
20 to all the residents and landowners within the
21 notification area. This time we also informed them with
22 an e-mail blast of the next open house. We made some
23 changes to the street notification signs, increasing
24 them from 24 by 36 to 36 by 48 and choosing different
25 locations.

1 Newspaper ads and social media campaigns ran
2 for two weeks leading up to the open house, and all of
3 our notification methods pointed the viewers back to our
4 project webpage which had all the of the project status
5 update information as well as the open house location.

6 We held our third and final agency briefing on
7 March 3rd and the final open house on March 4th. During
8 the meeting, we informed the public about the
9 compatibility analysis and sought feedback on the
10 alternative routes.

11 On April 28th, TEP sent out a final round of
12 e-mails to the 11 Native American tribes. This e-mail
13 was noticed that TEP had selected Route 1 and 3 as part
14 of our CEC application and that we had filed our
15 application on April 17th.

16 We also shared our Class 1 cultural resources
17 report with the tribes by way of a secure ShareFile
18 link. And also prior to filing the application to the
19 CEC, TEP attended a meeting of the Four Southern Tribes
20 Cultural Resources Working Group on March 20th. This
21 was held at the Ak-Chin Indian Community in Maricopa.

22 During this meeting, we recommitted ourselves
23 to honest and sincere engagement with the tribes and
24 citing the work that we had done on this project as an
25 example. This was an opportunity to meet face to face,

1 share a meal, and develop relationships and trust.

2 So the results of Phase 5, our outreach efforts
3 included, again, the participation of 19 stakeholder
4 agencies, and this time we had 55 attendees of our
5 public open house.

6 During the open house, TEP team spoke with
7 people, answering questions and clarifying details about
8 each route that we were proposing. In total, we
9 received 20 public comments during the meeting,
10 responding directly to the routes and their preferences
11 or opposition for each.

12 In the meeting, we received 14 comments in
13 preference for Route 1. We received two in preference
14 for Route 3 or 3A. There was one letter in opposition
15 to Route 2. And, generally, there was support for the
16 project as a whole.

17 So I want to be clear here that the comments
18 that we received showing a strong preference for Route 1
19 and some preference for Route 3 were strictly from this
20 open house. Each route at some point during the siting
21 process received comments in opposition. However,
22 generally speaking, when we explained that the routes
23 being proposed would be co-located on existing
24 facilities and not proposing additional lines,
25 commenters didn't have further comment.

1 We also received two letters from tribal
2 nations describing no effect, finding of no effect, and
3 no additional meetings were requested.

4 A. BY MR. BRYNER: So as a result of the feedback
5 that we received by the public and stakeholder groups,
6 as well as the higher costs and greater environmental
7 and land use impacts, TEP made the decision to eliminate
8 two of the routes.

9 So Route 2, which is the route that goes kind
10 of down the center along Alvernon Way was eliminated, as
11 well as Route 3A which was that subalternative to
12 Route 3 that had contemplated building a parallel line
13 to the existing infrastructure.

14 Route 1 was identified as a proposed route in
15 the CEC application because it represented the lowest
16 cost route, it had the highest overall environmental
17 compatibility largely because most of the route would be
18 co-located with existing and approved facilities and, as
19 you just saw, was generally supported by the public.

20 And Route 3 was also identified as a proposed
21 route in the CEC application again because it was
22 primarily co-located with existing facilities and
23 represents the shortest route. Route 3, as we
24 mentioned, would cost more than Route 1 because several
25 miles of the existing facilities would need to be

1 rebuilt to accommodate the second circuit.

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So, in summary, we are
3 requesting approval of Route 1 and Route 3. We have
4 developed these routes through a comprehensive siting
5 process taking into consideration public input,
6 environmental factors, constructability, and the cost to
7 ensure that TEP customers may continue to have safe and
8 affordable, reliable electric service to power their
9 lives.

10 Q. Mr. Ortiz y Pino, before we move into the legal
11 requirements, please turn to TEP-8, which is the summary
12 of public outreach conducted with respect to this
13 project.

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

15 Q. Have you seen this document before?

16 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I have.

17 Q. Was it prepared by you or under your direction
18 and control?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

20 Q. Was this document provided in response to the
21 Chairman's procedural order --

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

23 Q. -- specifically at paragraph 16?

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

25 Q. Did TEP provide a supplement to the summary of

1 public outreach?

