

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT AND
2 TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE

3
4 IN THE MATTER OF THE)
APPLICATION OF UNS ELECTRIC,) DOCKET NO.
5 INC. AND ITS ASSIGNEES, IN) L-00000F-21-0050-00188
CONFORMANCE WITH THE)
6 REQUIREMENTS OF A.R.S.) LS CASE NO. 188
§ 40-360, et seq., FOR A)
7 CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL)
COMPATIBILITY AUTHORIZING)
8 THE GOLDEN VALLEY 230 KILOVOLT)
(KV) TRANSMISSION LINE)
9 PROJECT, WHICH INCLUDES THE)
CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 230 KV)
10 TRANSMISSION LINE ORIGINATING)
NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF)
11 INTERSTATE 40 AND SHINARUMP)
DRIVE (TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH,)
12 RANGE 17 WEST, SECTION 4) AND)
TERMINATING NEAR U.S. HIGHWAY)
13 93 AND MINERAL PARK ROAD AT)
THE PLANNED MINERAL PARK)
14 SUBSTATION (TOWNSHIP 22 NORTH,)
RANGE 18 WEST, SECTION 3),)
15 MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZONA)
_____)

16
17 At: Kingman, Arizona
Date: April 26, 2021
18 Filed: May 5, 2021

19 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

20 VOLUME I
(Pages 1 through 169)

21
22 COASH & COASH, INC.
Court Reporting, Video & Videoconferencing
1802 N. 7th Street, Phoenix, AZ 85006
23 602-258-1440 Staff@coashandcoash.com

24 By: Kathryn A. Blackwelder, RPR
25 Certified Reporter
Certificate No. 50666

1 INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS

2	OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. DERSTINE	11
3	VIRTUAL TOUR	97
4	PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION	128

5

INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS

6	WITNESSES	PAGE
7	ERIC RAATZ, ED BECK, AND MIKE WARNER	
8	Direct Examination by Mr. Derstine	48

9

10 INDEX TO EXHIBITS

11	NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
12	UNSE-1	CEC Application	49	--
13	UNSE-2	Witness Summary of Eric Raatz	54	--
14	UNSE-3	Witness Summary of George Miller	54	--
15				
16	UNSE-4	Witness Summary of Ed Beck	54	--
17	UNSE-5	Witness Summary of Mike Warner	54	--
18				
19	UNSE-44	Corrected Tables H-2, H-3, and H-7 to Exhibit H	50	--
20				
21	UNSE-45	Corrected Figure 2 to Application	49	--
22	UNSE-48	Witness Slide Presentation	51	--
23				
24	CHMN-2	Letter dated April 14, 2021 from Utilities Division Staff	85	--
25				

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and
2 numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before
3 the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting
4 Committee at Hampton Inn & Suites, 1791 Sycamore
5 Avenue, Kingman, Arizona, commencing at 1:28 p.m. on
6 the 26th of April, 2021.

7

8

BEFORE: THOMAS K. CHENAL, Chairman

9

10 MARY HAMWAY, Cities and Towns
11 JACK HAENICHEN, Public Member
12 JIM PALMER, Agriculture
13 PATRICIA NOLAND, Public Member
14 RICK GRINNELL, Counties
15 LEONARD DRAGO, Department of Environmental Quality
16 JOHN RIGGINS, Arizona Department of Water Resources
17 (Videoconference)
18 KARL GENTLES, Public Member (Videoconference)
19 ZACHARY BRANUM, Arizona Corporation Commission
20 (Videoconference)

21

22

APPEARANCES:

23

For the Applicant:

24

25 Snell & Wilmer, L.L.P.
 Mr. J. Matthew Derstine
 One Arizona Center
 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 1900
 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

26

27

28

29

30

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Good afternoon, everyone. My
2 name is Tom Chenal, Chair of the Line Siting Committee.
3 And we have a Committee, both in person and virtually
4 due to COVID, to hear the applicant on the application
5 filed for CEC 188, the UNSE Golden Valley case.

6 May I have appearances, please.

7 MR. DERSTINE: Good afternoon, Chairman,
8 Members of the Committee. Matt Derstine, Snell &
9 Wilmer, appearing on behalf of the applicant, UNS
10 Electric, Inc. Joining me is Gourjia Odisho -- I
11 pronounced it right, I think I've said it wrong a bunch
12 of times -- and she is a paralegal with the law firm of
13 Snell & Wilmer.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Very good. And I
15 know we have Mr. Cunningham. You're going to be --
16 you've just filed a statement of -- a statement for
17 your family's position, and I understand we'll hear
18 from you at the time of public comment, which we'll
19 take a little later in the proceeding.

20 Just a couple housekeeping rules. Because of
21 COVID, we want to follow a COVID protocol that the
22 applicant has come up with, but essentially it's wear
23 masks when we're walking around in public areas, but no
24 need to wear a mask when we're seated and we're
25 socially distanced. When people enter the hearing

1 room, their temperature will be taken, they'll be asked
2 a series of safety questions. That's true for people
3 if they want to make public comment from the public.
4 But we also have the ability for the public comment to
5 be taken outside in the, I guess, the hallway. There's
6 a way to do that that's been set up. So there's
7 multiple opportunities and ability to give public
8 comment.

9 We'll take a break about every 90 minutes for
10 the benefit of the court reporter and all of us.

11 I would ask the folks in the room to not talk
12 to the Members of the Committee about the case, at
13 least substantively, because now that the hearing has
14 started, we all want to make sure we hear the same
15 evidence. And to have any material conversations
16 regarding the application, that will mean that some
17 Committee Members might receive information that others
18 haven't that could be critical to the decision. So
19 happy to talk to you about the weather, things like
20 that, but not about the project.

21 I've made the executive decision in the
22 meetings leading up to this hearing that there will be
23 no physical tour, again, due to COVID. In the hearings
24 in the past, except the more recent ones, we have
25 always had tours, and I know it's very popular among

1 the Committee Members to take tours. But just because
2 of COVID and confined space and being in buses and
3 such, it seems like that would not be prudent, so we're
4 not going to do that this time. But to compensate for
5 that, I've asked the applicant to come up with a very
6 robust flyover. So we'll spend more time than we
7 normally would on kind of a virtual flyover, if you
8 will, of the proposed routes, and so I think that will
9 be a good substitute for this project.

10 We don't know how long this hearing is going
11 to take. I would have thought it would be something
12 over Wednesday, maybe Thursday. But I've polled the
13 applicant on a number of occasions, and it seems like
14 the general consensus is this will certainly go into
15 Thursday, and very possibly into Friday.

16 And, you know, my strong preference is that
17 we begin deliberations on a CEC in the morning and we
18 don't try to attempt that in the afternoon. It's too
19 great a temptation to try to hurry up and finish and
20 have people get on the road, and I think we've all
21 found that it's better to start fresh in the morning.
22 Now, if we go an hour or two in the morning and we're
23 finished, well, that's a different story. But if we're
24 into the afternoon, I'm going to suggest that we hold
25 off deliberations until the next day, so that could

1 take us into Friday.

2 We have no party that's intervened. There
3 may be some public comment. We'll have every
4 opportunity to hear that. I mentioned to
5 Mr. Cunningham we're going to take his public comment
6 after the opening statement from Mr. Derstine. We have
7 a hearing this evening at 5:30 to take additional
8 public comment. It's typical for every case, we hold a
9 public hearing the evening of the first hearing day for
10 the members of the public and the community to give
11 public comment, so we'll have that at 5:30.

12 As I said, we've had a number of meetings
13 leading up to this, and I'm satisfied the applicant has
14 met the requirements of the procedural order, as
15 there's been an exchange of exhibits and statements of
16 the witnesses, which are part of the exhibit book. And
17 the Committee, at least the ones appearing live, have
18 been provided, you know, a Surface Pro, I guess, or is
19 it an iPad Pro, that has all the application exhibits
20 and the witness statements loaded into it.

21 There will be at least two exhibits that I'll
22 have. One is the standard letter from the Corporation
23 Commission in response to my letter, and I think the
24 applicant has extra copies of that and we'll make that
25 an exhibit. And then the statement of Mr. Cunningham,

1 that will be an exhibit as well.

2 So with that, are there any procedural
3 matters that we need to discuss before we turn it over
4 to Mr. Derstine to give his opening statement and begin
5 the hearing?

6 MR. DERSTINE: Nothing here.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Does the Committee have any
8 questions before we begin?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN. CHENAL: And I can't see everyone. We
11 don't have a separate screen that has all of the
12 Committee showing at one time.

13 MEMBER PALMER: It's across the top.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: It is across the top. Mine
15 doesn't have everyone, that I can see.

16 MEMBER HAMWAY: Tom, I don't have a camera,
17 and neither does Jack, on our face.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: I got it. Okay.

19 MR. DERSTINE: As to the Members of the
20 Committee who are appearing virtually, you may want to
21 cover that with your roll call, but I just want to make
22 sure you're able to see them.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, we'll do that. Okay.
24 That's better. Thank you very much.

25 So right before we begin, we'll do a roll

1 call of the Committee. Let's do the ones live here
2 first, and then we'll go to the ones virtually.

3 So Member Hamway, if you would start.

4 MEMBER HAMWAY: Mary Hamway, representing
5 cities and towns.

6 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Jack Haenichen,
7 representing the public.

8 MEMBER PALMER: Jim Palmer, representing
9 agriculture.

10 MEMBER NOLAND: Patricia Noland, representing
11 the public.

12 MEMBER GRINNELL: Rick Grinnell, representing
13 counties.

14 MEMBER DRAGO: Len Drago, representing
15 Arizona Department of Environmental Quality.

16 MR. RAATZ: Eric Raatz, representing UNSE.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: I didn't know you were on the
18 Committee.

19 MR. DERSTINE: You're not.

20 MR. RAATZ: Oh, I'm sorry. No, I'm not.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Riggins -- let's go
22 with Member Riggins, Member Gentles, and then Member
23 Branum.

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Riggins, do you want to

1 say that again? We didn't hear it in the room, so we
2 might have to have the audio turned up in here.

3 MEMBER RIGGINS: Sure. John Riggins,
4 representing Arizona Department of Water Resources.

5 (Technical difficulties.)

6 MEMBER RIGGINS: Can everybody hear me?

7 MR. DERSTINE: We can.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: We heard you three or four
9 times.

10 MEMBER RIGGINS: It's that important. I
11 wanted to say it multiple times.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Gentles, if you'd
13 introduce yourself.

14 MEMBER GENTLES: Good afternoon. This is
15 Karl Gentles, representing the general public.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Branum, if you'd
17 introduce yourself.

18 MEMBER BRANUM: Good afternoon. Zachary
19 Branum, representing the Chairwoman of the Arizona
20 Corporation Commission. Thank you.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. The sound crew just
22 suggested we move forward with the hearing, and we'll
23 get the technical issues resolved as we proceed.

24 So Mr. Derstine, unless there are any other
25 issues we should discuss before we begin, why don't we

1 turn it over to you and hear your opening statement.

2 MR. DERSTINE: All right. Thank you. I just
3 don't want to hear myself over and over again. Once is
4 enough, I think.

5 Can we transfer over to the opening statement
6 slides, Josh and team. Thank you.

7 Welcome. Welcome to Kingman. I guess I
8 wanted to start by welcoming our new Member of the
9 Committee, Member Grinnell, and thank you all for being
10 here.

11 Before this case, I had never been to Kingman
12 and I knew very little about Kingman other than it was
13 a place on the map of the state of Arizona. But
14 because of this case, I -- in driving around Kingman
15 you see street signs and buildings with names, and that
16 prompted me to want to know a little bit more about
17 Kingman. So I thought I'd start my opening statement
18 by sharing a little of that with you.

19 Josh, do I need to turn this clicker on? Oh,
20 I did it. Back one. There it is.

21 What was interesting to me when I'm reading
22 about Kingman and learning a bit about this area, it
23 seemed to me that Kingman and the surrounding area was
24 largely defined by roads: A wagon road; a railroad; a
25 highway; and an interstate freeway. In 1857 Edward

1 Beale surveyed and built a thousand-mile wagon road
2 following the 35th parallel. One of the interesting
3 things about Beale's expedition is that he used camels
4 to support the endeavor. But apparently camels were
5 not favored by members of his party, and ultimately the
6 use of camels around this part of the world ended. But
7 they made an effort in utilizing camels.

8 So some 30 years later, Beale's wagon road
9 was followed by the railroad. And the city's namesake,
10 Lewis Kingman, surveyed the rail route between Needles
11 and Albuquerque. And Kingman was very much and grew up
12 to be a railroad town. There was mining and there was
13 cattle, but it's very much defined by the railroad.

14 After the railroad came Route 66. In 1938
15 Route 66, the Chicago-to-Los Angeles highway, was shown
16 as continuously paved, but generally, again, followed
17 the path of the railroad. Route 66, the heydays were
18 the '50s and the '60s, the post-war era where people
19 would get in their cars and drive and travel.

20 And Route 66 was followed by I40. And I40
21 generally followed along the Route 66, but bypassed it
22 in sections. And I think Williams was the last segment
23 of I40 that bypassed Route 66 in that area.

24 I think also, in looking at Kingman today,
25 that its future and its growth is again defined by and

1 driven by its proximity to roads. Kingman's
2 population, I think, according to the census that I
3 looked at, is around 32,000. The unincorporated areas
4 surrounding Kingman are somewhere around 17,000
5 population. Kingman's population is growing at around
6 2.3 percent annually, but they had an increase of over
7 15 percent since 2010.

8 Again, Kingman's located on I40, a major
9 east/west corridor. It also intersects I93 running
10 from Las Vegas to Phoenix, and that I93 is also the
11 future I11 corridor running from Canada to Mexico. So
12 I think -- you know, with its history defined by roads,
13 I think Kingman's future will largely be defined by
14 roads, its proximity and its importance as a regional
15 trade service and distribution center, again, because
16 of its location on national transportation routes.

17 And that growth in Kingman that we're seeing
18 in population over the past years and what we expect
19 into the future is showing up on the UNS Electric
20 system. UNS Electric serves Santa Cruz County and
21 Mohave County, southern end of the state and the
22 northern part of the state, has over 96,000 customers.
23 But UNS Electric has seen increased demand -- energy
24 demand of 2.5 percent over the past five years, and the
25 load forecasts around studies show a significant

1 increase in energy over the next 10 years, energy
2 demand, that is. And it's that growth in Kingman and
3 it's the increasing energy demand on the UNS system
4 that's driving the need for additional transmission.

5 This area is served by a long radial 69 kV
6 line. We don't have the map up at the moment. You'll
7 see it on your place mat. You've probably seen it in
8 the application. This area is served by a long
9 extending radial 69 kV line. That line is inadequate
10 to serve growth in this area that's anticipated. It's
11 inadequate today at the far western end of that line.
12 It's already seeing voltage support issues at the far
13 end, at the far reaches of the line.

14 So it's this growth in residential and
15 industrial and business use that requires more
16 transmission capacity, a new line. So to satisfy that
17 need, we've proposed a project, it's a single 230 kV
18 line. It will be co-located with this existing 69 kV
19 line, as much as possible, at various locations on the
20 route. The length of the new project is approximately
21 17 miles; it varies depending on the route that's
22 selected. We'll talk about routes in a minute.

23 The line starts at the southern eastern end
24 at the Harris or McConnico substations. You'll hear
25 testimony about why we have two starting points,

1 potential starting points. Essentially, we're working
2 out the business commercial relationship or arrangement
3 to use the existing Harris substation. If that doesn't
4 come through, then we'll use the WAPA's McConnico
5 substation. The other end of the project, the other
6 end of this 230 kV line, will terminate at the planned
7 Mineral Park substation. That's at the western end of
8 the line.

9 This project has had a long permitting
10 history, longer than most. It started in 2007 and it's
11 finished up in 2020, but we're still receiving comments
12 in the federal permitting process. But there was --
13 the permitting process was led by the BLM. This
14 project covers certain amounts of -- significant
15 amounts of BLM land, Bureau of Land Management land,
16 and so BLM led the permitting process. BLM issued an
17 EA in 2020.

18 What's in the EA? The EA studied six
19 alternative routes, two eastern routes that are
20 referred to as the East Cerbat 1 and East Cerbat 2.
21 There are four western routes. There's West Cerbat 1,
22 2, 3, and 4. And you'll hear a significant amount of
23 testimony about those routes, why those six routes were
24 brought forward through the permitting process, how
25 that happened, when that happened, and ultimately --

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Derstine, let me interrupt
2 just for a second. I hate to do this. Member Gentles
3 sent a message that said they can't see any of the
4 slides or anything.

5 MR. DERSTINE: So our feed is not making its
6 way to the Committee Members.

7 MEMBER GENTLES: Chairman, it just showed up
8 under Jason Moeller.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: So you can see it now?

10 MEMBER GENTLES: It just showed up as soon as
11 you said something, but it's on a small -- okay. I'll
12 change my view and see if that works. That does
13 indeed. Thank you.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Mr. Derstine,
15 sorry to interrupt. I just want to make sure they have
16 the benefit of the slides.

17 MR. DERSTINE: Taking these shows on the
18 road, it was one thing when it was all of us just
19 showing up in a hearing room, but now we're having to
20 broadcast and get everyone looped in. And we continue
21 at times to struggle, but hopefully we'll -- please
22 continue to let us know if there's problems along the
23 way.

24 So the 2020 Environmental Assessment issued
25 by the Bureau of Land Management had the six routes,

1 and ultimately selected East Cerbat Number 1 as the
2 preferred route.

3 And so why BLM selected E1 as the preferred.
4 You'll hear a significant amount of testimony from two
5 of our witnesses, Mr. Beck and Mr. Warner, about the
6 federal permitting process, and in fact kind of that
7 early phase of the project starting in 2007, 2008 where
8 there were public open houses and outreach in which the
9 public made it very clear to us, to UNS and BLM, early
10 on that they wanted to see eastern routes. At the time
11 we had only brought forward two western routes for
12 their consideration. And the public made it clear,
13 very clear, in around May of 2008 that they wanted to
14 see eastern routes. We listened to the public, we
15 brought forward some additional routes, and that's
16 what's in the application.

17 And ultimately, the public outreach and
18 engagement has shown that the eastern routes, and in
19 particular E1, carries the greatest amount of support.
20 In addition, E1 is in a designated utility corridor for
21 the entire route. E1 follows or will be co-located
22 with the existing 69 kV transmission line, and E1 has
23 less impact on the Cerbat Foothills Recreation Area.

24 So with the federal permitting process
25 completed, we were ready to move forward with the CEC

1 application. The CEC application presents all of the
2 same six route alternatives that were studied by the
3 BLM in their EA.

4 And I will tell you that we had some early
5 discussion about does it make sense to bring all six
6 routes forward? Should we bring four of them forward?
7 Are there better routes -- routes that are clearly
8 better than others? And we didn't think it was
9 appropriate to make that judgment, and so we brought
10 all the routes forward, everything that was studied in
11 the EAs, before this Committee.

12 The application follows the EA and BLM in
13 selecting E1 as the preferred route, and the
14 application requests a corridor of 500 feet for the
15 siting of the line.

16 The testimony and the evidence that you'll
17 hear from our witnesses is that this project has
18 minimal environmental impacts. It has no significant
19 impacts to fish, wildlife, and plant life. There's no
20 significant impacts to recreation areas. There's no
21 interference with existing or future land use plans, no
22 significant visual impacts to scenic areas.

23 You'll hear testimony about BLM's methodology
24 and requirements for grading visual impacts. And I
25 think the highest sensitivity on the visual impact

1 studies show that along W1 and W2, that's West Cerbat
2 Route Alternative 1, West Cerbat Route Alternative 2,
3 had some of the most significant impacts, at least at
4 one location. But overall, no significant visual
5 impacts and no significant impact to historic sites.

6 So what are the key facts and the issues that
7 are before the Committee? I think one of the key facts
8 and one of the key data points is that BLM issued an EA
9 after a very long and extensive permitting history.

10 The public outreach conducted from 2007
11 through 2020 established significantly greater support
12 for the eastern routes versus the western routes from
13 the public, but there is opposition to the eastern
14 preferred route. That opposition comes from two radio
15 stations that are located in proximity to the eastern
16 route, and you'll hear testimony about our efforts to
17 resolve the concerns of those radio station owners and
18 minimize any chance of interference. There is
19 opposition to the eastern route in preference for the
20 western routes from the landowner, Mr. Cunningham's
21 family, in which the eastern route will cross a portion
22 of their property. And Mohave County has issued a
23 letter supporting the western routes over the eastern
24 route. Mohave County's recent letter comes in
25 comparison to the City of Kingman's resolution, going

1 back to 2008, in which the City of Kingman, by
2 resolution, indicated its support for the eastern
3 route.

4 No one is objecting to this project. No one
5 is saying it shouldn't be built, it's not needed. The
6 question is: Does the Committee agree with the BLM's
7 selection of E1 as the preferred route? I think that's
8 really the issue before this Committee.

9 We'll present our case to you through three
10 witnesses: Mr. Raatz, who appeared as a member of the
11 Committee, but really is a witness for UNS Electric;
12 Ed Beck, who the Committee is familiar with and has
13 seen in prior cases, now coming back as a consultant
14 for UNS Electric after years of working for the company
15 and testifying in cases like this; Mr. Mike Warner,
16 he's the president of Transcon Environmental. Transcon
17 was the environmental consulting firm that was hired by
18 BLM to do the scoping and the federal permitting
19 process.

20 The exhibits and visual aids that you'll see,
21 we've collected those on the iPad for you if you don't
22 want to use the paper books. The iPad has the
23 application, the CEC application, it has the witness
24 presentation slides, which you'll see on the two
25 screens here in the hearing room, and it also includes

1 the exhibits.

