

1 OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. GRABEL 24

2 OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. ARIAS 33

3

4 INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS

5 WITNESSES PAGE

6 ALI AMIRALI AND LOWELL ROGERS (PANEL 1)

7 Direct Examination by Ms. Grabel 38

8

9 VIRTUAL TOUR 150

10 EVENING PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION 170

11

12 INDEX TO EXHIBITS

13 NO. DESCRIPTION IDENTIFIED ADMITTED

14 DCR-1 CEC Application 39 --

15 DCR-2 Map of proposed route 39 --

16 DCR-3 Testimony summary of Ali Amirali 41 --

17

18 DCR-4 Witness presentation of Ali Amirali (Panel 1) 41 --

19 DCR-5A Notice of Hearing 124 --

20 DCR-5B Affidavits of publication and tear sheets 125 --

21

22 DCR-5C Map of Notice of Hearing sign locations 125 --

23 DCR-5D Photographs and coordinates of sign placement 125 --

24

25 DCR-5E Example of sign contents 125 --

1 INDEX TO EXHIBITS

2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
3	DCR-5F	Notice of services to affected jurisdiction	125	--
4				
5	DCR-5G	Return receipts of affected jurisdiction	125	--
6	DCR-5H	Letters to libraries	125	--
7	DCR-6	Summary of public outreach	113	--
8				
9	DCR-7A	Letter of support from La Paz County (DEIS)	127	--
10	DCR-7B	Letter of support from La Paz County (overall project)	128	--
11				
12	DCR-7C	Letter of support from OHV	128	--
13				
14	DCR-7D	Letter of support from 174 Power Global	137	--
15	DCR-7E	Letter of support from Eolus North America, Inc.	137	--
16				
17	DCR-8	Virtual tour	147	--
18	DCR-9	Tour itinerary/script/protocol	126	--
19	DCR-10A	Ten-year plan for 2016	138	--
20	DCR-10B	Ten-year plan for 2017	138	--
21	DCR-10C	Ten-year plan for 2018	138	--
22	DCR-10D	Ten-year plan for 2019	138	--
23	DCR-11	Receipt of filing fee	139	--
24	CHMN-1	Order denying CEC	34	--
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 the Phoenix Plaza Conference Facility,
5 2909 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, commencing
6 at 1:13 p.m. on the 22nd of January, 2020.

7

8 BEFORE: THOMAS K. CHENAL, Chairman

9 JACK HAENICHEN, Public Member
10 KARL GENTLES, Public Member
11 MARY HAMWAY, Cities and Towns
12 JAMES PALMER, Agriculture
13 LAURIE WOODALL, Arizona Corporation Commission
14 JOHN RIGGINS, Arizona Department of Water Resources
15 LEONARD DRAGO, Department of Environmental Quality
16 GIL VILLEGAS, JR., Counties (Starting at Page 99)

17 APPEARANCES:

18 For the Applicant:

19 OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.
20 Ms. Meghan H. Grabel
21 Mr. Elias J. Ancharski
22 Ms. Kimberly A. Ruht
23 2929 North Central Avenue
24 Suite 2100
25 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793

For the Arizona Corporation Commission Staff:

 Mr. Julio Antonio Arias
 Staff Attorney, Utilities Division
 1200 West Washington Street
 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

1 CHMN. CHENAL: Good afternoon, everybody. My
2 name is Tom Chenal, the Chair of the Line Siting
3 Committee. This is the time set to begin the hearing
4 on the application of Ten West Link, Case Number 185.

5 May I have a roll call, please. Let's start
6 with you, Member Haenichen, just to announce your
7 presence.

8 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Jack Haenichen,
9 representing the public.

10 MEMBER GENTLES: Karl Gentles, representing
11 the public.

12 MEMBER HAMWAY: Mary Hamway, representing
13 cities and towns.

14 MEMBER PALMER: Jim Palmer, representing
15 agriculture.

16 MEMBER WOODALL: Laurie Woodall, representing
17 the Chairman of the Arizona Corporation Commission,
18 Commissioner Bob Burns.

19 MEMBER RIGGINS: John Riggins, representing
20 the director of the Arizona Department of Water
21 Resources.

22 MEMBER DRAGO: Len Drago, representing the
23 Arizona Department of Environmental Quality.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Thank you very
25 much. Let's go over some logistics first before we get

1 into the opening statements and the heart of the
2 hearing. Just a typical, standard admonition to the
3 folks in the audience and the members of the team for
4 the Applicant. Now that the hearing is started, we're
5 not allowed to talk -- we, the Members of the Line
6 Siting Committee, are not allowed to talk to anybody
7 off the record, if you will, about the merits of this
8 case. So we would ask everyone to respect that. We're
9 happy to talk to you about the weather, about, you
10 know, Phoenix, but -- who's going to win the Super
11 Bowl, but not about this hearing. So I would ask you
12 to respect that. And if we refuse to talk to you about
13 it, if it does come up accidentally, it's not that
14 we're unfriendly. It's just -- it's open meeting laws
15 and it's just the way that we have to run this. And I
16 mean it.

17 We'll take breaks every 90 minutes just for
18 the benefit of the court reporter and everyone else.
19 It's just nice to have those breaks. Generally, the
20 hearing, I think, has been -- we have kind of not our
21 standard schedule. Let's just review it with
22 everybody, because we have hearings in different
23 locations.

24 So we start today. This evening, at 6:00,
25 we'll have a public comment session. We'll resume

1 tomorrow at 9:00 and Friday at 9:00. We'll typically
2 stop at 5:00, but we may, depending on the length of
3 the hearing and how the evidence is coming in and the
4 questions and we're going to time it, we may want to go
5 a little longer to make sure we finish within the time
6 we've set aside for the hearing.

7 Monday we start in Quartzsite. We have a
8 tour that starts at 11:00 a.m. We finish the tour --
9 we'll talk about that tour. We come back, and at
10 4:00 p.m. Monday we start the hearing, and that's when
11 we can discuss what was seen on the tour and questions
12 about that. Then we'll have -- 5:30 that Monday
13 evening, we'll have a public hearing -- public comment
14 in Quartzsite.

15 And then the next day, make sure I get this
16 right, 10:00 a.m. in Quartzsite will be for Tuesday,
17 this coming Tuesday, and we'll finish up as far as we
18 go on Tuesday. Then we come back to Phoenix, here to
19 this facility, Thursday, February 6, at 10:00 a.m., and
20 then we'll continue the hearing through Friday,
21 February 7th, and that will be at 9:00 a.m.

22 So if there's any questions about the times,
23 I'd suggest you look at the notice of hearing. But
24 we'll review when we're going to resume after every
25 hearing, at the conclusion of any hearing.

1 I'm going to say this probably a hundred
2 times, I'll say it the first time right now. We have a
3 helicopter tour that we're going to be going on, two
4 separate helicopters. We'll go into some length about
5 it. But the only way that works is if the Members do
6 not talk about anything about the application, the
7 topography, the line, anything about it during the
8 helicopter tour. Talk about the Super Bowl, okay,
9 because we cannot talk about the tour.

10 Everything will be -- will be transcribed.
11 There will be a script that will be read on each
12 helicopter to the Committee Members. There will be
13 separate hover points where that script will be read.
14 And that will enable the public to recreate the tour by
15 going to those hover points, they're accessible by car.
16 They're not going to be able to go as fast, but if they
17 want to recreate the tour at some subsequent time, or
18 even beforehand, they have the ability to do that.

19 There will also be a virtual tour that will
20 basically do a flyover of the tour that we're going to
21 take, and again, it will hover, as Google Earth hovers,
22 over the hover points, but I think you get the idea.

23 But again, back to the admonition to the
24 Committee. We cannot talk about anything about this
25 application or the hearing during the helicopter tour,

1 and I just would ask everyone to respect that. I know
2 you will. But just the accidental slip is what I'm
3 concerned about. So if it happens, just -- just remind
4 somebody. And that also depends on the communication
5 ability while we're in the helicopter; it's probably
6 going to be limited in any event.

7 We'll take public comment at various times
8 for the convenience of the public throughout the
9 hearing, it won't be just at those two -- at those two
10 public comment sessions in the evenings. So for
11 example, if people show up right after a break, we can
12 take public comment. This morning I'd be willing to
13 take public comment if anyone wishes to make public
14 comment after the opening statements and before we
15 start the actual presentation of the evidence, just as
16 a convenience to those people who show up and want to
17 give public comment.

18 We have two procedural -- let's talk about
19 parking, a couple issues there. Parking validation
20 will be handled by the Applicant. Ms. Ruht will take
21 your parking, you know, your --

22 MS. RUHT: Parking tickets.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: -- tickets, and will validate
24 them for us and give them back to us. And I don't know
25 the situation for the folks staying at hotels. What

1 would you recommend?

2 MS. GRABEL: I believe that the parking is
3 already taken care of as part of the hotel, which we
4 are already paying.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Do we want to talk
6 about the iPads now?

7 MS. GRABEL: Certainly.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's talk about that, and we
9 appreciate the Applicant providing that and loading the
10 documents and exhibits into the iPad. I think we're
11 going to have a little tour.

12 MS. GRABEL: And Mr. Ancharski was the
13 architect of the iPad, so I'm going to defer to him on
14 giving you the little tour through them.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Ancharski.

16 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes. Chairman, Committee
17 Members, good afternoon. So we're just going to run
18 through the iPads really quick. You are able to take
19 these home for the night, you know, to review the
20 documents that are on there, the virtual tour is on
21 there. We do ask that you bring them back every day
22 for the hearing so you can use them, and we will
23 collect them at the end of the hearing.

24 As you see, your password is 0309. That
25 corresponds to the docket number from the ACC filing.

1 That was kind of the most convenient password that I
2 could figure out that made sense that would allow me to
3 work.

4 So once you enter in your password, you
5 should come to a home screen that looks similar to what
6 we have on the screen up here. I'll be able to guide
7 you around on this screen here. And the six apps at
8 the bottom are pretty much all we believe that you will
9 need throughout this hearing. You'll see those down
10 here. We have Safari, which is your Internet, iBooks,
11 which is where your documents are going to be, your
12 Apple TV, which is where the virtual tour will be
13 located, the only video in there.

14 The next application is Google Earth. You
15 are able to use that if you want to kind of run through
16 the west Arizona desert and kind of look at where this
17 line might go. There's no information loaded in there,
18 but that is just for your convenience.

19 We also have the camera app there if you
20 would like to use that, and then settings if there are
21 anything that you need to change. So just -- just
22 really quickly, I was going to jump into the iBooks
23 application. When you --

24 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, Member Haenichen.

1 MEMBER HAENICHEN: I have a quick question.

2 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes.

3 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Do you want us to remove
4 this plastic?

5 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes, you can remove that. I
6 left that on just so it was as fresh out of the box for
7 you all. Yeah, it should just slide off for you. You
8 can rip it off. You don't need to save that. That's
9 just how they came.

10 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Okay.

11 MR. ANCHARSKI: So once you get into iBooks,
12 every -- or, every document is loaded in the iBooks
13 application there. You'll see the entire list here.
14 They should be already sorted and titled by title; but
15 if they're not, there's a sort by click up here that
16 you are able to select that to make sure they are in
17 title order, that way you can find them, locate them
18 easier.

19 At the beginning, you will see your exhibit
20 list, which just is a quick little list of every
21 exhibit on the iPad. And then if you just scroll
22 through, you'll be able to find every exhibit minus any
23 exhibit that we do intend to provide to you in paper
24 form which was not submitted with the exhibits
25 initially.

1 And just for a quick review, the CEC
2 application, which is the big application that you all
3 have received early on, you are able to access this
4 from the first link, and there's a table of contents
5 that is clickable and accessible. That's located --
6 there should be a little icon up at the top left corner
7 that looks like different points; I don't believe it's
8 showing up, but it should be right up there. It's not
9 on the screen there. And that will give you your table
10 of contents.

11 But also, if you are in the application, each
12 of the -- when you are on the table of contents, these
13 are clickable as well, and that will take you there.
14 So because this is a bigger document, we wanted to make
15 this as accessible as possible. So you are able to go,
16 and if you click executive summary and introduction,
17 that should take you right there. So those are
18 clickable, and you will be able to move through those.

19 Are there any questions with the documents?

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

21 MEMBER WOODALL: I just want to say, this is
22 the first time, due to the meticulous nature of your
23 hot linking things, that I think I will actually use
24 the iPad, because it's going to be easy to find things.
25 And in the past, it has not been easy to find things.

1 So I congratulate whoever was responsible for this.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. ANCHARSKI: You're welcome for that. We
4 wanted to make this as accessible as possible. And
5 just in terms of more ease of access, there is a search
6 icon that should be in the top right corner when you're
7 in the iBooks, and you are able to search a page
8 number. So more -- more so looking at the CEC
9 application, you're able to look for a specific page
10 number, or if you're looking for a term, just realize
11 that because of the size of the application, it will
12 take a little bit of time to find what you're looking
13 for if you do type a search word, because it does have
14 to go through all those pages.

15 So I'm just going to go then to the Apple TV
16 application, and if you are -- once you click on that,
17 which is down in your bottom dock from the main screen,
18 you should be able to click the virtual tour, which is
19 the only thing loaded in the document, and hit play,
20 and that should load right up. That will be the
21 virtual tour that is given later today by Mr. Lowell
22 Rogers.

23 There is sound. So if you do play it, just
24 realize that there will likely be some sound that plays
25 along with that. And we ask maybe that you review that

1 later on tonight. We will have that play during the
2 presentations today, and that will be accessible to you
3 later in the afternoon.

4 MS. GRABEL: Can I add something to that?
5 Actually, the other thing you could do, if you wanted
6 to, you could take DCR Exhibit 9, which is the tour and
7 the helicopter script, and the hover points in the
8 virtual tour are identical to the hover points that
9 we'll be taking on the aerial tour. And so as you're
10 going through the virtual tour, you could read the
11 narrative, and it actually applies to the terrain that
12 you're looking at.

13 MR. ANCHARSKI: And that's actually about
14 really it. If you did want further explanation on
15 anything, I'd be happy to provide that. If you do have
16 any questions right now or throughout the hearing,
17 please feel free to, you know, contact me some way, you
18 know, call me over, I'd be happy to assist you with the
19 iPads.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: I'll ask you right now.

21 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: And I'm going to get your name
23 right. Ancharski.

24 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes, perfect. Thank you.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: But it helps when I see your

1 card there, the name tag.

2 One of the exhibits that I'd asked to be
3 included by virtue of the procedural order, and
4 something that I know Member Gentles has asked for in
5 the past, is kind of a summary of outreach efforts and
6 comments that result from the outreach efforts. And
7 you were able to locate, you and Ms. Grabel were able
8 to locate that document, but it's in the -- it's in the
9 application, exhibits to the application. And maybe
10 you could just run through that now and tell us how to
11 get there. I know it's Page 2367.

12 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes, Chairman.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: So maybe just run through how
14 to do that, because I know that's going to be something
15 that a lot of people are going to look at.

16 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes, of course. So Chairman,
17 Committee, when you go into your documents, it is
18 DCR-1, which is our application that you've already
19 seen that was filed, and you are able to go in there.
20 And with the search function in the top right corner
21 that looks like a little magnifying glass, you can
22 search it. It's coming up here. You're just able to
23 type in the page number, which Chairman mentioned was
24 2367, and that will take you to what we had -- had a
25 conversation about as a summary of the public comments

1 in response to the FEIS. So once you type in the Page
2 Number 2367, it will take you straight to that location
3 in the document itself, and you're able to review that.

4 MS. GRABEL: And for the record, that is
5 Appendix 8 to the FEIS, which is attached as Exhibit B1
6 to the CEC application, which is Exhibit DCR-1.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: And we can go over that any
8 time to help if someone has a problem locating that
9 document.

10 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes, of course.

11 CHMN. CHENAL: Any further questions on the
12 iPad? And again, thanks for making these available. I
13 think we finally have 100 percent buy-in from the
14 Committee to not use the paper and to go to the
15 electronic format.

16 MEMBER WOODALL: Well, just for this case,
17 because it's so well done.

18 MR. ANCHARSKI: Setting the standard.

19 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes.

20 MS. GRABEL: The rose gold standard. Get it,
21 because the rose gold? That's a joke.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's see. What else do we
23 need to discuss? There are two interventions in this
24 case, and they are of right. Some interventions are by
25 permission and some by statute are by right. The

1 Corporation Commission Staff has moved to -- has given
2 notice of intervention. Mr., I want to say this
3 correctly, Arias.

4 MR. ARIAS: Arias.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Arias, okay, I'm sorry. I
6 apologize. It reads the same when they read the
7 transcript.

8 MR. ARIAS: Yeah, it does.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Arias. But that has -- that's
10 obviously -- it's not even granted, it's a matter of
11 statute. So the Corporation Commission through Staff
12 is a party to this proceeding. Thank you.

13 There's also -- and you have also, Mr. Arias,
14 provided -- and because of the circumstances, we
15 discussed this at the prehearing conference last week.
16 Your witness -- you have provided testimony and a
17 PowerPoint, two separate documents, that will be
18 exhibits in this hearing, and you provided paper copies
19 of those two documents to the Members of the Line
20 Siting Committee. So those are before you on the
21 table.