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

3 Q. Is a copy of that supplement marked as
4 Exhibit TEP-19?

5 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I don't have TEP-19.

6 Q. It's one of the loose exhibits that was handed
7 out this morning.

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

9 Q. Thank you.

10 Does that supplement accurately summarize the
11 public outreach that was performed since mid-April at
12 the time the CEC was filed?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It does.

14 Q. Thank you.

15 And does the summary accurately convey the
16 public outreach that was performed?

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

18 Q. Thank you. We can go ahead and continue.

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Well, before you go into
20 the legal requirements, I think now is a good time to
21 take our break. I think the court reporter is probably
22 ready.

23 I think when we get back, before we start going
24 into the legal requirements, let's talk about a tour and
25 look at the route, the proposed route itinerary.

1 MS. GRABEL: Sounds great.

2 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's take a 10-minute
3 recess.

4 (A recess was taken from 4:19 p.m. to
5 4:40 p.m.)

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the
7 record.

8 Ms. Grabel, I believe we were going to discuss
9 your Exhibit No. 7 about the potential tour.

10 MS. GRABEL: That is correct.

11 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) So I guess I'm going to ask
12 Mr. Ortiz y Pino, have you seen Exhibit TEP-7 before?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I have.

14 Q. And is this the tour itinerary, script, and
15 protocol if we decide to take the tour tomorrow?

16 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

17 Q. Was it prepared by you or under your direction
18 and control?

19 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It was.

20 Q. Why don't you give the committee a general
21 understanding of where we would go if we take a tour,
22 how long it would be, the temperature outside on this
23 summer day. I'm just kidding.

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: It's not summer yet.

25 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) How uncomfortable the bus is.

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Sure.

2 So we have several route pauses where we'll be
3 speaking to a script in the bus. We have two route
4 stops where we'll get out and discuss what we see. The
5 first stop will be at the residential subdivision south
6 of the Sonora Substation. It will be looking primarily
7 at the TEP/WAPA and Route 3 -- Route 1 -- I apologize --
8 corridor in that area.

9 From there we'll pass through this south Swan
10 neighborhood. We'll get to Wilmot Road and continue
11 south. We don't get to the end of that residential area
12 along Wilmot. We'll get about halfway down. It will be
13 enough to get a character of the neighborhood -- feel
14 for the character of the neighborhood.

15 We'll then double back to Pause No. 5 at
16 Sahuarita Road, heading west to Pause Number 7, which is
17 from the KOP 6 within the Sahuarita Acres subdivision.

18 So something important to note that, actually,
19 from the No. 2 by the Sonoran Substation to No. 7, all
20 of that section of Route 3 is -- you can't get to.
21 There's no roads that you can get to that section of the
22 line. So the closest we can get to it from the south is
23 No. 7 from that Sahuarita Acres subdivision.

24 From there, we'll continue south and getting to
25 the Country Club Road and Toro Road intersection where

1 the two lines cross the intersection diagonally. And
2 then, again, we'll have our final stop at the edge of
3 the Sahuarita Highlands subdivision.

4 This total route will take about two and a half
5 hours with anticipating about 15-minute stops. And I
6 think our temperatures are expected in the mid- to high
7 90s tomorrow.

8 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And what was the total
9 duration of the tour?

10 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: About two and a half
11 hours.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And that's assuming how
13 much time at the stops?

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: About 15 minutes.

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Well, members, are you
16 interested in a tour, or do you think we can forgo the
17 tour?

18 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman, personally, I
19 don't think we need a tour if we're going to look at
20 poles that are going to be replaced by the same poles.
21 I think I can visualize that here, so -- my opinion.

22 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: And I think the virtual
23 tour is pretty good because it was the aerial shots. We
24 could see the locations of the houses and the character
25 of the neighborhoods.

1 It seems that most of the -- well, the entire
2 line, Route 1, is either going to be a -- it's going to
3 be just a new conductor on existing poles or there's a
4 new build section that's going to be parallel to
5 existing lines.

6 And then for 3, the bulk of that is also
7 co-located and there's a section that's going to be a
8 rebuild, but they had to take out the existing poles and
9 replace them with similar poles that could take a second
10 circuit, but it's not going to be -- there's not poles
11 going in where before there were none. So I'm inclined
12 that the tour is not necessary.