2 One of the things we'll show to you, which
3 the Chairman mentioned, would be the flyover
4 simulation. That's to take place of you folks getting
5 in a van or a bus and driving around. We think the
6 flyover simulation, which will also be paired with a
7 Google Earth, will give you a really good understanding
8 of the project and the routes. We'll supplement the
9 flyover simulation with some drone photography and, as
10 I mentioned, Google Earth views.

11 The place mat is here. And I think you all
12 have a copy of it, except for probably our Committee
13 Members who are appearing virtually. The place mat
14 shows the structures, the alternative route costs, the
15 route alternatives, and has some of the key observation
16 points. Again, the place mat is intended to be kind of
17 a quick, easy reference. If you can't find it on your
18 iPad or in the book, you might look to your place mat.

19 At the end of the case we will request a
20 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility for the
21 project covering the E1 as the preferred route for this
22 project. We think it's the best route.

23 The evidence will show that the project
24 satisfies the criteria of 40-360.06. Those are the
25 factors that this Committee is, by statute, required to

1 consider in evaluating a CEC application. And I
2 believe that the evidence will show that the project
3 balances the need for adequate, economic, and reliable
4 supply of electric power, while minimizing the effect
5 thereof on the environment and ecology of this state.
6 That language is from 360.07.

7 And with that, we're looking forward to
8 presenting you with our case and appreciate you all
9 being here.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Thanks, Mr. Derstine.

11 Any questions from the Committee? I need to
12 look at the screen too to see. Any follow-up
13 questions?

14 (No response.)

15 CHMN. CHENAL: I actually have one, just
16 since this is the opening statement. The time
17 period for, you know, the review of the routes going
18 back to -- I mean, what year was it, 2000 and --

19 MR. DERSTINE: '7.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: 2007. And there was a hiatus
21 period there, but it's definitely a long time from then
22 until now. I'll be paying attention to this, as I'm
23 curious. The notion that the public support that was
24 given that preferred the east alternatives versus the
25 west alternatives, and I assume the BLM relied in part

1 on that public support for the eastern routes for
2 coming up with their preferred alternative, but is
3 there some sense of when the -- when most of that
4 public support for the eastern routes was derived? Was
5 it long ago or is it more recent? I mean, because
6 obviously things have changed since 2007, so I just
7 want to know how fresh that data is, that public
8 support for the east side, now in 2021.

9 MR. DERSTINE: That's a good question, and we
10 will -- Mr. Beck and Mr. Warner have been with this
11 project since the beginning, since 2007, and so part of
12 our presentation, part of our testimony and evidence
13 will be educating the Committee, informing the
14 Committee about what that outreach looked like and
15 sounded like in 2007, 2008, up through 2010.

16 But then when the project, as you mentioned,
17 went on a hiatus and then came back and was triggered
18 again by the load growth and the growing population in
19 this area that I mentioned in my opening, the scoping
20 then continued to receive consistent and -- let me
21 search for the right adjective -- I think overwhelming
22 support for the public for the eastern routes, and
23 we've tabulated those comments. The application has --
24 I don't know. It's 170-some pages, the spreadsheet
25 that we're required to provide that catalogs all the

1 comments. There's a lot of comments, but we've broken
2 it down by route preference and tried to give the
3 Committee an understanding of, to your point, what was
4 the early support for, what routes, and in the second
5 phase, 2016 to the present, what was the support, how
6 did people feel about these route alternatives, all
7 six.

8 So that will be part of the testimony. And I
9 think what it fairly represents is that the public
10 views in the early phase said, we want to see eastern
11 route options, and in the second phase, 2016 on,
12 continued to say, we prefer to see -- the eastern route
13 is the preferred route, is the better route. So that's
14 gone a long way.

15 I mean, I think this Committee, you have, you
16 know, made it clear to us that you take seriously
17 public comment. We do too. And so we've been careful
18 in kind of looking and tracking the public comment and
19 the public sentiment. Again, not to say that there
20 isn't folks who support the western routes over the
21 eastern; there are some. And you'll hear from
22 Mr. Cunningham in a bit about why they prefer the
23 western routes. But I think in general, the public
24 support strongly favors the eastern route.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you. Thanks for the

1 answer.

2 Member Haenichen had a question.

3 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Mr. Derstine, can you, in
4 a few words, summarize kind of a compendium of all
5 those comments favoring the eastern side? Why did they
6 favor them? Give us some of the reasons that were
7 stated.

8 MR. DERSTINE: I think -- and I'll have to,
9 you know, qualify this statement by: You will better
10 hear from Mr. Warner and Mr. Beck. But I think a big
11 part of it was that and continues to be that on the
12 eastern routes we're building this line along the
13 existing 69 kV line for the vast majority of it.

14 So for folks on the eastern route who are
15 getting this project, if we're looking at just
16 residential impacts, how many houses are within a
17 hundred feet or a thousand feet of the project on the
18 eastern compared to the western routes, the difference
19 is the folks in the west don't have a transmission line
20 along the route that's preferred, the western route,
21 and the folks in the east have an existing 69 kV line.
22 Our new project will be co-located with the existing
23 69.

24 And in fact, you'll hear some testimony, but
25 the cost breakdown, we save money, because that aging

1 69 kV line, a big portion of it on the eastern end,
2 will need to be rebuilt. And by this project, we're
3 able to co-locate it on the new structures and we're
4 not having to rebuild a 69 and build a new 230 project
5 somewhere else.

6 But I think to Member Haenichen, to your
7 point, I would say the main driver is the co-location
8 aspect of it.

9 Concerns about the Cerbat Foothills
10 Recreation Area that is having the line impacting an
11 area that's important to folks, you know, in that area,
12 you'll see that the eastern route does cross the Cerbat
13 Recreation Area, but it does so in an existing corridor
14 where there is an existing line or distribution lines
15 and where there are existing roads. The route that's
16 being presented, the variations for Western 1, 2, 3,
17 and 4, follow along new corridors where there's not an
18 existing line, and therefore, in our view, creates more
19 impacts, new impacts.

20 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Now, I'm sure I'll learn
21 more about this when Mr. Beck and company make their
22 pitch on this, but it's obviously not totally
23 co-located with the existing corridor, because
24 Mr. Cunningham --

25 MR. DERSTINE: That's right.

1 MEMBER HAENICHEN: -- has an objection to it.

2 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah. The portion of the
3 project that crosses the Cunningham family property,
4 there's not an existing line there. It is within BLM's
5 designated corridor. And I think it will be important
6 for you to hear from Mr. Warner and Mr. Beck, there was
7 a process that goes back, it predates the scoping, the
8 permitting process for this project, predates 2007,
9 where BLM, through an EIS process, designated a utility
10 corridor for this area of the world. And the project
11 does follow BLM's designated corridor, but that
12 corridor crosses Mr. Cunningham's land, and you are
13 right, there's not a transmission line there.

14 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Was that BLM decision or
15 position, I guess is a better way to put it, part of
16 the so-called Corridors of National Interest that was a
17 big deal about 20 years ago?

18 MR. DERSTINE: I think you may be right. I'm
19 going to ask -- and we haven't sworn our panel in, they
20 aren't under oath yet, but I'll look to Mr. Beck to
21 give us a quick response to that answer.

22 MR. BECK: Yes, Member Haenichen, there was a
23 statement within the RMP, the plan developing those
24 corridors, that references that western-wide corridor
25 study that was done throughout the western states.

1 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you.

2 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes. Who spoke? Who is
4 asking?

5 MEMBER GENTLES: This is Member Gentles.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, go ahead.

7 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chair, Mr. Derstine,
8 first of all, to the applicant, I really do appreciate
9 the extensive public comment section for going all the
10 way back to 2006. I actually cracked open a bottle of
11 wine and I read through those 170 pages. I'm still
12 reading through them, going back and forth.

13 But to Member Haenichen's question, what I
14 didn't see, and I went back to try and find it, was an
15 aggregation of all those comments into the ranking, if
16 you will, of the different routes. And so I may have
17 missed it, but I would love to be able to see that.
18 Because it is a long period of time that you received
19 input from the public, and I can't see whether or not
20 it changed over time. There's a seven-, eight-year gap
21 in between dialogue with the public there, so I'd like
22 to see -- if you can point that out somewhere, I'd love
23 to be able to see that kind of aggregated ranking based
24 on all the comments.

25 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Chairman, Member Gentles,

1 thank you for the question, and you're exactly right.
2 That was certainly one of the questions I had is
3 that -- unlike you, I'm not patient enough to sort
4 through all those comments. And I wanted to know, can
5 you break these down for me and tell me what are the
6 totals and give it to me in a way that I can understand
7 it and maybe look at those aggregated totals? So we do
8 have slides in our witness presentation that provide
9 you with that, and I was going to look and see if I
10 could even find it here.

11 So the slide presentation is marked as UNS
12 Exhibit 48. And if we didn't get that out to -- I
13 think we did share it with the Chairman's office; but
14 if it didn't make its way to you, we can make sure that
15 we get that out. But there is a slide in Mr. Warner's
16 testimony, I think it's included in the land use
17 section, that contains pie charts that show exactly, I
18 think, what you're asking for.

19 MR. WARNER: Page 71, yeah.

20 MR. DERSTINE: And I'm hearing a friendly
21 voice indicating it's on Page 71.

22 MR. WARNER: 70 and 71.

23 MR. BECK: Slide 70 and 71. I'm not sure how
24 that corresponds to page numbers.

25 MR. DERSTINE: Right. So yeah, Slide R70 and

1 R71 in our witness slide presentation, and that falls
2 under the section of 2016 to 2021 scoping and outreach.
3 The slide on R70 shows public comments 2016 to 2021, so
4 they're the more recent comments, and Slide 71 covers
5 the comments 2007 to 2010.

6 If I'm looking at Slide 71, the 2007 to 2010,
7 of 331 comments, it appears that 81 favored the eastern
8 route, nine favored the western route. And the balance
9 of the comments, I think, probably went to issues other
10 than route preference. And then Slide 70 shows the
11 more near-term comments, 2016 to 2021, supporting an
12 alternative -- one alternative over the other. And in
13 that more current phase of the permitting process,
14 again, 2016 to 2021, 32 comments favored the eastern
15 route, with 13 favoring the western route of 124
16 comments total.

17 So that information is there. And you'll
18 have an opportunity, Member Gentles, and other Members
19 of the Committee, to ask more detailed questions on
20 that topic, but I think that's an important part of the
21 case.

22 MEMBER GENTLES: Thank you.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Any further questions,
24 Member Gentles?

25 MEMBER GENTLES: No, that's it for now.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure.

3 Any other Committee Members have any
4 questions?

5 New Member Grinnell.

6 MEMBER GRINNELL: When you said the cost that
7 was being absorbed would be less for the eastern route
8 versus the western route, just generally, who is the
9 ultimate cost savings going to be applied to?

10 MR. DERSTINE: Well, that's always a tricky
11 question to answer before this Committee. But in
12 general, a project like this, a transmission project,
13 will ultimately make its way into UNSE's FERC rate
14 base. I'm looking just for a nod of the head from my
15 witnesses, and I have that right. So it will make its
16 way into a FERC rate base, and that rate base will then
17 be used to establish wholesale rates. And then those
18 wholesale rates also then become a component of the
19 rates that individual customers pay on their bill
20 through a -- I believe it's a transmission adjustor
21 component. I may be wrong on that, but I think that's
22 how it works its way.

23 So ultimately, customers, ratepayers of UNS
24 Electric will cover this cost as it's passed through
25 the various ratemaking processes at FERC and at the

1 Arizona Corporation Commission.

2 And if I misspoke, on the place mat -- and
3 there will be more testimony on the breakdown of costs.
4 I think what I tried to indicate to the Committee is
5 that E1, the preferred, shows a cost for construction
6 materials of 25,277,000. That amount does not take
7 into account the cost savings that UNS will have to
8 incur to rebuild a portion of the 69 kV line if E1 is
9 not selected. So they will have to build the project,
10 and, in addition, rebuild a portion of the 69 kV line.

11 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen.

12 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Well, now I'm confused.
13 On the last column on this chart here the heading is
14 "total cost." Are you now saying that there are
15 additional costs that have not been factored into that?

16 MR. DERSTINE: No. I think that last column,
17 Member Haenichen -- and you're referring to the cost
18 box on the place mat --

19 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Yes.

20 MR. DERSTINE: -- which coincides to the same
21 information in the application, and we have slides that
22 carry the same information. The total cost is the
23 combined construction materials and land acquisition,
24 that would be right-of-way. Total costs are those two
25 figures combined. So if someone has a calculator,

1 hopefully those numbers work out. The 25,277,000 in
2 construction and materials, when I add the land
3 acquisition costs of \$1,169,160, that gets me to the
4 total cost of 26,446,160.

5 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Correct me if I'm wrong,
6 but I thought I heard you say a few minutes ago that
7 there were additional costs.

8 MR. DERSTINE: There is a cost that is not
9 part of this project and is not on that chart that you
10 will hear testimony from Mr. Raatz about. This aging
11 69 kV system, there's a leg of it that has to be
12 rebuilt. If E1 is selected as the preferred route, we
13 don't have to independently rebuild that segment of the
14 69 kV line because it's going to be co-located on E1.
15 But if E1 is not selected as the preferred route, then
16 we'll have to incur the cost to rebuild that 69 kV.

17 So if the Committee were to decide, we think
18 BLM was wrong, we think W2 is the best route, and those
19 cost numbers you see for W2 turn out to be 23,775,445,
20 UNS Electric and -- the testimony you would hear on the
21 record is that that will also require that UNS Electric
22 spends another 300-and-some-million dollars to rebuild
23 the 69 kV line that's not part of this project. That's
24 the only difference.

25 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Yeah, but this is a very

1 important point. And it's difficult to, at least for
2 me, to understand how to vote on it, on that aspect of
3 it. So I wish somebody would cover that in detail.

4 MR. DERSTINE: We'll make sure we do.

5 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: And Mr. Derstine, I know you
7 covered it, and I've read it in the materials, but just
8 what's driving this additional load? Is it just the
9 population? There are a lot of factors in there, but
10 is there anything in particular that's driving the load
11 here?

12 MR. DERSTINE: I think it's, in general, the
13 growth, the population growth that I mentioned in my
14 opening statement slides that are happening in this
15 area, but you're also seeing growth in the commercial
16 and the business sector in this surrounding area. So
17 the load pocket is Kingman, but you're seeing growth in
18 the surrounding areas, the unincorporated areas
19 surrounding Kingman. And what I mentioned -- and I
20 think Mr. Beck can speak to this in greater detail in
21 terms of the businesses, the population growth, the
22 other factors that are driving the load growth. And
23 you'll hear testimony from Mr. Beck and maybe
24 Mr. Warner about that.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen.

1 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Along that line, I'd like
2 to have Mr. Beck talk about the additional -- where
3 will the additional generation come from for this new
4 load capacity.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Any further questions
6 from the Committee?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Mr. Cunningham,
9 why don't you -- I think you were provided a microphone
10 or have access to a microphone to provide your public
11 comment. I mean, normally we ask people to keep it to
12 three minutes. I think that would be an injustice to
13 you. But three minutes is normally the limit, so go
14 longer than that, but, you know, don't --

15 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Don't go an hour.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, don't go an hour. Well,
17 don't go anywhere near an hour.

18 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's right.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Your written statement will
20 become an exhibit, okay, and so I think a high-level,
21 you know, review is all that's necessary.

22 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. Chairman, we'll do
23 exactly that.

24 So Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the
25 Committee, my name is Patrick Cunningham. I'm an

1 attorney from the Valley, but I'm also from Kingman,
2 Arizona. And I'm in the high school class of 1972 in
3 Kingman High School, my father is the high school class
4 of 1942, my aunt is the high school class of 1917.
5 We've been here since 1917 building Mohave County, and
6 we'd like to bring some concerns to you. And we'd like
7 to thank the Committee, and the Chair in particular,
8 for letting us go early so I can be somewhere near
9 Mr. Derstine's wonderful comments to rebuff them.

10 I'm representing the Cunningham family. We
11 own about 230 acres of land, and the east route goes
12 right through the middle. It goes to the west of Box
13 Canyon, that we bought in 1950, and it goes to the east
14 of Cook Canyon, that we bought in 1943. The president
15 of Atchison, Topeka, Santa Fe signed the deeds. We
16 think the west route is absolutely the way to go. We
17 ask you to approve West Route Number 1 because it's
18 been moved farther away from residents in Golden
19 Valley.

20 I want to thank Matt and the entire team and
21 commend them. We have been working with Transcon and
22 UniSource since 2008. In fact, we went to that famous
23 open house in 2007 and many others. We went on a walk
24 on our property with Mr. Warner on December 13, 2008.
25 We went again with BLM in 2016, and we went again about

1 a month ago. I want to commend them for their
2 professionalism and their willingness to even entertain
3 having us speak.

4 We are making a limited appearance. We are
5 not intervening, because we want the line to be built.
6 It will help build Mohave County, and we've been doing
7 that for over 100 years. Our only quarrel is, the BLM
8 and UniSource picked the wrong route. They flat out
9 picked the wrong route; here is why.

10 Let me answer the question about the Golden
11 Valley residents and why there was more people asking
12 for the east route than the west route. It's very
13 simple. The people in Golden Valley want the new
14 substation, they want 35 megawatts of power, they want
15 additional reliability, they want all the things that
16 UniSource is providing, and they want to put the line
17 to support that in Kingman and not in their valley.

18 In Kingman we have a very easy statement for
19 what we think about that: That ain't right. It's not
20 right for them to get the reliability and this new
21 substation and all that power and stick us with the 230
22 kilovolt line. There's no Mineral Park substation
23 going to Kingman; it's going to Golden Valley. The
24 Mineral Park Mine, which may be a big -- a big consumer
25 of electric power, that's not in Kingman; it's in

1 Golden Valley.

2 I will go through the wonderful statement
3 that you have in front of you with the color pictures.
4 Mr. Chairman, thank you for making it a Chairman's
5 Exhibit Number 1. We appreciate that. And I will hit
6 the high points of those various arguments. There's, I
7 think, six of them that Matt and his entire team lay
8 out, and they did so, you know, orally and in writing.

9 Number one, it's the shortest route. They
10 say E1 is the shortest route. It's the shortest route
11 by seven tenths of a mile, guys. That's not material.

12 And it's \$2.9 million more expensive.
13 Several of your Members have already questioned on
14 that. And I get Matt's point that if you combine the
15 redoing of the 69 kV line maybe this somehow makes the
16 eastern route cheaper, but that's not what it says in
17 Table 2 and 3. Table 2 and 3 of their application
18 says, the west route is \$2.9 million cheaper. In
19 Kingman, that's real money. I realize it's going to be
20 folded into the rate base. I know we're all going to
21 pay it. My family is going to pay it, I'm happy to pay
22 it. But if the 69 kV line in Kingman needs to be
23 fixed, then let's fix it and let's have the Kingman
24 people pay for that, but that's not a reason to stick
25 us with a 230 kV line.

1 Their second point, that the alignment is
2 entirely inside the utility corridor. I love this
3 point. In 1993 the BLM somehow designated our
4 property, in 1993, a utility corridor. There was no
5 public vote for that. There was not a public process
6 that involved my family. And we read the Mohave County
7 Miner or the Kingman Daily Miner pretty closely; been
8 reading it since 1917. If they indeed delegated, made
9 our property a utility corridor, that's a taking.
10 That's a flat out taking, because we've never been
11 compensated for that, we've never had a vote on that.

12 That utility corridor, if that's the reason
13 you're going to put the line in East 1, I think that
14 that reason is flat out wrong. Why would I say that?
15 Because the west line has 50 percent public land and
16 the east line has 24 percent public land. The east
17 line uses 65 percent private property, the west line
18 only 42 percent private property. I've been in Arizona
19 a long time. If there's a state that defends private
20 property more than us, maybe South Carolina, but I
21 don't think so. And in Mohave County, one of the most
22 conservative counties, we defend private property to
23 the hilt. Maybe Graham County does a little bit more,
24 Mr. Palmer. And Member Noland, I've seen you defend
25 private property at the Arizona legislature a lot. We

1 should be using the public land in Golden Valley, we
2 should be using that because it's for a public purpose.

3 Their next argument, the greatest percentage
4 of existing transmission line easement. Does a 1940s
5 choice of where to stick a 69 kV line mean that now the
6 people of Kingman have signed up for a 230 kV line? I
7 don't think it means that. I understand their
8 argument. I understand that they can save some money
9 on that. But private landowners on the east line get
10 stuck with this line, and the power is going to Golden
11 Valley.

12 The same argument is made in the next --
13 their next argument about 65 percent private property
14 and that it is located in proximity to existing lines.
15 You ask the question about why so many people liked the
16 east line. Well, maybe some people liked the east
17 line, but like 241 people said they had no preference.
18 And why did these people in Golden Valley come to the
19 public process to talk about it? It's very simple.
20 They moved in from Modesto, California or some other
21 place, they come to Mohave County, we welcome them, my
22 family welcomes them, we're happy to have them. Come
23 on in here and live here. But you can't come here and
24 live here and say, I want a new substation and I want
25 reliable power, but I want to stick the people in

1 Kingman with the line that delivers all of that.

2 The public property in Golden Valley is owned
3 by 330 million Americans. It's not owned by the people
4 of Golden Valley. It's not owned by the people of
5 Kingman, Arizona. It's owned by this country. And BLM
6 is not the owner; they're the manager. Their choice to
7 stick the line in Kingman and somehow save the viewshed
8 in Golden Valley is the wrong choice. This power line
9 is for a public purpose, and we should use public land.
10 That's what is available on the west line. That's what
11 the Cerbat Recreation Area is, it's public land, and it
12 should serve a public purpose.

13 On the residences -- the residences on the
14 Kingman side versus the Golden Valley side. In the
15 original application you'll see there's 142 residences
16 or public areas within a thousand feet. And how many
17 are in the west line? 76.