22 The second entity that has filed a notice of
23 intervention is La Paz County. And I don't know if
24 they're actually going to appear at the -- at this
25 proceeding. I've never had a situation, frankly, where

1 some party has either moved or noticed that it intends
2 to intervene and has not shown up at the hearing. So I
3 guess that's an issue we'll have to deal with if they
4 actually show up later. But La Paz County, at least as
5 of the beginning of this hearing, is deemed to be a
6 party to this proceeding as well.

7 I'm unaware of any disclosure issues with
8 regard to the procedural order that was issued that I
9 issued in terms of disclosure, previous disclosure of
10 witnesses, testimony, or exhibits. I haven't heard of
11 any issues. Have the parties complied with the
12 procedural order as far as that goes?

13 MS. GRABEL: Yes, sir.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Arias.

15 MR. ARIAS: Yes, Chairman.

16 MS. GRABEL: Chairman Chenal, if I may speak
17 on that.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure.

19 MS. GRABEL: We do have two additional
20 exhibits that were not filed because they didn't exist
21 as of the date of the -- January 14th, I think it was.
22 They're two letters of support that we received, and
23 I'll admit them into evidence today during the
24 proceedings.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure, that's very good.

1 Mr. Arias, I traditionally send a letter to
2 the Corporation Commission Staff asking if they have
3 any comment regarding each hearing that we have with
4 regard to every application that's filed, and I have
5 not as of yet received a response on this one. So I
6 don't know if there's going to be one or not. But if
7 there is, you know, I think we can -- I can make that a
8 Chairman's exhibit. Obviously, it would be more
9 helpful to have that sooner rather than later.

10 MR. ARIAS: Okay, we can work on that and get
11 that filed.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah. And like I said, we've
13 always sent -- I always send a letter inviting
14 Corporation Commission through Staff to make comments
15 about the application; in every case I've received one.
16 But I have not received one in this case, to my
17 knowledge, so I just wanted to point that out.

18 And we do like to get -- we do like to get
19 the input, the formal input from the Staff on these.
20 It's very important to me and, I think, other members
21 of the Committee. Maybe we will have, in effect, the
22 same -- the same information provided to us through the
23 case that you'll be presenting. But I just want to
24 point out that we have not received that letter. This
25 is the only case I'm aware of where that hasn't been

1 provided.

2 MR. ARIAS: Okay, yeah. It was my
3 understanding that filing direct testimony PowerPoint
4 would be sufficient, but we can also get a letter of
5 support or Staff comments.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, as you wish. Just
7 making the observation.

8 Okay, we've talked about the tour. Is there
9 anything further we want to talk about the tour?
10 There's a couple things. The Applicant will be asking
11 for a release to be signed by the individuals taking
12 the tour. It would be a release where the individuals
13 are releasing any liability, not on behalf of the
14 State, just the individuals. Everyone can have someone
15 look at -- have an attorney look at it if you wish.
16 Not as your attorney, but as the Chairman, I did make a
17 suggestion of a couple changes to it, and I'm happy to
18 report the Applicant has agreed to those, and I would
19 have no further changes from my point of view regarding
20 the release. But perhaps today that could be passed
21 out to the Members of the Committee so they could look
22 at it, and if they have any questions they can ask
23 about it.

24 MS. GRABEL: Certainly, we can get that
25 printed out on a break.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: Mr. Chairman.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes.

3 MEMBER WOODALL: My understanding is that at
4 least one Member of the Committee has contacted ADOA
5 Risk Management, who had expressed an interest in
6 seeing that document, so thank you.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: So at 11:00 a.m. on Monday we
8 will meet at the -- maybe you can remind me,
9 Ms. Grabel, how it's going to work Monday.

10 MS. GRABEL: We're meeting at the Riggles RV
11 Event Center at 11:00. Then the DCRT team will be
12 driving the Committee Members to the Quartzsite
13 airport, where we will meet the helicopters. You are
14 limited to what you can take on the helicopters;
15 there's a weight limitation, and so perhaps a notebook.
16 And you can leave your personal belongings and your
17 cell phones with us; we'll have them in a safe
18 location, guarded.

19 We'll then take the helicopter tour, which we
20 anticipate being two hours or less. We'll then drive
21 you back from the Quartzsite airport to the RV Riggles
22 Event Center, where we will convene the hearing at
23 4:00 p.m. Probably have a little downtime in between.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Very good. All right. And
25 then there will be communications within the

1 helicopter, but as I said, I can't impress it upon you
2 enough that we can't talk about anything about the tour
3 or the application. And we can talk about that further
4 on Friday before we -- and Monday when we convene.

5 Are there any other procedural matters that
6 we should discuss? Oh, Member Woodall, yes.

7 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes. For purposes of the
8 record I wish to advise that in 2008 and 2009 I was an
9 employee of URS Engineering and worked on the Starwood
10 Solar I matter. I had common connections with
11 Mr. Amirali during the course of that. My
12 understanding is the project has been canceled, and the
13 CEC expired on December 24th, 2016. The docket
14 number of that Starwood Solar I project is Docket
15 Number L-00000MM-09-0446-00150. And I wanted to
16 disclose that.

17 And if anyone has any questions or concerns
18 regarding that matter, I received my salary for working
19 on the prior project, and I have no further financial
20 interest whatsoever in any Starwood entity.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Thanks for the
22 disclosure, Member Woodall. I have no concerns at all.
23 It's not a conflict that I can see in any way.

24 If anyone else has a concern, or if the
25 Applicant has a concern or the ACC has a concern.

1 (No response.)

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, I don't hear any. Good.

3 Are there any other procedural issues we
4 should talk about before we go to opening statements?

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN. CHENAL: All right, Ms. Grabel.

7 MS. GRABEL: Take it away? All right.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Take it away.

9 MS. GRABEL: Thank you, Chairman, Committee
10 Members. My name is Meghan Grabel of the law firm
11 Osborn Maledon, and I represent DCR Transmission,
12 L.L.C., I'll refer to my client as DCRT, the Applicant
13 for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility, or a
14 CEC, that authorizes the construction of the Arizona
15 portion of the Ten West Link Transmission Line. With
16 me, from my firm, are my colleagues, Kimberly Ruht and
17 Elias Ancharski.

18 This map, which you will see often, is
19 identical to side one of the laminated place mat in
20 front of you, which has been marked and prefiled as DCR
21 Exhibit 2. I will speak to the second side of the
22 Exhibit DCR-2 momentarily.

23 The line in red, the thickest of the lines as
24 you see right there, is the proposed route for Ten West
25 Link, a 125-mile, 500 kilovolt, electric transmission

1 line that, if approved, will run from Arizona Public
2 Service Company's Delaney Substation to Southern
3 California Edison's Colorado River Substation near
4 Blythe, California.

5 The Arizona portion of Ten West Link, the
6 subject of this CEC application, is 103.4 miles long,
7 beginning at the Delaney Substation until it crosses
8 the Colorado River into California.

9 As you will learn, Ten West Link is unlike
10 any other transmission project that has come before
11 this Committee, with a unique origination. Although it
12 is being developed by DCRT, which is an affiliate of
13 Starwood Energy Group, L.L.C., it is not a merchant
14 project like SunZia or Southline, which I know the
15 Committee is familiar.

16 Rather, the project was studied by the
17 California Independent System Operator, which I will
18 refer to as the CAISO, as part of its 2013, 2014
19 transmission planning process, and was recommended for
20 approval by the CAISO Board of Governors due to its
21 significant economic, reliability, and policy-related
22 benefits.

23 For those who may not be familiar with the
24 CAISO, it is a nonprofit entity created by the
25 California legislature in 1998 as part of that state's

1 restructuring of the electricity market. The purpose
2 of the CAISO is to oversee the operation of
3 California's bulk electric power system. It is a
4 reliability organization regulated by the Federal
5 Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, similar to the
6 several other reliability organizations that exist in
7 the United States, the New York ISO, the ISO New
8 England, PJM Interconnection, and closer to home, the
9 Southwest Power Pool.

10 All members of the CAISO that own
11 transmission assets are required by California law to
12 turn operational control of those assets over to the
13 CAISO. So as a practical matter, this means that all
14 of the lines in Arizona that are owned by California
15 utilities, such as, for example, the Devers to Palo
16 Verde line that's owned by Southern California Edison
17 that runs parallel to the proposed Ten West Link, are
18 all under the operation or control of the CAISO. It's
19 not an unfamiliar regime. And you'll hear a lot more
20 on this from Mr. Ali Amirali, and hopefully from a
21 CAISO representative who will submit additional
22 information either by way of a letter or potentially
23 being -- appearing by telephone.

24 So in this case, the CAISO studied the line
25 at issue and put the project to bid under FERC's

1 competitive bidding process. Several entities bid to
2 develop the project, and DCRT was ultimately awarded.

3 To develop the project, Ten West requires
4 approval from the Bureau of Land Management to secure a
5 federal right-of-way, the Arizona Corporation
6 Commission, which is why we're here today, of course,
7 and the California Public Utilities Commission.

8 Because the project required approval from
9 the BLM, it underwent an extensive environmental review
10 under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.
11 And as you will hear, this environmental review was
12 incredibly comprehensive and involved years of working
13 with stakeholders and policymakers in the affected
14 jurisdictions to determine a route for the project that
15 would avoid controversy.

16 We believe the evidence will show that the
17 proposed route does exactly that, as demonstrated by
18 the many letters of support and the lack of stakeholder
19 opposition that we have had so far in this proceeding.

20 In the coming weeks, you will hear a great
21 deal of testimony regarding how Ten West Link meets
22 Arizona's need for an adequate, economic, and reliable
23 supply of power. The project was specifically designed
24 to transmit reliable, economic, and environmentally
25 friendly energy between southeast California and

1 southwest Arizona, and it brings significant benefits
2 to our state.

3 The evidence will show that Ten West Link,
4 among other things, improves the efficiency and
5 reliability of the interconnected electric grid between
6 Arizona and California, it reduces transmission system
7 congestion that's currently existing on the system, and
8 enhances Arizona's access to economic generation
9 resources, which helps keep Arizona's utility ratepayer
10 costs low. Ten West Link enhances the operational
11 flexibility of the bulk transmission network in this
12 region, and facilitates the interconnection of new
13 renewable energy and energy storage resources.

14 In fact, as you'll learn, Ten West Link has
15 already had 4,000 megawatts of active direct
16 interconnection requests, including almost 900
17 megawatts at the APS Substation, which means the line
18 is likely to be fully subscribed on its first day of
19 operations.

20 The project also enhances the Arizona
21 utilities' participation in the energy imbalance
22 market, or the EIM, again, helping to keep Arizona
23 utility ratepayer costs low, and it also provides
24 significant economic benefits to Arizona and to rural
25 counties, which you will hear Ms. Judy Chang from The

1 Brattle Group describe.

2 So some of you will recall a line similar to
3 what DCRT originally proposed to the CAISO went through
4 the CEC process in 2006, spearheaded by Southern
5 California Edison, which sought to construct a line
6 parallel to its existing Devers to Palo Verde
7 Transmission Line, and that proposed project was known
8 as DPV2, and was rejected by the Corporation Commission
9 for four primary reasons.

10 Those reasons are summarized in a memo that
11 the Arizona Corporation Commission's Utilities Division
12 director requested, and which the Applicant attached as
13 Exhibit J7 to the CEC application. As Mr. Ali Amirali
14 and Ms. Judy Chang will explain during their testimony
15 in this proceeding, the concerns regarding DPV2 simply
16 do not apply to Ten West Link. By avoiding the Kofa
17 and taking into account several stakeholder concerns,
18 Ten West Link's proposed route avoids many of the
19 environmental impacts that DPV2 might have had, and the
20 change in the bulk electric grid since 2006 renders
21 many of the prior concerns moot. Far from impairing
22 the reliability and resource supply of Arizona's energy
23 system, Ten West will enhance it, with minimal impact
24 to the environment of the state.

25 The map on this slide compares the Ten West

1 route to the Arizona portion of the DPV2 route, and is
2 identical to side two of your place mats. Also on the
3 place mat is a summary of how Ten West Link addresses
4 the concerns raised about the DPV2 route. Because
5 comparison to DPV2 was one question that Commission
6 Staff and various Commissioners raised during pre-filing
7 meetings regarding this project, we will address it
8 head-on during the testimony in this case.

9 So we've already talked a little off the
10 record about the exhibits. Each Committee Member
11 should have before you an iPad that is being loaned to
12 the Committee Members for use during the hearing. That
13 iPad contains all of the exhibits that will be used
14 during the proceedings, save two that did not exist at
15 the time we filed them, and I will go through those as
16 the testimony progresses.

17 The iPad files, as you know, contain
18 hyperlinks that will allow you to navigate to the long
19 exhibits easily. The iPad also has the virtual tour,
20 Exhibit DCR-8, that will be presented during the
21 hearing and which rests on hover points identical to
22 those that will be used during the aerial tour on
23 Monday.

24 Exhibit DCR-24 is the proposed CEC that we
25 will review at the close of the hearing. As required

1 by the Chairman's procedural order, it contains
2 references to the case numbers from which the
3 conditions were taken verbatim, except for one proposed
4 change that we recommend to Condition 13, which is
5 shown in redline in DCR-24.

6 So what are we going to be doing for the next
7 few weeks. We intend to present witnesses in three
8 different panels. The first witness panel just gives a
9 general introduction to the project, the Applicant, and
10 will present the virtual tour. On that panel, we will
11 have Mr. Ali Amirali, the vice president of Starwood
12 Energy Group, who will provide an overview of the
13 project and the Applicant, an overview of our public
14 outreach efforts, and testimony regarding compliance
15 with statutory notice requirements.

16 We will then hear from Mr. Lowell Rogers, the
17 president of Oak Strategic, who will provide the
18 virtual tour in this case.

19 Our second panel will be with reference to
20 the technical aspects of the project. Here we will
21 begin with Ms. Judy Chang, a principal at The Brattle
22 Group, who will present a technical and economic
23 analysis that focuses on a report prepared by The
24 Brattle Group about the need for the project and its
25 reliability and other benefits. That report is

1 contained in Exhibit DCR-14.

2 Next on the technical panel you will hear
3 from Mr. Ali Amirali, again, vice president of Starwood
4 Energy, who will talk about additional system benefits
5 resulting from Ten West Link, and who will elaborate
6 regarding how Ten West Link differs from DPV2.

7 Finally, on the technical panel, we will
8 again hear from Mr. Rogers, who will discuss the
9 infrastructure and facilities that are intended to be
10 used during the project.

11 Finally, we will close with an environmental
12 panel. That will be begun by Mr. Rogers, again, who
13 will talk about the NEPA process that the project
14 underwent, including the significant stakeholder
15 outreach and BLM consideration of various alternative
16 routes, and how and why the BLM reached its preferred
17 route, which is the route that DCRT proposes as the
18 proposed route in this case.

19 And finally, we will hear from Brian
20 Lindenlaub, who is a principal and vice president at
21 Westland Resources, who will apply the analysis
22 conducted by the BLM to the factors required for the
23 Committee's consideration under Arizona Revised Statute
24 Section 40-360.06.

25 And with that, we believe that at the close

1 of the proceedings you will conclude that the evidence
2 shows that Ten West Link will meet Arizona's need for
3 an adequate, economical, and reliable supply of power,
4 with minimal impacts to the environment and ecology of
5 the state.

6 And with that, I'd love for you to hear from
7 my witnesses.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Very good, Ms. Grabel. Thank
9 you.

10 Yes, Member Woodall.

11 MEMBER WOODALL: I'm sorry. I neglected to
12 include in my initial disclosure that at the time that
13 the DP -- Palo Verde 2 matter was pending before the
14 Corporation Commission, I was Chairman of the Line
15 Siting Committee at that time. So if anyone feels that
16 that creates any problems, I just wanted to alert you
17 to that.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: All right, thank you.

19 Thank you for your comments.

20 Mr. Arias.

21 MR. ARIAS: Close enough. Arias.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Arias.

23 MR. ARIAS: Yes.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Arias, okay.

25 MR. ARIAS: Thank you, Chairman, Members of

1 the Committee. Antonio Arias on behalf of Utilities
2 Division Staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission.

3 Staff has intervened in this case because of
4 the history of the line and to provide Staff's
5 perspective on the similarities and differences between
6 this proposed project and the CEC for the Devers Palo
7 Verde Line 2 that was denied in ACC Decision 69638, as
8 well as Staff's perspective on the reliability and the
9 economic benefits of the proposed project.

10 Staff has reviewed several regional and local
11 transmission line studies, as well as Decision 69638,
12 in preparing its testimony for this hearing. Staff is
13 providing one witness, Toby Little, who will speak to
14 the reliability and the economic benefits of this
15 proposed project, as well as those similarities and
16 differences between DPV2 and the proposed Ten West
17 line.

18 Thank you.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you, Mr. Arias.

20 All right. Before we begin, I'm going to
21 make, as Chairman's Exhibit 1, the order in the
22 previous case. And I discussed this, I think, at the
23 prehearing conference. It includes the CEC that was
24 issued in Case 130 that granted the -- a CEC was issued
25 approving of that line that follows a different route

1 than the Applicant's. It went to the Corporation
2 Commission, and the Corporation Commission denied it
3 for various reasons.

4 I'm going to very, very -- a perfunctory
5 condensation of that is, A, environmental concerns
6 about the route through the Kofa wilderness area, and
7 number two, that there was not a need for it in
8 Arizona.