13 MEMBER FANT: I agree.

14 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: There seems to be general
15 consensus of the committee.

16 All right. Well, then, we will not do a tour
17 in the morning. We can proceed with the case.

18 MS. GRABEL: Woohoo.

19 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: So you can make the call
20 and cancel the buses.

21 MS. GRABEL: Thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: With that, I guess we'll go
23 back to your direct case with -- you're about to go on
24 the legal requirements for notice.

25 MS. GRABEL: Indeed, we were. Thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman.

2 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) So, Mr. Ortiz y Pino, will you
3 please turn to Slide 90.

4 Now we're going to walk through the legal
5 requirements, starting with the 10-year plan. And in
6 addition to Slide 90, will you please turn to
7 Exhibit TEP-9.

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Sure. Ms. Grabel, can I
9 go ahead and interrupt really quickly? Because we do
10 have an answer to Member Little's question about the
11 transmission pole typical width.

12 Q. Sure thing.

13 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Excellent.

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: So we spoke with our
15 engineering department, and they do not have a base
16 circumference for the rebuild section on Section G.

17 At this stage and since engineering has not
18 been completed for the project, they just don't have
19 what that width would be. So it's kind of a nonanswer,
20 but -- until further engineering.

21 Q. Thank you.

22 And I know that Member DiCiccio had a question
23 for you. He's not here. I don't know if we want to
24 answer that in his absence.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I think he's outside on the

1 phone.

2 MS. GRABEL: Perhaps we'll wait till he gets
3 back then.

4 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Yeah. Either if he gets
5 back before public comment, I guess you can. If he
6 comes back for public comment, I guess you would
7 probably wait until the morning.

8 MS. GRABEL: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: But we'll have plenty of
10 time since we're not doing two and a half hours of tour.

11 MS. GRABEL: Excellent.

12 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you.

13 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) So then going back,
14 Mr. Ortiz y Pino, if you'll turn to Exhibit TEP-9, is
15 this an excerpt from TEP's 10-year plan for 2026 that
16 lists this project?

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

18 Q. Did TEP file this 10-year plan as required by
19 state statute?

20 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct, yes.

21 Q. And please turn to Page 91 and also -- or,
22 rather, Slide 91, and also Exhibit TEP-10A.

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

24 Q. Exhibit 10A is the notice of hearing in this
25 matter, dated April 17, 2026; correct?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct.

2 Q. And if we could turn to Slide 92 and
3 Exhibit TEP-10B. Is this the proof of publication of
4 the notice of hearing published in the Arizona Daily
5 Star?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It is.

7 Q. And the Arizona Daily Star is a newspaper of
8 general circulation in the project area; correct?

9 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

10 Q. Did TEP publish notice twice in the Arizona
11 Daily Star, on April 23rd and April 24th?

12 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

13 Q. And if we could turn to Slide 93.

14 Does this slide show that TEP provided copies
15 of the CEC application to the locations required by the
16 Chairman's April 17th procedural order?

17 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

18 Q. And did you hand-deliver copies of the
19 locations to the two libraries?

20 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I did.

21 Q. And this document is found in document TEP-10C;
22 correct?

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Correct.

24 Q. And if we could turn to Slide 94, what does
25 this slide depict?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: This slide depicts the
2 locations -- a map of the locations where we placed our
3 notification signs for the hearing.

4 In the middle, it's photo evidence of the
5 locations of those signs as they were installed, with
6 the addresses of where they were installed, as well as
7 an example of the sign that was installed.

8 Q. And were signs posted -- were these signs,
9 rather, posted in the general vicinity of where they
10 were identified on the map to the left?

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

12 Q. And is the map of sign locations marked as
13 Exhibit TEP-10D?

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

15 Q. And the pictures in the middle of this slide,
16 did you take those pictures or were they taken at your
17 direction?

18 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: They were taken at my
19 direction.

20 Q. Were the signs posted at least 20 days before
21 the hearing was set to begin as required by the
22 April 17th procedural order?

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, they were.