18 Now, I played football and I played baseball
19 at Kingman High School. We were kind of good. We won
20 the state championship in 1972. But we can read a
21 scoreboard. The east line wins this hands down.
22 There's 142 -- now I'm told 141 residences. They've
23 amended that, they've done some checking. 141
24 residences on the east line. There's 80 residences
25 now -- used to be 76, now it's 80 in their latest

1 exhibit they sent you. We still win that. Many more
2 residences are being impacted adversely on the east
3 line than the west line. And the people of Golden
4 Valley probably don't care, but you should care, and I
5 know you do.

6 This Committee has been a paragon of fairness
7 since I first got involved in it in 1991 working for
8 Grant Woods. And he said, go learn about the Line
9 Siting Committee. Charlie Pierson, some of you
10 remember Charlie, helped educate me about how this
11 Committee works. You are one of the most thoughtful
12 and deliberative committees.

13 And that's why the BLM has not issued a final
14 EA, Environmental Assessment, they've left it open,
15 because they know that you make the call, they don't
16 make the call, UniSource doesn't make the call. You
17 make the call. I'm saying to you, you pick West
18 Number 1, they will redo their Environmental Assessment
19 in a heartbeat and they will go to work. And as soon
20 as the Commission approves your recommendation, we'll
21 build a new line on the west side. And that's why I
22 think that EA is open.

23 Finally, on the co-location issue. If
24 UniSource goes to Kingman and says, we have to fix the
25 69 kV line, I believe they'll fix that kV line and they

1 will be pleased to have stronger infrastructure. But
2 right now what's in front of you is not that decision
3 at all. What's in front of you now is, do we have an
4 east line or a west line. We like West Number 1. We
5 go through why we like West Number 1 in great detail.
6 Mr. Chairman, I will spare you going through that
7 orally, because you have been courteous enough to even
8 let me speak out of order.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, you will.

10 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, that's right.

11 So I will close by saying this. You will
12 hear from KAAA tonight, that's Cameron Broadcasting,
13 why they don't like the east line, because it endangers
14 their tower that's on our property. You'll hear from
15 KYET, that's Joe Hart and his family, because it's
16 within 500 feet of their tower on Highway 93. The east
17 line hits not one radio station, but two radio
18 stations. And I believe they will make their --
19 they'll make their points, and I'll let them make those
20 points.

21 Finally, on the destruction of our two
22 canyons. When you see on the virtual flyover here,
23 watch for where I40 is. I40 went through our property
24 in the '70s. They did the survey on my brother's
25 birthday, the day he was born in 1957. From 1957 to

1 1977 we fought the freeway and we lost. Kingman put
2 the freeway right through our property and drilled
3 through 400 foot of rock in the back of our canyon,
4 which used to be a three-sided canyon with a spring in
5 the back. It was idyllic. Now it's an idyllic canyon
6 with a freeway through it. And that wonderful freeway
7 is great for Kingman.

8 And so when you decide, shall we stick the
9 Cunningham family with yet another right-of-way, I
10 would say to you, we have given at the office. We have
11 given. And we support that freeway now, it's going to
12 be there for the rest of our lives, maybe the rest of
13 perpetuity, but it is not time to hit us with five
14 towers going through two canyons. We've already given
15 at the office.

16 Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to answer any
17 questions from you and all the Committee, or, for that
18 matter, angry editorial comments.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, we normally don't do
20 that. We listen to the public comment and we leave it
21 at that. If there is a question, I'd certainly allow
22 it to be asked, but that's not something we normally
23 do.

24 Yes, Member Noland.

25 MEMBER NOLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I

1 was wondering if we could have the map put up on the
2 screen and Mr. Cunningham could show us the location of
3 the property.

4 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Sure.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Do you need a laser pointer?
6 Do you have that, Mr. Raatz?

7 MEMBER NOLAND: Mr. Chairman, can the Members
8 that are remote see this? Now they can.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Now they can. It's one of the
10 windows.

11 MR. CUNNINGHAM: So Mr. Chairman, Member
12 Noland, right in here is where it's beginning in this
13 nice box. And as you proceed north, you'll see that
14 right at the base here, where I have the green pointer
15 kind of steady, kind of not, you'll see on the left is
16 the freeway, that's I40, on the right is Highway 66.
17 We own the land between those places, and the line is
18 planned to go right through center.

19 Right to the left or the west of the line is
20 KAAA's tower that's on Highway 66 at Mile Post 47, and
21 to the east of the proposed line is Box Canyon. And
22 Box Canyon is our canyon that's about 105 acres, and it
23 is an idyllic canyon. And it is indeed a box canyon,
24 and we intend to develop that for residential -- on the
25 west side in Cook Canyon it's part commercial, like the

1 radio station tower, and part residential.

2 Member Noland, did I get to the right place?

3 MEMBER NOLAND: Perfect. Thank you.

4 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen.

6 MEMBER HAENICHEN: I'm going to just give
7 Mr. Beck a warning that this is something that I'll ask
8 when he gives his presentation. Why can't the line be
9 moved either to the right or the left along one of
10 those existing features, the freeway and the whatever
11 the thing is on the right? But that's later.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Cunningham.

13 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. Chairman, Members, thank
14 you again for your courtesy and taking me out of order.
15 I'll see you in the hallway if you want to know about
16 the top 10 people from Kingman, Arizona. By the way,
17 number one is Andy Devine, 144 feature films.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Very good.

19 Okay. So with that, is there anyone else
20 that we are aware of, the applicant is aware of, that
21 would like to make public comment at this time?

22 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Raatz, over here, did I
23 see someone was out in the area wanting to give public
24 comment? Is there anyone else who wants to give public
25 comment at this time?

1 MR. RAATZ: Let me check.

2 MR. BECK: There is one person out there.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, I would prefer not to
4 have them wait until 5:30 if they're here and they want
5 to give comment.

6 MR. BECK: They had no comment, apparently.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Mr. Derstine, I think,
8 if you'd like, we can begin with your case in chief and
9 I can swear the witnesses in.

10 MR. DERSTINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 We're going to -- as indicated in our list of
12 witnesses, we designated a panel of witnesses. So we'd
13 like to have Mr. Raatz, Mr. Beck, and Mr. Warner all
14 sworn. And they will testify as a panel, depending on
15 the topic or the subject matter, but we'll use them as
16 a panel of witnesses.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Do you prefer an
18 oath or an affirmation?

19 MR. RAATZ: Oath, please.

20 MR. BECK: Oath.

21 MR. WARNER: Oath.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Would you raise your right
23 hands, please.

24 (Eric Raatz, Ed Beck, and Mike Warner were
25 duly sworn en masse by the Chairman.)

1 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Raatz, let's start with
2 you.

3 And we need to switch over to our witness
4 slide presentation on the screens and make sure the
5 members of the Committee who are appearing virtually
6 are seeing it as well. We're in the right spot. You
7 can advance to Slide Number 3.

8 Can the Members see this who are appearing
9 virtually?

10 (No response.)

11

12 ERIC RAATZ, ED BECK, AND MIKE WARNER,
13 called as witnesses on behalf of the Applicant, having
14 been previously sworn en masse by the Chairman to speak
15 the truth and nothing but the truth, were examined and
16 testified as follows:

17

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. DERSTINE:

20 Q. Mr. Raatz, you're the manager of operations
21 planning for UNS Electric. Why don't we move on to the
22 next slide and have you summarize your education and
23 your experience, please.

24 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yes. I received my bachelor
25 of science in civil engineering from the University of

1 Arizona in 2000. I'm a registered professional civil
2 engineer in the state of Arizona as of 2006. I'm
3 currently, as Mr. Derstine just pointed out, the
4 manager of operations planning for UNS Electric from
5 2019 to present. And prior to that, I began my career
6 with UniSource Electric in 2008 holding various
7 positions within the company. And prior to that, I was
8 a civil consulting engineer. I have previously
9 testified in two line siting cases.

10 Q. All right. Mr. Raatz, one of the -- in your
11 role as manager of operations planning, you've kind of
12 taken over responsibility for this project and have
13 supervised the preparation of the application, the CEC
14 application, do I have that right?

15 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That's correct.

16 Q. Let me ask you a little bit about the
17 application, then. Have you had a chance to review the
18 CEC application, which is UNSE Exhibit 1, after it's
19 been filed?

20 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yes, I have.

21 Q. Okay. Do we have any corrections that we
22 want to make at this time to UNSE-1?

23 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yes, there's several
24 corrections to be made. Figure 2, the Figure 2 map
25 that is marked as UNSE Exhibit 45, the new figure has a

1 corrected legend. And that figure can be found on
2 Page XIII of the introduction of the CEC.

3 Additionally, we have a correction -- we
4 filed corrected tables that were included as Exhibit --
5 in Exhibit H of the application. New tables were
6 marked as UNSE Exhibit 44, and Mr. Warner will address
7 those changes in his testimony.

8 Q. And those tables break down, I think,
9 residential impacts within certain distances from each
10 of the routes, and Mr. Cunningham had referred to those
11 in his public comment, is that right?

12 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That's correct.

13 Q. And so those revised tables are marked as
14 UNSE Exhibit 44 and those will be the subject of
15 testimony later in the case?

16 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That's correct.

17 Q. Anything else?

18 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yeah, we have one more
19 additional revision. On Page 20 of the application,
20 under the "requested action" section, UNSE is
21 requesting -- it states that UNSE requested a corridor
22 in range -- within range from 150 feet to 500 feet.
23 UNSE will be asking for a common corridor of 500 feet,
24 as Mr. Derstine had pointed out previously.

25 Q. So it's a consistent corridor width of

1 500 feet for the entire project, regardless of the
2 route, is that right?

3 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That's correct.

4 Q. Any other corrections or changes to the
5 application, UNSE Exhibit 1?

6 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Not at this time. Thank you.

7 Q. Mr. Raatz, you also assisted in the
8 preparation of our witness slide presentation, which is
9 marked as UNSE Exhibit 48. And that exhibit, UNSE
10 Exhibit 48, is what we're projecting on the left and
11 the right screen here in the hearing room, and
12 hopefully members of the Committee are able to see a
13 left screen and a right screen as they're looking at
14 our presentation online. Do you have any corrections
15 to UNSE Exhibit 48, the witness slide presentation?

16 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) No, I do not.

17 Q. Mr. Beck, Slide Exhibit 5. It says here
18 you're a consultant for UNS Electric. Why don't you --
19 for the benefit of the Member of the Committee who
20 hasn't heard you testify in the past, please give us a
21 little bit about your background, your education, your
22 experience.

23 A. (BY MR. BECK) Sure. As many of the Members
24 of the Committee know, I worked for over 41 years with
25 Tucson Electric Power and UniSource Energy Services

1 providing, to a large degree in most recent years,
2 siting support efforts. I have an MBA and a bachelor
3 of science degree from the University of Arizona. I'm
4 a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers.
5 And I've testified in over 12 line siting cases and
6 some other cases, both at the ACC and FERC, over the
7 years.

8 Q. I know the Committee keeps asking you why
9 you're back, given that I think we made a big deal of
10 the fact that you had retired at one point in time.
11 But I think there's been two or three case since then,
12 and here you are.

13 A. (BY MR. BECK) Yes, I did not touch on that
14 issue. So specifically for this case, because the case
15 started back in 2006 with the process that we were
16 going through and received public comment throughout, I
17 have a lot of that background and experience and
18 knowledge of what went on in those early years and what
19 drove the project then, and also further information to
20 help drive the project at this time, so I was brought
21 back in to help support that early-on process with the
22 public.

23 Q. You also assisted in the preparation and had
24 input into various portions of the witness slide
25 presentation that's marked as UNSE Exhibit 48, is that

1 right?

2 A. (BY MR. BECK) That is correct.

3 Q. You heard me ask Mr. Raatz. Do you have any
4 corrections you want to make to UNSE-48?

5 A. (BY MR. BECK) No, I do not at this time.

6 Q. All right. That takes us to you, Mr. Warner.
7 We're on Slide 7. You too were involved in this
8 project going back to the very beginning, so we
9 appreciate you staying on and being here today. Give
10 us a little bit of understanding of your education and
11 experience.

12 A. (BY MR. WARNER) So I'm not retired and back.
13 I'm still employed gainfully. My name is Mike Warner.
14 I've got a master's degree in landscape architecture
15 and environmental planning from Utah State University,
16 I've got a bachelor's degree in agronomy from Brigham
17 Young University, and a member of the American Society
18 of Landscape Architects. I've been doing environmental
19 consulting for utilities for more than 30 years, and
20 I'm the founder and president of Transcon
21 Environmental. It's an Arizona-based firm. We started
22 our corporation here. And I've testified on six other
23 proceedings in front of the Committee.

24 Q. And Mr. Warner, did I have that right? I
25 think in my opening I mentioned that Transcon

1 Environmental was the environmental consulting firm
2 that was retained to work for, with BLM in the
3 preparation of -- well, through the federal permitting
4 process that culminated in the Environmental
5 Assessment, the EA?

6 A. (BY MR. WARNER) Yes.

7 Q. Mr. Warner, you also worked on the witness
8 presentation slides and had input. Do you have any
9 corrections that you'd like to make at this time to
10 UNSE Exhibit 48?

11 A. (BY MR. WARNER) Nothing at this time.

12 Q. All right. Now, we filed witness summaries,
13 as we're required to do in our procedural order, for
14 all three of these witnesses. There was actually four
15 witnesses that we had originally identified. One of
16 those is not testifying here today, but there are
17 witness summaries on file. Let me see if I can
18 identify those for the record. The summaries are found
19 at UNSE 2, 3, 4, and 5.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Derstine, just a quick
21 point of order on that, though. If one of your
22 witnesses is not able to testify, I don't think it's
23 appropriate that we include as an exhibit his witness
24 summary.

25 MR. DERSTINE: My plan was not to move the

1 admission of Mr. Miller's witness summary. I just
2 wanted to identify that it was there in the binder.

3 BY MR. DERSTINE:

4 Q. So I think you're going to kick us off,
5 Mr. Beck, with an overview of UNS Electric and a little
6 bit of the history.

7 A. (BY MR. BECK) Yes, that's correct. The
8 UniSource Energy Corporation in 2003 purchased assets
9 from what was at the time Citizens Utilities. They had
10 an Arizona division. They had gas, electric, and
11 communication facilities. UniSource purchased the gas
12 and the electric service territories in Arizona from
13 Citizens. So shown on the map on the left-hand screen,
14 the electric service territory that was purchased
15 covers Kingman and Lake Havasu, and down at the bottom
16 it also covers a portion of Santa Cruz County around
17 Nogales.

18 UniSource Energy Corporation formed a company
19 to house those assets, and it was called UniSource
20 Energy Services. And within that entity, two divisions
21 were created, one an electric division and one a gas
22 division. So the electric side is referred to as
23 UniSource Energy Services Electric, or UNSE for short.
24 So throughout my testimony I'll be referring to UNSE.

25 UniSource Energy Corporation saw an

1 opportunity to leverage a sister company's personnel
2 and resources and reduce costs at the UNSE entity. And
3 so that sister company was Tucson Electric Power, were
4 both owned by UniSource Energy Corporation.

5 There were two areas in particular that were
6 identified as opportunities for cost savings and for
7 developing a better system. One area was in planning,
8 specifically for transmission and distribution assets
9 that would cover delivery and distribution of energy
10 throughout the service territories. And part of the
11 early process of ownership of UNSE was some limitations
12 on the Western Area Power system. So at the time we
13 purchased -- UniSource purchased Citizens' operations,
14 Citizens had an all-requirements contract for energy
15 from Pinnacle West Capital and they depended on Western
16 Area Power for all transmission to get generation to
17 their service territories.

18 And so one of the early activities at UNSE
19 was identification that if we changed from what was
20 called point-to-point service to network, we would
21 reduce some of the overloads that were coming up on the
22 Western system. And we were also looking for
23 opportunities to expand and develop transmission at the
24 UNSE entity to alleviate concerns on the Western
25 system.

1 Second area that UNSE was looking at
2 improving was on the resource side. As I mentioned,
3 all of our resources back in 2003 were coming through
4 Pinnacle West Capital. We saw a large opportunity for
5 Tucson Electric Power to supply planning, procurement,
6 and management functions for UNSE, and so we had -- the
7 Pinnacle West Capital contract was expiring. We didn't
8 extend that. And we developed an intercompany
9 agreement for TEP to provide that planning,
10 procurement, and management for the resource side.
11 Part of that also included change in balancing
12 authority area. Because that resided with Pinnacle
13 West, that also was coming over to Tucson Electric
14 Power.

15 In 2006, the load growth in Kingman was
16 5 percent. So not only was there a lot of activity
17 going on relative to energy, how we were going to
18 procure it, looking at opportunities to develop
19 transmission to support that, we were also dealing with
20 a large load growth. And we had just taken on the
21 resource side, so we had to figure out how and where we
22 would get resources to serve that load.

23 There were two drivers to that load growth,
24 and they're still there today. On the industrial side,
25 it comes down to location, location, location. As

1 Mr. Derstine mentioned in his opening, the proximity of
2 the mainline railroad, as well as I40 and Highway 93,
3 which is going to be the future Interstate 11, which
4 will go all the way from Mexico up to the Canadian
5 border, the location puts Kingman within 350 miles of
6 33 million people from a distribution standpoint. So
7 it's a great location for both manufacturing and
8 distribution centers for various companies, as an
9 example, Walmart or Amazon.

10 On the residential side, the growth
11 potentials and possibilities there have an interesting
12 history. So at the time that this started, in the
13 2005, '6, '7, time frame, there was extreme growth in
14 Las Vegas, and it was being driven by the development
15 of the mega resorts up there. And as a result, the
16 land and housing costs were skyrocketing in the town,
17 and there was even a question about sustainable water
18 supply and whether or not future development could even
19 occur in Las Vegas.

20 In November of 2008 the New York Times
21 actually had an article specifically about Kingman,
22 interestingly enough, and it was driven by the fact
23 that two Las Vegas developers had bought land, one in
24 Golden Valley where they put in plans for 33,000 homes
25 on 5,000 acres. Just as a note, it was -- the Pravada

1 development was the plan. The other developer bought
2 47,000 acres up in northwest Arizona, and he was
3 projecting that he could develop homes up in that area
4 at one-third of what it would cost people to live in
5 Vegas.

6 At the same time, by 2010, there were plans
7 for the new bridge to bypass Hoover Dam and greatly
8 shorten any commutes from the Las Vegas area down into
9 the Kingman area. At the same time, those developers
10 were able to get a hundred-year water supply assurance
11 from ADWR. And so the area west of Kingman, from
12 Golden Valley all the way up to the Hoover Dam, was all
13 primed for housing development and becoming effectively
14 bedroom communities to Las Vegas.

15 And so the activity that was driven by all
16 this planned growth was energizing the residents in the
17 Golden Valley area to look at projects and look at what
18 was going on in their area. And specifically when our
19 project came forward, the 230 kV project back in the
20 2007 time frame, as you're going to see in further
21 testimony, that population was energized to show up and
22 show up loud with a very strong voice as to what their
23 preferences were.

24 As the article in the paper had said, Golden
25 Valley was populating pretty well in the '90s by those

1 looking for a rural lifestyle of peace and solitude.
2 And they quoted one resident at the time saying it's
3 not -- he's not going to have that solitude with 80,000
4 people living 1 mile from me. So they were very
5 energized to take a stand on development in their area.
6 They theoretically already had lost on the housing
7 development issue, but they saw the 230 kV line as one
8 area that they were adamant they didn't want going
9 through Golden Valley. And that will be covered in
10 further testimony.

11 Now, just to give you a little bit more feel,
12 here is some historic load growth numbers. And you'll
13 see, this is comparing -- the orange color, hopefully
14 you can see that, is the UNSE load growth. And the
15 blue, just for comparison purposes, is TEP. And you'll
16 see that up through about 2016 UNSE was below TEP, but
17 starting in about 2016 UNSE came up above the load
18 growth for the TEP system, and as you'll also hear in
19 further testimony, partially driven by some issues with
20 the mining load that was part of the original impetus
21 for this project.

22 Now, this is a forecast slide, so 2022 and
23 beyond. Again, you'll see the UNSE numbers are riding
24 quite a bit higher than what the TEP numbers are. Now,
25 I will point out, this is the composite load growth for

1 UNS Electric, which includes both Santa Cruz and
2 Mohave. Specifically for the Kingman area, we're
3 looking at something in the 2 and a half to 3 percent
4 range of load growth, which coincides with the 2 and a
5 half to 3 percent that was shown as population growth
6 by Mr. Derstine.

7 Q. Mr. Beck, can you back up one second on
8 Slide 12. I'm just struck by -- there's this
9 significant increase in the -- beginning in 2025 that
10 continues up until 2028, and then it drops off on the
11 UNSE system. Do you have an explanation for what that
12 graph is doing and why?

13 A. (BY MR. BECK) So both of these spikes are
14 driven by mining load. For the TEP system it's the
15 Rosemont project down south of Tucson; but for the UNSE
16 system, this likewise is driven by a future mining load
17 in southern Arizona. So again, the composite nature of
18 this, you have to take that into account. Our 2 and a
19 half to 3 percent is specifically to Kingman. This
20 incorporates all UNSE load.

21 Q. And the mine growth is largely attributed to
22 some sort of planned mining operation in Santa Cruz
23 County, as opposed to mine operations in Mohave County,
24 is that true, or is it both?

25 A. (BY MR. BECK) No. Well, for the most part

1 it's driven by mining in the Santa Cruz area.

2 Right now the mine that is in the Kingman
3 area has self-generation. It's not -- doesn't have
4 much of an operation right now. The anticipation is it
5 will continue to self-generate if they really bring
6 their service back up, and we didn't see a lot of
7 potential load growth there.

8 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen.

10 MEMBER HAENICHEN: So see if I've got this
11 right. So are you saying that that giant peak, which
12 was the forecast, never happened?

13 MR. BECK: Well, this is the forecast out
14 into, I think that's '25, '26 time frame, so we don't
15 know yet. It's an anticipation, we sure hope it would
16 occur, but there's no guarantees.

17 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you.