9 So I'm going to make this Exhibit 1, and I
10 have copies for everybody, and I encourage you to read
11 it, at least the decision of the Corporation
12 Commission.

13 Now, why do I do that. Because this
14 application is different, it's a different route, times
15 have changed, but I think to have the historical
16 context that in 2007 a project that was in some
17 respects similar to this one was denied, and I just
18 think to make a good record for us and for the
19 Commission -- and this isn't any surprise to the
20 Applicant, because we talked at some length at the
21 prehearing conference -- I think the elephant in the
22 room is, this has to be distinguished from that case,
23 because there's enough similarity between these two
24 projects that, I mean, if it was turned down in 2007,
25 there better be reasons why this is different, or it's

1 going to be turned down at our Committee and it's going
2 to be turned down at the Corporation Commission
3 potentially.

4 So I think, in fairness, and to create that
5 record, I think that it's important that the
6 differences be explained. It's no -- it's obvious
7 because, I mean, the place mat itself goes into the
8 differences, and I know the witnesses and the testimony
9 that I've looked at that's been prefiled certainly goes
10 into that in great detail. So -- but I just think it's
11 good to have the historical perspective and to put this
12 project into some context. So I will make this
13 Chairman's Exhibit 1, and I will pass out copies right
14 now.

15 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If
16 I might make just one comment. It's my recollection
17 that during the course of the Palo Verde Devers 2 case,
18 there was a concern that that line would essentially be
19 a, quote, extension cord to take Arizona-generated
20 power and send it to California.

21 So to the extent that you want to distinguish
22 that case, I think addressing that might be helpful for
23 those, and there are people at the Commission who do
24 remember that case, including one of the advisors,
25 so...

1 MS. GRABEL: Thank you, Chairman, Member
2 Woodall.

3 MEMBER WOODALL: You're welcome.

4 MS. GRABEL: We are well prepared to do
5 so.

6 MEMBER WOODALL: I'm sure you are.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: And I know you are,
8 Ms. Grabel. We did talk about this. This isn't any
9 surprise. I just think our job is to create a good
10 record -- one of our jobs is to create a good record,
11 and obviously, this is something that the Corporation
12 Commission is going to want to see. So I don't believe
13 in surprises, so I just think that's something, you
14 know, you obviously already anticipate is going to be
15 an issue in the case.

16 So with that, do we want to take a
17 five-minute break before we start with the witness
18 panel? Maybe that would be a good thing to do. Let's
19 take a five-minute break, and then we'll resume and
20 start the panel.

21 (Off the record from 1:53 p.m. to 2:09 p.m.)

22 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Are we ready to
23 resume the afternoon session and start with the
24 witnesses?

25 MS. GRABEL: Absolutely. Thank you,

1 Chairman.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: I'll have to swear them in.

3 (Ali Amirali and Lowell Rogers were sworn en
4 masse by the Chairman.)

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you both very much.

6 Ms. Grabel.

7 MS. GRABEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'll
8 begin with Mr. Ali Amirali.

9

10 ALI AMIRALI AND LOWELL ROGERS (PANEL 1),
11 called as witnesses on behalf of the Applicant, having
12 been previously sworn by the Chairman to speak the
13 truth and nothing but the truth, were examined and
14 testified as follows:

15

16

DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MS. GRABEL:

18 Q. So Mr. Amirali, will you please state your
19 name and business address for the record.

20 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Ali Amirali. Address is
21 5 Greenwich Office Park, Greenwich, Connecticut 06831.

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

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) I'm the senior vice
25 president with Starwood Energy Group Global.

1 Q. Thank you. I think I unintentionally demoted
2 you during my opening statements. I'm very sorry about
3 that.

4 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yeah, I was getting afraid
5 that you knew something I didn't.

6 Q. You have before you a book of exhibits. Do
7 you see that?

8 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I do.

9 Q. Will you please look at Exhibit DCR-1, which
10 is the CEC application that was submitted in this
11 matter?

12 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

13 Q. Have you seen this document before?

14 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I have.

15 Q. Was it prepared by you or under your
16 direction and control?

17 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

18 Q. Now, are the statements contained in the CEC
19 application true and correct, to the best of your
20 knowledge?

21 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they are, ma'am.

22 Q. Thank you. Turn, please, if you will, to
23 Exhibit DCR-2, which are maps of the project route that
24 are also on the laminated place mats that the Committee
25 Members have before them.

1 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

2 Q. Were these maps prepared by you or under your
3 direction and control?

4 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they were.

5 Q. And if you turn to Map Number 1, which is the
6 first page of the place mat map -- first of all, are
7 you familiar with the proposed route in this case?

8 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I am.

9 Q. And does this map accurately depict the
10 proposed route and the other items that are contained
11 in its legend?

12 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they do.

13 Q. Thank you. And if you will turn to Map 2,
14 which is the comparison of the proposed route to the
15 DPV2 line.

16 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

17 Q. Have you seen this map before?

18 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I have.

19 Q. What does this map convey?

20 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) That map conveys the
21 proposed project route and the proposed Arizona section
22 of the line for DPV2.

23 Q. And do you believe that this map accurately
24 depicts the portion of the proposed DPV2 route that's
25 conveyed on that map?

1 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it does.

2 Q. And there's verbiage to the right of side
3 two, correct?

4 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yeah, I see it, ma'am.

5 Q. And was that language crafted by you or under
6 your direction and control?

7 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

8 Q. And we'll talk about later in the hearing.
9 If you would please turn to Exhibit DCR-3,
10 which is the testimony summary of Ali Amirali.

11 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

12 Q. Have you seen this document before?

13 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I have.

14 Q. And was it prepared by you or under your
15 direction and control?

16 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

17 Q. And does this summary accurately convey the
18 testimony that you will present to the Committee today?

19 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it does.

20 Q. Thank you. Please turn to Exhibit DCR-4,
21 which is the witness presentation of Ali Amirali on
22 Panel 1.

23 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Please proceed.

24 Q. Have you seen this document before?

25 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I have.

1 Q. Was this presentation prepared by you or
2 under your direction and control?

3 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

4 Q. And is the information contained in this
5 presentation true and correct, to the best of your
6 knowledge?

7 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it is.

8 Q. And do you have any corrections you would
9 like to make to this presentation?

10 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, there are three, if
11 you don't mind.

12 Q. Would you like to do it now, or would you
13 like to do it as you move through your presentation?

14 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) I can do it as I move
15 through my presentation.

16 MS. GRABEL: If that's okay with the Chairman
17 and Committee Members.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: That's fine.

19 MS. GRABEL: Okay, thank you.

20 BY MS. GRABEL:

21 Q. With that, I am going interrupt your
22 presentation a couple of times to lay additional
23 foundation, but please begin your remarks.

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Thank you.

25 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, good

1 afternoon. My name is Ali Amirali, and I'm a senior
2 vice president with Starwood Energy Group Global, Inc.

3 In my current position, I perform a dual
4 responsibility. First of all, I am the general manager
5 for StarTrans, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Starwood
6 Energy Group; and in that role, I manage all operations
7 of Mead-Phoenix and Mead-Adelanto Transmission Lines.
8 These are two regulated assets in the southwest that
9 are owned by Starwood Energy Group. In addition, I
10 also support the origination, development, and
11 acquisition activities associated with the
12 utility-scale power generation, biomass, biofuel,
13 energy transmission, and energy storage projects for
14 our company.

15 I have 30 years of experience in the power
16 and energy sector, with emphasis in transmission and
17 generation development and operations, power marketing
18 and contracts, regulatory compliance, and market
19 design.

20 Prior to joining Starwood Energy Group in
21 2010, I held a variety of key leadership -- technical
22 and leadership positions at Element Power, LS Power,
23 Calpine Corporation, California Independent System
24 Operators, and Pacific Gas & Electric Company. And no,
25 I can attest that I was not responsible for any of the

1 fires over there.

2 During my tenures, I participated in the
3 development and interconnection of more than 5,000
4 megawatts of generation in U.S. and Mexico,
5 approximately a thousand megawatts of transmission
6 line, and have developed and managed several large
7 transmission line projects designed to improve the
8 reliability, reduce congestion, and improve
9 deliverability from thermal and renewable resources.

10 Finally, I have received my bachelor's of
11 science in electrical engineering from Iowa State
12 University, a master's of science in electrical
13 engineering from University of Idaho, master's of
14 engineering and engineering management from University
15 of Colorado, and an MBA from Colorado State University.
16 I also am a licensed professional engineer with the
17 state of California.

18 As Ms. Grabel mentioned, Ten West Link is a
19 125-mile-long, series-compensated 500 kV transmission
20 line connecting the existing high-voltage bus at APS's
21 Delaney Substation that is located in the Tonopah,
22 Arizona to the existing Colorado River Substation owned
23 by Southern California Edison, or SCE. Colorado River
24 Substation is located just west of the town of Blythe
25 in California.

1 The DCRT, an independent transmission
2 developer, is the sponsor for the proposed new
3 transmission infrastructure project. The project was
4 awarded to DCRT by the California Independent System
5 Operator after a competitive solicitation process
6 conducted by the ISO under the FERC 1000 process. The
7 line is expected to be in service in the fourth quarter
8 of 2021.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

10 MEMBER WOODALL: I'm sorry to interrupt your
11 orderly and logical flow. Was Abengoa ever involved in
12 this project? Because I noted a reference to it while
13 delving through the many thousands of pages of the
14 FEIS. And could you explain their role and kind of the
15 history?

16 MR. AMIRALI: Absolutely. Member Woodall,
17 you are absolutely correct. Abengoa, I don't want to
18 butcher the name, but Abengoa Transmission and
19 Infrastructure Group was one of the original partners
20 of the joint venture that is DCRT. As I will explain
21 through my presentation, DCRT is a joint venture that
22 is led by Starwood Energy Group; and at the time of
23 receiving the award, Abengoa was a partner in the joint
24 venture. Abengoa is no longer involved with the
25 project.

1 And the DCRT is still a joint venture between
2 Starwood Energy Group and -- or, Starwood Energy Group,
3 as well as Atlantica Yield. And on Slide -- I believe
4 on Slide 5 you see the structure of the -- the
5 structure of the company.

6 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you very much.

7 MR. AMIRALI: Ms. Grabel, my first correction
8 is a comma that I'm missing -- it's two inverted commas
9 that I'm missing after CAISO, so I got one out of the
10 way.

11 All right. May I proceed, Member Woodall?

12 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes, thank you. Thank you
13 very much.

14 MR. AMIRALI: Thank you.

15 So before I go any further, I would like to
16 take an opportunity to say a little bit about
17 California ISO, their operations and planning
18 practices, and FERC Order 1000 and its impact on the
19 development of long-distance transmission line
20 projects.

21 I apologize for the members of the Committee
22 who are already familiar with California ISO, so please
23 do indulge me as I explain a little bit further.

24 So California ISO is a FERC jurisdictional
25 nonprofit corporation responsible for controlling the

1 operations of the California bulk transmission system.
2 The main goal of this company is to maintain the
3 reliability of the major portion of the California
4 transmission grid, operate and transport accessible
5 wholesale energy -- a wholesale energy power, oversee
6 the comprehensive planning efforts in the state,
7 identify the need for new transmission infrastructure,
8 and provide a nondiscriminatory access to the bulk of
9 the state's wholesale transmission network to all
10 market participants.

11 California legislation created CAISO in 1998
12 as a part of the restructuring of the state's energy
13 markets. As interstate -- transportation of energy
14 falls under the umbrella of interstate commerce laws,
15 FERC regulates California ISO, and it approves their
16 tariffs.

17 It must be remembered that CAISO actually
18 does not own any generation or transmission. It
19 operates -- operates the energy markets, and it is --
20 and in California it is a centralized and organized
21 energy market. CAISO also has operational control over
22 the transmission assets owned by its member entities,
23 and they call them PTOs, or participating transmission
24 owners.

25 ISO also oversees all the planning activities

1 associated with the transmission, transmission lines,
2 and the transmission infrastructure inside the state.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Amirali.

4 MR. AMIRALI: Yes, sir.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's back up to what you
6 said, operational control. CAISO has operational
7 control over the facilities of its members, I think is
8 the way you put it. And I know, from the materials,
9 that California ISO is going to have operational
10 control over that portion of the line that is in
11 Arizona. What does that mean?

12 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, thank you for
13 this question. And I'm glad that you asked so I can --
14 because I was hoping that I was going to address this.

15 So California is a -- first of all,
16 California Independent System Operator -- California is
17 a little bit different than Arizona. In Arizona, each
18 utility owns and operates the transmission
19 infrastructure, as well as has control over the entire
20 -- the network that they own.

21 California is a little bit different. After
22 the formation of the CAISO, it became -- it was
23 important for the state's deregulated energy market
24 that all market participants have a non-discriminative
25 access to the transmission network to facilitate a

1 robust and purely competitive market.

2 With that goal, CAISO was -- California ISO
3 was created, and all of the transmission went under
4 their operational control. And by "operational
5 control," it means that California ISO does not own any
6 assets, but what it does is it allows -- all the
7 capacity is subsumed under the CAISO's umbrella, and
8 CAISO facilitates the interconnection of the generation
9 and the operation of all the generation assets that are
10 connected to that network.

11 California ISO -- California is a network
12 transmission system and -- which is different than a
13 point-to-point transmission system that you see in
14 other states in the west. Please allow me to elaborate
15 a little bit on that.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Oh, I'm going to allow you to
17 elaborate, Mr. Amirali, and we're going to have to come
18 back and dumb it down for me. I'm still trying to get
19 my hands around what operational control means in a
20 very concrete, simple example sense.

21 So please proceed, but I'm sure there's going
22 to be a few follow-up questions.

23 MR. AMIRALI: Mr. Chenal, if you do just bear
24 with me, I'm just taking a slow train to your response.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: You might have to back it up a

1 few times, but that's fine.

2 MR. AMIRALI: So in the other states -- in
3 the other states in the west, if a generation connects
4 to Point A, and they want to transmit energy to Point
5 B, it is basically -- they basically have to acquire
6 what is called a point-to-point transmission service
7 from the member utility.

8 California, you know, that's -- compare that
9 to California, which is a network transmission model.
10 And a network transmission model is pretty much akin to
11 having a canal system, okay? And a canal system is
12 where, you know, you can have injection from Point A
13 and a withdrawal at Point B, and the path that the
14 energy will take is basically based upon the
15 characteristics of the network.

16 California is exactly the same way. Now, in
17 an organized market where -- that is where energy is
18 flowing across the grid owned by multiple utilities,
19 the most efficient way of doing so is by having a
20 central operator that provides all participants who
21 wants to sell to inject into the network, and all the
22 load that wants to acquire to withdraw from that
23 particular network, and manage the network itself.

24 So the CAISO basically manages the network
25 and the flow, and it will be like they are the ones who

1 want to make sure that nothing is -- no lines are
2 overloaded. And if there is any kind of -- any kind of
3 increase or decrease in generation is acquired, they
4 are the ones who manage that.

5 That is, in effect, the operational control.
6 So they don't own it, they just want to -- they just
7 make sure that they allow everybody to flow and not
8 provide anybody -- not discriminate against any
9 supplier or load. It is purely based on the network
10 topography, the prices, and our -- and they manage it
11 in accordance with their FERC-approved tariff.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: That's helpful. I'm going to
13 have a hundred questions for you this hearing.

14 Member Haenichen.

15 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 Would it be fair to say, Mr. Amirali, that
17 when you answer questions from this Committee, and I'm
18 going to ask you some questions, that those answers you
19 give are not binding upon CAISO?

20 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, I can only --
21 I will represent, to the best of my ability, the
22 operations of the CAISO as, one, a former employee of
23 the corporation, and as a market participant. But they
24 are -- you know, I cannot speak on behalf of the ISO.

25 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Well, I have to say that

1 I'm surprised and very disappointed that there isn't a
2 representative of CAISO at this hearing. Because I'm
3 going to ask a lot of questions about the direction of
4 flow on this line over time. Is it all going to go in
5 one direction? And if not, what are the percentages?
6 Because it looks to me as though this line is nothing
7 but a direct line from Tonopah to California. Would
8 you say that's a fair assessment?

9 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, I would say
10 that is not an accurate statement.

11 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Then would you correct me,
12 please.

13 MR. AMIRALI: It will be my pleasure, sir.
14 Member Haenichen, what you described was the situation
15 that was -- that was examined as a part of the DPV2
16 line process in 2006, 2007 time frame. Since then, the
17 world has changed quite a bit.

18 First of all, this is purely a bidirectional
19 regional asset that will provide value to both Arizona
20 and California. Because of the changing business --
21 because of the changing environment, California, even
22 though it may be a net importer of energy, just because
23 of its share size, today the direction of flow on
24 transmission lines connecting the two states changes --
25 could change multiple times during the day each day, as

1 well as seasonally.

2 The two regions share resources in order to
3 effectively serve the electric load, and the line
4 provides for a more efficient sharing of the resources.
5 If you don't mind, I would like to elaborate with an
6 example.

7 Each -- there are -- western-controlled grid
8 is broken down into several areas called balancing --
9 balancing area authorities, or BAs or BAAs, depends
10 upon which nerd you talk to. Each balancing authority,
11 according to the WECC, or Western Electric Coordinating
12 Council, requirements, has the responsibility to
13 maintain the reliability, as well as the -- adequacy
14 and reliability of that particular network.