24 Q. And are the photographs shown in the middle of
25 this slide included as Exhibit TEP-10E?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

2 Q. And turning to Exhibit TEP-10F, is this an
3 example of the contents of the notice signs?

4 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

5 Q. And does that align with the picture on the
6 right of Slide 94?

7 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: It does.

8 Q. And please turn to Slide 95 and also go to
9 TEP-10G.

10 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

11 Q. Are the contents of TEP-10G similar to what is
12 displayed on Slide 95?

13 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

14 Q. And what do those depict?

15 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: They depict the notice of
16 jurisdiction to the Arizona State Land Department, the
17 City of Tucson, Pima County, and the Town of Sahuarita.

18 Q. So just to clarify, so they depict proof that
19 TEP mailed copies of the notice of hearing to the
20 affected jurisdictions you just mentioned; correct?

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

22 Q. And please turn to Slide 96 and also
23 Exhibit TEP-11.

24 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

25 Q. What does this depict?

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: This is an invoice and
2 the receipt for the filing fee for the CEC.

3 Q. So this demonstrates that we paid the requisite
4 filing fee to the Arizona Corporation Commission;
5 correct?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

7 Q. Did TEP also direct communications with the ACC
8 business office confirming that TEP would cover the
9 expenses of this CEC hearing above and beyond the filing
10 fee?

11 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

12 Q. Thank you.

13 And did TEP do so on April 20, 2026?

14 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

15 Q. Okay. Now if you could turn to slide 97.

16 So we've just gone through the basic legal
17 requirements outlined in statute and regulation. But in
18 addition to the legal notice that's required by law, did
19 TEP perform additional outreach concerning the hearing
20 in this matter?

21 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: We did.

22 Q. Please walk through it.

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: I'm sorry. Say that
24 again.

25 Q. Please walk through it.

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Sure.

2 So similar to our outreach efforts for every
3 previous outreach with open houses, we mailed
4 notifications, postcard mailers, to landowners and
5 residents, business owners, homeowner associations, and
6 current occupants of 2,923 residents' addresses.

7 We also sent a similar e-mail notification.
8 This time we sent it to 1,924 e-mails, including all of
9 those within TEP's service territory, as well as 64
10 agency representatives, 22 elected officials, and
11 17 tribal members.

12 We had a social media campaign on Facebook and
13 Instagram that ran from April 27th through tomorrow
14 advertising for this hearing. We also had our webpage
15 updated with all the information for this hearing,
16 including the application, the transcripts, and the
17 exhibits for each of the hearing conferences.

18 Q. Excellent.

19 And before we conclude our presentation and
20 actually answer the question Member DiCiccio had, will
21 you please turn to TEP Exhibit 20, which is the last of
22 our late-filed exhibits.

23 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay.

24 Q. Is this a copy of the staff letter that was
25 docketed in the ACC's docket for this line siting

1 project?

2 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes, it is.

3 Q. Thank you.

4 And is it an accurate copy of the letter that
5 was docketed?

6 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Yes.

7 MS. GRABEL: And with that, Mr. Chairman, I
8 would like to admit TEP's Exhibits 1 through 20. I
9 believe I got them all.

10 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Indeed you have.

11 TEP Exhibits 1 through 9, Exhibits 10A through
12 10G, and Exhibits 11 through 20 are admitted.

13 MS. GRABEL: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Because there's not a
15 separate 10. It's just it's all 10A --

16 MS. GRABEL: Correct.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Okay.

18 Q. (BY MS. GRABEL) And I don't know who -- if
19 Mr. Ortiz y Pino or Mr. Bryner would like to talk to the
20 question that Member DiCiccio raised.

21 Mr. Bryner?

22 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Yeah, I'll address.

23 Q. And as I recall, this is about a portion of
24 Route 2, the eliminated route?

25 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Sure. Do you want me to

1 rephrase the question that was raised?

2 Q. That would be great.

3 A. BY MR. BRYNER: Okay. So during the break,
4 Member DiCiccio had a question, and we just wanted to
5 make sure that we addressed it on the record.

6 And if we can turn to the application, yeah,
7 Page 82 in the application, which is TEP-1.

8 So this is a map that depicts graphically or
9 visually the results of our compatibility analysis that
10 was Phase 4 of our siting study. So I know it's kind of
11 tiny up there.