18 BY MR. DERSTINE:

19 Q. So this next chapter is titled "Transition
20 from Citizens to UNSE." You talked a bit about the
21 fact that UNSE acquired the Mohave County and Santa
22 Cruz systems from Citizens Electric. I assume you want
23 to drive home some more points in terms of the
24 transition that occurred and why?

25 A. (BY MR. BECK) Yes. So specifically for the

1 resource side, we saw some big advantage in putting
2 some local generation in place. And so we actually did
3 build a generation site in the Kingman area, which
4 you'll see in further testimony. It will pop up on a
5 map. I don't know if we had that -- there it is. It's
6 on the left screen.

7 So down south of the Kingman area, UniSource
8 Energy built the Black Mountain generating station, and
9 it's in service. It's 120 megawatts. It serves a
10 portion of the UNSE load. But it gave us the benefit
11 of having generation local to our needs and owned and
12 controlled by UNSE, as opposed to a purchased power
13 agreement.

14 So also at the time that -- in that 2005, '6,
15 '7 time frame, we were dealing with a customer shown on
16 the map. This is Nucor Steel. Historically had been
17 North Star Steel. They had had a large arc furnace
18 operating there, and they were attached to the Mohave
19 electric system because when they originally started
20 operations, Citizens couldn't handle that load.
21 Western Area Power, jointly with Mohave Electric Co-op,
22 said, we can do that, and it was carved out of the
23 Citizens territory at that time to allow Mohave
24 Electric to serve that.

25 They shut down their operation. In 2003,

1 North Star Steel purchased that site. And they
2 approached UNS Electric and said, hey, we'd like to
3 take service from you guys. MEC no longer wanted to do
4 that load. And so the service territory was brought
5 back into the UNSE system, but without the arc furnace.
6 They had agreed they weren't going to use the arc
7 furnace.

8 And historically the arc furnace, when the
9 arc was struck, caused system issues throughout the
10 west, into Las Vegas, down to Phoenix. And basically
11 UNS Electric said, that's not something we are sized to
12 handle. And so Nucor said, we're not going to put an
13 arc furnace in at this time. We're just going to go
14 back to melting steel, basically a flat load, something
15 UNSE could handle.

16 So this is the Harris substation adjacent to
17 the Nucor Steel operation, right adjacent to
18 Interstate 40. And you'll see a lot of this on further
19 maps and also during the flyover.

20 But at the time we were having discussions
21 with Nucor about service to them -- the line that
22 served them for MEC came out of this McConnico
23 substation. It was a Western connection, but the line
24 was owned by Nucor Steel itself. And UNSE said, hey,
25 we would like the opportunity to build a substation

1 adjacent to your Harris substation. We were
2 negotiating with them on the rates and terms for
3 service to their operation. We said, we'd like to buy
4 a piece of land, build a substation adjacent to yours.
5 We'll use that as the service point to Nucor, and it
6 would also give us an opportunity for future
7 distribution development in the area for UNSE loads.

8 Nucor was open to that discussion, but it
9 never came to fruition at that time because we had not
10 proceeded with our 230. We had some tentative
11 agreements with Nucor that basically said, when we get
12 approval for a 230 kV line, we'll make this deal. And
13 we had talked with them about paying appraised value of
14 the land, and they seemed okay with that. As I said,
15 we never executed agreements.

16 We've recently restarted those discussions.
17 We think they'll be open to dealing with us; they've
18 said initially that they are. But because we don't
19 have a final resolution of the land for Harris sub,
20 that's why within the application we've said our
21 starting point for the 230 project will be one or the
22 other of these two substations. They're within four
23 tenths of a mile, they're on industrial land owned by
24 Nucor, and from a construction standpoint there's
25 really no difference from our perspective. There's an

1 existing line there; it's matter of whether we build
2 adjacent to that or not.

3 And I already mentioned we were looking at
4 the opportunities for building transmission resources.
5 One of the ideas of that is we build generation, and as
6 renewables build and Western has some system
7 limitations, by building some 230 backbone on our
8 system we really improve our reliability to all of
9 Kingman and Mohave County.

10 And at the time of the initial discussions,
11 and we'll cover this further in further testimony, the
12 Mercator Mine had approached us. And we were not quite
13 ready to build that for our general customer base, so
14 initially it was strictly for the mine, and we'll talk
15 more about that later.

16 And I also mentioned becoming our own BA. So
17 TEP took on the balancing authority requirements for
18 UNS Electric through a contract with UNSE, and they
19 took that away from Pinnacle West, basically.

20 Q. This may not be the right place, but it's top
21 of mind, and I never like to forget to follow up on a
22 question. Member Haenichen raised the question about
23 generation. Where's the generation resources that will
24 be used to flow on this new -- the new 230 kV project?
25 Can you address that issue?

1 A. (BY MR. BECK) Just at a high level right now
2 I'll address the fact that the UNSE resources come from
3 a combination of this local generation at Black
4 Mountain in the Kingman area, again, it's
5 121 megawatts, we have renewable projects within the
6 Kingman and Mohave County area that we take some of, we
7 have -- UNSE has ownership in the Gila River power
8 plant. They've got a -- I think it's a 25 percent
9 ownership of one block at Gila River. And then the
10 balance of the power needs are met with market
11 purchases, whether they be from other third parties or
12 from Tucson Electric Power. It's basically least cost
13 generation procurement.

14 Did that get to your question, Mr. Haenichen?

15 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Yeah.

16 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Chairman, I'm just
17 careful of my watch, because I think, in terms of the
18 things that are important in my mind for the Committee
19 to see today will be to get to the Google flyover
20 this afternoon. That will take some time, and that
21 always -- there's stopping and starting and gives the
22 Committee an opportunity to really see some of these
23 areas that we've already touched on both in my opening
24 and in Mr. Cunningham's public comment. So if this is
25 a good opportunity to take a break, we'll come back,

1 hit purpose and need and project overview, and then
2 move to the flyover, with your permission.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: That sounds -- I was just
4 about to say we should be taking a break soon. I was
5 waiting for a break, and this is it. So let's take a
6 20-minute break, and we'll resume at that time.

7 (Off the record from 3:10 p.m. to 3:48 p.m.)

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Good afternoon, everyone.
9 This is the time set for the resumption of the hearing.
10 It was a little more than 20 minutes, but that's okay.

11 So Mr. Derstine, if you want to continue with
12 your examination of Mr. Beck or your next witness.

13 MR. DERSTINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 We're going to move to Mr. Raatz.

15 BY MR. DERSTINE:

16 Q. Mr. Raatz, we're going to -- I think let's
17 start on Slide 15, if we can advance our deck. So it
18 looks like we need the right-hand screen also to
19 advance. There we go. Oh, I said 15 and that says 19.

20 Judging by the heading here on Slide 19,
21 Mr. Raatz, you're going to talk about the need and the
22 purpose for the project, am I right?

23 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That's correct.

24 Q. Oftentimes I throw around the term "purpose
25 and need." But I see you have "need and purpose," and

1 I like that in that I think you're going to address
2 what's on the existing system and how that drives this
3 project and what it's intended to do. Is that a fair
4 statement?

5 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yes, that's correct.

6 Q. Okay. Well, take us through the need for the
7 project, please.

8 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Okay. Just to orient
9 everyone, up on the lefter -- upper -- on the left-hand
10 side you can see the UNSE service territory identified
11 by the purple line.

12 Q. Mr. Raatz, I'm just going to caution you, for
13 the benefit of the court reporter and me, if you'll
14 slow down that will be helpful.

15 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yep. Thank you.

16 Up on the left-hand slide you can see the
17 UNSE service territory identified by the purple line.
18 And also on this slide you can see the blue lines, they
19 identify the existing 69 kV transmission system serving
20 the Kingman and surrounding areas. And finally, we
21 have the two triangles, they represent the two import
22 points that provide power to the UNSE electrical
23 system.

24 So as Mr. Derstine had pointed out, I'll be
25 speaking to the need and purpose. The need for this

1 project. The Golden Valley service territory is
2 currently served by a radial 69 kV transmission
3 network. As you can see here -- whoops -- on the
4 left-hand side there's a long 70-mile radial -- 69 kV
5 radial transmission line that originates towards the
6 Hilltop substation and terminates at the Hoover Dam.
7 This long radial 69 kV line supplies power to the five
8 substations shown on this map: There's the So-Hi
9 substation, Chloride, Pierce Ferry, Dolan Springs, I
10 believe that is Highway, and the Willow Beach
11 substation, and terminates at the Hoover Dam.

12 At the Hoover Dam we can backfeed all of
13 these substations in an emergency situation. We have
14 an agreement with Nevada Power. Currently it
15 terminates there; however, a switching operation could
16 allow power to flow from the north to the south
17 direction should we lose one of these import points at
18 either Griffith or Hilltop substation.

19 Q. So let me have you stop there a minute. When
20 you say a radial line, that just means a single line.
21 I mean, there's substations along what you've described
22 as a radial 69 kV line. But the importance of a radial
23 line means what, that there's no other -- you're
24 getting generation from one point, which I assume is
25 Griffith or Hilltop on the southern end, and that's it,

1 and that serves -- that pushes power all the way up to
2 the north to Hoover Dam?

3 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That's correct.

4 Q. And so in my opening -- and I see you have
5 some bullet points here in terms of voltage issues.
6 What happens is that, because you're getting the
7 generation only at the bottom end of the line, folks
8 further up north may be having service and reliability
9 issues simply because you don't have any new generation
10 imports, no new sources of generation that are being
11 put on the system, it all comes from the south and it
12 has to make its way all the way to the north end of
13 that line?

14 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yeah, that's correct.
15 There's line losses inherent to the transmission
16 system. So, for instance, at the Hilltop or Griffith
17 substation the voltage may come in at 230, it's
18 transformed down to 69 kV; however, given the line
19 losses along this line as we move in the north --
20 excuse me -- northwest direction, the voltage at Willow
21 Beach or Pierce Ferry, it subsequently drops --
22 decreases from that 69 kV. So this can cause issues on
23 residential and commercial properties, lights
24 flickering, ACs stalling, air-conditioners stalling.
25 So we need to provide -- move that point -- provide a

1 stronger source to service these folks up here in these
2 substations.

3 Q. So if -- I'm looking again at your first
4 bullet on Slide 20. It says, "Golden Valley service
5 territory currently served by radial 69 kV transmission
6 network." Does that mean Kingman itself is served by
7 something other than this same radial 69 kV line?

8 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) The Kingman system has been
9 designed to be a radial system with options to switch
10 power, so it can be fed from multiple directions. So,
11 for instance, if we look at the -- I believe this is
12 the Golden Valley substation right here, you can see
13 two lines terminating into it. Only one of these lines
14 is providing power into this substation, so therefore,
15 it is a radial line; however, we do have the option to
16 switch this line out and put this line back in -- or,
17 allow this line to provide power to this substation.

18 Q. But absent the switching, Kingman is being
19 served off of the same radial 69 kV line that ventures
20 out along the substations that you just identified on
21 the map in Slide -- on the left screen for Slide 20, is
22 that right?

23 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

24 Q. So when you say the Golden Valley service
25 territory, you're talking about the entire Kingman area

1 and Golden Valley, right?

2 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

3 So as I was stating, the energy demand within
4 the Kingman service territory, over the past five years
5 there's been an increase of 2 and a half percent, and
6 that trend seems to continue. Over the next 10 years
7 we forecast an average increase of 2 and a half to
8 3 percent of the Kingman and surrounding areas, and the
9 existing system cannot accommodate this increase in
10 energy demand.

11 Q. I'm sorry to interrupt you. That existing
12 system, I just was reading along on that last bullet,
13 the existing system is the 69 kV transmission network
14 that serves Kingman and the surrounding area?

15 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

16 Q. Is there anything else you wanted to point to
17 in terms of the existing system and the need for this
18 project, that is, the 230 kV transmission project?

19 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Well, one thing that the
20 existing system cannot accommodate is load requests.
21 For instance, if an Amazon or a data facility were to
22 request an increase in load, Amazon warehouse might be
23 50 megawatts or so, the existing system could not
24 sustain that data request currently. And this project
25 will allow flexibility in accepting or responding to

1 those data requests.

2 Q. When you're saying "data requests," you're --

3 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yes, load requests. Sorry.

4 Q. So let me ask you about that. So you
5 mentioned a distribution center. So say if Walmart or
6 Amazon were to establish a new distribution center,
7 say, on the east side of -- right off of I40 on one of
8 the exits into the Kingman -- off of the Kingman area,
9 if there's suitable land and they were to develop a new
10 distribution center there, how would that new
11 distribution -- hypothetically Amazon distribution
12 center be served? Does the 69 have adequate capacity
13 to serve that new distribution center?

14 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) The 69 system currently does
15 not have adequate transmission to serve that service
16 request.

17 Q. And so does the new 230 give UNSE the ability
18 to serve new medium to large load customers throughout
19 the Kingman area?

20 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yes, it does. It will allow
21 UNSE flexibility to respond to those service requests.

22 Q. And I heard Mr. Cunningham in his public
23 comment say that they have plans to develop this Box
24 Canyon as a residential development, to develop Cook
25 Canyon, which is next door, and we'll see these places

1 in the Google flyover, but to develop that as a mixed
2 commercial and residential development at some point in
3 time in the future. Would those have to be served off
4 of the existing 69 kV line, those new develops that the
5 Cunninghams have hopes and plans for at some point in
6 the future? How would you serve the new Cunningham
7 projects?

8 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) It would be more advantageous
9 to serve them from this project. Without knowing what
10 the load growth is, I can't necessarily answer that
11 question, what the energy demand would be.

12 Q. So you'd either have to tap off of the
13 existing 69 kV radial line, which you're indicating
14 already has voltage and capacity issues, or you would
15 be better able to serve them from the 230 kV project,
16 the new project that's being proposed. Is that an
17 accurate statement?

18 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

19 Q. So what I hear you saying is that this
20 project isn't just to serve Golden Valley. It's not
21 just to put a new substation and push power to Golden
22 Valley. It serves the entire Kingman and surrounding
23 area?

24 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

25 Q. And so for future business and residential

1 development in and around Kingman, they will benefit
2 from this project and UNSE will have the ability to
3 serve them from this project?

4 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Let me ask a question here at
6 this point. Mr. Raatz, can you show on the map where
7 the McConnico substation or the Harris substation is?

8 MR. RAATZ: Do you mind if I advance one
9 slide, Mr. Chairman?

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure. Because I want to see
11 where this line is. Actually, I'd like to see it in
12 relation to what's up on the map there so I can see how
13 it relates to the existing system.

14 MR. RAATZ: So here is the existing Harris or
15 McConnico substation. And just for reference, you can
16 find that as well on your place mat. Do you want to
17 bring the place mat up? There we go. Ed, I got it
18 advanced.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: I was kind of interested in
20 seeing where this line is -- how it looks in relation
21 to the existing system. I have the place mat. But if
22 we could go back to the -- yeah, that. So where is
23 this new line going to be? Because it goes from Harris
24 to the planned Mineral Park substation. So now I see
25 on the slide a yellow or gold line. That represents

1 this project, correct?

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

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Now, north from Mineral Park
4 to Hoover Dam, will that remain a 69 kV line?

5 MR. RAATZ: Mr. Chairman, that will remain a
6 69 kV line.

7 MR. BECK: Mr. Chairman, just to be clear,
8 that's for the foreseeable future, but that doesn't
9 mean with growth in the future you don't extend that
10 230 up there.

11 CHMN. CHENAL: I understand. I think what
12 I'm understanding now better is that the -- there will
13 be the ability to bring more power from Harris to
14 Mineral Park and tie-ins to that to service Kingman
15 and Golden Valley. North of that there will be more
16 power at Mineral Park to provide more power north on
17 the 69 kV, but the point is that this project will
18 bring more power into the system, into those load
19 areas.

20 MR. RAATZ: Mr. Chairman, that's correct.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you.

22 BY MR. DERSTINE:

23 Q. And I think we jumped past your purpose
24 slide, Mr. Raatz, if we want to -- here we go. So
25 you've covered the needs, and we talked through a

1 little bit in terms of the -- already the benefit of
2 the new 230 kV project in terms of serving load around
3 Kingman and dealing with the voltage issues that are
4 existing on that long radial 69 kV line. But it looks
5 like you have a slide in terms of listing of the
6 benefits of this project, so those are what I see on
7 Slide 21. Do you want to walk us through those?

8 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) This project will improve
9 reliability. This project will provide another
10 interconnection point served by the Western Area Power
11 Administration transmission system, which, just for the
12 record, is not shown on this map, just the import
13 points serving our existing 69 kV system. So that
14 point of interconnection would be at the Harris or
15 McConnico substation, so it will eliminate a distance
16 that is served off of this long radial line.

17 This project will allow UNSE to serve
18 increasing energy demand within the UNSE service
19 territory. This project will provide new 230 kV import
20 and additional contingency support. One benefit this
21 project provides is if we've lost connection at either
22 the Hilltop or Griffith substation, with the
23 interconnection to the 230 kV transmission system this
24 will provide that additional contingency support. And
25 then this project will provide flexibility in switching

1 in operation of the 69 kV system.

2 And I'll advance to the next slide for that.

3 Q. Let me stop you there in terms of the
4 switching aspect of it. Explain what that means when
5 you say it gives you switching functionality.

6 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) So as I had said previously,
7 power flows from a south to a northern direction along
8 this 69 -- existing 69 kV transmission line. With this
9 project, portions of this will become a double-circuit
10 69 and 230 kV transmission line, and those 69 lines
11 will be terminating into the planned Mineral Park
12 substation. This will allow flexibility in switching
13 to allow power to flow from a north to a southern
14 direction, providing power back into the Kingman area.

15 Q. So while power flows currently just from
16 south to north along the radial 69 kV line, the ability
17 to -- the flexibility with switching that you
18 identified in the prior slide, Slide 21, is that you
19 can then essentially backfeed Kingman and the
20 surrounding area from the Mineral Park substation using
21 the 230 system?

22 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

23 Q. And that provides greater reliability?

24 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

25 Q. And that greater reliability is important to

1 not only Golden Valley and the residents along the line
2 who are served by the substations off the 69 kV, but
3 that also applies to the Kingman area, correct?

4 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

5 Q. So I'm sorry. You were moving on to
6 Slide 22. Was there more you wanted to talk about, the
7 purpose and the benefits of the project, or you were
8 pointing to this?

9 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Well, just one thing I'd like
10 to emphasize is that this 230 kV project does become
11 the building block of the UNSE system that will provide
12 the backbone that will not only support forecasted
13 energy demand, but will allow UNSE flexibility to
14 respond to increase in energy demand.

15 Existing substations along this project, for
16 instance, the existing So-Hi substation, if an
17 interconnection -- or, a service request came in this
18 proximity, this substation may be converted from a
19 69 kV substation -- from a 230 to 69 kV substation to
20 allow us a little more flexibility on the existing
21 system. So this will allow us to respond to service
22 requests more quickly.

23 Q. And a service request means a new house, a
24 new residential subdivision, a new business that
25 requires service that has moved to this area?

1 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) It would be a larger service
2 request. It would be something like we were speaking
3 to earlier, like an Amazon distribution center,
4 something that would require a large amount of power.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: So what again? You're
6 converting a 230 to a 69? Can you just explain that
7 again? You kind of lost me. I'm sorry. We always
8 hear about it in the other direction, it goes from 69
9 to 230. So if you could just unpack that for me, I
10 would appreciate it.

11 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So this will
12 allow us the flexibility, if the need arose, where we
13 could convert one of our existing 69 kV substations to
14 a 230 substation. We could provide additional
15 transformation there to tap into these existing
16 substations. And as Mr. Beck had pointed out,
17 future -- if this line were extended, we could
18 eventually convert these from 69 kV substations to
19 230/69 kV substations.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Grinnell.
21 You have to talk into the microphone.

22 MEMBER GRINNELL: Oh, I'm sorry.

23 The west side proposal or the alternative,
24 how much of that would -- your substations, how much
25 would you have, if any, a dropoff of service in

1 convertibility, number one? And would you be using, I
2 guess it would be step-down transformers to go from 230
3 to 69 or something of that nature? Does that make --

4 MR. RAATZ: That makes sense, Member
5 Grinnell.

6 MEMBER GRINNELL: Okay. But just for
7 argument's sake, just for a second, if you went to the
8 west side and you just drew that line from the west
9 side instead of the east side, how much of this
10 information would change as far as availability of
11 power to the same serving district?

12 MR. RAATZ: So the existing So-Hi substation
13 is common to both the eastern and western alternatives;
14 however, there are no additional 69 kV transmission
15 lines in proximity to any of the western routes, nor
16 are there any existing 69 kV substations in proximity
17 to any of the western routes.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: I think the question,
19 Mr. Raatz, is western alternatives. It's the east
20 alternatives versus the west alternatives in Kingman.
21 And the green arrow, you were way over north of
22 Bullhead City.

23 MR. RAATZ: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. The
24 western routes tend to go just to the east of this
25 existing Golden Valley substation. So the western

1 routes would come approximately along this path here.

2 BY MR. DERSTINE:

3 Q. Can we go back to a better map that better
4 illustrates this?

5 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yeah. So there are no
6 existing 69 kV in proximity to the western alternatives
7 being presented. So the eastern routes have more
8 flexibility -- well, more flexibility to serve the
9 Kingman area. We could -- UNSE could construct a new
10 substation along the eastern routes, it's closer in
11 proximity to the Kingman area, as well as we could
12 expand either the Harris or McConnico substation and
13 bring that power back into the Kingman area.

14 Q. Mr. Beck, did you have something you wanted
15 to add on that point?

16 A. (BY MR. BECK) Just to make the point that
17 without this eastern option in here, we lose the
18 ability to tap a 230 line in the future for any load
19 needs that are in this area. And along I40 and the
20 railroad are the likely candidates for the larger
21 loads, the industrial loads in here. And so to serve
22 these loads, one option is out of Hilltop, but that
23 today is highly, highly loaded with all of the service
24 to the Kingman, Mohave County area from Western to UNS
25 Electric. So you wouldn't want to put all your eggs

1 into that basket. You need to diversify.