15 That means that, one, it has to carry
16 adequate energy at all times to satisfy its load, and
17 it has to be balanced on a four-second basis. That's
18 why, you know, that's -- electric energy is unlike any
19 other resource where you have to have a perfect balance
20 at every given instance between supply and demand.
21 That's the -- you know, that's the supply adequacy
22 part.

23 The reliability aspect is associated with
24 having adequate reserve. I'm only talking about the
25 supply side at this time, and I'll come to your answer.

1 The reliability aspect of the business is related to
2 having adequate reserve to sustain the most severe
3 single contingency, and to make sure that the -- and
4 that the system, the balancing area, comes to a new;
5 stable point following a disturbance, and it should be
6 able to withstand all single contingencies.

7 Having a robust transmission network between
8 states or between balancing areas -- California ISO is
9 its own balancing authority area, APS is its own
10 balancing area authority. Both of these independently
11 are required to carry the reserves that are required by
12 WECC, and that level is also prescribed.

13 In the absence of that robust network, each
14 resource will be carrying that reserve independently.
15 A robust transmission network between balancing areas
16 allows the two regions to, one, share resources, and to
17 make sure that the most efficient resources in between
18 the two regions is running so that each region can
19 serve its load in the most cost-effective manner.

20 Today that -- this line will further
21 facilitate and improve the transmission network between
22 Arizona and California, and will allow the two regions
23 to store their load effectively. It will also reduce
24 system losses. It will facilitate the development and
25 interconnection of new resources. But more so than

1 that, as you know, the renewable resources -- and if I
2 read it correctly today, APS just announced its target
3 of going 100 percent carbon free. That means that
4 there will be more intermittent resources that will be
5 required to achieve these targets for both states.

6 This line -- by allowing the sharing of
7 resources, one, this line will allow for each region to
8 utilize the diversity -- diversity of resources, as
9 well as it will allow the integration of intermittent
10 resources in the most efficient of manners.

11 So I would strongly disagree with the fact
12 that it is a -- it is an extension cord to California.
13 That statement no longer is correct. And you will
14 further see it during the testimony of Ms. Judy Chang,
15 and she could address a lot of this, because her and
16 her team performed a lot of studies during the -- a lot
17 of studies that identified the flow of -- flow of
18 energy between the two regions, and the economic
19 benefits that Arizona will receive from this line.

20 Finally, the line will significantly improve
21 the reliability between the two states. It is like,
22 think of it as having -- adding a new lane to an
23 existing highway that under several operating
24 conditions is running full. If you add a new -- if you
25 add a new lane, it will reduce the flow of traffic and

1 make the traffic move faster. And I will further
2 address that in my -- in my testimony on Panel
3 Number 2.

4 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Okay. We've established,
5 then, that in the absence of a representative of CAISO,
6 that we can't determine what their intent is on how to
7 dispatch energy across that line. And wouldn't it be
8 possible that they could see that the flow was
9 primarily from east to west?

10 MS. GRABEL: Chairman Chenal, Member
11 Haenichen, we actually are expecting the CAISO to send
12 through a letter or perhaps by telephonic participation
13 a representative to speak to some of these issues. We
14 do respectfully believe DCRT as the Applicant is well
15 positioned to answer your questions. But if you'd
16 rather hear from the CAISO, we will do what we can to
17 make a person available.

18 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Well, they may be well
19 positioned to answer them, but it's not binding upon
20 the state of California. So a letter isn't going to do
21 it, because it's a one-way correspondence. So I really
22 have to be able to talk to somebody from CAISO.

23 MS. GRABEL: We understand. Thank you.

24 MEMBER HAENICHEN: I'm real surprised that
25 there isn't a representative here, seeing as how

1 important this is to the state of California.

2 Okay, back to you, sir.

3 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, actually, the
4 CAISO cannot do that. This is an alternating current
5 line, and the alternating current line is not like a --
6 it is not like a faucet with spigots on both sides.
7 You cannot control what direction the power flows.

8 The power flows actually -- it's -- western
9 interconnect is truly an interconnected network, and
10 the energy flow -- directions of the energy flows are
11 purely based upon the schedules that each entity
12 prescribes on both ends.

13 Finally, CAISO does not -- not only does
14 CAISO not own any generation, they don't own -- they
15 don't take position on any flows or any energy
16 transactions as well.

17 So for example, if APS wants to -- is buying
18 energy from California at the time that the prices in
19 California are, like, negative, okay, all APS does is
20 schedules the energy -- and I will use Palo Verde bus
21 because it's the -- Palo Verde hub, as it is the
22 eastern terminus in the connection with APS. All they
23 have to do is schedule energy buy or energy procurement
24 at Delaney bus, and they can buy it from CAISO. And in
25 that situation, during the times when the prices are

1 low or prices are negative in California, APS actually
2 gets paid to take that energy.

3 APS is -- APS is currently participating in
4 the EIM market, and all of the -- APS, SRP, and TEP
5 have already provided -- have already documented the
6 benefits of participating in the EIM market. SRP is
7 expected to start participating in the middle of 2020
8 in the EIM market, and TEP is expected to start their
9 participation in 2022.

10 All of them -- all of these entities are
11 extremely excited by the -- by the upcoming EDAM market
12 or the ahead market that is going to be established
13 between the two regions. So Arizona is actively
14 procuring energy from California today. This line will
15 facilitate further the -- will allow Arizona to procure
16 it in a much more cost-effective manner, because it
17 reduces the congestion between the two regions.

18 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Would it be fair to say
19 that the generation capacity, including allowances for
20 the margin of safety they have to maintain on the
21 system, is such that there is not a large amount of
22 excess capacity in Arizona right now, and that should
23 this line be built, additional generation would have to
24 be built in the state of Arizona?

25 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, at this time,

1 Arizona has not indicated any capacity deficiency in
2 their advanced planning process.

3 MEMBER HAENICHEN: But how about excess? Do
4 they have -- how is California going to be assured that
5 there will be energy to put onto this line going from
6 east to west? Have they talked to people who will
7 build new generation here?

8 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, as Ms. Grabel
9 already alluded to, DCRT already has requests for over
10 4,000 megawatts of project that are proposing to
11 interconnect to this line right now.

12 MEMBER HAENICHEN: And where are those
13 requests coming from?

14 MR. AMIRALI: Those requests are from solar
15 and -- solar and solar plus storage projects that are
16 proposing to locate in Arizona. In addition to that,
17 there is approximately 900 megawatts of active request
18 right at Delaney Substation.

19 As you know, California has a goal of
20 becoming 100 percent carbon -- serving its load with
21 using 100 percent carbon-free resources by 2045. This
22 line will help facilitate that goal as well. That
23 is -- there's not an energy shortage in the west right
24 now. This line will help facilitate the development,
25 regional development of new renewable resources and

1 help an efficient interconnection of those resources as
2 well.

3 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Now, I've estimated that
4 this line is capable of about 1500 megawatts. Is that
5 correct?

6 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, we are in the
7 process of going through our WECC path rating process.
8 So the current carrying capacity or the power transfer
9 capacity of the line is approximately 3200 megawatts.

10 MEMBER HAENICHEN: 3200?

11 MR. AMIRALI: 3200 megawatts. Our limiting
12 factor is our series compensation station.

13 Member Haenichen, you are pretty much taking
14 away all my thunder. I was actually getting excited
15 about talking about the technical characteristics of
16 the line, but that's okay.

17 It's -- our series compensation station is
18 our limiting factor, so 2700 megawatts is the limiting
19 capability of the line. The WECC path rating process
20 will assign the simultaneous rating for the line, and
21 we will know -- and we are in the midst of that
22 process, and the process is expected to end towards the
23 end of this year.

24 MEMBER HAENICHEN: We will not know that
25 during this hearing, then.

1 MR. AMIRALI: No. But if you want, I can
2 talk to my expert as to what his studies are saying,
3 sir.

4 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Ms. Grabel, of these
5 tremendous number of people who are -- want to connect
6 to this line, what percentage of those so-called
7 applicants are in Arizona -- I mean, are representing
8 facilities to be built in Arizona vis-a-vis built in
9 California?

10 MS. GRABEL: Chairman Chenal, Member
11 Haenichen, I believe that Mr. Amirali is in the best
12 position to answer that question. My understanding is
13 that they're all located in Arizona, with 900 megawatts
14 specifically connecting to Delaney.

15 I do think, however, we have a large amount
16 of testimony related to this subject ready to be given
17 to you during the second panel. And just for the
18 efficiency of the hearing, it might be best to kind of
19 go back, do an overview of the project, and deep dive
20 into the technical studies when we have our expert,
21 along with Mr. Amirali, who can take these questions.
22 Because I know they're important questions, and I
23 absolutely agree we need to get them answered.

24 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Well, another one of my
25 questions is going to be: Why not build those

1 generation facilities in California, including solar?
2 Southern California, in the desert part, has a very
3 similar resource to what we have in Arizona.

4 MS. GRABEL: We will certainly get those
5 questions answered. I would ask you to think, isn't it
6 nice to have them built in Arizona to get the economic
7 benefits that are associated with those projects?

8 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Along with the
9 environmental and other non-benefits. So it's not all
10 beneficial, as was pointed out by the Commission in
11 2006.

12 MS. GRABEL: We will be prepared to address
13 that, sir, in the second panel.

14 MEMBER HAENICHEN: I certainly hope so.

15 MS. GRABEL: Thank you.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Hamway.

17 MEMBER HAMWAY: Compared to Jack, my
18 questions are quite simple. Are there other CAISO
19 lines under operation in Arizona or other states? I
20 mean, do you have this relationship with other states,
21 and are there other transmission lines in Arizona that
22 are in this same model?

23 MS. GRABEL: Member Hamway, as I indicated
24 during my opening statement, yes. But I would like
25 that to be in evidence, so I'll let Mr. Amirali answer

1 the question.

2 MR. AMIRALI: Member Hamway, absolutely.
3 California ISO has got transmission lines
4 interconnecting to pretty much all of its member -- all
5 of its neighboring states. The transmission lines in
6 the -- I'll just address the west -- the southwest
7 right now.

8 The CAISO boundary extends into Nevada, in
9 southern Nevada, Mead -- the key substations over there
10 are Mead, Marketplace, El Dorado. In Arizona, they go
11 all the way to Westwing. In fact, when I mentioned
12 Mead-Phoenix and Mead-Adelanto project, we are already
13 an owner of the transmission lines, which we own in
14 partnership with APS and SRP, as well as WAPA.

15 Our capacity is in the CAISO under CAISO's
16 operating control on those lines. California ISO also
17 has transmission lines all the way going into Four
18 Corners in New Mexico, California ISO in Arizona
19 directly at the Palo Verde hub. They have transmission
20 lines -- CAISO boundary or the balancing area boundary
21 for CAISO extends to almost the Palo Verde and
22 Hassayampa hub, and they have lines into North Gila
23 Point as well.

24 So these lines already exist between -- this
25 interconnection between California and Arizona already

1 exists. The Ten West Link is further enhancing the
2 interconnection between the two -- between the two
3 states.

4 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay, thank you.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

6 MEMBER WOODALL: Mr. Amirali, I know
7 Ms. Grabel is going to mark as an exhibit a letter we
8 received from 174 Power Global dated January 16th and
9 signed by Henry Yun, and in that letter they indicate
10 that, quote, "We have filed a large generator
11 interconnection request to connect our proposed
12 generation facility to the proposed Ten West Link
13 500 kV transmission line project."

14 My question to you is: Right now, does DCRT
15 have an interconnection queue? And if you could
16 explain what "queue" means, that would be helpful. And
17 if you could explain how one could find it or how one
18 could get a copy of it, or perhaps that might be happy
19 news as well.

20 MR. AMIRALI: Okay. Member Woodall, let's
21 start with the generation interconnection queue. As I
22 had indicated -- as I had started to indicate in the
23 roles of California Independent System Operator, they
24 provide non-discriminative access to all participants
25 to the transmission network.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: So any project that wanted
2 to interconnect to your line would have had to have
3 filed an interconnection request with CAISO; is that
4 correct?

5 MR. AMIRALI: That is correct, Member
6 Woodall.

7 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay. It might be
8 helpful -- I'm assuming CAISO has a queue, and by
9 "queue" I mean a list of generation projects that want
10 to connect to the transmission system. And it might be
11 helpful to some of our members if we could get an
12 identification of which projects want to connect to
13 this proposed line.

14 Because typically, the queue Excel
15 spreadsheet talks about from where to where, et cetera,
16 et cetera. And it may have other useful information; I
17 haven't looked at them in a long time. But I believe
18 that is readily accessible, and it might be helpful to
19 some of our Committee Members if they could see that.

20 And I'm not suggesting you do that this
21 instant. I'm just saying if there continue to be
22 questions about generator interconnection, that might
23 be helpful. Is that something you think is a doable
24 thing? And I'm looking at both you and your counsel,
25 because I don't know if technically it's possible for

1 you to get that.

2 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, we can
3 definitely provide a list of the project proposing to
4 connect. The amount of information that we can share
5 is limited, because it is -- certain aspects of the
6 information are confidential.

7 MEMBER WOODALL: Of course.

8 MR. AMIRALI: But we can definitely share the
9 megawatts of the projects and the number of active
10 requests we have.

11 MEMBER WOODALL: And is there going to be
12 something about the general location of the facility
13 that's making the request? And I don't mean the street
14 address.

15 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, I will have to
16 check with the ISO on how much I can share. It
17 typically says point of interconnection, and it
18 provides a node, okay, as our transmission -- as our
19 transmission line, it's in the middle of the -- so you
20 can't tell whether it will be, you know, 10 miles from
21 Delaney Substation or 30 miles. It will just say,
22 interconnection to Ten West Link project.

23 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay. But at least you can
24 get us a list of projects and the number of megawatts
25 that want to be connected; is that correct?

1 MR. AMIRALI: Absolutely.

2 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay. That -- personally, I
3 haven't looked at one in a long time; it might be
4 helpful.

5 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Mr. Chairman.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Haenichen.

7 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Adding to what Ms. Woodall
8 just said, we need to have information on each of these
9 proposed generation projects as to what type of
10 generation is it. If it's -- is it a thermal plant?
11 Is it a solar thermal, thermal or nonthermal,
12 conventional thermal? That type of information is very
13 important to me for -- if I'm going to make an
14 intelligent vote on this project.

15 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, I can see
16 it -- I can state it right now. All of these projects
17 are solar plus storage projects. But the list we will
18 provide will have technology identified in it.

19 MEMBER HAENICHEN: But what type of solar is
20 it? Is it PV or is it solar thermal?

21 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, they all are
22 solar PV projects, solar photovoltaic.

23 MEMBER HAENICHEN: I know what phot- -- PV
24 is, yeah. Are these tracking projects or fixed, single
25 or double-access tracking?

1 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, I have to
2 check with the -- check with the developers about how
3 much information I can share, because, you know, a lot
4 of developers do not want to share their secret sauce
5 or their project-related information. And, you know,
6 the developers are free to share. But what I can share
7 is the project interconnection, what is the status of
8 their interconnection request, the expected COD, or
9 commercial operation date, the technology, and the
10 magni- -- and the size.

11 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Well, that's going to make
12 the vote very difficult.

13 MS. GRABEL: Member Haenichen, is your
14 interest whether or not the interconnecting project
15 would itself have to come before the Committee for a
16 CEC, or is it unrelated to that?

17 MEMBER HAENICHEN: No, no. I just want to
18 know how the generation is done and what the output is,
19 a serious technical discussion on the generation
20 proposed.

21 MEMBER WOODALL: May I ask one question?

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

23 MEMBER WOODALL: Mr. Amirali, are you
24 connected with any project developer? By "you," I mean
25 DCRT.

1 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, no, we are not.

2 MEMBER WOODALL: So you don't have any
3 subsidiaries, associated entities that have solar
4 projects that will connect to this line?

5 MR. AMIRALI: Not at this time, Member
6 Woodall.

7 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay, thank you.

8 MR. AMIRALI: But -- and just to elaborate,
9 DCRT, as a transmission entity, will not have -- will
10 be subject to FERC jurisdiction, and as such, we will
11 not have any kind of direct relationships with any
12 solar facilities, even if it wants to connect to it.

13 So -- and we will be subject to all of the
14 same regulation that a utility that owns a generation
15 site. It is no different than APS generation having to
16 make a request to APS transmission sites should they
17 want to connect to that line.

18 MEMBER WOODALL: And one more question. When
19 CAISO evaluates the project in its interconnection
20 queue, does it have to evaluate them in accordance with
21 FERC requirements for an open access transmission
22 tariff, meaning they can't discriminate and say, oh,
23 no, we cannot connect your project because you're in
24 this county, and we don't like this county or we don't
25 like this number? Does CAISO have the ability to do

1 that under FERC regulations?

2 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, the California
3 ISO -- the California ISO has a FERC file and
4 FERC-approved large generator interconnection process.
5 They manage an interconnection queue that is based upon
6 very prescribed rules, and they do -- and ISO does not
7 discriminate against any generator owner irrespective
8 of their ownership or on the -- of the location. It is
9 purely based upon the rules specified by -- agreed
10 upon -- approved by FERC.

11 MEMBER WOODALL: So if CAISO had solar
12 projects in California that were proposing to
13 interconnect to this line, and they wanted to sell it
14 to Arizona customers, CAISO could not say, oh, no, we
15 can't let you do that. We can't let you interconnect,
16 because you're selling that energy to Arizona?