12 But the question was with respect to the red
13 line that you see -- so the red line along -- this is
14 Route 2. It was along Alvernon Way that was considered,
15 well, kind of towards the latter end of our siting
16 study.

17 And so why was that line red? So red means,
18 typically, bad. So in this case, yeah, it meant it was
19 less compatible, and the reason why it was less
20 compatible was for a variety of reasons.

21 In this compatibility analysis, as I testified
22 earlier, we had subject matter experts that looked at
23 each segment we were looking at and evaluated them one
24 by one by one for a number of different things. This
25 one scored very poorly with respect to its adjacency to

1 residential properties. There were homes on either side
2 of the route with no existing line there.

3 Also, it had pretty high visual impacts to
4 those residential areas. If you recall, one of the
5 biggest things that was brought up by the public was
6 "Hey, please preserve our views of the mountains." This
7 would have had impacts where none exist today.

8 Also, right-of-way acquisition, we don't have
9 any transmission facilities there. The right-of-way is
10 not wide enough. We would need to purchase private
11 easements throughout that area, which would likely cost
12 quite a bit, and so it also scored very poorly on cost
13 compatibility or how expensive this segment would be.

14 So in composite, it scored poorly on many of
15 those and so it was red, one of the reasons why it was
16 eliminated.

17 MEMBER DICICCIO: So that's not really -- I
18 mean, I just want to be up front about this. It was an
19 even more simple question, like, what's there? And it's
20 residents. That's all I needed to know. You guys are
21 overcomplicating a simple question.

22 I'm just letting you know. It's not your
23 fault. It's that guy's fault over there that came over
24 here and barged into a simple question.

25 So it was that simple: What's there?

1 So I didn't need an overcomplicated question,
2 because that's not what I was looking for. I was just
3 looking for what was there. That's it.

4 BY MR. BRYNER: You got your answer?

5 MEMBER DICICCIO: I got it. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you, Mr. Bryner. I
7 did appreciate that additional information.

8 Any other questions from members?

9 All right. It is almost 5 o'clock. We will be
10 returning at 5:30 for public comment.

11 I'm looking to Ms. Grabel. You have the forms
12 ready for the public? They can participate either in
13 person or online or on the phone; correct?

14 MS. GRABEL: We do, yes. And we do have one
15 final conclusory slide. I don't know if Mr. Ortiz y
16 Pino wants to read it. It will save me from doing a
17 closing argument, so there you go.

18 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: I thought you might want to
19 wait until after public comment in case you want to have
20 any rebuttal testimony and then do your closing.

21 MS. GRABEL: We can do that. Sure.

22 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Okay. That works.

23 So are we waiting to do this to --

24 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: You're going to do the
25 conclusion side.

1 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Her closing?

2 MS. GRABEL: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: No. She's going to do that
4 probably in the morning after public comment in case you
5 guys need to address any issues that come up in public
6 comment. So you may have some more testimony coming in
7 the morning.

8 A. BY MR. ORTIZ Y PINO: Understood.

9 Okay. So in conclusion of our study of the
10 Santa Rita Connection Project, we've addressed the needs
11 and benefits to improve the reliability and resiliency
12 of the electric transmission system. It will strengthen
13 the regional electric grid, and it mitigates the risks
14 of transmission circuit overload under contingency
15 conditions. As well, coupled with the planned Santa
16 Rita Substation, it will provide additional capacity to
17 serve the town of Sahuarita and its surrounding
18 communities.

19 With respect to environmental compatibility of
20 the project, it balances the need for an adequate,
21 economical, and reliable supply of electric power and
22 the effects to the environment and the ecology of the
23 state.

24 It minimizes impacts on environmental factors
25 considered by the committee and is consistent with the

1 applicable land use plans and policies.

2 MS. GRABEL: Thank you very much. That
3 concludes our presentation.

4 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. Well, it's
5 almost 5:00. We will take a recess until 5:30, at which
6 point we will come back and take public comment. And
7 we'll stay here until at least 6:00 p.m. to allow the
8 public the opportunity to comment, but we may not have
9 that much to fill the entire half hour. If that's the
10 case, then we'll go off the record and wait and stay
11 here until at least 6:00.

12 So with that, we stand in recess.

13 (A recess was taken from 4:58 p.m. to
14 5:30 p.m.)