2 So not having this leg in here precludes any
3 options of tapping off of that 230 to serve what likely
4 will be larger loads along Interstate 40. The stuff to
5 the west, likely you're not going to see big
6 distribution centers or data farms or the real high
7 users of energy locating out in the valley. They'll
8 likely locate along, again, either I40 and/or the
9 railroad and/or Highway 93.

10 So that's the -- one of the big values of
11 this 230 kV route is that future opportunity. Again,
12 this is long-term planning, developing that backbone
13 system, and having the opportunity to then just tap a
14 230 line for that future service.

15 And if we go to the west of the Cerbat
16 Mountains, to be able to utilize that you'd be building
17 69 across the recreation area, and maybe multiple
18 lines, which would not be good.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Now I understand.

20 Mr. Grinnell, does that answer your question?

21 MEMBER GRINNELL: Yes. Thank you.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Now I've got it. Thank you.

23 BY MR. DERSTINE:

24 Q. I guess in terms of the broader system, you
25 were on the letter from Commission Staff. Is that

1 where we were?

2 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Technical difficulties.

3 Q. Jason, can you advance back to that? That
4 one, 22. Thank you.

5 So the Chairman of this Committee always
6 sends a letter to the ACC requesting that ACC Staff, as
7 a subject matter expert, provide input on new projects
8 that are coming before the Committee. This is the
9 letter that came back from Staff dated April 14, 2021.
10 It's also marked as -- subject to check, I think it's
11 Chairman's Exhibit --

12 CHMN. CHENAL: 2.

13 BY MR. DERSTINE:

14 Q. -- 2. Thank you. Mr. Raatz, you have a
15 portion of the letter or a quote from the letter
16 highlighted here. Why don't you tell us about what you
17 have quoted here and why.

18 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) "Staff believes that the
19 proposed 230 kV transmission line project could improve
20 the reliability and the safety of the grid, and also
21 the delivery of power in Arizona."

22 We've highlighted this section. This aligns
23 with UNSE's position regarding this project. UNSE
24 feels that this project will -- as indicated also in
25 the load saturation study, that this project will -- is

1 needed to maintain system reliability and help support
2 an increase in energy demand.

3 Q. So what I read from Chairman's Exhibit 2, the
4 letter from Commission staff dated April 14, 2021
5 that's on Slide 22, is that they're saying something a
6 bit different and broader than what you've testified
7 to. You've testified about the need and the benefits
8 of this project for the -- on the UNSE system, how it
9 benefits and is able to serve load growth in the
10 Kingman area. This quote to me, as I read it,
11 indicates that it improves the reliability and safety
12 of the grid and the delivery of power in Arizona. I
13 read that as being a broader benefit. Am I reading
14 that correctly?

15 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

16 Q. So there's benefits to the UNSE system,
17 you've testified about that, Mr. Beck has testified
18 about that; but beyond that, Staff is saying there may
19 be benefits to the broader regional grid in Arizona, is
20 that right?

21 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

22 Q. Is there anything else you wanted to point
23 out in Staff's letter?

24 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Not at this time.

25 Q. Well, thank you. Anything else you wanted to

1 add on the need and the purpose of the project before
2 we move on to the next section, which is an overview of
3 the project itself?

4 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Not at this time.

5 Q. Okay. Well, let's transition to the project
6 overview and have you tell us about the project.

7 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) This project will consist of
8 the design and construction of a new 230 kV
9 transmission line ranging in length between 17 and 18
10 miles. For consideration there have been six
11 alternatives presented in the application, four west
12 alternatives that are separated by the Cerbat mountain
13 range and two eastern alternatives separated by the
14 Cerbat mountain range. All of these alternatives have
15 been studied in the Environmental Assessment that has
16 been prepared by the BLM.

17 The structures will be designed as
18 double-circuit capable monopole weathering steel
19 structures. And this project will interconnect at
20 either the existing WAPA or McConnico -- excuse me --
21 Western Area Power-owned McConnico substation or Harris
22 substation. This project will terminate at the planned
23 Mineral Park substation located approximately 17 miles
24 northwest of Kingman.

25 Q. And when it says the planned Mineral Park

1 substation, I assume there's a separate, I guess,
2 county-led permitting process for this future Mineral
3 Park substation, is that right?

4 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That's correct. It's an
5 industrial use permit. And just to note that the
6 planned Mineral Park substation was included in the EA,
7 as it is on BLM-administered lands.

8 Q. Okay. So the land on which the Mineral Park
9 substation will sit is BLM land, and you'll have to
10 obtain some sort of a lease or purchase the property
11 from the Bureau of Land Management, is that right?

12 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

13 Q. But it will still be subject to whatever sort
14 of zoning and permitting requirements are under Mohave
15 County?

16 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct, the
17 industrial use permit.

18 Just to note as well, if the expansion occurs
19 at either the McConnico or Harris substation, we'll be
20 required to obtain an industrial use permit at either
21 of those locations as well.

22 Q. You've mentioned the six alternatives
23 included in the application, four west and two east.
24 Can you use the map on the left screen, Slide 24 on the
25 left screen, and just kind of show those again? So you

1 said west of the Cerbat Mountains. Just describe in
2 general, using your laser pointer, where those west
3 alternative groups are and where the east alternatives
4 are.

5 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Sure. If you look towards
6 the lower right-hand corner of the map, you can see the
7 point of origination at the Harris or McConnico
8 substation. And then traveling directly west, there's
9 a blue line that goes along Shinarump Road, and this is
10 common to all western alternatives. And then
11 continuing just across -- I believe that is Shinarump
12 Road where -- this continues on -- the west W4
13 alternative continues along in a more westerly
14 direction and continues north to Tooman Road. And
15 again at the blue line, these all become common -- this
16 point becomes common to all alternatives.

17 Q. And I don't want to go into too much depth,
18 but just orient the Committee in terms of what are the
19 eastern two and what are the western four. I think
20 that's helpful at this point. Hopefully we'll be able
21 to show, using the Google flyover, much greater, you
22 know, clarity on these routes and where they are, but I
23 think that's useful.

24 More on the project overview?

25 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) The project shown up on the

1 screen, as well as in your place mats and identified in
2 Exhibit G of the application, are the typical
3 double-circuit construction. These poles would be
4 tubular weathering steel monopole structures ranging in
5 height from 85 to 199 feet, with an anticipated average
6 height of approximately 95 feet, although this height
7 may vary depending upon terrain and clearances
8 required. The average span length will be 700 to
9 900 feet.

10 Shown up on the screen is the double-circuit
11 configuration, as I had stated. The pole on the
12 right-hand side is a foundation pole. These foundation
13 poles are used at angle points or at dead end points
14 along the route.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Noland.

16 MEMBER NOLAND: Yes. Can you tell me what
17 the average span length is of the 69 kV?

18 MR. RAATZ: Can I get back to you with that?

19 MEMBER NOLAND: Sure.

20 MR. RAATZ: Thank you.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Again, what's -- I can't read
22 the writing on the screen between the direct embedded
23 and the foundation. What's the -- what is the
24 functional difference between the two?

25 MR. RAATZ: It is a disclaimer, Mr. Chairman,

1 a disclaimer that has been post on -- placed on both of
2 the structures just indicating that the height shown is
3 typical. The height -- whoops. Excuse me. The height
4 shown here is a range of 85 to 199 feet, so this
5 disclaimer states that the average height will be
6 approximately 99 feet, although taller structures may
7 be required dependent upon clearance requirements.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: So it's okay that I can't read
9 it, because it's a disclaimer and no one reads them
10 anyway?

11 MR. RAATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

12 BY MR. DERSTINE:

13 Q. So I just want to make sure that -- the prior
14 Slide 25 showed the double-circuit configuration. The
15 double-circuit portions of this project will be 69/230
16 double-circuit, is that right?

17 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

18 Q. Is there any segment that's double-circuit
19 230?

20 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) There potentially could be,
21 depending upon the point of interconnection and -- if
22 we use the map on the left-hand side, depending upon
23 the approved point of interconnection and the route
24 approved. If the Harris substation is the approved
25 point of interconnection, and one of the western

1 alternatives or E2 is the alternative selected, there
2 is an existing 230 kV line between the McConnico and
3 Harris substation that is approximately four tenths of
4 a mile in length, this portion would be double-circuit
5 230 construction.

6 Q. So the only segment of the line which
7 potentially could be double-circuit 230 would be if you
8 end up coming out of the Harris substation and it's for
9 that short segment of line, is that right?

10 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

11 Q. The other double-circuit portions of the
12 project will be double-circuit 230/69 kV?

13 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Hamway has a question.

15 MEMBER HAMWAY: You said the four tenths of a
16 mile the 230 is double-circuit and it's on the eastern
17 side. Could you guys tap into the that? You know, you
18 were saying that if you go with the western side, you
19 can't tap in as easily. Could you -- to service those
20 needs that Mr. Beck was talking about with I40 and all
21 of that, could you tap in, through that four tenths of
22 a line, the double-circuit 230?

23 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Beck.

24 MR. BECK: Member Hamway, we could extend
25 69 kV from the future Harris substation if we're able

1 to build that, but then we're building a 69 kV line and
2 it would not come before the Committee at all, so it
3 would be easier for UNSE. But it would still require
4 construction of a line, and it would only serve the
5 area really close to Harris. It still doesn't address
6 issues farther to the north in the northern Kingman
7 area.

8 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. BECK: And just -- I wasn't clear on the
10 question that Member Noland was asking. When you said
11 the 69 kV spans, were you referring to the existing or
12 the future with joint existing?

13 MEMBER NOLAND: The existing.

14 MR. BECK: Okay. Thank you.

15 BY MR. DERSTINE:

16 Q. Mr. Raatz, let's see. The next area is cost,
17 correct? And you were beaming and chuckling and came
18 up after my opening statement and said that I said that
19 the cost savings for the separate rebuild of the 69 kV,
20 which I had a fair number of questions from Member
21 Haenichen and others about, I said 300 million. But
22 it's really 3 million, is that correct?

23 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

24 Q. So the cost savings of the East 1 Cerbat
25 preferred route that will result from not having to

1 rebuild this portion of the 69 kV line will be
2 \$3 million, not 300 million?

3 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) That is correct.

4 Q. I have a tendency to exaggerate, but I try
5 not to do it to that degree.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, I have to tell you,
7 Mr. Derstine, my mind was made up when I heard 300
8 million.

9 MR. DERSTINE: I thought it was a good
10 selling point too.

11 CHMN. CHENAL: I don't care what
12 Mr. Cunningham said or could say.

13 MR. DERSTINE: That was great until I was
14 told I was wrong.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Hamway has a question.
16 Sorry.

17 MEMBER HAMWAY: I just have a quick question.
18 If E1 is less miles, why is the construction material
19 more?

20 MR. RAATZ: Member Hamway, the cost is
21 increased for routes either E1 or E2 due to the
22 number of foundations that would be required. There
23 are a lot more turns along either of those
24 alternatives, and a foundation structure both -- yeah,
25 more overall, the foundation and the pole itself.

1 MEMBER HAMWAY: So you're talking about a
2 turning structure, right?

3 MR. RAATZ: Correct.

4 MEMBER HAMWAY: So the foundation to support
5 that turning structure?

6 MR. RAATZ: The foundation, as well as the
7 pole itself, is more costly than if the line were going
8 straight through the structure.

9 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay. Thank you.

10 BY MR. DERSTINE:

11 Q. After cost I think you have a slide that just
12 kind of ticks off the reasons why the E1 was selected
13 as the preferred route. We've covered some of that in
14 my opening, but go ahead and let's touch on those
15 quickly.

16 A. (BY MR. RAATZ) Yes. UNSE has selected
17 alternative E1 as its preferred route based upon the
18 following factors. As Mr. Beck and Mr. Warner will
19 testify to, there's been consistent and overwhelming
20 public support from the beginning of this project,
21 starting in the public meetings in 2008 and continuing
22 on through the life of the project. I believe we've
23 had eight comments as a result of the public outreach
24 efforts that we've made to date, the public meeting
25 that was held in support of this project earlier this

1 year. All of those showed favor to the eastern
2 alternatives or opposed the western alternatives.

3 The selection by BLM as its preferred
4 alternative. The BLM selected this route due in part
5 to the public -- overwhelming public support, as well
6 as the fact that they have a designated utility
7 corridor. The public -- Mr. Warner will speak more in
8 depth to this, but the public did identify that utility
9 corridor in those public outreach efforts and asked why
10 that utility corridor could not be utilized for this
11 line.

12 In addition, E1 aligns more closely with
13 UNSE's design philosophy of using existing corridors.
14 This is an existing utility corridor in this case.
15 We'll be co-locating more of the existing 69 kV on this
16 E1 alternative. I believe it is in approximately four
17 additional miles that we'll be co-locating the 69 and
18 230 kV, whereas on the western alternative there will
19 be no co-location of the 230/69 other than the point
20 that is common along 93, State Route 93, that parallels
21 State Route 93.

22 Finally, this will replace more aging
23 infrastructure. As we've spoken to, this will allow us
24 the opportunity to replace that existing 69 kV line and
25 co-locate those structures. If one of the western

1 alternatives were selected, we would incur an
2 additional \$3 million, approximately \$3 million in
3 costs to rebuild that 69 kV transmission line along the
4 eastern routes.

5 Q. The next section here is -- we were going to
6 cover the stakeholder concerns. But we've already
7 heard from Mr. Cunningham and he's summarized his
8 family's concerns and he's also mentioned the radio
9 station owners who have concerns. What I'd like to do,
10 given that we've got about a half hour left of hearing
11 time today before we transition to public comment, is
12 to skip over that section, we'll address the
13 stakeholder concerns in greater detail tomorrow
14 morning, but I'd like to move on to the flyover, if we
15 can.

16 (Virtual tour plays.)

17 MR. BECK: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
18 Committee, as has been mentioned, we did develop a
19 flyover for this project. We have a flyover that shows
20 all of the routes. You will see, on the left-hand
21 screen, the Google flyover, and then on the right-hand
22 screen we'll have some photos that we can show as we
23 get to certain points. You'll see on the left there's
24 the list of all of the alternatives, they're color
25 coded. You may not be able to see those, but they are.

1 There's the map of the alternatives down in
2 the lower left-hand corner. As we get going, you will
3 see a little marker that skirts along the route that
4 we're particularly looking at at the time. So it will
5 give you the context somewhat of where we're at on the
6 map, because when we're doing the flyover you're not
7 going to see this detail.

8 Again, this is the Kingman area here, Cerbat
9 Mountains and the recreation area up through here, the
10 mine up in the very upper corner or the top of the map.
11 And all of the alternatives generally down here, with
12 one common portion to every route is this long segment
13 along Highway 93.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: And Mr. Beck, I think I know,
15 but the historic district of Kingman, the old section
16 of downtown Kingman, can you point to where that is on
17 the map?

18 MR. BECK: I believe it's right in there. Is
19 that right, Mr. Warner?

20 CHMN. CHENAL: I think it's a little further.

21 MR. WARNER: Yeah. Let me see if I can work
22 this thing. So you can see I40 coming through here,
23 right? But this is where we -- where we start to see
24 66, it comes right through there. So that historic
25 area where Beale Street is and where the train museum

1 is in that area, that's all down in there.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Thanks very much.

3 MR. BECK: Okay. With that, we'll start the
4 flyover. We're going to start with the western routes.
5 We're working in reverse order. We're going to do W4
6 first, it's the order that they're listed on the
7 overview legend.

8 Again, you saw the Cerbat Foothills
9 Recreation Area popped up as green.

10 Again, we have talked about this a little
11 bit, but these are the two optional points for starting
12 our project. Again, McConnico is a Western Area Power
13 substation. That's served off of their 230 system.
14 Goes up to Hilltop, goes to Griffith, which are both
15 off of this screen, but then there's a 230 tie-line
16 from McConnico to Harris substation.

17 Harris is owned by Nucor Steel. And what
18 we're proposing with Nucor is we build, on an adjacent
19 piece of land, our own substation, a UNSE substation,
20 and we would utilize that existing 230 line to serve
21 it, and that becomes a starting point for the project.
22 If for some reason we don't reach agreement with Nucor,
23 we would just extend out of McConnico and interconnect
24 there.

25 So again, starting point, Harris substation.

1 This is a single-circuit. We're heading south towards
2 McConnico station, we make a right turn. Again, this
3 is all Nucor property. We approach the crossing of
4 US 66, as well as Interstate 40. This is the Oatman
5 Highway or Highway 66.

6 On the right-hand screen I'm bringing up a
7 photo view. This was taken with a drone. So this is
8 taken at the Number 1, basically at the crossing of the
9 Oatman Highway on the proposed alignment. In the upper
10 right-hand corner there's a -- of the photo is a
11 directional arrow to tell you which way you're looking.

12 So generally here you're looking in a
13 westerly direction, again, looking down the line. We
14 would be parallel to that WAPA line, which is hard to
15 see. There's a Western Area Power line on lattice
16 structures, as well as a UNSE distribution line right
17 next to it. We would be just north and adjacent
18 parallel to that.

19 And again, these photos were just intended to
20 give a little bit of context of what's out there.
21 There's the existing UNSE line, distribution line.
22 There's the I40 crossing, looking back to the east.
23 This is the railroad, Nucor Steel.

24 One of the things I want to point out in this
25 view, because you don't see it on Google, is in the

1 distance east of McConnico and Harris is this wind
2 farm. And it's up on the ridges to the east of Nucor,
3 Western Wind. I'll talk about it in the flyover later,
4 but the towers themselves don't show up in the Google
5 because they didn't do their photography stuff out in
6 the middle of nowhere.

7 Again, we're single-circuit all along this
8 stretch. Here we're coming up to where the
9 alternatives peel off. W4 goes off to the left and the
10 others go a little bit to the right, but we're going to
11 follow W4 now.

12 Past the gravel pit for Mohave County. As
13 you can see in this area, there's not much out here.

14 Then we have another photo point right here,
15 the Number 2. So on the right-hand screen you're
16 seeing a picture taken from this Photo Point 2. Well,
17 we're actually at Photo Point 3, so it's a little
18 further off in the distance. And these photos aren't
19 working real well, so I think we won't look at all of
20 them.

21 BY MR. DERSTINE:

22 Q. I was just going to say, in the interest of
23 time, are we able to do W4, which I think is the route
24 you're showing currently, without the photo points, and
25 then can we skip to the eastern route and jump to that?

1 A. (BY MR. BECK) Yeah, I think that's a good
2 idea. We can go back through this again tomorrow in
3 more detail.

4 Q. Yeah, we plan to.

5 A. (BY MR. BECK) So again, just to remind you,
6 down in the lower left corner you're seeing we're
7 starting to turn the corner here and head north. We go
8 right along this dirt road. We get to this point here.
9 We're probably going to have a diagonal versus a square
10 corner. Our engineers went with exactly what the plan
11 said, so they put a nice 90-degree corner.

12 Here we're crossing where the other
13 alternatives will join in, but for W4 we're just
14 continuing north.

15 Q. When you say "the other alternatives," you're
16 talking about the other western alternatives?

17 A. (BY MR. BECK) Westerns 1 and 2 come in there.

18 This is the Cerbat Recreation Area to the
19 right, or east of this swath, and then private land
20 over to the left. You can see a little bit of
21 undulating terrain through here. That was just a
22 change in perspective to go to the other side of the
23 line.

24 Again, this is -- the BLM Cerbat Recreation
25 Area is from here to the east. We do kind of tuck

1 behind this hill to try and shield the line a little
2 bit from further west.

3 You can see we're coming to the point where
4 we're turning back towards the east in here, and Shipp
5 Drive is kind of an east/west route. We're right along
6 Shipp Drive.

7 Now, it's not shown, but this is where the
8 eastern alternatives will join in. And here we're
9 turning north to cross Highway 68, which is the road to
10 Bullhead City. 93 is off to the right.

11 We're going to continue from this point,
12 Highway 68, going north. As you'll notice, this has
13 now become double-circuit. Because where we joined in
14 with the eastern alternatives, that's where it's
15 co-located, so this is both 69 and 230 on these poles.
16 And this goes along Highway 93 on just the west side
17 basically replacing the existing 69 kV line.

18 There is one cell tower. We put a rough
19 representation for height purposes there. We do have
20 some photo points we'll show tomorrow, and we'll be
21 able to see existing structures, the existing 69 kV
22 structures and what would be replaced. In particular,
23 we have a few photo points right here at the RV park.

24 You can see there is some development to the
25 east side of 93, the So-Hi Estates. And if you noticed

1 earlier, the So-Hi substation is in this vicinity here.
2 Again, this will be double-circuit 230/69 all along
3 Highway 93.

4 Q. Mr. Beck, can we pause it there just quickly.
5 I just wanted to touch on -- Mr. Cunningham mentioned
6 that it's easier and less expensive for UNS to
7 co-locate. But it's more than that, isn't it? I mean,
8 the benefit of co-locating an existing line with this
9 new project we're bringing in means that we don't have
10 to create more ground disturbance and put a new line
11 somewhere else and create new impacts. Isn't that the
12 real benefit of co-locating? It's not just a cost
13 saving, although that's important.

14 A. (BY MR. BECK) There's a cost saving aspect
15 to it, but it's also, like you say, the impact to the
16 environment. We don't have to blaze new trails, new
17 access roads that don't exist. Our access road for the
18 existing 69, they're already there. So we can utilize
19 those roads and minimize that further disturbance by
20 having to create roads to get into these sites.