17 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, that's
18 absolutely correct.

19 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay. I thought it was, but
20 I'd rather have someone who has some expertise. Thank
21 you.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. You're giving us a
23 project summary, right, the 20,000-foot level?

24 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, right now I
25 don't even know where I was.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: You mentioned the word
2 "operational control," and I think it just -- it went
3 haywire from there.

4 MS. GRABEL: Mr. Amirali, I think you could
5 jump to the -- oh, I'm sorry, Chairman.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: No, no, seriously, I --
7 Let's resume with your testimony. I'm going
8 to reserve some additional questions I have when you
9 get to the technical aspects, but I just kind of want
10 to give you a heads up that I will have some. And I
11 want to know more about how the power is purchased and
12 who decides the flow going east versus west and just
13 kind of how that all works. And we can talk about that
14 later; this is a summary. But I'd just like to hear
15 more about that, have better education on that.

16 But why don't we go back to your project
17 summary and where you left off. I think operational
18 control is where you left off.

19 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, I'm a nerd,
20 so -- and when you say you have technical questions, I
21 start to drool, so I'll try not to slip over it now.

22 I was also going to address, just to give a
23 very brief overview of FERC Order 1000 and the
24 competitive solicitation process that it -- that is
25 associated with it.

1 So prior to 2010, all -- the construction and
2 development of all long-distance transmission was the
3 sole privy of the incumbent utilities in whose service
4 area their transmission line was supposed to reside in.

5 In 2010, with an aim to introduce -- with an
6 aim to incentivize competition in the long-distance
7 transmission arena, the FERC issued an order called
8 FERC Order 1000. This order accomplished the goal of
9 incentivizing new developers to enter into the
10 long-distance transmission, development, and ownership
11 arena by removing barriers to entry for nonincumbent
12 transmission owners like DCRT, and TransCanyon is one
13 of the non- -- you know, one of the independent
14 transmission developers as well.

15 The California Independent System Operator
16 implemented the FERC regulations associated with Order
17 1000, and now all long-distance and large transmission
18 projects that fall under specific categories in
19 California are put out to bid by California ISO to all
20 qualified developers. And the California ISO selects
21 the bids based upon the predetermined qualifications
22 and the specifications for the project.

23 So Ten West was awarded to DCRT following
24 such a competitive, open solicitation conducted by
25 CAISO in 2014, '14. So that is -- and I'll be

1 mentioning FERC 1000 and competitive process. I
2 thought that I can give a little bit of a background,
3 background for that.

4 Going back to the project summary, from a
5 permitting and licensing point of view, in addition to
6 the CEC, DCRT will also obtain a Certificate of Public
7 Convenience and Necessity, or CPCN, from the California
8 Public Utilities Commission, sometimes we refer to it
9 as CPUC. The project has completed the NEPA process;
10 BLM was the lead agency for that process for us.

11 In addition to the variety of economic,
12 reliability, operational flexibility, and public
13 policy, you know, public policy benefits, Ten West
14 offers a variety of economic development opportunities
15 in Arizona as well. With this presentation, and those
16 provided by my colleague, Mr. Lowell Rogers, and our
17 expert, Ms. Judy Chang from The Brattle Group, we will
18 demonstrate that the Ten West Link will provide
19 economic -- economic, adequate, and reliable supply for
20 power to Arizona.

21 I was going to say, even my clicker fell
22 asleep.

23 As Ms. Grabel had indicated in her opening
24 statement that during the 2013, 2014 transmission
25 planning process, the California ISO identified

1 significant economic benefits associated with the
2 establishment of a 500 kV transmission connection
3 between the buses at existing Delaney Substation and
4 Colorado River Substation.

5 After receiving an approval from their board,
6 the CAISO issued an RFP under the FERC 1000 process
7 that I just described to invite all qualified bidders
8 or qualified transmission developers to submit a
9 comprehensive bid for developing, constructing, owning,
10 and operating this new transmission line. After a
11 rigorous, competitive process, on July 10th of 2015
12 DCRT, which as I described was a joint venture led by
13 Starwood Energy, was selected as the approved project
14 sponsor for this project.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Amirali, how many
16 participants or how many people were in the running for
17 this project?

18 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, to the best of
19 my -- best of my recollection, there were five
20 proposals that were submitted. But please recall that
21 there were -- each proposal could have been submitted
22 by multiple parties. For example, I do remember that
23 one of the proposals was submitted by a -- which was a
24 joint venture between Berkshire Hathaway, TransCanyon,
25 which is an independent transmission developer, APS,

1 and Southern Cal Edison. Another one was submitted by
2 NextEra, another one by LS Power, to name a few.

3 Moving on, a little bit about Star -- DCRT
4 and its relationship with Starwood Energy Group and a
5 little bit about Starwood Energy's experience in
6 developing -- developing and owning solar -- developing
7 and owning energy infrastructure projects.

8 As I had stated, you know, DCRT is a joint
9 venture of Starwood Energy Group. Starwood Energy is a
10 sister company to Starwood Capital. Most people know
11 us from our -- Starwood Capital from our hospitality
12 industry investments, SPG was one of the companies
13 under Starwood umbrella long time ago. And no, we
14 don't own that and I never got to stay for free in any
15 of those hotels.

16 So we are -- Starwood Energy Group is a
17 private investment company specializing in
18 developing -- deploying capital in energy
19 infrastructure project in North America. We opened our
20 doors in 2007, and that is Starwood Energy. And in the
21 short period of 12 years, we have firmly established
22 ourselves as one of the leaders in our space.

23 We currently own or have owned utility-scale
24 generation projects, both combined cycle as well as
25 peaking generation. At one point, we owned two of the

1 largest biomass energy and interstate projects in North
2 America. We also currently have investments in energy
3 storage, both technology as well as projects. We own
4 almost a gigawatt of wind, still own a significant
5 amount of wind in Texas, and we own regulated
6 transmission lines in the southwest right now.

7 We also have the distinction of being one of
8 the first developers and owners of undersea
9 transmission lines in the U.S. We developed and owned
10 the Hudson, Hudson Power Project, which was a -- which
11 connected PJM to NYPA, and Neptune transmission
12 project, both of them were undersea transmission line
13 projects that went under the Hudson River, and that
14 connected the PJM RTO to LIPA. Both of these were
15 contracted transmission lines which had 20-year
16 contracts with the other entities.

17 Our team is comprised of 24 energy
18 professionals with a diverse background, and that are
19 dedicated to the success of our organization and
20 optimizing the value of our assets.

21 Though my colleague, Mr. Rogers, will give
22 you a lot more details regarding the environmental
23 process associated with Ten West Link, I want to just
24 provide a very quick summary of the environmental
25 process.

1 The environmental activities for the project
2 started in September of 2015, shortly after us
3 receiving the project award. And we filed the
4 right-of-way application after we received a Notice of
5 Intent from the Department of Energy in April of 2016.
6 BLM assumed the responsibility for the lead agency for
7 the NEPA process.

8 Now, since this project is -- also will
9 receive a license from California Public Utilities
10 Commission, a typical process for a project like this
11 will involve a BLM -- completing a BLM or NEPA process,
12 as well as a California Environmental Quality Act
13 process, with the California Public Utilities
14 Commission typically being the lead agency for this
15 project.

16 However, for this particular project, the two
17 agencies came together, BLM and CPUC, and they executed
18 a Memorandum of Understanding. Under that Memorandum
19 of Understanding, the BLM will lead the NEPA process
20 and prepare an EIS that will address all of the CEQA
21 requirements. And the CEQA document, or the EIS, will
22 serve as a document that will satisfy requirements with
23 both of the agencies.

24 Now, the NEPA process for this project has
25 been completed. The Draft Environmental Impact

1 Statement, or DEIS, was issued in 2018. And in that
2 document, the BLM identified the 125-mile proposed
3 project route for the line.

4 The Final Environment Impact Statement, or
5 FEIS, was issued in September of 2019, and the route
6 that was finalized in that document remained almost --
7 remained unchanged between the DEIS and the FEIS. We
8 have already received the Record of Decision for the
9 project, and that was issued in November of 2019.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

11 MEMBER WOODALL: So do you have all the
12 right-of-way you need right now, or are you going to
13 have to acquire it? And I understand BLM has to issue
14 the permits. I'm talking about the private lands that
15 are referenced in your application.

16 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, Mr. Lowell
17 Rogers will get into further details of it, but we are
18 in the right-of-way acquisition process on the private,
19 as well as state land.

20 MEMBER WOODALL: May the force be with you.

21 MR. AMIRALI: Always.

22 So the proposed project route is 125 miles in
23 length, with 103.4 miles in Arizona, the remaining 21.6
24 miles residing in California. Approximately 62.5 miles
25 of the line will parallel the proposed DPV line.

1 Now, based on the BLM requirements of
2 matching the structures, as well as our desire and our
3 conversations with SCE that will allow us to utilize
4 the existing access roads associated with the DPV line,
5 we can minimize both the environmental, as well as the
6 visual impacts of this particular -- of Ten West Link
7 project.

8 Mr. Rogers -- you know, the proposed route
9 has several important characteristics, and instead
10 of -- you know, I have listed them over there, but
11 Mr. Rogers will go through each one of them in
12 significant detail.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

14 MEMBER WOODALL: Mr. Amirali, are you the one
15 that's going to address the proximity of the proposed
16 line with the existing DPV2 line, or is that something
17 Mr. Rogers will do?

18 MR. AMIRALI: Mr. Rogers will get into that.

19 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay, thank you very much.
20 That was an issue, I remember, from before. There was
21 concern, like, what if one tower falls on another
22 tower. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

23 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, that is one of
24 the -- I'm glad that you brought it out. One of the --
25 when DPV2 line was proposed, it was proposed to be

1 built like 18 of those -- 18 towers -- or, 11 or 18
2 towers were -- the line was supposed to span on 11 or
3 18 towers, on the same towers as the existing DPV1
4 line.

5 Under the California ISO requirements, in
6 order to ensure that both lines are not considered a
7 single contingency, we are required to maintain
8 adequate spacing between the lines so as to not count
9 for them to be a credible single contingency.

10 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you. I will have no
11 further questions on the topic.

12 MR. AMIRALI: You have already seen this map,
13 but this is the proposed map of the line. Just to give
14 a little bit of reference, you know, to provide you a
15 little geographic reference, the eastern terminus of
16 the line is Delaney Substation in Tonopah, Arizona.
17 The western substation -- western terminus is Colorado
18 River Substation located in Riverside County,
19 California.

20 It is just -- the Colorado River Substation
21 is just west of the town of Blythe, which is just right
22 there, okay. The reference point, this is the Colorado
23 River, town of Quartzsite is right there. And as
24 Mr. Rogers will point out, that the line drops -- the
25 line avoids all the population centers, as you can see,

1 both Blythe, as well as in Quartzsite. It also will
2 avoid the visitor center, the long-term visitor center
3 in La Paz County here.

4 This is the Kofa Wildlife Refuge, and the
5 line completely avoids the Kofa Wildlife Refuge as
6 well. It parallels the I10, or Interstate 10, in an
7 area that is deemed as the DOE energy corridor. So
8 those are some of the features of the line. As I said,
9 Mr. Rogers will go into much details of this line.

10 See, now I'm starting to drool; technical
11 characteristics. So technically speaking or truly in
12 geek lingo, Ten West Link is a 125-mile-long series
13 compensated 500 kV extra high voltage alternating
14 current three-phase interstate transmission line. Each
15 phase of the line will comprise of three 1,780 kcmil
16 ACSR. And ACSR stands for aluminum conductor steel
17 reinforced conductors.

18 The conductor is called Chukar. And those
19 three conductors will be arranged in what is called a
20 triple bundle triangular configuration. The size of
21 the conductor is akin to having the size of the pipe in
22 a water system. The larger the pipe, more power can
23 flow. You can also increase the flow by putting
24 multiple pipes. That's why we are putting three
25 conductors per phase, to allow for a -- to allow for

1 the line to have a capacity of transferring 3,200
2 megawatts bidirectionally.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Gentles has a question.

4 Okay, sorry.

5 MR. AMIRALI: Now, Ten West Link will have
6 25 percent series compensation located at a series
7 compensation station, and you will see that during the
8 virtual tour where the series compensation station is.
9 And it will be located approximately somewhere in the
10 middle of the line.

11 Now, series compensation station is a fancy
12 way of saying a series capacitor. And a series
13 capacitor is used to control the impedance of the line.
14 The series capacitor is required to match the impedance
15 of the new line, or Ten West Link, to the DPV line.
16 That will allow us to match the flows on both of the
17 lines. In the absence of having a series compensation
18 station, one line could carry more power than the
19 other, and there will be a mismatch of flows on the
20 line that will allow one line to load up faster than
21 the other. This allows for a more balanced flow
22 between the two facilities.

23 So within two months of receiving the project
24 award in July of 2015, DCRT filed a wire-to-wire
25 interconnection application with both of our

1 interconnecting transmission owners, that is APS and
2 Southern California Edison. As a part of this process,
3 both of our interconnection transmission owners have
4 performed extensive analysis and studies to determine,
5 one, the impacts of this -- whether this line will have
6 any impacts on any of the existing transmission
7 network. They also performed studies to determine the
8 facilities required to achieve the physical
9 interconnection of this line to the existing
10 substations. Finally, they will also -- they will also
11 be performing all of the design engineering, as well as
12 the construction activities inside their own
13 substations.

14 Now, first of all, DCRT will pay for all of
15 the activities associated with interconnection of these
16 lines to the existing substations. So APS and APS
17 customers will not be responsible for any costs,
18 neither will Southern Cal Edison or their customers.

19 First of all, the studies performed by the
20 two transmission owners on both terminuses of the line
21 have established that Ten West Link will not have any
22 downstream impacts to the existing transmission
23 network.

24 Now, one of the things I would like to
25 mention here is, as Members of the Committee may know,

1 but I would like to inform anyway, that to manage the
2 flow or to manage the short circuit rating at the
3 existing Hassayampa and Palo Verde Substation, SRP, on
4 behalf of the ANPP members, had installed a line
5 reactor in between the two substations, that's Palo
6 Verde and Hassayampa.

7 Now, even though we are not connecting
8 directly to any of those substations, as an
9 impacting -- as an impacting asset, impacting utility,
10 APS -- SRP requires DCRT to pay for their proportionate
11 share of the existing asset that they have installed.
12 And a study was already performed by DCRT that was
13 approved by SRP on behalf of ANPP, and they had
14 identified a total short circuit contribution
15 associated with Ten West Link on the new reactor and
16 have assigned a proportional cost to the project. And
17 we will be paying that to SRP following the execution
18 of an agreement, and we have already met SRP on this
19 matter.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Amirali, is that part of
21 the interconnection agreement?

22 MR. AMIRALI: No, that is -- it is called an
23 impacted system, impact -- it is an impacted system
24 charge, so as to say. We are waiting for SRP to send
25 us an agreement to execute. It will not be a part of

1 the interconnection agreement, because the
2 interconnection agreement is only signed with the
3 utilities you are making a physical interconnection
4 with.

5 So -- but this will be under an agreement
6 that we will sign with SRP. And we have already
7 established the dollar amount and have already had
8 dialogue with SRP, and we are waiting for them to just
9 send us a -- send us an agreement and an invoice to
10 pay.

11 CHMN. CHENAL: And briefly describe the items
12 that are covered in an interconnection agreement,
13 please.

14 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, it seems like
15 you are looking forward, sir, and I am looking down.

16 So as far as the interconnection, physical
17 interconnection is concerned, at Delaney Substation we
18 will install five new circuit breakers and convert the
19 existing ring-bus configuration at that substation into
20 a much more reliable and robust breaker-and-a-half
21 configuration.

22 The breaker-and-a-half configuration, in
23 addition to being much more superior from reliability
24 point of view, also has the additional benefit of
25 creating new interconnection points that can be used by

1 generation proposing to -- future generation proposing
2 to interconnect to Delaney Substation, and this will
3 help them achieve a much more cost-effective
4 interconnection at that substation. It will also help
5 avoid -- also help minimize the environmental impact.

6 E-generation typically -- generation that
7 wants to build typically would have had to connect
8 directly to the line. And to connect to a 500 kV line,
9 a generator owner is required to build a
10 breaker-and-a-half substation. Those can get a little
11 more expensive. By building a new breaker-and-a-half
12 configuration and making new interconnection points
13 available to the developers, they can come in and
14 connect directly to the Delaney Substation. This will
15 help them reduce their environmental footprint -- the
16 physical footprint of the project.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: Let me ask a couple questions,
18 because you're using a lot of technical terms.

19 MR. AMIRALI: Yes.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Couple points. And I want to
21 come back to what my question to you was, which was:
22 What are the topics that are generally covered in an
23 interconnection agreement? I'm talking about just the
24 topics in the contract itself. I'm talking about the
25 interconnection agreement and the topics that are

1 generally covered in that.

2 But now that you mention the substation and
3 interconnection by one of the generators, where are
4 they able to interconnect to this line, this proposed
5 line? Is it only at the substations, or are there
6 other ways in which a solar -- PV solar plant could
7 interconnect to this line?

8 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, you just
9 mentioned -- you mentioned a little while ago about the
10 proposed project by 174 Energy Global. 174 Energy
11 Global project is proposing to connect in the middle of
12 the line. A typical line of this nature, since it's an
13 AC line, an alternating current line allows for an
14 interconnection at any point across its length, okay.
15 So a project can connect, you know, one, two, three
16 projects can connect in the middle of the line.