15 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the
16 record.

17 Now is the time set for public comment.

18 At present, we have no members of the public
19 signed up to speak that are here in the room.

20 I'm looking to the AV team. Is there anyone
21 online or on the phone? No.

22 All right. Well, we will remain here until
23 6:00 to allow the public the opportunity to comment. In
24 the meantime, we'll go off the record and wait for
25 anyone to show up.

1 (A recess was taken from 5:31 p.m. to
2 5:38 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the
4 record.

5 We have some members of the public to comment.
6 First we'll start with John Dougherty. Please
7 spell your last name for the court reporter.

8 JOHN DOUGHERTY: Thank you, committee, and
9 other folks who are here from TEP, and the general
10 public. I went to the wrong casino, so that's why it
11 took me a little bit. I went down to Pima Mine Road. I
12 didn't know there were two Desert Diamond Casinos.

13 But anyway, my name is John Dougherty. I'm
14 executive director of Save the Scenic Santa Ritas. It's
15 an environmental group that has been working for
16 30 years to stop open pit copper mining in the Santa
17 Rita Mountains.

18 And so my comments here today are based on what
19 I read in the application and the introduction to the
20 application. And I respectfully request the committee
21 suspend all further consideration of Tucson Electric
22 Power's application for a certificate of environmental
23 compatibility for the Santa Rita project until TEP
24 submits a revised application that includes approval of
25 the Santa Rita Substation. The Santa Rita Substation is

1 a crucial part of the project, but, inexplicably, it has
2 been excluded from TEP's application.

3 I quote, "While approval of the Santa Rita
4 Substation is not requested as part of the certificate
5 of environmental compatibility, the benefits of the
6 project cannot be fully realized without it."

7 That's from the introduction, Application For
8 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility, Santa Rita
9 Connection Project, Page 7 in Roman numerals.

10 It's obvious why the project's benefits cannot
11 be fully realized without the Santa Rita Substation.
12 The project originates at the existing Sonoran
13 138-kilovolt substation and terminates at the planned
14 Santa Rita 138-kilovolt substation, so it's an obvious
15 part of this project.

16 How can the endpoint of the project not be
17 included in TEP's application for a CEC? It makes no
18 sense.

19 Furthermore, TEP also states "The Santa Rita
20 Substation will provide additional capacity and
21 reliability to over 14,000 distribution customers in the
22 area. It would also allow TEP to retire the 46-kilovolt
23 subtransmission system serving the town of Sahuarita."

24 The Santa Rita Substation is clearly a pivotal
25 part of the project, and it should be included in TEP's

1 application for a CEC. Why, then, does TEP want to keep
2 it out?

3 The public evidence I've reviewed strongly
4 indicates that TEP is not seeking approval of the Santa
5 Rita Substation to avoid public disclosure of the
6 project's direct connection to the proposed Copper World
7 mine. Copper World is planning to construct a
8 138-kilovolt Toro switch on property immediately west of
9 TEP's planned 138-kilovolt Santa Rita Substation.

10 The Toro Switchyard will connect to the Santa
11 Rita Substation. I brought a map here. It's probably
12 hard for you to see it, but there's the Toro Switchyard.
13 If you look to the left on your map there, there's a
14 little white rectangle. That white rectangle is owned
15 by Hudbay, and that's where they're going to build the
16 Toro Switchyard, and the Toro Switchyard is going to
17 connect to the Santa Rita Substation.

18 And once that happens, the Toro Switchyard will
19 be energized, and it will then transmit electricity
20 along the 138-kilovolt power line that was approved in
21 2012 on a separate CEC, right down to Santa Rita Road,
22 right out to the mine site.

23 Inexplicably, the Santa Rita Substation is not
24 in this CEC, because they don't want to disclose that
25 this is going to be the power source for the Copper

1 World mine.

2 And by approving this project, you're not just
3 approving one power line that runs from the Sonoran
4 Substation down to the Santa Rita Substation, you're
5 approving, in essence, the construction of a second
6 power line that's going to go from the Santa Rita
7 Substation into Toro Switchyard, 9 miles across the
8 Santa Rita Road to Copper World's mine site on the base
9 of the Santa Rita Mountains. The public has no idea
10 because TEP has not disclosed that.