21 In particular, on the West Cerbat
22 alternatives as we're going up along the recreation
23 area, one of the issues there is there's minimal access
24 into that area for the public. The minute we put a
25 road in to build transmission, there's a nice access

1 point for the public. And that was one of the concerns
2 raised in the process, are you going to further
3 exacerbate encroachments into that recreation area in
4 areas they don't exist today. And again, because on
5 the east side we already have a 69 line, we have our
6 roads in there, that's already been disturbed; and to
7 the extent people are using them, they're using them.
8 But if we build new ones on the west side, it just
9 gives further access for the public.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen had a
11 question and then Member Noland.

12 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Isn't yet another
13 alternative to just leave the existing distribution
14 line as is instead of co-locating it on the new towers?

15 MR. BECK: That would be an option. I mean,
16 from a visual and public perspective, co-locating
17 eliminates a lot of poles, but we could leave that
18 existing line as is. In some cases those poles will be
19 topped, because we have no control over the
20 communication facilities that are underneath our
21 circuit.

22 MEMBER HAENICHEN: What does "topped" mean?

23 MR. BECK: So we would remove our circuit,
24 the 69 kV wires on the top of the pole, and cut the
25 pole off right above those communication wires. And

1 then that pole would remain until a communication
2 company does something with the pole and their
3 communication circuit.

4 So you'll see, if you look in the EA, that
5 there are some portions that would remain -- those 69
6 poles would remain in place, to your point, but the 69
7 would be moved off of them and the top portion of the
8 pole would be removed.

9 MEMBER HAENICHEN: So from a visual
10 standpoint that's not all that great, if the poles are
11 still there?

12 MR. BECK: That's true. It doesn't eliminate
13 all of the visual issues. It would be nice if we had
14 control over the communications companies and could get
15 them to move off, but that's kind of out of our
16 control.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Noland had a question.

18 MEMBER NOLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 Mr. Beck, what's the right-of-way width that
20 you have for the 69 kV line?

21 MR. BECK: So it varies. It's as little as
22 50 foot, and I think -- the maximum, I believe, is a
23 hundred. So in some areas we'll have to -- we'll
24 definitely have to widen the 50-foot right-of-way out,
25 and we're intending to go with 125 feet. So we'll try

1 and work out with the property owners to have a
2 125-foot-wide right-of-way.

3 MEMBER NOLAND: Mr. Beck, would you then --
4 well, you would remove the 69 kV poles. Would you
5 locate the other lines onto your new poles?

6 MR. BECK: Not the communications circuits.

7 MEMBER NOLAND: So are you going to leave the
8 poles anyway?

9 MR. BECK: There are some. It's not the
10 whole line, but there are some locations where there
11 would be existing 69 poles that will still have
12 communications on them.

13 MEMBER NOLAND: Then where would you locate
14 the 230 kV as compared to those poles? That's why
15 you're going to need a 125-foot right-of-way?

16 MR. BECK: Well, we would build adjacent to
17 them, yes.

18 MEMBER NOLAND: Can you give us an
19 approximate idea of how many poles would be left that
20 previously held the 69 kV?

21 MR. BECK: We can take a look at that
22 overnight and provide that sum tomorrow.

23 MEMBER NOLAND: Thank you.

24 Mr. Chairman, I think that's an important
25 point, because I assumed that those poles were all

1 going to be taken down and everything relocated to the
2 230 kV line.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, I think that's what we
4 were all thinking, unless we knew that they weren't
5 going to be.

6 Just so I'm clear, where again is the
7 existing 69?

8 MR. BECK: It's generally right -- generally
9 where this is shown. So we'll offset the poles a
10 little bit just for construction purposes.

11 CHMN. CHENAL: It's along 93?

12 MR. BECK: It's along 93 in this section
13 here, yes.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: And it goes up -- how far
15 north does it go again? It goes all the way to Hoover
16 Dam?

17 MR. BECK: Yeah. So it goes up, crosses the
18 road here, but it then continues on up to Hoover Dam
19 along 93.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: And as we discussed
21 previously, this project would only replace the line up
22 to the Mineral Park substation, and from there north
23 the existing 69 line would remain in place?

24 MR. BECK: The existing line would remain in
25 place, yes.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: So it would be nice to know,
2 to Member Noland's question, how many of these 69 kV
3 poles are going to be, in a sense, co-located with the
4 new line.

5 MR. BECK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We'll get some
6 information on that.

7 MEMBER GRINNELL: Mr. Chairman, just real
8 quick.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, Member Grinnell.

10 MEMBER GRINNELL: As a follow-up to that,
11 couldn't you negotiate with the communications
12 companies to relocate their lines under your new poles?

13 MR. BECK: We'll work with them to try and do
14 some of that. But since they don't have to and we have
15 no real hook to make them, it's difficult.

16 BY MR. DERSTINE:

17 Q. On that point, Mr. Beck, I assume the
18 long-term objective is to remove those topped poles?
19 You've mentioned and testified you don't have control
20 over those communication circuits, but long-term the
21 objective would be to transfer those communication
22 lines over to the new 230. And presumably those wood
23 structures that are currently carrying the
24 communication circuits aren't going to last forever,
25 and at some point in time those topped poles will have

1 to come down. And the cable companies, whatever these
2 communication circuits are, they're going to have to
3 move over to the newer structures, right?

4 A. (BY MR. BECK) That's true. And a lot of the
5 existing infrastructure of wire likely will go away at
6 some point in the future as we go to more
7 through-the-air-waves-type transmission.

8 Q. It's more a matter of we don't have the legal
9 right to move them off those existing poles under our
10 joint use or whatever sort of attachment agreement we
11 have in place?

12 A. (BY MR. BECK) That's correct.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: And is it cable, is that
14 generally what we're talking about? What are the
15 facilities that are on the 69 kV poles from the
16 communication companies?

17 MR. BECK: I think to a large degree it's
18 cable and telephone. And there may not be any
19 communication along 93, so it's more on the southern
20 edge. So we'll get you that information overnight so
21 you have it tomorrow.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you.

23 Member Drago.

24 MEMBER DRAGO: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

25 Mr. Beck, I've got a question. A while back

1 in our Line Siting Committee we worked on making sure
2 that we don't leave, for example, solar panels behind
3 and that someone should clean them up eventually.
4 Remember the old waste issue? When you all were
5 discussing this, I was thinking that those poles that
6 you talk about, the 69 kV poles with the communication
7 piece on it, were going to be abandoned in place. And
8 that's not the case, correct?

9 MR. BECK: No. If there's nothing on those
10 poles, we will remove them and get rid of them. It's
11 only where there are some communication conductors that
12 they will still have the right to be attached to those.

13 MEMBER DRAGO: Perfect. Okay. Because I was
14 thinking the same thing, why can't we put the coms onto
15 the 230 kV, because I think that would make sense. But
16 I don't know what jurisdiction we have for this
17 Committee to even talk about the communications.

18 MEMBER NOLAND: We don't.

19 MEMBER DRAGO: And we don't.

20 MR. BECK: But we will address in our
21 testimony the issue of the communication conductors.

22 MEMBER DRAGO: Thank you.

23 MR. BECK: So we're going to finish this
24 western one all the way up to the substation, and then,
25 as Matt indicated, we'll jump over to E1 just so you

1 have a view of that. And then we can go back over all
2 of them tomorrow.

3 So again, we're just heading north along 93,
4 double-circuit 230/69. You'll see we're approaching up
5 ahead where we're going to cross over Highway 93.
6 You'll see there's really not much of anything out in
7 this area. Not much out here, and not a whole lot to
8 talk about. It's a straight shot of transmission line.

9 So we hit a corner pole here, and we'll cross
10 Highway 93 on an angle. Existing alignment again in
11 here, double-circuit 69/230, up to the site of the
12 proposed Mineral Park substation. And then the line
13 continues on and around to go up to Hoover.

14 BY MR. DERSTINE:

15 Q. While we're transitioning over to the E1
16 route, Mr. Beck, I'm looking at the route alternatives
17 map and this long section that parallels 93. You
18 started with the western W1. But to the point where W1
19 joins in with the E1, that common route on that long
20 stretch of 93, that's common to the entire project,
21 right?

22 A. (BY MR. BECK) That's correct. All routes
23 use that last portion.

24 Q. So what we saw and the issues there with
25 having to top poles and maybe some communication

1 facilities that are remaining in place, that's common
2 to whether you're on the eastern route or you're on the
3 western route?

4 A. (BY MR. BECK) Well, as I said, we'll
5 validate that and get that information for the
6 Committee tomorrow or the next day. It's probably more
7 along the area along Highway 68 as opposed to the area
8 along 93.

9 Q. Okay. So it's not necessarily in that area
10 of that long stretch that we were looking at?

11 A. (BY MR. BECK) Correct.

12 So this is the E1 alternative. Again, Harris
13 existing substation. If UNSE is successful, we will
14 build adjacent to that and we will head out in an
15 easterly direction. We'll be crossing the railroad
16 tracks here. Turn the corner. Again, this is
17 single-circuit construction, just 230 kV line.

18 If you could pause it right there, please.

19 So just to give you a little bit of context,
20 as we've heard from Mr. Cunningham, the Cunningham
21 property is all of this area over here. He mentioned
22 Cook Canyon. Here is I40 where it cut through. This
23 is Highway 66. And then Box Canyon, which is hard to
24 see, but is right over and kind of curls around in
25 here, is just below the line. So our proposed line

1 goes east just south of 66, south of the railroad
2 tracks, and comes over and crosses 66 at this point.
3 And here is the KAAA radio tower.

4 MEMBER HAMWAY: Quick question, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Hamway.

6 MEMBER HAMWAY: So this is the existing path
7 for the 69 or this is a new line?

8 MR. BECK: This is the new 230 line.

9 MEMBER HAMWAY: So there's no existing 69
10 here?

11 MR. BECK: Not through here, no.

12 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay. So the -- what did he
13 call it -- the utility corridor that BLM was saying
14 that -- Mr. Cunningham said never really went through a
15 public process, so is this the utility corridor he's
16 talking about?

17 MR. BECK: Member Hamway, the BLM utility
18 corridor is specifically for BLM lands. So this is
19 private property, so it's not technically a BLM
20 corridor on this property. So we need to really
21 clarify for the Committee our use of corridor and
22 whether we're talking about a UNSE corridor, which is
23 an existing 69 alignment, or the BLM corridor under
24 their plan. The BLM corridor under their plan had an
25 extensive public process, over 103 public comments and

1 some other stuff, and we could put that on the record
2 too, but that was specific to BLM lands, not on the
3 private land. So yeah, we need to be more tactful in
4 our use of the word "corridor" also.

5 MEMBER HAMWAY: One other question. And I
6 should know the answer to this, and I'm kind of
7 embarrassed to say that I don't. When we authorize or
8 say you can have this corridor, once the lines are
9 created does the corridor go away?

10 MR. BECK: We've had that discussion
11 previously. My opinion is, yes, once you've built the
12 line, you've got a right-of-way, our use of the
13 corridor really has little value to us. It's just for
14 the flexibility in negotiating and working with the
15 property owners to obtain the right-of-way we need to
16 build the line.

17 MEMBER HAMWAY: So you have to purchase the
18 right-of-way, but you don't purchase a corridor?

19 MR. BECK: Correct. And typically the CEC
20 language -- or, within the CEC application we say,
21 we're going to procure, for example, a 125-foot
22 right-of-way within this 500-foot corridor. The
23 500-foot is for flexibility to deal with minor
24 adjustments, as well as right-of-way acquisition
25 issues. Once we acquire a right-of-way, we're going to

1 build in that right-of-way. And at least in my mind,
2 and it's a legal issue, but I think a CEC, once the
3 line is built, kind of has very little value other than
4 there is an -- there are ongoing conditions and
5 compliance usually, which only lasts up until
6 completion of construction. So it's the conditions
7 about radio interference and stuff that have an ongoing
8 life to them.

9 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Noland.

11 MEMBER NOLAND: Thank you. Mr. Beck, real
12 quick. Are you going to be looking at a 125-foot
13 right-of-way in here?

14 MR. BECK: I believe that's what we've asked
15 for. Yeah, in the application it's 125-foot, yes.

16 MEMBER NOLAND: Thank you.

17 MR. BECK: So again, Highway 66. We're
18 heading east, and then we're going to turn and cross
19 over 66. There is a small trailer RV park right here.
20 There's the railroad right down here. 66 is at the
21 base of this little hill. Here again is Box Canyon,
22 this is Mr. Cunningham's property, and the line would
23 be placed on top.

24 And there's some information in the record,
25 and we'll talk about that. The location was chosen

1 after some discussions with Mr. Cunningham. While it's
2 not his preference for the line, of the various
3 alternatives for the eastern routes this was his
4 preference if we ended up there, not that he prefers
5 the route.

6 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chair.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes. Who is speaking? Oh,
8 Member Gentles.

9 MEMBER GENTLES: Just going back to this
10 conversation around Mr. Cunningham's discussion around
11 the utility corridor, was that corridor designated for
12 use in -- just for BLM or public lands, or was it used
13 -- was it put in place for future projects like this?

14 MR. BECK: Well, it's the resource
15 management plan put together by BLM. And I think we'll
16 be adding -- we're putting some testimony on
17 specifically to language that was in the EIS for that
18 document where it will address Member Haenichen's
19 earlier question about the western corridor study. And
20 it talks about why they created the corridors, the
21 utility corridor specifically. But again, it is
22 specific to BLM lands.

23 MEMBER GENTLES: Okay. But that utility
24 corridor was designated some years ago, correct?

25 MR. BECK: Yes. It was back -- well, it

1 dates way back into the early '90s and there was
2 process in '95 and I think they finalized it around
3 early 2000. So BLM is not the speediest of entities to
4 get things done.

5 MR. WARNER: Let me just add a little color
6 to that.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Microphone, Mr. Warner.

8 MR. WARNER: Yeah, this is Mike Warner. Let
9 me just add a little color on that, the '93 Resource
10 Management Plan for the BLM. And in addressing your
11 question, I think this is taken from Page 66 of their
12 Resource Management Plan. "Large utility facilities
13 would be restricted to the above 11 corridors," of
14 which the BLM land on the eastern alternative is one of
15 those corridors. "The power line corridors are to be
16 used for aerial rights of way. All others are for
17 varied facilities, with the exception of 93 and
18 Interstate 40, which may be used for both." So that's
19 some of the language we'll go into in a little more
20 detail tomorrow about where those are, how they
21 specifically apply to those eastern routes, and the
22 western routes for that matter.

23 MR. BECK: And I will verify the dates. The
24 '93 -- the RMP was in '93. I think the Record of
25 Decision was issued after that, but we'll verify that,

1 because it was maybe '95, not 2000.

2 MEMBER GENTLES: This is Member Gentles
3 again. So in the conversation with Mr. Cunningham, it
4 sounds like there are several tours that were taken on
5 this property. In this last flyover section that you
6 just showed us, this alignment was what was -- of all
7 the alternatives, if it were to go through their land,
8 this was the most preferred alignment through his land?

9 MR. BECK: Yes, that's correct. So a week or
10 two weeks ago we did some visual simulation or visual
11 views for Mr. Cunningham that we likely will be showing
12 the Committee. And we showed if we move the line
13 further west on the top of the --

14 Can we back up a little bit, Jason?

15 MEMBER GENTLES: There might be a delay, but
16 I'm unable to -- there it is. Thank you.

17 MR. BECK: Stop right there.

18 So this is the preferred alignment that we've
19 shown. We've shown some alternatives that move the
20 alignment further to the west, across the top of this
21 mesa, back to the west and further to the west, and
22 showed him some views of what it would look like from
23 his land, as well as what it would look like from his
24 brother's property, because his brother has a house on
25 the other side of this mesa.

1 And after showing him that and having
2 discussions, we -- he indicated that his preference, if
3 we got approved for an eastern corridor, his preference
4 would be this alignment. Again, he's not saying --

5 MEMBER GENTLES: Is this E1 or E2?

6 MR. BECK: This is E1. But this is common to
7 both E1 and E2, because E2 only has a variation down
8 just out of the Harris substation, so it's south of
9 this area. This is common to E1 or E2. And as I said,
10 we'll show that to the Committee in the next few days,
11 kind of what we showed Mr. Cunningham, to show the
12 options and what it does. What serves one entity and
13 his view has impacts to a different entity and their
14 view and also proximity to I40 and the volume of
15 traffic on I40.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: So Mr. Beck, at least the
17 portion of the flyover we're looking at -- and there
18 seem to be strong headwinds on this flyover. In fact,
19 they're so strong it's actually -- we're going in
20 reverse.

21 MR. BECK: This is true.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: But on the portion we're
23 looking at, there's no real utility corridors that
24 exist there at this time, right? Because it's not BLM
25 land, so there's no BLM utility corridors. And I'm

1 gathering it's not -- there's no Mohave County or
2 Kingman utility corridors built into any plans for this
3 location?

4 MR. BECK: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. I
5 mean, we have a different issue with the jurisdictions
6 who are supposed to include these corridors in their
7 plans, but they don't. But there was no discussion
8 with anyone and there's no corridors that exist, that
9 I'm aware of, in this area.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: So at least this area, when we
11 talk about corridors, it's the corridor that would be
12 created by the CEC?

13 MR. BECK: Correct. You would be developing
14 it.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: So we have a whole bunch of
16 corridors we've got to talk about, right?

17 MR. BECK: Correct.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: There's the CEC corridor,
19 which we will create, there's the BLM corridor, there's
20 the corridor that exists because of existing structures
21 that are already in place. And you're right, I think
22 we just need to be clear, when we use the word
23 "corridor," which one we're talking about.

24 Member Haenichen.

25 MEMBER HAENICHEN: I'd just like to remind

1 everybody on the Committee that in addition to
2 corridors, there are linear features that can then
3 later be designated corridors, such as a highway, a
4 railroad, and what have you, and those offer
5 opportunities for a location.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: So given it's 5:15, maybe we
7 put the afterburners on and we see what this sucker
8 looks like from here all the way to the end.

9 MR. BECK: We'll try that, Mr. Chairman.
10 So again, we're just leaving -- going to
11 leave the Cunningham property. We're adjacent to I40
12 up on top of this ridge line.

13 BY MR. DERSTINE:

14 Q. Don't stop it, but who owns this land?

15 A. (BY MR. BECK) This is, I believe, mostly
16 private land. It's individual owners. An example here
17 is the adult detention center, so they have some
18 property, Mohave County Administration Building is
19 here, some state-owned property here, truck stop right
20 here. We'd be skirting behind the truck stop. Again,
21 we have an existing line through here. You'll see some
22 roads at the base of these poles. Those are the
23 existing access for that existing 69 kV line.

24 A. (BY MR. WARNER) And just off to your left is
25 the BLM land, you can see it up here, the recreation

1 area.

2 A. (BY MR. BECK) Yeah. So this is all the BLM
3 Cerbat Recreation Area.

4 We come up and we cross Highway 93 right
5 here. Maybe just pause it real quick just to point out
6 Fort Beale Springs. And that's an area we're going to
7 be talking about in further testimony, but that's a
8 point of information.

9 Okay, go ahead.

10 We go a little ways on the east side of 93
11 and then we cross back over. And as we cross over,
12 you'll see some trail heads. These are the -- some of
13 the recreation paths and trails that are through the
14 hills.

15 A. (BY MR. WARNER) BLM land on both sides of
16 the road here.

17 A. (BY MR. BECK) And again, these are
18 double-circuit. So we picked up the 69 just back after
19 that -- about the crossing. We picked up the 69 and
20 are building this as 230/69.

21 Here is the location of the KYET tower.
22 We'll have more testimony about that and regarding what
23 we did to try and work around that the best we could.
24 Again, notice the height. That tower is going to be
25 taller than what our lines will be.

1 So we swing back around that tower towards
2 93. We go and we'll skirt by the old Arizona Port of
3 Entry, which I'm not sure what it's used for today.
4 And then we're following kind of the ramp for 68 and
5 then we're along 68, because this is 68 going to
6 Bullhead City.

7 And then this is the end of that portion.
8 Here we join up with what was the same as the western
9 route. Maybe we'll run a little bit of this. It's the
10 same thing. We did it a little bit higher speed, but
11 you've seen this already. Again, it's just coming up,
12 getting adjacent to Highway 93, and then basically
13 zipping right along 93 all the way up.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: So approximately where does
15 this E1 route, from where it starts, hook up to the
16 existing 69 kV line?

17 MR. BECK: Justin, can you back this up to
18 where we cross Highway 93?

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Unless someone wants to see
20 the rest of that. It's similar to what we just saw.

21 MR. BECK: So we show it starting right
22 there. So it was right basically at Fort Beale
23 Springs. And we head -- from that point all the way
24 north to Mineral Park substation will be the
25 double-circuit 230/69.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: So it's continuing to go,
2 but -- so it hooked up back by Beale Springs?

3 MR. BECK: Yes. So just after we crossed 93
4 and we hit Beale Springs, from that point north is the
5 double-circuit.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: And roughly what's the length
7 from the beginning to that point, rough?

8 MR. BECK: Approximately 3 miles.

9 So unless there's something you want to see,
10 I think maybe we'll stop it here and then we'll go
11 through this again --

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Hamway has a question.
13 Yeah, I think tomorrow we need to go through this stuff
14 more closely, but Member Hamway has a question.

15 MEMBER HAMWAY: Just professionally, how far
16 does a 230 kV line need to be from a radio tower, and
17 can it be achieved in E1?

18 MR. BECK: So there's some parameters for
19 wavelength, of what the wavelength of the radio waves
20 are sending out and how close --

21 MEMBER HAMWAY: Yeah, there's got to be some
22 engineering standard that this line can't be this close
23 to this tower. I would hope there --

24 MR. BECK: Well, there's some parameters like
25 that, the wavelengths and so on, which we can address

1 -- we will address in our further testimony, but there
2 are also provisions for detuning a structure. So there
3 is a company that will come in -- or, multiple
4 companies will come in, work with a transmission owner
5 that's having problems with radio interference, and
6 they put equipment onto the transmission tower to
7 eliminate the interference that it's causing to the
8 radio waves.