17 Since it is an interstate transmission
18 project, 500 kV lines typically require that the
19 connection -- interconnection point established in a
20 manner not to adversely affect the reliability of the
21 line. So all the -- the requirements basically specify
22 that they have to build -- the interconnection
23 substation that the generation owner builds has to
24 match the -- match the configuration so as not to
25 adversely affect the reliability of the existing

1 assets. So as far as the points of interconnection are
2 concerned, they can connect at any point along the
3 length of the line.

4 Having said that, typically a utility -- APS
5 typically does not want them -- want a generator owner
6 to come in and connect just 1 mile outside Delaney
7 Substation. They would not consider -- you know, you
8 don't want -- you want to minimize the number of taps
9 that you want to take out of a 500 kV line. So that is
10 a -- you know, that's just a -- that's just a
11 preference of our -- one of our interconnecting deals.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: But at the interconnection
13 point, the power would have to be stepped up to 500 kV,
14 correct?

15 MR. AMIRALI: That is correct, Chairman
16 Chenal.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. I haven't
18 forgotten about my question about the interconnection
19 agreements, but we'll talk about -- bring that up at
20 some point in your presentation.

21 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, it will be
22 about in one minute.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you.

24 MEMBER WOODALL: Great. Because I'd like to
25 know the difference between, if there is any, between

1 an interconnection for a transmission line or one for a
2 generating project, because I may have become
3 completely befuddled by that.

4 But I wanted to address these remarks to
5 Mr. Arias. Mr. Amirali has made some comments on
6 Page 10 with respect to the more reliable configuration
7 that he's proposed, and I would be interested in
8 getting Staff's thoughts on that representation.

9 No disrespect to you, Mr. Amirali, I'd just
10 like to hear from other -- another witness. So...

11 MR. AMIRALI: None -- none taken, Member
12 Woodall.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: Please proceed, sir.

14 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, at the risk of
15 sounding, you know, a little smart aleck, one is a
16 generation interconnection, the other one is a
17 transmission interconnection.

18 But it is -- so one of the -- one of the key
19 differences is, first of all, generation
20 interconnection agreements by all of the FERC-regulated
21 utilities is typically filed at FERC, and it's quite
22 well prescribed. Transmission interconnections are a
23 new phenomenon and are -- even though the typical
24 format is similar to a generation interconnection, it
25 has some subtle differences regarding -- regarding the

1 ownership of -- you know, where the change of ownership
2 occurs between -- between the interconnecting
3 transmission facility, who will have the physical
4 authority to manage what transmission connection.

5 Another key difference is that, if you
6 recall, that generation -- after the -- around after
7 EPAct 2005 where the network transmission -- FERC
8 addressed the network transmission issues where the
9 generation only pays for the transmission -- only pays
10 for the transmission facility that directly only --
11 only impact their -- only impact their -- are
12 associated with their generation project, transmission
13 owner typically pays for all of the facilities
14 associated with interconnection.

15 MEMBER WOODALL: Are both processes FERC
16 regulated? In other words, is there a pro forma
17 process for transmission line interconnections the way
18 there is for generation projects?

19 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, no.

20 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay.

21 MR. AMIRALI: The generation interconnection
22 process is, as I said, is quite well prescribed, and
23 every utility has -- FERC utility have filed a pro
24 forma agreement, whereas a transmission interconnection
25 process or the wire-to-wire interconnection agreements

1 are developed by individual utilities. And since --
2 they are quite rare and most of them are customized,
3 however, every one of them is filed at FERC.

4 MEMBER WOODALL: Gotcha. And by -- when you
5 mentioned EAct, were you referring to the Energy
6 Policy Act of some year that I've forgotten?

7 MR. AMIRALI: That is correct, ma'am.

8 MEMBER WOODALL: Could you give us the
9 correct --

10 MR. AMIRALI: It's Energy Policy Act of 2005.

11 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you very much.

12 MR. AMIRALI: I'm just showing my age, you
13 know. I keep telling all my -- all the young members
14 of our team that I need -- I used to sit next to Edison
15 in kindergarten, and he stole my pencil there.

16 MEMBER WOODALL: I recently found a stopper
17 for a bottle in my sock drawer, and I have no idea how
18 it got there. So we're both traveling the same road,
19 sir.

20 MR. AMIRALI: Except, Member Woodall, I think
21 I'm aging like milk.

22 So going back to the interconnection, at
23 Delaney Substation we will also install a 136-MVAR
24 shunt reactor. And a shunt reactor is a, you know, is
25 a fancy way of saying a large inductor, which is a

1 voltage-controlled device. And that is typically used
2 to, you know, manage voltage during normal and
3 transient conditions at the substations, and are fairly
4 common for 500 kV projects.

5 At the Colorado River Substation, the
6 interconnection facilities are a little bit smaller.
7 We will install only one new breaker and a 75-MVAR
8 shunt reactor. There will also be -- also be metering
9 and communication equipment installed at both of those
10 -- both of those terminus substations. The important
11 point to note, that all of the interconnection-related
12 activities are going to be -- are going to transpire
13 and be inside the boundaries of the existing
14 substations.

15 We are in the process of negotiating the
16 large -- negotiating a wire-to-wire interconnection
17 agreement with both of our interconnecting transmission
18 owners. We anticipate signing the agreement with APS
19 within the next 60 days.

20 So Chairman Chenal, you had questions
21 regarding interconnection agreements?

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Just generally, what topics
23 are covered in an interconnection -- the
24 interconnection agreements that you anticipate for this
25 project?

1 MR. AMIRALI: Typically -- so an
2 interconnection agreement basically covers all of the
3 facilities that are required to obtain the physical
4 interconnection. As I mentioned, it outlines the
5 change -- the boundary of the change of ownership,
6 metering requirements that are associated with it, the
7 communication requirements of the interconnection
8 utilities, as well as also covers the cost assignment
9 for the -- for the requesting -- requesting
10 transmission owner.

11 Now, typically, a utility only -- typically,
12 utilities only work after they receive a payment from
13 the requesting transmission developer. As the -- you
14 know, as I responded to Member Woodall's question,
15 wire-to-wire interconnection agreements are all
16 customized documents, and APS did not have one ready to
17 go at that time. And in the absence of having an
18 executed document, we can't pay them for the work on
19 our project.

20 So while they worked on developing a
21 document, we signed an advanced funding agreement with
22 APS. And after executing the agreement, we made the
23 payment associated with the engineering design and
24 advanced procurement of long lead time items with them,
25 and we are currently under that -- operating under that

1 advanced funding agreement with APS.

2 As I said, the document is all but ready, the
3 wire-to-wire interconnection agreement is all but
4 ready, and we'll be executing it in the next few
5 months.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: And what's the -- the life
7 anticipated of this agreement? Is there a term
8 associated with this agreement -- with the agreement
9 you anticipate for this project? 10 years, 20, 30, 50?

10 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Woodall -- I'm sorry.
11 I just promoted you, ma'am.

12 Chairman Chenal, typically a transmission
13 asset is 50 years, so most of these agreements are for
14 the duration of -- life of the project.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, Member Woodall.

16 MEMBER WOODALL: Since we're asking for the
17 CAISO queue, does CAISO have a standard form for
18 interconnection applications, or are they all
19 customized? In other words, do they have a specific
20 format so -- that would be blank that we could see for
21 what someone -- what information someone has to put in?

22 I don't know if that would be helpful to the
23 other Committee Members or not. I'm just thinking if
24 we're dredging through CAISO products...

25 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, are you talking

1 about the generation interconnection?

2 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes, I am, sir.

3 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall, they do have
4 that form and we'll be more than happy to provide it.

5 MEMBER WOODALL: I think that might be
6 helpful to some of the Members of the Committee, and it
7 would be helpful to me, to know just exactly what
8 information CAISO wants to know from these projects.
9 Thank you.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Maybe this is the
11 time to take our afternoon break, since we're getting
12 into a new topic.

13 Mr. Arias.

14 MR. ARIAS: Just real quick, Chairman. I
15 just want to make it clear that Staff will go back and
16 prepare testimony to answer Member Woodall's question.

17 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, very good.

18 MEMBER WOODALL: I personally don't need it
19 in writing. I mean, I'm happy to listen to whatever
20 the witness has to say on the stand, so...

21 MR. ARIAS: Okay, yeah, we will do that.

22 Thank you, Chairman.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Let's take a
24 15-minute break, and we'll resume after that. Thank
25 you.

1 (Off the record from 3:37 p.m. to 3:57 p.m.)

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's resume the afternoon
3 session.

4 MS. GRABEL: Thank you, Chairman Chenal.

5 BY MS. GRABEL:

6 Q. Mr. Amirali, I believe you were about to
7 start talking about the project regulatory structure.
8 But before we do so, if you could go back to Slide 6, I
9 believe that there's an error that you omitted to
10 correct on that slide.

11 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am. My eyesight
12 is --

13 Q. It relates to the second bullet.

14 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yeah. On the second
15 bullet, I had -- the error is that instead of Arizona
16 Department of Game and Fish, it's U.S. Fish and
17 Wildlife.

18 Q. Thank you.

19 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) While we are -- while we
20 are on the -- in the correction mode, I would like to
21 request another correction. On the last bullet,
22 instead of loads and imports it should be loads and
23 exports on this slide.

24 Q. And for the record, this slide is Page 11?

25 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Slide Number 11, that is

1 correct.

2 Mr. Chairman, may I start?

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, please.

4 MR. AMIRALI: So from a structural viewpoint,
5 Ten West Link will be a regulated transmission line.
6 DCRT, as I had stated before, will become a
7 participating transmission owner with the California
8 Independent System Operator. And following the
9 completion of the CPCN process with the California
10 Public Utilities Commission, we will also become a
11 utility in the state of California.

12 We will have the same type of a utility like
13 SCE and -- like an SCE or PG&E, however, we won't be
14 serving any retail load. So that will be the
15 distinction between DCRT and the other utilities inside
16 the state.

17 The transmission revenue requirement
18 associated with this project will be established by the
19 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. That is
20 no different than the transmission revenue requirement
21 established for any other transmission owner like APS,
22 TEP in Arizona, or any other utility that's FERC
23 jurisdictional.

24 The CAISO will collect the FERC-approved
25 transmission revenue requirements for Ten West Link

1 from its customers, that's all the loads and exports,
2 and they will do so as a part of its transmission
3 access charge, it is sometimes also referred to as TAC.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: And over what period of time?

5 MR. AMIRALI: DCRT -- Ten West Link will be a
6 50-year asset, and it will be collected over a 50-year
7 period.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: So, I mean, I can guess how it
9 works, but would you just tell me how that works, how
10 that transmission access charge recovers the
11 transmission revenue requirement?

12 MR. AMIRALI: I'll be delighted, Chairman
13 Chenal. So the way the California ISO has worked, all
14 of the member utilities have -- each member utility had
15 a transmission revenue requirement associated with
16 their whole bucket of assets. So Edison, City of
17 Colton, BG&E, SDG&E, all had a different transmission
18 revenue requirement. The way California ISO's TAC work
19 is they took all of these transmission -- the total
20 transmission revenue requirement associated with all of
21 its member entities, put them in a bucket, and it gets
22 peanut buttered across all of the California ISO
23 so-called customers, and the customers' loads and
24 exports pay for that charge.

25 So this charge is -- so let's say that there

1 is an energy transaction that's happening. This charge
2 gets tacked on on top of it. This is a little bit
3 different than what happens in, say, for example, say
4 Arizona. So let's say that an entity wants to move
5 power from the border of Arizona, say, to the border of
6 Nevada, and for the sake of argument, assume that it
7 will -- the power has to go over two different
8 utilities' transmission systems, say SRP and APS for
9 the sake of argument.

10 (Member Gil Villegas, Jr. entered the
11 proceedings.)

12 MR. AMIRALI: The entity transmitting the
13 power will have to buy transmission services from SRP
14 and APS and have two different charges, and they will
15 add them together to the price of energy. By peanut
16 buttering the charge across all of the loads and
17 exports, all of the transactions only pay one charge,
18 and it's almost like a postage stamp rate in the state
19 of California.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Hamway.

21 MEMBER HAMWAY: So you said that DCRT is a --
22 will be a utility in California. What will it be known
23 in Arizona? Why isn't it a utility in Arizona? Is it
24 even a relevant question? It just popped up in my
25 head.

1 MR. AMIRALI: Member Hamway, the only thing I
2 can think of is since California is paying for the
3 line, we have to be a utility in the state of
4 California. Arizona is not paying for any portion of
5 this line.

6 MS. GRABEL: Member Hamway, if I could add to
7 that question. It's just part of the legal structure.
8 In California, once DCRT receives the -- it's called
9 the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, by
10 regulation and rule, it's actually a utility that has
11 all of the rights and entitlements and obligations that
12 any other California utility has.

13 We don't have the same kind of structure here
14 for a private developer. If we're not already a public
15 service corporation that's regulated by the ACC, we
16 don't magically become one just by getting a
17 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility. We are,
18 however, under the statutes, a utility as the statute
19 uses that term in order to determine who must apply for
20 a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility.

21 MEMBER HAMWAY: But don't we still have to do
22 a needs -- what was the acronym that you just used in
23 California? Don't we have that here in Arizona?

24 MS. GRABEL: We do, but you only apply --
25 here it's called a CC&N, a Certificate of Convenience

1 and Necessity.

2 MEMBER HAMWAY: Correct.

3 MS. GRABEL: And you apply for that only if
4 you want to become a public service corporation. And
5 DCRT can't become a public service corporation in
6 Arizona without providing all of the energy services to
7 retail customers. And because we're not a deregulated
8 market right now, we don't have that opportunity.

9 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay. So DCRT will just be
10 known as what to Arizona?

11 MS. GRABEL: It will be the owner of the
12 transmission asset that has the license that allows it
13 to construct the transmission line.

14 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Amirali, I don't know if
16 this is -- maybe this is a good time to kind of get
17 into this; I'm going to leave this up to you. I still
18 would like some explanation of how the energy is
19 controlled -- that's not the best word.

20 Who charges for the energy? Who collects it?
21 Who decides the power, whether it's going east versus
22 west? I guess if I'm the customer, I initiate -- I buy
23 power, and then mysteriously to me, all of a sudden I
24 get a bill for it and I'm allowed to take the power.
25 But who controls that?

1 I think, as you were explaining earlier the
2 role of CAISO, I'm thinking in terms of like air
3 traffic control that doesn't own the airports or the
4 aircraft, but it kind of controls, you know, who takes
5 off, who lands, the order. All that control is like
6 air traffic control, and I'm trying to get a feel, a
7 better feel for how the system works.

8 MR. AMIRALI: Okay. Chairman Chenal, I'm
9 going to try and answer your question. If I get too
10 much into the weeds, please do stop me, okay?

11 So let's start with how a power flow works on
12 an interconnected network. On any interconnected
13 network, power follows the path of the least
14 resistance, that's the physical flow of energy, okay?

15 So power system is -- power system is almost
16 like a living, breathing entity which involves both
17 injection of energy and the withdrawal of energy by the
18 load. And there's a perfect balance of load and
19 resources at all times.

20 Think of a network of, as I had started the
21 analogy, of canals, where there are multiple, multiple
22 injection points or multiple sources of water coming
23 in, and then there are multiple points of withdrawal
24 across the whole network. And assume that the network
25 is completely connected. Some of the ditches or some

1 of the pipes are small, some of them are large, and the
2 amount of flow on each pipe is based upon its diameter,
3 its length, and its distance from the withdrawal and
4 everything.

5 As far as the -- as far as the power system
6 is concerned, it is not that much different than that.
7 So let's say that you and I are getting into an energy
8 transaction, you know, where you have a generation --
9 we have a generation and I have got a load. At the
10 same time, Member Woodall also has a generation and,
11 you know, my colleague, Mr. Rogers, has a load here.

12 We will sign an agreement whereas I will
13 reach out to you and say, you know, my scheduling
14 coordinator -- and all transactions occur through
15 scheduling coordinators, and they are recorded in
16 what's called an e-ticket.

17 So what happens is I will contract with you
18 for, let's say, buying 100 megawatts for one hour, and
19 Member Woodall is selling Mr. Rogers 300 megawatts for
20 two hours or one hour -- let's make it all simple, one
21 hour. You will both increase your generation during
22 that time, okay. You have got a resource, you just,
23 you know, increase your generation during that hour,
24 and Mr. Rogers and I both have a load that went up at
25 the same time because we anticipated it going up.

1 So the system network, the CAISO, is the
2 entity in the middle controlling all the lines. Now,
3 when you bought the generation, injected power, it just
4 flew whatever direction it took based upon the network
5 topography and the different loads. But when it comes
6 time for the billing, you're -- at the point at which
7 you're supposed to increase your generation, the amount
8 of generation you increased will have to match up with
9 the amount of increased load that I had. And that's
10 how our payments will flow; similarly on Mr. Rogers's
11 side.

12 So now let's say, for the sake of argument,
13 Member Woodall's generation was supposed to be 300
14 megawatts, and at that given time for some reason her
15 plant was only able to perform partially and she can
16 only supply 200 megawatts instead of 300 megawatts.
17 That created an imbalance that was made up by somebody
18 else in the system.