11 Why is the Santa Rita Substation not included?
12 That's why. They don't want the discussion to turn to
13 Copper World at all. But you guys have the opportunity
14 to do what's right and ask TEP to simply resubmit their
15 application and include the Santa Rita Substation as
16 part of the application.

17 It's astounding. How could you not include the
18 substation as part of the application when it's the
19 terminus for the project?

20 And it also feeds all these other power lines
21 over here to the southwest which TEP says need to have
22 the substation installed to create redundant, you know,
23 duplication so you don't have power outages down there.

24 Another key thing here, this power line will
25 bisect the Santa Rita Experimental Range, which TEP

1 states prohibits construction of new power lines.

2 I quote, "The Santa Rita Experimental Range,
3 located at the southern end of the study area, is a
4 dedicated native rangeland research area that prohibits
5 the development of new transmission lines."

6 That's Exhibit B1, Santa Rita Connection Line
7 Siting Study, TEP, March 26th, Page 5.

8 Well, that's rather astounding to hear, because
9 in 2012, the CEC was -- the Corporation Commission in a
10 line siting committee granted TEP the right to build a
11 power line from the Toro Switchyard right next to the
12 Santa Rita Substation, right across the Santa Rita
13 Experimental Range.

14 So what's going on here? You can either put it
15 across the range or you can't.

16 In TEP's pending 804-page CEC application, TEP
17 has not disclosed the fact that the project is crucial
18 to providing power needed to operate the Copper World
19 mine. The company appears to be taking the position
20 that since the Santa Rita Substation is not part of the
21 pending CEC application, it doesn't have to reveal that
22 the project's 138-kilovolt power line running from the
23 Sonoran Substation to the Santa Rita Substation will
24 provide the power for Copper World via the Santa Rita
25 substation's connection to Copper World's switchyard.

1 I mean, come on. Let's tell the truth, folks.
2 Let's tell the truth about what is going on here. They
3 have not told you the truth. This slight of hand has
4 been facilitated by public officials, including
5 Sahuarita mayor Thomas Murphy during a January 26th
6 public meeting where TEP officials made a presentation
7 to the council and public on the project.

8 Murphy asked Christopher Ortiz y Pino, TEP's
9 project manager for siting, outreach, and engagement, if
10 there was any link between the project and Toronto-based
11 Hudbay Minerals, the owner of Copper World.

12 I was sitting there. I heard it. And this is
13 what Murphy asked Mr. Ortiz y Pino. "Just because I
14 know there's some concerns, this really is just
15 connected to having future capacity and growth. This is
16 not connected to Hudbay in any way, is it?"

17 That's the mayor asking TEP's representative,
18 and the representative replied, "No." No.

19 A few minutes later, I had a conversation with
20 Mr. Ortiz y Pino, and he confirmed to me that the Santa
21 Rita Substation would directly connect with the Toro
22 Switchyard. That's a pretty basic fact that's not
23 disclosed anywhere in the CEC application.

24 It gets worse. An unnamed TEP employee, about
25 a month later in February, a citizen left a voicemail on

1 the company's outreach line asking if the project is
2 for, quote, the proposed mine they're going to build in
3 the Santa Rita Mountains.

4 An unnamed TEP employee called the person back,
5 according to notes of the conversation, and told the
6 person the project has nothing to do with the mine.
7 Nothing to do with the mine.

8 I explained -- quote, "I explained that it was
9 not for the mine."

10 Then the person went on to ask, "If it's not
11 for the mine, it sure looks like it's the same line.
12 How is it different?"

13 Because, you know, the TEP line from the Toro
14 Switchyard for the mine is going to go right on the same
15 pathway as this line leaving the Toro Substation out to
16 the Santa Rita Road.

17 So the person said, you know, I explained that
18 Route 1 alternative would be a double-circuit option
19 that would take advantage of the planned Copper World
20 138-kilovolt line and share the structures at the double
21 circuit all the way back to the substation. That's
22 Exhibit J10, Public Comments Received, redacted,
23 Page 779.

24 This answer only tells half the story. While
25 it's true the project's 138-kilovolt power line could

1 share a short section of TEP's 138-kilovolt power line
2 structure for Copper World, it failed to explain that
3 the project would also provide the power for the mine
4 via the Santa Rita Substation and tie into Copper
5 World's Toro Switchyard. That should be in the CEC
6 application and it's not.