9 And usually that interference, it's a
10 reflection or a bouncing of the waves. So the radio
11 tower is sending something out; and because it hits a
12 couple of surfaces on a pole or a tower, there's a
13 double signal going out, and so it confuses the
14 downstream user. So they can detune that structure to
15 eliminate that process.

16 MEMBER HAMWAY: No matter how close they are?

17 MR. BECK: Right. And so we've reached out
18 to the detuning company. They ran a quick study. It
19 doesn't appear to be an issue for these structures.
20 They've come back, they don't think there will be any.
21 And then they further said, but we're here to help you
22 if there should be any found, and they have the
23 detuning capability to fix that.

24 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chair.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, Member Gentles.

1 MEMBER GENTLES: To that point, I did read in
2 the information that the radio station's strong
3 objection was due to the fact that there wouldn't be
4 any way to understand if there is an interference until
5 after the line was built, and then to mitigate for that
6 might take some time and potentially be a challenge
7 with their broadcast during that time. Is this the
8 appropriate place to address that, or will we do that
9 sometime later?

10 MR. BECK: Mr. Chairman, as I said, we've got
11 some testimony to talk about the radio towers, so that
12 might be the right time to address it, and what the
13 findings were from that company when Eric had reached
14 out to them.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, I think that's the more
16 appropriate time, Member Gentles. We'll get into it
17 more substantively. And just a reminder, that's why we
18 have conditions for these CECs. So we'll have to pay
19 special attention to the standard interference
20 condition and might have to fine-tune it to apply to
21 this situation.

22 MEMBER GENTLES: Thank you.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen had a
24 question.

25 MEMBER HAENICHEN: My question will also fit

1 into that discussion.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen, can you
3 repeat that? We couldn't hear from the -- you weren't
4 talking into the microphone.

5 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Oh, I'm sorry. My
6 question will be better served tomorrow when we discuss
7 this.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. We're going to
9 take a break before we start up our 5:30 public comment
10 hearing, and we'll see everyone tomorrow, then, at 9:00
11 to resume the hearing.

12 (Off the record from 5:23 p.m. to 5:54 p.m.)

13 CHMN. CHENAL: Good evening, everyone. My
14 name is Tom Chenal, the Chair of the Line Siting
15 Committee. And we have our Committee here both in
16 person and by Zoom. Some Members are in person, some
17 are by Zoom. Apologize for the short delay in getting
18 this meeting started. Technical difficulties, but we
19 got them resolved.

20 So we want to take public comment -- we want
21 to take public comment. And we're going to take public
22 comment first from the people who are live here in
23 person, and then we will go to people that are
24 appearing by video if they want to provide the comment.
25 Before we begin -- before we ask for your public

1 comment, we would ask that you provide your name and
2 contact information --

3 Someone is trying to communicate with me, and
4 I can't hear what they're saying. Sir, can you please
5 repeat that? There's two gentlemen on one frame. Can
6 you repeat what you just said? I want to make sure the
7 audio is working.

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, we're going to start
10 with the people live, and then we'll go to the people
11 on the video. And I'd ask you to --

12 MR. GLAWSON: Tell the Chairman to unmute his
13 microphone. We can't hear you.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Can you hear me now?

15 MR. GLAWSON: Yeah.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Jason, do you want me to use
17 the computer audio or not?

18 MR. MOELLER: No, let's not do anything with
19 that. It's all set and ready to go back here.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Marc, I can only see your name
21 as Marc. Can you hear me now?

22 MR. GLAWSON: Yes, I can, real nice. Thank
23 you.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you for letting me know.

25 So let me make a real quick repeat of what I

1 said, which is unfortunate for the people that had to
2 hear it the first time.

3 My name is Tom Chenal, Chair of the Line
4 Siting Committee. I have the Committee here both in
5 person and by Zoom. Some are here live and some are
6 remote. This is the time we have set for the public
7 comment. We want to hear what you have to say. It's a
8 very important part of our process, and we take what
9 you have to say very seriously. We'll start with the
10 people that are here, like I said, and then we'll hear
11 from the people that are appearing by Zoom.

12 When you -- when we call your name, at least
13 when we start out I have a few names to call, that will
14 put some order to this. If you could provide your name
15 and your contact information so that if you later need
16 to be notified, there's a way to contact you, such as
17 an e-mail address, a residential address would be very
18 good as well.

19 We'd like to ask you to limit your comments
20 to about three minutes; won't hold you to that if you
21 want to go an extra minute or so. But we've got a lot
22 of people here that might want to provide comment, so
23 I'm going to ask you to try to keep it to three
24 minutes.

25 This is not a back and forth where you're

1 asking us questions. This is where we hear what you
2 have to say, and then we take that information and it
3 helps inform us and it helps us ask questions and get
4 into areas of the testimony that we'll be hearing
5 tomorrow. So it's very important to us to hear what
6 you have to say, but it's not a situation where we're
7 going to be getting into a back and forth with you.
8 That's not what the public comment is about.

9 So with that --

10 MR. MOELLER: Mr. Chairman, may I say
11 something?

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

13 MR. MOELLER: Just from a technical
14 standpoint, if you would, please, if you're on Zoom
15 remotely, please keep your microphone muted until your
16 name is called to have an opportunity to speak. That
17 will help us mitigate any background noise. Thank you
18 so much.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. The first -- again, I'm
20 reading someone else's handwriting. No one's
21 handwriting is worse than mine. I got a D in grade
22 school from the nuns for penmanship. It's the only D I
23 ever got in my life. My handwriting is terrible. But
24 I think the first name I have on the list is Keith
25 MaGann, if I'm saying that correctly, pronouncing it

1 correctly. So Mr. MaGann, if you would come to the --
2 I guess there's a microphone set up.

3 MR. MAGANN: Can you hear me?

4 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, that's perfect. If you
5 could give your name, contact information, and let's
6 hear what you have to say, sir.

7 MR. MAGANN: All right. My name is Keith
8 MaGann, M-A-G-A-N-N. It's also keithmagann@yahoo.com.
9 My phone number is 928-681-7051. And my address is
10 3720 West Shinarump Drive. I live on Shinarump Drive.

11 I guess thanks for the electric. I like
12 having it. I'm not against things being improved and
13 upgraded; I know it's necessary.

14 I guess all of the western routes, me being
15 on Shinarump, are of concern to me. I think the very
16 specific route that I'm the most concerned about is the
17 W3 route, which takes the power line right through my
18 front yard. So it would literally be 50 feet outside
19 my front door, maybe closer. So that would, in my
20 opinion, render my house uninhabitable, which would be
21 not good. It would be unsightly, and I think that my
22 property value would be maybe cut in half at the
23 minimum.

24 So W3, which is the third, I guess, of the
25 western choices, is of my greatest concern. And I

1 don't know if you have a map, you can look at that, but
2 if you look, my house would literally be almost
3 directly under the lines. So you can say what you want
4 about EMFs; I don't want to live under them.

5 I guess that's pretty much all I have to say
6 on it. You have my contact information. Did you get
7 all that?

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

9 MR. MAGANN: All right. That's about it.
10 Again, all the western routes would be unsightly; that
11 one specifically would be unbearable. Thank you.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. MaGann, thank you for your
13 testimony. We appreciate it.

14 And I want to make sure the applicant has the
15 contact information, Mr. Derstine?

16 MR. DERSTINE: Yes.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Thank you.

18 Next is Pat Fox, please. Mr. Fox.

19 MR. FOX: Hello. Pat Fox. I live on 2278
20 South Kirkland Road in Golden Valley. My e-mail
21 address is ruta@ -- I'm sorry -- rutafox@aol.com. My
22 phone number is 760-347-5796.

23 My, of course, interest will be if this line
24 runs to the west. And I'd like to point out that my
25 wife and I bought this property about 14 years ago for

1 retirement. We have built our home and retired in the
2 area for the last 11 years. We bought this property
3 because of the scenery around us, the BLM property
4 behind us, and the valley view in front of us. Now,
5 that being said, I'd like to read a written statement.

6 The eastern route is the only logical route
7 for the majority -- that's majority -- of private
8 landowners. Just because the pole will not be set in
9 your property doesn't mean that it won't affect you and
10 your property values.

11 In 2007 and 2008 a large number of opponents
12 to the western route voiced their opinions and should
13 still be considered valid. Those opinions went to the
14 BLM, and they should still have all of those opinions
15 on record. Just because this has gone on for 13 years,
16 people start losing interest.

17 And I would also like to point out that
18 most -- most -- private property owners were not
19 notified of this, only private residents. That is
20 wrong, total wrong.

21 The agencies involved in this have -- I'm
22 sorry. I just said that.

23 Some years ago, our County Supervisor, Jean
24 Bishop, made a recommendation that the west route would
25 be the recommended route. Sometime after that

1 recommendation, she apologized for getting involved,
2 especially for making the recommendation, yet the
3 County Supervisors are involved in recommending again.
4 This should not be a County recommendation. This is
5 private voting residents, private landowners that are
6 involved in this. I do not see any County property
7 involved in it.

8 As of this time, we haven't even seen an
9 exact route, just recommendations for multiple routes,
10 so that kind of makes it hard. Gee, all the other
11 routes from your original routes are worse than the
12 original routes. Think there could be a little bit of
13 subterfuge in that? Gee, if we recommend an even worse
14 route, they'll go for the original route? Only makes
15 sense to me.

16 I don't know how big corporations and
17 government agencies work. But if I'm going to tell
18 somebody that I'm going to paint your fence blue, I'll
19 give you a color blue to look at and that's the color
20 you will get. I won't come back again and say, well,
21 we changed our mind, and we might use this route or
22 that route, but in the end you'll like the one that
23 maybe I chose.

24 And as I -- I'm sorry. And as I said, I'm
25 not a big corporation or a government agency. I'm just

1 a person of my word. If I tell you something, that's
2 what you get. And so far with all of this action,
3 that's not what I'm seeing. Every time there's a
4 change. It's not right. If you hold out long enough,
5 you will get what you want.

6 And those private property owners should be
7 notified. A friend of mine that bought property right
8 next to my residence, 10 acres, for his retirement, has
9 never been notified of this. He lives out of the area,
10 but his address is on his property registration.
11 That's wrong. Thank you for your time.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you, Mr. Fox.

13 Next name on my list is Don Jaeger.

14 MR. JAEGER: Good evening. My name is Don
15 Jaeger. I live at 2362 Risco Lane, Laughlin, Nevada.
16 My e-mail address is djaeger@cameronbroadcasting.com.
17 My cell number is 951-538-5700.

18 My brother and I, William Jaeger, are
19 celebrating 30 years of serving the tri-state area as
20 proud local broadcasters this year. We take great
21 pride in being a second generation broadcaster and
22 providing a clear, strong signal for all of our
23 listeners. As the primary EAS, Emergency Alert System,
24 broadcaster for Mohave County and La Paz County,
25 Cameron takes this responsibility very seriously. The

1 easterly route project has the potential to threaten
2 this.

3 Two highly respected radio engineers -- and
4 the profiles were both submitted with my handouts, I
5 provided 15 handouts, I think, tonight -- who are
6 extremely credible, some of the best in the United
7 States we have here out of Vegas and Los Angeles,
8 experts in AM, have stated that the easterly route
9 could provide problems as proposed. Recently we
10 learned that, "In general, it is a good practice to
11 keep objects, such as these monopoles, 1.25 miles or
12 greater from the KAAA tower."

13 This is news we've had for the last year.
14 This project has been going on, to my recollection, for
15 13 years, so there's been a lot of letters back and
16 forth.

17 "In addition, the KAAA tower has a grounding
18 system comprised of a hundred equally-spaced
19 135-foot-long wire radials buried just below the
20 surface of the land. If these are disturbed during
21 construction or later service, serious problems to our
22 signal could result to the KAAA coverage area."

23 With this in mind, Cameron joins the Hart
24 broadcasting family, the Cunninghams, and the board of
25 supervisors in strongly opposing the easterly route and

1 requesting that Westerly 1 route be utilized for all
2 the reasons I have detailed, plus the reasons that
3 Patrick Cunningham so clearly detailed in his
4 objections.

5 Back in September of 2008 and July of 2016
6 Cameron went on record as opposing the current proposed
7 route. In 2019, I had some dialogue with somebody from
8 UniSource and indicated that I would be okay with the
9 easterly route should they mitigate any problems that
10 were caused by the project, which wasn't clearly
11 defined at the time.

12 Cameron can no longer support the easterly
13 route, as I stated in my letter of September 2020 which
14 went to the BLM and UniSource. Information from radio
15 engineer Joe Sands suggests that the desired setbacks
16 should be at least a mile and a quarter or greater and
17 that disturbing the grounding system discussed above
18 could create serious problems.

19 If there were problems, and the only remedy
20 was to move the KAAA tower somewhere else, this would
21 be a very undesirable remedy for both UniSource and
22 Cameron. A move of our tower would be very time
23 consuming and costly with FCC and FAA reviews,
24 approvals, and permits, as well as a significant effort
25 to find an acceptable replacement site.

1 I know there's been some dialogue I heard
2 earlier about there's services that can come in and
3 mitigate this. Trust me, there's no guarantees, and
4 there would be a time lag. We could be totally off the
5 air. In our area of coverage, which we send out
6 emergency broadcast signals over KAAA to the area,
7 there could be people that no longer get the signal.
8 There could be people in areas that now get the signal
9 that don't want to get the signal. There could be
10 interference caused with other radio stations when you
11 do things like this. It is a lot more significant of a
12 problem than I've heard some people discuss. Again, a
13 simple solution is not at hand, trust me on that. I've
14 done a lot of research on this.

15 Considering the fact that the Cunningham
16 family has already had the I40 freeway imposed on their
17 beautiful property and that the easterly route would
18 cause a significant problem for two long-time local
19 broadcast companies, I do personally feel very strongly
20 that this should be enough of a reason to strongly
21 consider the westerly route and go with that solution.
22 Thank you very much.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Thanks, Mr. Jaeger.

24 Next name I have is Jean Bishop.

25 MS. BISHOP: Thank you for allowing me to

1 speak today. My name is Jean Bishop, and I'm the
2 Mohave County Supervisor for District 4 that covers
3 Golden Valley and east Kingman. My family has lived
4 here since the 1800s, and I would just like to thank
5 the Committee for traveling to Mohave County and
6 holding your meeting here and for all your work on this
7 line siting.

8 I'm speaking today to oppose the eastern
9 route and to recommend the Committee select either the
10 West Route Number 1 or Number 2 for this 230 kV line.
11 I'm providing you a copy of the Board of Supervisors'
12 letter dated April 19th supporting the West Lines
13 Number 1 or 2 that was approved unanimously by the
14 board of supervisors last week. I'm also providing you
15 a copy of my letter dated August 31st, 2020 that I
16 submitted during the BLM public process that Mr. Fox
17 referred to.

18 I do oppose the east lines for two very
19 important reasons. The first reason, number one, is
20 the east route will impact 142 residences and two
21 public facilities because they are within the
22 1,000 feet of the transmission line alternatives. But
23 the West Route 1 and 2 will impact only 76 residences
24 and two public facilities because they are within
25 1,000 feet. Table 19 and 23 show these numbers, and I

1 understand UniSource has amended those numbers. In the
2 corrected Tables H-2 and -- to 141 residences in the
3 east -- 141 residences in the east and 80 residences in
4 the west. Those changes do not change my opinion,
5 however.

6 Number two, the proposed east routes will
7 likely obstruct the operation of two radio stations,
8 the first being Cameron broadcasting tower for KAAA,
9 it's located in the mouth of Cook Canyon on the
10 Cunningham family property, and KYET of Grand Canyon
11 Gateway broadcasting located off Highway 93 on the Hart
12 family property. You have in your record letters from
13 both KAAA and KYET advising you of their opposition to
14 the east routes.

15 And I also would like to note that the
16 Cunningham family has already sacrificed some of their
17 lands for the public good when we built Interstate 40
18 in Cook Canyon, and it seems to me like they should not
19 be forced to sacrifice more of their land's remaining
20 value to the public for the 230 kV line which is going
21 to benefit Golden Valley.

22 And I wanted to note that my daughter and her
23 family, her husband and my grandchildren, live just off
24 Shinarump Road, and I did ask their opinion, because
25 they bought the property after the BLM public outreach.

1 And they said they didn't really care one way or the
2 other, they had no opinion. So they're new in the
3 neighborhood, so I wanted to bring those comments to
4 you.

5 So thank you again for conducting your
6 meeting in Mohave County, and I hope your stay is a
7 pleasant one and that you select West Route Number 1 or
8 Number 2.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you, Supervisor.
10 Appreciate your comments.

11 Next name I have is Trish Hart. Trish Hart.

12 MS. HART: Chairman Chenal, Members of the
13 Committee, for the record, my name is Trish Hart. I'm
14 here today on behalf of my parents, Joe and Rhonda
15 Hart. They are today getting a little bit of a payback
16 on their investment in my higher education.

17 So we appreciate the opportunity to be able
18 to provide input on this important matter. As local
19 radio broadcast owners with a communications tower
20 directly impacted by the proposed route within 500 --
21 our tower is within 500 feet, we have serious
22 objections to this route.

23 We have opposed both East Routes Number 1
24 and 2, and we urge the Committee to grant the
25 applicant, UniSource, a right-of-way from one of the

1 four west Cerbat routes for the transmission line and
2 substation for the BLM-administered land and we
3 recommend West Route Number 1.

4 As you can understand, as local broadcast
5 owners, during COVID-19 we've seen the necessity of
6 ensuring that the public is kept aware of ever-changing
7 dangers that is associated with a state of emergency.
8 And right now we have a dangerous fire that we're
9 dealing with. And during these times, local radio is
10 used to make sure that people have the opportunity to
11 be kept up to date with the latest information so that
12 they can be kept safe. And also during these times of
13 COVID the local radio stations have been hit extremely
14 hard, and now you're asking us to take on an additional
15 burden by having these lines run through our properties
16 and the additional expenses that could come with those
17 issues that could arise.

18 We oppose the eastern routes due to
19 legitimate concerns raised by our broadcast engineers.
20 The AM signal can be interrupted and distorted. And
21 our KYET engineer, Matt Krick, advised that the 230 kV
22 electric line will directly impact the KYET tower due
23 to its close proximity and likely interfere with the
24 radio signal. Krick stated the KYET signal could be
25 negatively impacted by the power lines being located

1 less than a full wavelength to the center of the KYET
2 tower, which that full wave distance is 850 feet, and
3 cause interruption to the AM signal.

4 We have raised our concerns about signal
5 interruption with UniSource during a meeting with
6 industry representatives in August of 2019. We were
7 told by UniSource that they would deal with any
8 disruptions to our AM signal only after the project was
9 built.

10 UniSource has committed to working with KYET
11 to ensure that no interference results from the
12 construction or operation of the transmission line, but
13 unfortunately, the mitigation is only offered after the
14 line is built and interference is documented. And they
15 have indicated that we would have to pay for the
16 studies to make sure that those were caused by the
17 lines.

18 Please note that the effects or disruption to
19 the signal will not be known until after the project is
20 constructed. Since the effects and severity of the
21 disruption will not be known until after the line is
22 constructed and operational, we have no way to
23 determine how long or to what extent the disruption
24 will negatively impact the KYET signal.

25 And as Cameron Broadcasting said in their

1 previous comments, we have the responsibility to be
2 operators of the Emergency Broadcast System, and those
3 are -- we take very seriously and want to make sure
4 that there is no interruption or disruption to our
5 signal. We have no way to estimate the lengths, the
6 cost, or the severity of the disruption. We ask: What
7 mitigation can UniSource offer to KYET after the line
8 is built?

9 Cameron Broadcasting also has a tower that
10 could be negatively impacted by the eastern routes, and
11 we have been made aware of their letter in which they
12 stated, "Our investigation has disclosed that if your
13 monopoles are closer than 1,150 feet of the Hart tower,
14 they will cause unacceptable pattern distortion." It's
15 worth noting that our tower is within 500 feet of the
16 route and pattern distortion is likely imminent.

17 The signal interference with KYET and Cameron
18 Broadcast radio towers are compelling reasons why to
19 reject both east routes. If you look at the
20 Environmental Assessment on Page 21 it says, "The
21 western routes are preferable. No effects to radio
22 broadcast towers are expected to result from any of the
23 west Cerbat alternatives because they do not pass near
24 any radio towers."

25 If the kV power line is determined to go near

1 KYET's property, then our engineers have asked that we
2 insist that UniSource monopoles within a thousand feet
3 be limited to 60 feet in height and that all poles
4 within a 1-mile radius to the tower have detuning kits
5 installed. In addition, UniSource should be
6 responsible to pay the costs associated for engineering
7 services, studies, and equipment required to resolve
8 issues related to KYET signals.

9 It's also important to note that when the
10 highway was widened, we were asked to give up valuable
11 acreage, and now we're asked to sacrifice the value of
12 our private property for the public. In the case
13 public lands are available -- or, in this case public
14 lands are available, and they should be used for the
15 benefit of the public. We strongly oppose the east
16 routes and we support the western routes along existing
17 public lands to achieve the public good.

18 With that, I would just like to say that, for
19 the record, I did not -- I failed to mention my contact
20 information. My contact information is 318 West
21 Roosevelt Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85003. My phone
22 number is 602-332-2904. And my e-mail is
23 trishahart19@gmail.com.

24 And with that, I'm happy to answer any
25 questions. Thank you for your time.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you, Ms. Hart.

2 Last name I have on my list is -- I'm going
3 to butcher this -- Leah Armendariz.

4 MS. ARMENDARIZ: Good evening. My name is
5 Leah Armendariz, and my contact information is -- my
6 phone number is 702-406-8347 and our address is 2356
7 South Klondyke Road in Golden Valley.