19 The CAISO also operates and makes sure that
20 that imbalance is made up, and whoever was the one who
21 supplied that energy gets paid for that energy from
22 Mr. Rogers. So Mr. Rogers will pay, but there was an
23 imbalance that was associated with it. California ISO
24 finds out who the imbalance was and assigns the
25 appropriate price of that imbalance to the proper

1 entity.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, so couple questions.

3 Does CAISO -- is that the system that figures out the
4 charges?

5 MR. AMIRALI: The computer system, the model
6 that they run, the market structure that they have in
7 place determines the price at each node, and it figures
8 out what the associated price was.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: But what if the power is
10 coming from the Arizona balancing authority, like APS,
11 going to CAISO. Who decides, since it has to be in
12 balance, that the charges are sufficient to cover the
13 cost to be paid? Who does the financial transaction
14 there?

15 MR. AMIRALI: The model determines what the
16 price was, and the ISO's -- ISO's -- there's a
17 department of the ISO. Give me one second, sir. The
18 ISO's scheduling department determines whether there
19 was balance or imbalance. And all transactions happen
20 at a particular point. So if it's coming from
21 Arizona -- you determine, actually, where your
22 transaction is going to happen, and that was a part of
23 the e-ticket. The e-ticket says who is going to sell
24 and where the delivery point is going to be.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: And who manages the e-ticket

1 system?

2 MR. AMIRALI: The e-ticket is a WECC and --
3 WECC-mandated system.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: For the western --

5 MR. AMIRALI: For the western U.S, yes.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: -- U.S.? Okay.

7 MR. AMIRALI: So again, everything that is
8 done by the California Independent System Operator is
9 FERC approved, or it's in line with the WECC system.
10 The transactions are -- you know, the transactions are
11 governed by all of the federal regulations.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: And so one of the charges that
13 CAISO will charge the user, the one who ordered the
14 power to be transmitted from another place, one of the
15 charges that will be passed on to the customer is the
16 transmission -- no, excuse me -- the transmission
17 access charge?

18 MR. AMIRALI: The transmission access charge
19 will be one of the charges that will be assigned to the
20 buyer of energy to the load.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: To the buyer, got it. Thank
22 you. That's helpful. Thank you.

23 MR. AMIRALI: My pleasure, Chairman Chenal.

24 So getting back, DCRT will own, maintain, and
25 operate their transmission infrastructure in accordance

1 with the regulatory requirements set forth by FERC.
2 Arizona and California will adhere to the same NAERC
3 operating standards, or the operating standards
4 established by North American Electric Reliability
5 Council, and these are the same standards that are, you
6 know, that Arizona utilities like APS and SRP and WAPA
7 have to follow as well.

8 So now, at the risk of sounding like a broken
9 record, Ten West promises a variety of benefits,
10 including, but not limited to, improving transmission
11 system reliability, operational flexibility,
12 facilitating the development of renewable resources, as
13 well as the delivery from these resources, and
14 integration of intermittent resources into California
15 and Arizona.

16 It will allow the two regions to share
17 resources, thereby reducing the cost of serving
18 electric load in both areas. It will -- and it will
19 enhance the participation or opportunity to participate
20 in the EIM and EDAM.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Question, Mr. Amirali.

22 MR. AMIRALI: Yes, sir.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: The congestion that you speak
24 of, the system -- transmission system congestion, I
25 envision that this is like your example, a highway

1 where there's too many cars and it gets backed up. But
2 the transmission congestion is really the congestion
3 for power that's going to California, is it not? I
4 mean, is there congestion from power coming from
5 California to Arizona at this time in the system -- in
6 the lines that presently exist?

7 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Chenal, may I request
8 that you -- that this question be addressed by our
9 expert, Ms. Judy Chang?

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure.

11 MR. AMIRALI: She has -- she has performed
12 detailed analysis and can address this in much more
13 detail than I can.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure, absolutely.

15 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, Member Haenichen.

17 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Along the same lines, and
18 perhaps Meghan can make note of this, I would like to
19 see data from a recent year, probably 2019 is too
20 recent, say 2018, on all of the high-capacity,
21 high-voltage lines running between California and
22 Arizona. What were the megawatt hours flowing from
23 east to west on each one, and what were the megawatt
24 hours flowing from west to east? That's one question.
25 That will give us a feel for intent.

1 And the next question is: Before considering
2 building -- requesting a permit to build this line, did
3 California study the possibility of not building a line
4 like this, but rather, putting the generation required
5 to fill it up in Southern California out in the middle
6 of the desert somewhere, and saving -- thereby saving
7 the cost of this line and being much closer to loads
8 there?

9 And on the first question that I asked you, I
10 would like that to be in written form and signed by
11 somebody from California.

12 MS. GRABEL: Member Haenichen, so the
13 question about data from recent years regarding the
14 capacity on the high-voltage lines, you'd like that to
15 be in writing and signed by a member of the California
16 ISO?

17 MEMBER HAENICHEN: That's the one, yeah.

18 MS. GRABEL: We will see what we can do.

19 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you.

20 MS. GRABEL: Mr. Amirali, go ahead.

21 MR. AMIRALI: Member Haenichen, would it be
22 okay if I request my colleague to address your last
23 question?

24 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Sure.

25 MR. ROGERS: My name is Lowell Rogers, I'm

1 under oath.

2 As part of the Environmental Impact Statement
3 that the BLM conducted, as Ali pointed out earlier, the
4 FEIS -- or, the EIS was done to also address
5 requirements of the California Environmental Quality
6 Act, CEQA. As part of CEQA, it's required to study
7 what's called a no-wires alternative. Can the need for
8 a project like this be met in another way that is not a
9 transmission line, can generation be constructed, can
10 storage be constructed, so on and so forth. That study
11 is included in the EIS, the technical appendices, under
12 a no-wires alternative, and that was done independent
13 of DCRT. That was done by a consultant of the
14 California Public Utilities Commission, so it's an
15 independent analysis of that option.

16 MEMBER HAENICHEN: And what was the
17 conclusion there?

18 MR. ROGERS: The conclusion was that it could
19 not meet the need, and it was vastly more expensive.

20 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Really? It's more
21 expensive to build a generating plant in California
22 than it is in Arizona?

23 MR. ROGERS: To meet the system needs that
24 Ten West will do, will provide, yes, it was.

25 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Can we see that study?

1 MR. ROGERS: I believe it's in evidence.

2 BY MS. GRABEL:

3 Q. So just to clarify for the record, so
4 Mr. Rogers, you're saying that it is an appendix to the
5 FEIS?

6 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) I believe it's in the
7 technical appendices of the FEIS, yes.

8 MS. GRABEL: Okay. So then that would be in
9 Exhibit DCR-1, Exhibit B2 is the FEIS.

10 MEMBER HAENICHEN: In this book?

11 MS. GRABEL: Yes. So you can look at --
12 find it on your iPad, just Exhibit 1. You can go to
13 Exhibit B2, that's the FEIS, and somewhere in the
14 appendix, and we'll direct you to the right place,
15 we'll find that on a break, will take you to the
16 document that Mr. Rogers is referring to.

17 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, please proceed.

19 Oh, did you have a question, Member Woodall?

20 MEMBER WOODALL: Were you saying Exhibit B to
21 the application?

22 MS. GRABEL: Yes, Exhibit B2 to the CEC
23 application, which is Exhibit DCR-1.

24 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, please proceed.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you. As you know, I
2 printed all this stuff up, so I was just wondering.

3 MR. AMIRALI: So soon after receiving the
4 project award, our team engaged in an extensive and
5 comprehensive outreach process for this project. In
6 Arizona, we partnered with Mr. Stan Barnes and his
7 company Copperstate, and in California we recruited the
8 services of a similar company called Kearns & West.

9 And we wanted them to help us develop a
10 stakeholder outreach plan, identify all the key
11 stakeholders, set up meetings, have public workshops,
12 develop and maintain an up-to-date project website,
13 monitor -- create an e-mail address for the project
14 and an 800 line, and monitor all of the calls and
15 e-mails received and respond to them in a timely
16 manner.

17 Our primary goal with our outreach effort was
18 to inform all stakeholders about the project, listen to
19 and address their concerns, as well as seek important
20 guidance, educate them on the environmental review
21 progress, its status, and inform them as to how they
22 can participate in the BLM process and provide their
23 input, and to keep them abreast of the project status.
24 I'm extremely proud of the extensive stakeholder
25 outreach effort that we engaged in.

1 On the next slide --

2 BY MS. GRABEL:

3 Q. Actually, Mr. Amirali, before you leave this
4 slide, I would like to lay foundation for the exhibit
5 you referenced on this slide.

6 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Go ahead, ma'am, please.

7 Q. Thank you. So on the last bullet on Slide
8 Number -- on your stakeholder outreach efforts slide,
9 you have referenced Exhibit J8. That is Exhibit J8 to
10 the CEC application; is that correct?

11 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) That is correct, ma'am.

12 Q. And the CEC application, again, is Exhibit
13 DCR-1, correct?

14 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) That is correct.

15 Q. Will you please take a look at Exhibit DCR-6,
16 which is a summary of public outreach that was filed in
17 this matter.

18 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

19 Q. Is that document identical to the CEC
20 application, Exhibit J8?

21 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it is.

22 Q. And what information does Exhibit DCR-6
23 convey?

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) It is a summary of all of
25 the outreach activities associated with the project.

1 Q. And was this document prepared by you or
2 under your direction and control?

3 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

4 Q. Is the information it contains true and
5 correct, to the best of your knowledge?

6 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it is.

7 Q. Do you recall whether a summary of the
8 comments received from the public during the BLM
9 process was attached as an appendix to the FEIS in this
10 matter?

11 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

12 Q. And do you remember whether that was
13 contained in Appendix 8 to the FEIS, which is in
14 Exhibit B1 and is current as of September of 2019?

15 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it is.

16 Q. Thank you. Please continue.

17 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) So on the next slide, you
18 see a list of all of the entities that we had an
19 outreach effort -- we engaged in an outreach effort to.
20 I have listed, you know -- these are, you know,
21 agencies, elected officials and their offices, advocacy
22 group, developers, and general public. And we have
23 been in constant communication with them over the past
24 four and a half years of this project during the
25 project development phase. We are committed to

1 maintaining a high level of communication efforts in
2 association with our project.

3 Finally, this is the project timeline. As I
4 stated early on in my presentation, the expected
5 commercial, full commercial operation date for this
6 project is towards the end of 2021. We have already
7 completed the NEPA process and have received a Record
8 of Decision.

9 On the licensing front, we are engaged in a
10 parallel process to receive both CEC, as well as the
11 CPCN from California Public Utilities Commission.

12 Most of the long lead time items associated
13 with the construction of this project have been
14 ordered, and we anticipate the construction activities
15 to begin in Q4, toward the later part of Q4 of 2020,
16 and the commissioning and -- commissioning and testing,
17 along with the full commercial operation, to occur
18 around the end of 2021.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Question: How do you deal,
20 with respect to private land, a recalcitrant landowner
21 who does not want this project going through his or her
22 property? I mean, I know you try to persuade them.
23 But at the end of the day, if you're absolutely at an
24 impasse, what condemnation authority does the Applicant
25 have?

1 MS. GRABEL: Would you care if I address
2 that?

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Yes, Ms. Grabel.

4 MS. GRABEL: As you know, I believe we did
5 request an opinion from the Attorney General as to
6 whether or not we have eminent domain authority, and we
7 were given the advice that we would have eminent domain
8 authority under a certain set of facts that we think we
9 may well be able to meet. And so we do think that
10 we -- as a very last matter of resort, though, I mean,
11 I think the client -- and we'll hear more about this
12 tomorrow -- takes great pride in trying to work with
13 stakeholders, as opposed to condemn them.

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. But you'll go into more
15 detail, then, in testimony in the second panel?

16 MS. GRABEL: Correct, yes. We'll get into
17 that in Panel Number 2.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: All right, thanks.

19 Member Hamway.

20 MEMBER HAMWAY: Would a condemnation be
21 easier if they were deemed a utility?

22 MS. GRABEL: Chairman, Member Hamway, yes, it
23 would be easier.

24 MEMBER HAMWAY: Okay, thanks.

25 MR. AMIRALI: As required -- yeah. Did I go

1 too far?

2 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall, sorry, did you
3 have a question?

4 MEMBER WOODALL: Actually, at some point, I
5 think several Committee Members would like to know the
6 page where that no-wires study was done, so I was going
7 to ask about that ahead of time. I don't need it this
8 instant. But delightful as it is, it's not yielding
9 what I need to do. I'm not saying that my gigantic
10 banker's box full of printed materials would either,
11 but I would like to read it. Thank you.

12 I did have one question, though. So the
13 land -- you've made an application with the State Land
14 Department, Mr. Rogers?

15 MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry. Excuse me?

16 MEMBER WOODALL: You've made an application
17 with the State Land Department for land?

18 MR. ROGERS: Yes, we have. And I'll get into
19 that process.

20 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay, great. Thank you very
21 much.

22 MR. ROGERS: I, too, am having problems
23 searching with the iPad to find that reference, so
24 we'll get that page reference for the no-wires
25 alternative.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: You didn't have to say that
2 just to make me not look bad, but I appreciate it.

3 MR. AMIRALI: Moving on, as required by the
4 statute, DCRT filed an application for Certificate of
5 Environmental Compatibility on December the 9th, 2019.
6 DCRT's CEC application conforms to the statutory
7 requirements Arizona Revised Statute 40-360 through
8 40-360.13, and the Arizona Administrative Code
9 R14-3.201 through R14-3.219. The details of the
10 exhibits are included in the application, and will be
11 covered as a part of the testimony provided by
12 Mr. Brian Lindenlaub of Westland.

13 The procedural order required DCRT to provide
14 a Notice of Hearing that is shown on the slide and will
15 be -- and was docketed by Chairman Chenal on
16 December 13th, 2019.

17 As legally required, the Notice of Hearing
18 was published twice in Arizona Republic by
19 December 23rd, 2019, which is within 10 business days
20 after the CEC application was filed. The Notice was
21 also published in Parker Pioneer as a courtesy to the
22 local jurisdiction. The Notice of Hearing was also
23 posted on our project website, and that website is
24 tenwestlink.com.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: In the application itself,
2 the CEC application, you say the cost of the line,
3 including the portion in California, is expected to be
4 less than 400 many zeros.

5 MR. AMIRALI: Million.

6 MEMBER WOODALL: Million. I think I read in
7 the EIS an estimate for 279 million. So was there some
8 change or did that relate only to the California
9 portion or was there some modification?

10 You look as dumbfounded as I am, so I just
11 wondered. Because I read it in one of the EIS studies,
12 and I compared it to what was in the application, and I
13 thought, well, gee willikers, a hundred million dollars
14 is not loose change.

15 MR. AMIRALI: Chairman Woodall, all I can
16 represent is what the actual cost of the project is
17 going to be.

18 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay.

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Which is how much?

20 MR. AMIRALI: Just slightly shy of
21 400 million. But you can get it for a bargain basement
22 price of slightly less than 400 million.

23 MEMBER WOODALL: And remind me again when the
24 EIS process started, what year.

25 MR. AMIRALI: The environmental process

1 started in September of 2015.

2 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay.

3 MR. AMIRALI: And the cost could have been
4 carried over from the original application.

5 MEMBER WOODALL: That's why I wanted to ask.
6 Okay, thank you.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Gentles.

8 MEMBER GENTLES: I'm looking at map of Notice
9 of Hearing signage locations. Are those signage
10 locations along the I10 corridor? Is that -- I can't
11 tell. Or are those just out in the middle of nowhere?

12 MR. AMIRALI: Member Gentles, would you
13 indulge with me for just one minute. I'm just about
14 getting there. It is very difficult to see -- it is
15 very difficult to see on this picture, but those signs
16 are posted through the entire length of -- there are 11
17 signs posted through the entire length of the project
18 route in Arizona.

19 MEMBER GENTLES: I'll withdraw the question.
20 I should have read ahead. Sorry.

21 MR. AMIRALI: So, you know, on the signage,
22 on the posting of the Notice of Hearing signage, in
23 accordance with Chairman's procedural requirement, at
24 11 locations along the proposed project route that were
25 discussed with Chairman Chenal in the prefiling

1 conference, DCRT posted signage of the Notice of
2 Hearing. That task was completed on December 24th,
3 2019. And here is the picture of the signs that we
4 posted at 11 locations, along with the GPS coordinates.
5 I apologize, the markers of where the signs were posted
6 on the Google map did not show up really well, but
7 hopefully they will show better on your -- on your
8 iPad.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

10 MEMBER WOODALL: So I have a high-profile
11 truck. And if I was hurtling along Interstate 10, what
12 do you think would be the likelihood that these signs
13 would be legible to me hurtling along? Let's say I'm
14 poking along at 40 miles an hour and driving traffic
15 crazy. How did you determine the height and the size
16 of the font, et cetera, to ensure that the motoring
17 public, as we used to say in ADOT, could actually read
18 these?

19 MS. GRABEL: Member Woodall, Mr. Amirali
20 asked me to address this.

21 MEMBER WOODALL: Please.

22 MS. GRABEL: So there is no requirement as to
23 the actual height and length of the signs that we
24 needed. So we looked back at what other utilities had
25 done. We examined Tucson Electric Power signs, we

1 examined Southline signs, and we determined that this
2 was the relative size associated with those signs as
3 well.