7 So, again, the project will run a 138-kilovolt
8 power line from the Sonoran Substation to the Santa Rita
9 Substation, and the Santa Rita Substation will connect
10 to Copper World's Toro Switchyard, which will then allow
11 a separate TEP 138-kilovolt power line to head east
12 across the Santa Rita Experimental Range and connect to
13 Copper World.

14 TEP is totally aware of this. They were
15 granted a CEC on June 12, 2012, Case No. 164, comma,
16 L-00000-11-0400-00164, Decision No. 73232.

17 At this point, the public has no clue that the
18 project will result in two 138-kilovolt power lines, nor
19 does the public know that the project's connection is
20 going to empower the Toro Switchyard for the Copper
21 World mine.

22 The fact that the Santa Rita Substation is
23 critical infrastructure necessary to operate the Copper
24 World mine is all the more reason it should be included
25 in TEP's pending CEC application.

1 In conclusion, I respectfully request the
2 committee to suspend consideration of TEP's CEC
3 application until the company submits an amended
4 application that includes the Santa Rita Substation.

5 The amended application should describe in
6 detail the Santa Rita Substation's connection to Copper
7 World's Toro Switchyard, the Toro Switchyard's
8 connection to TEP's 138-kilovolt power line that was
9 approved in the 2012 CEC, and TEP's 138-kilovolt power
10 line crossing the Santa Rita Experimental Range to
11 Copper World's mine site, when TEP now states in its
12 pending CEC that the Santa Rita Experimental Range
13 doesn't allow any new power lines.

14 So please contact me with any questions. I
15 look forward to the committee taking action in the
16 public interest and requiring TEP to amend its CEC
17 application and disclose what is really going on here
18 before you move forward with approving this project.

19 Save the Scenic, our group, has no problem with
20 you guys building the project if it needs to supply
21 electricity to other communities where they've had power
22 failures, but we have a huge issue when you're doing it
23 under the table and hiding it from the public. That is
24 not acceptable.

25 And we hope that this committee does the right

1 thing and just says, "Hey, resubmit your application and
2 disclose the truth about the connection between the
3 Santa Rita Substation and the Toro switchyard."

4 I have written comments. I don't know if I
5 should provide them to you now or if I can mail them in
6 or whatever the procedure is. If somebody can inform me
7 afterwards, I would be glad to do it. If you want to
8 take a closer look at the diagram, I have it here as
9 well.

10 I appreciate the opportunity to appear today.

11 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you. Mr. Dougherty,
12 could you please spell your last name for the court
13 reporter.

14 JOHN DOUGHERTY: Sure. It's D-O-U-G-H-E-R-T-Y.

15 And I'm Executive Director of Save the Scenic
16 Santa Ritas Association.

17 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Thank you, sir.

18 JOHN DOUGHERTY: Thank you very much.

19 (Applause.)

20 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: All right. We have a
21 Dottie Wright. Did you wish to speak? You had a
22 question mark whether you wanted to speak or not on the
23 form.

24 DOTTIE WRIGHT: John covered everything.

25 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: There are no other public

1 commenters in the room.

2 Do we have any online? No.

3 All right. Well, we will be here until at
4 least 6:00 to allow anybody else from the public the
5 opportunity to speak.

6 In the meantime, we'll go off the record.

7 (A recess was taken from 5:53 p.m. to
8 6:02 p.m.)

9 CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the
10 record.

11 It is now 6:02, and there are no other members
12 of the public here to make comment.

13 With that, we will recess until tomorrow
14 morning at 9:00 a.m.

15 (The proceedings recessed at 6:02 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
2 COUNTY OF YUMA.)

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
7 to the best of my skill and ability; that the
8 proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and
9 thereafter reduced to print under my direction.

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

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

16 DATED this 31st day of May, 2026, at Yuma,
17 Arizona.

18

19

20



21

22 MICHELE E. BALMER
23 Arizona Certified Reporter
24 No. 50489

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 I CERTIFY that GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICE, LLC,
35 has complied with the ethical obligations set forth in
36 ACJA 7-206(J)(1).



37 GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICE, LLC
38 Arizona Registered Firm
39 No. R1035

40