8 I'm actually going to grab the sheet.

9 I understand that concerns have been voiced
10 on most routes. Obviously, we oppose the route that
11 has been offered by Jean Bishop, Alternate W2. In
12 agreement with Pat Fox, I believe that the County is
13 offering a position where they should not. We are
14 personal property owners. We are greatly affected by
15 this. I understand that people on the eastern route
16 are also affected, but it is clear that the County has
17 spent time with those families and those families may
18 have influence. And as a person who is directly on the
19 route recommended by Jean Bishop, we have never been
20 contacted, we have never had a phone call, an e-mail,
21 nothing.

22 So as Pat Fox said earlier, I also would like
23 to note that there were many concerns brought up by
24 many people along this alternate route two years ago,
25 before this project was put to rest for a while, and so

1 I would really appreciate those concerns being brought
2 to the forefront again. I would be happy to resend my
3 e-mail. I believe it was to a gentleman named Mark at
4 the time who was heading the project.

5 With that, there were also concerns with --
6 while we received notice this time, because we now live
7 at the property, we did not -- our neighbors on both
8 sides of us that own vacant property, who have full
9 intentions of building homes on that property, were not
10 notified because they do not actually live there. So
11 while, yes, the current residents may be less on this
12 side, although I would argue with that, this
13 property -- I know this property along this alternate
14 route, many people have full intentions of not just
15 investing in this property, but making it their forever
16 home. And I am concerned with the lack of
17 communication and getting the word out to those
18 individuals.

19 Additionally, I understand the broadcasting
20 concerns, as well as this family giving up a portion of
21 their property for I40. I'm sure that was very hard
22 for them, but I am sure they were compensated for that
23 based on imminent domain laws and such. And I know
24 that there is no compensation for this, and it will
25 greatly drastically affect our property values. Not

1 only will we be looking out the east of our property
2 and seeing these power lines, as they will be directly
3 on our property line if they follow the alternate W2,
4 but they will also be to the north of us in our view.

5 So we moved from Vegas when we purchased this
6 property because we loved it so much. We moved back
7 home. We put our family here. We run a small business
8 here. We have invested time and money and everything
9 into this property and into this community. And the
10 fact that we were simply given a date and nothing more,
11 you know, no contact, nothing, when clearly contact has
12 happened with others, it's, quite frankly, just
13 ridiculous.

14 So I would suggest if obviously our -- the
15 position we would take is that the easterly route is
16 the one that is going to affect the least number of
17 residents. I would really like to see the number of
18 people who actually own and live on property along the
19 route, not, you know, several blocks down or whatever.
20 But beyond that, I understand the Alternate 2 was the
21 one that was suggested. If it does need to go on the
22 west side because of radios and everything else, I
23 would greatly urge the west Cerbat common alternative
24 route. Thank you.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Thank you very much.

1 We have some people that are appearing by
2 video. I see a -- well, I see Marc. I don't have a
3 last name. Marc, would you like to give comment? If
4 so, please give your full name and contact information,
5 please.

6 And you're on mute. I'll return the favor.

7 MR. GLAWSON: Yeah. I think I'm unmuted now,
8 right?

9 CHMN. CHENAL: You're good.

10 MR. GLAWSON: Okay. I commented when the BLM
11 was requesting comments in writing.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's make sure we have your
13 contact information, sir, your full name and contact
14 information.

15 MR. GLAWSON: Okay. My name is Marc Glawson.
16 Contact information, I have a home phone that's
17 928-377-1778.

18 I didn't really have a whole lot to say,
19 because I have more questions than anything. Chiefly,
20 I'm against going on the east side. But it sounds
21 like, with the environmental statement and all the
22 information you've collected, that it's probably not
23 going to go down that way. So anyway, I really don't
24 have a lot of comment. I have more questions than
25 anything. So there's nobody there to answer them, so

1 I'll just go offline for right now. Thanks for asking.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Thanks for your comments, sir.

3 Next name I see on my screen is Keith Walker.

4 MR. WALKER: Yes, this is Keith. Can you

5 hear me?

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

7 MR. WALKER: My name is Keith Walker. I own
8 my forever home at 3560 West Abrigo Drive in Golden
9 Valley. My property is directly adjacent to the west
10 common alignment, so any of the west routes would go
11 directly on the east side of my 10-acre property there.

12 I'm obviously opposed to the west routes.
13 I'm not opposed to UniSource needing more power supply
14 up in the new substation that they want to build, but I
15 am highly opposed of it going directly next to my
16 property for many health reasons, the impacts it would
17 have on wildlife. I have a six-year-old daughter and
18 an eight-year-old son. And if you did put that
19 property -- or, the power line adjacent to my property,
20 it would be less than 300 feet from my front door.

21 I bought this house three and a half years
22 ago. I was never notified of any of this power line
23 thing going on and didn't know about this meeting until
24 there was somebody flying a drone for the west routes
25 and I went outside and talked to him. And that's the

1 only reason I was able to get online and find out about
2 this meeting here. So not being informed was highly
3 annoying.

4 I retire in two years. I plan on retiring
5 here, raising my family here. I don't want this power
6 line right adjacent to my property. So I would oppose
7 the west route and I would be in favor of the east
8 route. I know that you're not going to make everybody
9 happy with either route that you choose.

10 So anyway, I could ramble on about all the
11 reasons why I don't want it next to my house. But like
12 I said, I just bought it three and a half years ago.
13 I'm pretty sure it would decrease my property
14 significant, my property value, the noise pollution,
15 the impact on the wildlife, just those types of things.
16 Like I said, I highly, highly oppose the west route and
17 am really kind of unhappy with the noncommunication
18 that I've had regarding this whole thing.

19 My e-mail address is
20 firemanhotrod1@yahoo.com. My phone number is
21 928-279-1530. And thank you for letting me speak.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you, Mr. Walker.

23 The next person I see a Jerrod. I see
24 Jerrod's Galaxy. So if you could provide your name,
25 sir, and contact information, we want to hear what you

1 have to say.

2 MR. PUETT: Yeah. Can you hear me okay?

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

4 MR. PUETT: Yeah, my name is Jerrod Puett.

5 My phone number is 928-299-6002.

6 Just like what Keith was saying, I'm also
7 looking at, of course, the east route. I live just a
8 couple acres over from Keith. And the main thing
9 I'm -- I'm just concerned about -- we have wildlife --
10 I mean, I have livestock, I have my children, I have
11 two young daughters, I have a wife, she has a
12 pacemaker. And I was concerned about the power lines
13 just growing up with the kids around this area, you
14 know, for any kind of problems that that can be in the
15 future, plus my wife's pacemaker. Any kind of -- I
16 forgot what they are -- the EMFs or whatever also will
17 drain that battery a little faster. I mean, we've got
18 them in the house. Everybody has them, they say. You
19 know, you go to the casinos, they're out there. But
20 it's one of those things, just living under a power
21 line is not a really good thing for the most part. So
22 I already put those comments in or sent them in to you
23 guys.

24 And to kind of go back with what Keith was
25 saying, more than anything just kind of annoyed with

1 the way we were informed, because we were really not
2 informed. It was just getting the information
3 ourselves from seeing people out here, you know, just
4 randomly.

5 Other than that, I don't know -- I have more
6 questions also, same with what Marc was saying, than I
7 do just me rambling, but I didn't really have a little
8 speech for you or nothing. But if anything, I'll think
9 of something while you guys are going still with it.

10 I was looking at your guys' video earlier and
11 how they were talking about detuning those towers for
12 those other routes. To me, I would of course suggest
13 the other routes going on the west side. I want the
14 east ones. So other than that, I'll just stand by and
15 listen.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Puett, thank you very much
17 for your comments.

18 MR. PUETT: I kind of lost you there. You
19 cut out.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Your address, sir.

21 MR. PUETT: My address is 3591 West Abrigo,
22 and that's Golden Valley, Arizona.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you, sir. Thanks for
24 your comments.

25 MR. PUETT: Thanks, man.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: And I'd just let everyone
2 know -- there may be other people that want to speak,
3 but just to let everyone know, these hearings are going
4 to be going on for a few days. So if there are other
5 people that wish to make comment, we'll make ourselves
6 available to hear it earlier at the beginning of a
7 hearing or right after a break. So there will be
8 opportunities if people want to come down and make
9 comment. This is not the only opportunity. We won't
10 hear from people twice, but we'll hear from everyone
11 who wants to make comments. So we'll make time to do
12 that.

13 Is there anyone else who would like to
14 provide public comment? I just can't see from the way
15 the screen is set up here.

16 MS. SCHAFFER: Hi. I would like to -- hello?

17 CHMN. CHENAL: Hello. Yes.

18 MS. MILES: Yes.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Is this Jen?

20 MS. MILES: This is Jen Miles.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's go with Jen Miles first.
22 We'll take them in order. Everyone will have their
23 opportunity. Ms. Miles.

24 MS. MILES: Thank you. I really appreciate
25 the opportunity to be here and give some comments.

1 This is such a difficult decision given the impact on
2 all these families. But I have to offer my support, as
3 Mayor of Kingman, in support of the board of
4 supervisors' position to select the western routes and
5 to not select the eastern routes for this line.

6 I think the statements have been made about
7 the number of homes impacted, but I know that doesn't
8 -- that rings kind of hollow if you're one of the ones
9 that are in Golden Valley that are impacted. But the
10 truth is that the interference with any of our radio
11 communications will have a very negative effect on our
12 community, which relies on them for a lot of
13 information. And so I just wanted to take a moment and
14 voice support.

15 I apologize, I've been out in this rain. We
16 are having some issues, of course, as everyone knows,
17 with these fires. But I wanted to take a moment and
18 just voice that support for the board of supervisors'
19 position and that the east routes should not be
20 selected. So thank you very much.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Mayor, thank you
22 for your comments.

23 There was another lady who wished to speak.
24 Is it Laura?

25 MS. SCHAFFER: Yes. Can you hear me?

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes. Laura, you have to give
2 your name and contact information.

3 MS. SCHAFFER: My name is Laura Schaffer. My
4 phone number is 928-897-3347. My address is 2949 South
5 Apache Road in Golden Valley, Arizona.

6 I am opposing most of these western routes
7 with the fact being that I own property on Patagonia, I
8 own property on Pine. I'm trying to invest in Golden
9 Valley and the community. I live right off of Apache,
10 which is where one of the lines is projected to go, and
11 literally through one of my properties on Pine and then
12 right above the back side of my property on Patagonia.

13 Golden Valley has been my home since I was
14 born and I've lived in Golden Valley my whole entire
15 life. And I've always wanted to invest in Golden
16 Valley and make it something where other people can
17 enjoy and bring more people here to have homes and
18 enjoy the beautiful scenery here, whereas now, if you
19 do go through my property lines, it will dramatically
20 decrease the value of my properties. I really can't
21 stress that enough.

22 I know they're saying things like with the
23 radio towers, but I feel like there's ways to deter
24 that, as in putting, like they were saying, inhibitors
25 and stuff that can defer it from affecting that,

1 whereas if it were out here on our property lines, this
2 is going to deeply affect us.

3 The other problem I have is I have property
4 going directly through these locations, and I was never
5 notified of this meeting. If it wasn't for Leah, who
6 is a neighbor of my property off of Klondyke and
7 Patagonia, I would have not known about this meeting or
8 known that this was going to happen.

9 The other problem I have is I own a shop
10 that's located directly on Shinarump, so the line is
11 possibly going to go through -- literally through my
12 shop on the other side of my property. And that could
13 affect my property value of my business property as
14 well. I just hope that there's another way to look at
15 this.

16 I know the eastern route runs along 93 and
17 through I40, along the back side of gasoline alley and
18 then up and over through the back side of Old 66, and
19 there's not a lot of houses that I feel like that would
20 affect. I mean, it could affect potentially the radio
21 broadcasting, but it's not going to affect people's
22 homes and property values, which is something that
23 running this western route will definitely affect us.
24 That's all.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Ms. Schaffer,

1 thank you very much.

2 Is there anyone else? Is there anyone else
3 online who would like to provide any comment? Is there
4 someone in the hallway outside? Yes, there is. Could
5 you just --

6 MS. LOW: Yes, a very important person, so
7 much so that I came in late.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Would you provide us your
9 name, please?

10 MS. LOW: Sure. My name is Tami Low. I live
11 at 3403 West Ballard Drive in Golden Valley.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Tami what? I'm sorry.

13 MS. LOW: I had to make sure with my fellow
14 colleagues here.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Could you provide your last
16 name again?

17 MS. LOW: My name is Tami Low. I live at
18 3403 West Ballard Drive in Golden Valley. My e-mail is
19 tammylowe@dc.rr.com.

20 And I've lived in the valley now -- I've
21 owned property here for about seven or eight years now
22 and I've lived here and built a home here as my
23 retirement home and I've been here for the last five
24 and a half years.

25 I am opposed, very highly opposed, to the

1 western routes altogether because those lines will
2 permanently affect my property and my property values.
3 And my neighbors, who aren't here today because they
4 weren't notified that -- they own property in the area
5 and weren't told that this was actually happening. So
6 I was not aware of that, that they owned property, have
7 not built yet. They're retiring and building there as
8 well. It's their lifelong dream to live there in this
9 beautiful valley where the Cerbats are at 2,300 feet or
10 2,400 feet and we get to see them every day,
11 unobstructed by the beauty of our valley.

12 And Golden Valley is growing. In 2010 the
13 population was right around 4,000. Right now -- well,
14 in 2019, before the census -- and we don't even know
15 right now what the census is going to tell us. But
16 there's 9,300 people who live in Golden Valley without
17 the census. That's something we need to consider, that
18 this valley is growing.

19 And it's a pristine valley. It has beautiful
20 wildlife. It has awesome views of the Black Mountains,
21 the Cerbats, the Hualapais. And our neighbors are all
22 fantastic. We work together as a community and make
23 sure that people are taken care of there.

24 The eastern route is the only route that
25 is -- I believe keeps our environment from peril. We

1 have burrowing owls. There's less than 10,000 --
2 10,000 -- in the whole western United States left.
3 It's going to be an endangered species if we don't take
4 care of them now. And we have burrowing owls on my
5 property and several of the properties surrounding
6 mine. Who's done an Environmental Impact Study on
7 these particular animals? It took one spotted owl in
8 Oregon and Washington to shut the entire logging
9 industry down. That still has not recovered to this
10 day. So we need to think about those things. And I
11 haven't even talked about half the species of lizards
12 or the birds or even the wildlife like our predators
13 that are in our environment. Those things have not
14 been discussed, and it upsets me that that hasn't been
15 discussed at all.

16 Now, as far as the residents on both east and
17 west sides, it's terrible, it's horrible that we have
18 to make these decisions. And it's not my decision to
19 make. I can only make a comment. But I can say that
20 this valley is growing, and to impact them in such a
21 way that -- these power lines can be diverted onto the
22 already established route. It's just mind boggling to
23 me.

24 And with that said, I've talked to BLM on
25 many occasions. This is the fourth time talking and

1 e-mailing and getting things in the mail to send back,
2 fourth time we've had to say something. Where are all
3 of those responses we've given before? And yet we're
4 here again, and it's very upsetting.

5 My property value -- I'm on the Tooman route.
6 I'm not even worried about the property at this point,
7 because I don't know even if the species of animals
8 that are around me are going to survive it.

9 But I can say, to the people who own radio
10 broadcasting in and around our valley, that an
11 unbelievable, awesome, great company like UniSource
12 would say it will not happen. Those circumstances that
13 may interfere with your particular broadcast can be
14 mitigated. They've said it on many occasions. They
15 say they can mitigate the problem, period, the end. I
16 believe them, because they're the technology of the
17 future, they're the technology of now. And I believe
18 that they're going to do what they say they do because
19 that's what they do for their community.

20 I support the eastern routes. The western
21 routes, for every person in this room who lived there,
22 we're afraid. We're very afraid of what's going to
23 happen to our community. And it's growing. And I
24 would love to see an impact study on the animals that
25 are going to be in our community or live with us on our

1 properties that we take care of. I want to make sure
2 that they're taken care of.

3 And the only route I believe that is even
4 viable is to stick with the eastern route. It already
5 is next to an ugly freeway. And one of the things that
6 really bothered me was BLM and -- a supervisor at the
7 time said, well, there's hikers that go through that
8 canyon. Hikers? Okay. Hikers go on the weekend, on a
9 Saturday or a Sunday. I live 24/7, seven days a week
10 on my property. I don't want to see those things. I
11 don't want to be near them, of course. I don't want to
12 have any health problems because of them. But I don't
13 care about the hikers on the weekends, I really don't.
14 They don't live here. That's their choice to hike
15 there. Not my problem. But like I said, I'm 24/7 on
16 my property, and I don't want to live with those lines.

17 There's already a viable place. And thank
18 god UniSource says it can mitigate any problem with
19 communications, which I'm very much appreciative of.
20 Thank you.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Ms. Low, can you give us the
22 address again, please, your address?

23 MS. LOW: 3403 West Ballard, Golden Valley.
24 I'm the only house on that road.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you.

1 MS. LOW: All the way to the end, far away
2 from everybody.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Anyone else, either online or
4 in person?

5 MS. FOX: My name is Ruta Fox, and I live at
6 2278 South Kirkland Road in Golden Valley off of
7 Shinarump. My phone number is 760-668-0864.

8 And this will only take a moment, and it's
9 part of how many people were not informed. This is
10 crazy. Why are they not informed? There's tax roles,
11 property tax roles that can be used to notify the
12 people.

13 But one of the things that I noticed is that
14 they did put up some signs on Shinarump telling people
15 that this meeting was coming up. And we have one very,
16 very sharp curve on Shinarump right at South Kirkland
17 Road where there's been numerous car accidents. One
18 sign was on the eastbound lane going into the curve and
19 one sign was on the westbound lane going into the curve
20 with no safe place to park. You can't park and walk up
21 there. You're going to get run down by somebody. So
22 the method in which this was used was useless and it
23 shouldn't have been done that way and someone did not
24 use their head when they put that up there.

25 So anyway, that's -- that's the thing that

1 bothered me a lot. And I do have a lot more to say,
2 but I'm going to do it in a letter. I appreciate you
3 listening to our concerns. I know it takes a lot of
4 time, you're away from your families and your homes, to
5 come hear us talk. And of course, I want it on the
6 east end, and you'll hear that in my letter also.
7 Thank you.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Thank you,
9 Ms. Fox.

10 Anyone else either online or in person?
11 We've got something crazy happening with the
12 screen.

13 MR. MOELLER: It's Internet related.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: It's Internet related we're
15 told.

16 MR. ARMENDARIZ: Hi, my name is Eloy
17 Armendariz. Telephone number 702-493-3970. Address is
18 2356 South Klondyke Road, Golden Valley, Arizona.

19 And we bought this property several years
20 ago. We loved the location so much that we decided to
21 leave our good-paying jobs in Las Vegas and put down
22 roots in Golden Valley. My wife and I both quit our
23 jobs, sold our home, moved our family, and built our
24 forever home solely based on the love of this land.

25 As Laura stated, the transmission lines

1 affecting the radio towers can be negated. Power lines
2 go up near radio stations frequently, and modern
3 technology has provided means of negating the concerns
4 of the broadcasting stations.

5 Additionally, these lines are not meant to
6 benefit Golden Valley, as stated by Jean Bishop. These
7 lines are proposed to run through many, many Golden
8 Valley residences, without any benefit to us at all.

9 Although we bought this property because of
10 the views it has to offer, that is not even our largest
11 concern. We have young children and animals. This is
12 where we plan to raise our family. We cannot risk the
13 health and hazards that this power line could bring to
14 our young children. It is scientifically proven that
15 overhead power lines can cause childhood leukemia,
16 among other health problems. Our children will not be
17 the only ones affected by this decision. I know
18 multiple neighbors that have children and grandchildren
19 that these power lines could hurt.

20 As a local business owner in the housing
21 market, we know how important location and views are.
22 I have no doubt that if this power line does run
23 directly behind our home, we will have lost a large
24 part of our investment. No one would want to purchase
25 a home with the health risk and obstructed views that

1 our home will be tainted with.

2 While it is no shock that Jean Bishop is not
3 for the people of Golden Valley, as I have found not
4 just in this project but in many others, I would like
5 to note that thus far only two families have been
6 mentioned as being affected by the eastern route.

7 While I fully understand the concerns of the Cunningham
8 family, we're talking about a multitude of families
9 being affected in Golden Valley. Thank you.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you, sir.

11 Anyone else who would like to speak either in
12 person or online? Anyone?

13 MR. PUETT: Mr. Chairman, can you hear me?

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

15 MR. PUETT: This is Jerrod again. I just
16 wanted to clarify. I'm pretty sure you understood what
17 I was saying, but I wanted the east route.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, we got that.

19 MR. PUETT: Okay. Just making sure. I
20 didn't know if I said the west, but, you know, I got a
21 little -- caught me off guard, that's all. Anyways,
22 that's all I wanted to clarify. Other than that, thank
23 you for your time.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: You bet.

25 Anyone else? I don't want to cut anyone off,

1 but if we don't see someone soon, we're going to stop
2 the hearing. And like I said, there will be other
3 opportunities for people to make comment.

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Going once, going twice, sold.

6 Okay. That will adjourn the public comment
7 hearing for this evening. We'll adjourn and thank
8 everyone for showing up either in person or by video.
9 We really appreciate your comments; they're very
10 helpful to the Committee. We invite you to come watch
11 the hearing if you'd like or online. And if you have
12 other people you know who would like to give comment,
13 we'll make every effort to make sure we hear what they
14 have to say.

15 So with that, we're adjourned for this
16 evening, and we'll see everyone tomorrow morning at
17 9:00 a.m. Thank you.

18 (The hearing recessed at 6:53 p.m.)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA)

2 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

3

4 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings
5 were taken before me; that the foregoing pages are a
6 full, true, and accurate record of the proceedings all
7 done 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
11 of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in
12 the outcome hereof.

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

17

18

19

20



KATHRYN A. BLACKWELDER
Certified Reporter
Certificate No. 50666

21

22


23 I CERTIFY that Coash & Coash, Inc., has
24 complied with the ethical obligations set forth in ACJA
25 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) through (6).

26

27

28

29



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

30

31

32