4 MEMBER WOODALL: And are those located in the
5 ADOT right-of-way, do you know?

6 MS. GRABEL: I do not know the answer to that
7 question. Mr. Lowell -- Mr. Rogers might know the
8 answer.

9 MR. ROGERS: Lowell Rogers. The signs that
10 are adjacent to I10 are part of the offramp area, the
11 parking area for the rest areas. So any public that
12 was using the rest areas that would have more exposure
13 to the lines would see those signs; that's where
14 they're located.

15 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay. I have long
16 questioned the value and the utility of these sorts of
17 signs. I can see on, for example, a major arterial, a
18 minor arterial, where they might have some practical
19 use, but I'm not going to get into that at this time.
20 I just wanted to know where they were and how anyone
21 could see them. So you're saying all of the signs were
22 near rest areas?

23 MR. ROGERS: No, no. Only the signs that
24 were along I10.

25 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay. And how many rest

1 areas are there?

2 MR. ROGERS: There's two, one on westbound
3 and southbound lanes, that we put on both sides, and
4 those are on the map. The other signs are in -- near a
5 community center, I believe, in Quartzsite, near OHV
6 trails that are used in the area, and along different
7 more minor roads closer to the project.

8 MEMBER WOODALL: Mr. Lowell -- Mr. Rogers, I
9 know you did your best, but I have to question the
10 practical utility of doing this. And I understand
11 there was a procedural order. But I'm just
12 wondering -- and I'm not going to ask you, as an
13 experienced public outreach person, what you think
14 about the practical utility of these either, but I
15 just -- I question their value.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, we discussed these at
17 the prefiling conference, and so these were put after
18 discussion on the record. And, you know, that's --
19 they've complied with what I thought, and after we
20 discussed what we thought was appropriate. As far as
21 signs can give notice, we thought this was appropriate.

22 MR. AMIRALI: Also, as required by the
23 statute, DCRT provided, via certified mail, a Notice of
24 Service to the affected jurisdiction listed on the
25 slide. This Notice was sent by December 17th of 2019.

1 Copies of the CEC application were provided
2 to the Arizona Corporation Commission docket control
3 center, Phoenix office, located on 1200 West Washington
4 Street, Suite 108, Phoenix, Arizona. It was also
5 hand-delivered to Chairman Chenal's Attorney General
6 Office on 15 South 15th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. It
7 was sent to the -- was sent to the Chairman Chenal's
8 Attorney General's Office on the same address and
9 hand-delivered as well, and --

10 BY MS. GRABEL:

11 Q. Mr. Amirali, if I can stop you for a moment,
12 I would like to lay foundation at this time for Exhibit
13 DCR-5, which essentially repeats, in hard copy form or
14 in exhibit form, what you've just put on the slide. So
15 if you could please turn to Exhibit DCR-5, and DCR-5
16 has Subparts A through H.

17 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

18 Q. Have you seen the documents in DCR-5A through
19 H before?

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

21 Q. And can you please describe generally what
22 they are?

23 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) They are the notice of
24 hearings for the project.

25 Q. Okay. As well as other compliance items,

1 correct? If you could flip through A through H and
2 just, for the record, tell me what's in each of those
3 exhibits.

4 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) 5B is the affidavit for
5 publications and tear sheets. 5C is map of Notice of
6 Hearing of sign locations. 5D is photographs and
7 coordinates of sign placements. 5E is the example of
8 the sign content. 5F is Notice of Service to affected
9 jurisdictions. And 5G is return receipt for the
10 affected jurisdictions. And finally, 5H is the letter
11 to the libraries.

12 Q. Thank you. And were these documents compiled
13 by you or under your direction and control?

14 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they were.

15 Q. And are the contents of Exhibit DCR-5,
16 Subparts A through H, true and correct, to the best of
17 your knowledge?

18 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they are, ma'am.

19 Q. Thank you. Please continue.

20 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) To familiarize the members
21 of the Line Siting Committee with the Arizona section
22 of the proposed project route, on January 27th DCRT
23 will be conducting a tour of the 103 miles of the
24 proposed project route from Delaney Substation to the
25 Arizona border at Colorado River.

1 Given the extensive length of the line and
2 the challenging terrain, especially through the Copper
3 Bottom Canyon, DCRT will be conducting this tour via
4 aerial -- this tour via helicopter. The aerial tour
5 is -- we felt that the aerial tour is both efficient,
6 as well as cost effective.

7 Q. Thank you. Would you please take a look at
8 Exhibit DCR-9?

9 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

10 Q. Have you seen this document before?

11 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I have, ma'am.

12 Q. Could you please generally describe what's
13 contained in Exhibit DCR-9?

14 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yeah. This exhibit
15 describes the details associated with the line route
16 tour, including procedures, protocols, and the script
17 that will be read during the flight.

18 Q. Does it also give the schedule that the
19 Committee Members are going to be following during the
20 tour?

21 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it would.

22 Q. And does it also attach examples of the
23 structures that will be pointed out during the tour?

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it does.

25 Q. Thank you. Was this document prepared by you

1 or under your direction and control?

2 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

3 Q. Are the contents of DCR-9 true and correct,
4 to the best of your knowledge?

5 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they are, ma'am.

6 Q. Thank you. Do you have any further comments?

7 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) No. And this concludes the
8 formal portion of my presentation.

9 Q. I do have a couple of more exhibits I need to
10 lay foundation for, unless the Committee would like to
11 ask some questions first.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: No, please proceed.

13 MS. GRABEL: Okay, thank you.

14 BY MS. GRABEL:

15 Q. Before you conclude, if you could please turn
16 to Exhibit DCR-7, which are a series of letters of
17 support that the project has received to date in this
18 proceeding.

19 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

20 Q. And DCR-7 is also in several subparts. I
21 believe we have DCR-7A, 7B, and 7C; is that correct?

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

23 Q. Can you please describe what is in DCR-7A?

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) DCR-7A is the letter of
25 support received from La Paz County for the proposed

1 project route.

2 Q. Thank you. And what is in Exhibit DCR-7B?

3 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) DCR-7B is also a letter of
4 support from La Paz County on the overall project.

5 Q. Does it express support for the project in
6 DCR-B -- 7B, I mean?

7 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it does, ma'am.

8 Q. And what is contained in Exhibit DCR-7C?

9 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Exhibit 7C is a letter of
10 support for the project received from the off-highway
11 vehicle community in La Paz County.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall.

13 MEMBER WOODALL: I have a question with
14 respect to the letter that you received from the La Paz
15 County Board of Supervisors. I don't actually see this
16 as a full-throated support for this project. It's
17 remarkably sterile in its -- in its contents.

18 And in view of the quite animated comments
19 made by one of the Board of Supervisors that is
20 contained in the comment matrix in Exhibit J to the
21 application for the CEC, I'm surprised that you are
22 characterizing this as a letter of support. I mean,
23 maybe you've made -- maybe you've made arrangements
24 with the County that have eliminated the concerns that
25 were expressed by one of the supervisors in that

1 Exhibit J support, but this seems pretty weak-kneed to
2 me.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Woodall, which exhibit
4 number are you referring to?

5 MEMBER WOODALL: Oh, I'm terribly sorry.
6 They were referring to Exhibit DCR-7, and B is a letter
7 from the County Board of Supervisors. And I --

8 MEMBER HAMWAY: No, it's A, 7A.

9 MEMBER WOODALL: Oh, 7A, I beg your pardon.
10 Thank you.

11 I don't see that as being particularly
12 enthusiastic or energetic. And because -- because in
13 Exhibit J to the application of the CEC, there's some
14 specific requests by the Board of Supervisors for
15 mitigation measures, I'm just -- I will probably want
16 to explore that with somebody. And if it's Mr. Rogers,
17 that's great. But this doesn't seem like they're very
18 enthusiastic.

19 MEMBER PALMER: Are you looking at 7A or 7B?

20 MEMBER WOODALL: I'm looking at the letter
21 from the County.

22 MEMBER PALMER: 7B says they're in support.

23 MEMBER WOODALL: No, they don't say support.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Amirali, let's figure out
25 what exhibit Member Woodall is talking about.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: Well, that might be hard to
2 figure out. They're in support of the preferred route.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Which exhibit number?

4 MEMBER WOODALL: 7B, I guess.

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay, 7B, as in boy.

6 MEMBER WOODALL: So what's the date on that
7 one?

8 CHMN. CHENAL: October 22nd.

9 MR. AMIRALI: Member Woodall.

10 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes.

11 MR. AMIRALI: The first letter --

12 CHMN. CHENAL: January 6, 2020.

13 MR. AMIRALI: Sorry, Chairman Chenal.

14 MEMBER WOODALL: They got more enthusiastic
15 as time went on; is that correct?

16 MR. AMIRALI: Actually, Member Woodall, the
17 October 22nd letter I would like to characterize. It
18 is the letter confirming that the line route is --
19 alternate route is consistent with La Paz County zoning
20 regulation.

21 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes.

22 MR. AMIRALI: And then in the January 6th
23 letter, they provided a support for the route. And,
24 you know, La Paz County is an intervenor in the project
25 and, you know, I'm pretty sure they'll be more than

1 happy to provide you their comments.

2 MEMBER WOODALL: Well, they can't, because
3 they're not here. So what I really wanted to ask was:
4 Has anyone, on behalf of the Applicant, been in
5 negotiations with La Paz County with respect to
6 proposed mitigation measures, which were referenced in
7 their comments by the Board Commissioner in Exhibit J?
8 Because they were talking about that.

9 So I just want to know, and I'm trying to get
10 that on the record, have you agreed to any or not?
11 Because I'm sure they want to express their point of
12 view, but I'd like there to be some evidence in the
13 record about any negotiations, discussions, commitments
14 by the Applicant and La Paz County with respect to the
15 concerns that they expressed in their comments that are
16 contained in Exhibit J to the CEC application. That's
17 -- I'm trying to do that; they're not here.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: Before we go any further,
19 let's give the Committee an opportunity to look at the
20 Exhibit J. Because right now, for most of us, this is
21 a discussion with no meaning.

22 MEMBER WOODALL: I beg your pardon.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: So let's go to Exhibit J and
24 look at that and then compare that with these letters.

25 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you. And I apologize

1 for running ahead. It would be behind tab Appendix D.
2 Excuse me, Appendix E, scoping comment matrix. And the
3 comments of La Paz County --

4 CHMN. CHENAL: May I ask the Applicant to
5 give us a page number, then we can find it on the
6 search function of the iPad, please.

7 MS. GRABEL: We're finding that right now.

8 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you. So we're looking
9 at DCR-1, and we'll get a page number to put in the --

10 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes. Chairman, Committee,
11 Page 5639 on the iPad starts Appendix B, the scoping
12 invitation letters and e-mail notifications, which I
13 believe is what Committee Member Woodall is referring
14 to.

15 MEMBER WOODALL: I'm referring to the matrix.

16 MS. GRABEL: Which is Appendix E to that
17 scoping letter.

18 MEMBER WOODALL: It's Appendix E, scoping
19 comment matrix.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: We're going to have to get a
21 new page number. Mr. Ancharski is coming up with a
22 page number for us.

23 MEMBER HAMWAY: And you're saying -- what's
24 the page number?

25 CHMN. CHENAL: They're getting it for us.

1 MS. GRABEL: It might be easier if we read it
2 into the record, rather than search for it, if that
3 would be all right with you.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure.

5 MS. GRABEL: Member Woodall, are you
6 referring to scoping comment letter ID Number 24?

7 MEMBER WOODALL: It starts on Page 20 of
8 the -- yes, 24, it is. It starts on Page 20 and
9 continues to Page 27 of the matrix.

10 MR. ANCHARSKI: On the iPad, the scoping
11 comment matrix is 5683. Page 5683 of DCR-1, that's the
12 first page. So Page 20 --

13 CHMN. CHENAL: 5683?

14 MR. ANCHARSKI: Yes, correct. And then
15 you'll have to scroll through that to Page 20.

16 MS. GRABEL: And we'll be happy to read this
17 into the record and address your comments. I do want
18 to let you know, I have spoken with the County Attorney
19 for La Paz County who has said, although they do not
20 intend to participate during the hearings, they
21 intervened to protect their rights to be able to talk
22 to the Arizona Corporation Commission, and the Board of
23 Supervisors intends to be present in Quartzsite to give
24 public comment. And so these are questions that you'll
25 be able to ask the supervisors as well.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes, but I won't have
2 evidence on them. And I want to make sure that there's
3 evidence on the record about whether or not there has
4 been any discussion with La Paz County concerning their
5 concerns, I hate to use the same verb twice, because
6 they're quite emphatic in how they believe that this is
7 not -- I characterize it as not fair to them.

8 And so I want to know if the Applicant has
9 had any conversations, and it can be addressed later
10 on, with them regarding that. Because if they come and
11 make comments, we still don't have any evidence in the
12 record about whether or not the Applicant has talked to
13 them, tried to negotiate with them, or whatever, and
14 that's what I want. I want something in the record.

15 MS. GRABEL: Absolutely.

16 MEMBER WOODALL: And I apologize to my fellow
17 Committee Members for talking paper instead of the
18 iPad. I apologize. I really should have done that.
19 So...

20 CHMN. CHENAL: We need to get to the comments
21 that you're talking about, Member Woodall.

22 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes, I apologize.

23 CHMN. CHENAL: So let's get there before we
24 talk about anything else. Let's just get to the
25 comments.

1 MEMBER HAMWAY: What is your scoping comment
2 letter ID?

3 MEMBER WOODALL: It's Number 24, as
4 Ms. Grabel indicated.

5 MEMBER HAMWAY: Sorry, I didn't understand
6 what that was.

7 MR. ANCHARSKI: And that's Page 5706 of the
8 iPad, it is.

9 MEMBER WOODALL: And their scoping comment ID
10 that I think is -- I just think it's very emphatic and
11 I want to know --

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Can we find out which one it
13 is? I'm looking --

14 MEMBER HAMWAY: It's 24.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: I see 24, but there's pages
16 and pages of scoping letter -- comment letter ID 24,
17 and then there's a second column that says "scoping
18 comment ID."

19 MEMBER GENTLES: Go to 5706.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: 5706. All right. So it's
21 scoping comment letter ID 24, scoping comment ID
22 Number 5.

23 MEMBER WOODALL: Actually, it's -- well,
24 there's several of them. But the one that's the most
25 emphatic is scoping comment ID Number 8, which is on

1 Page 25 of the matrix.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. Let's look at
3 Number 8.

4 MEMBER GENTLES: It's 5708.

5 MEMBER WOODALL: And it doesn't have to be
6 that one. I just want to know if the Applicant has had
7 any discussions with the County, have they asked for
8 anything in particular, and what has been your
9 response, if any.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: All right, let's do this.

11 MEMBER WOODALL: We can do this later.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: All right, let's do this. I
13 don't know if this is the correct panel or if the next
14 panel is the correct one, but at some point let's have
15 someone summarize the comments, scoping comment 24, and
16 then we can have someone testify about response to
17 that. Let's do it some other time than right now.

18 MEMBER WOODALL: An elegant solution,
19 Chairman.

20 MS. GRABEL: Mr. Rogers, on the environmental
21 panel, will give a very detailed overview of the NEPA
22 process and how we responded to stakeholder concerns,
23 and we can do it at that time.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: That's perfect.

25 MEMBER WOODALL: That's great.

1 MS. GRABEL: I do have a couple more exhibits
2 to lay foundation for, if that's all right.

3 CHMN. CHENAL: Absolutely.

4 BY MS. GRABEL:

5 Q. So you have before you, I believe -- Ms. Ruht
6 handed out two additional exhibits that were just
7 recently received from two other supporters.

8 Mr. Amirali, do you have those in front of you?

9 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Please repeat it, ma'am.

10 Q. Certainly. Two new exhibits that were not in
11 existence at the time that we filed our prefiled
12 exhibits. Those are Exhibits DCR-7D, which is a letter
13 of support from 174 Power Global, and DCR-7E, which is
14 a letter of support from Eolus North America, Inc.

15 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) I do.

16 Q. Can you please describe generally the
17 contents of DCR-7D?

18 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) DCR-7D is a letter of
19 support for the proposed project and the proposed
20 project route from 174 Power Global, which is a large
21 generation development company proposing to build a
22 very large solar plus storage project and to be
23 interconnected to the Ten West Link.

24 Q. Thank you. And will you please describe what
25 is contained in Exhibit DCR-7E?

1 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) DCR-7E is a similar letter
2 of support from Eolus North America, Inc., that's
3 another large development company proposing to build a
4 solar plus storage project that is expected to be
5 connected to Ten West Link project.

6 Q. Mr. Amirali, are you familiar with the
7 signatories of the letters that are contained within
8 Exhibit DCR-7? Let me just ask it another way.

9 Do you believe that these are true, no one
10 forged these?

11 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I do.

12 Q. If you would please turn to Exhibit DCR-10.
13 And these contain the ten-year plans that Ten West Link
14 has filed over the past several years?

15 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they do.

16 Q. And have you seen the documents marked as
17 Exhibit DCR-10A through DCR-10D before?

18 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) I have.

19 Q. Were these documents prepared by you or under
20 your direction and control?

21 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they were.

22 Q. And did DCRT file these ten-year plans in
23 compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes 40-360.02?

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they were.

25 Q. Is DCRT in the process of filing another

1 10-year plan this year regarding the Ten West Link
2 project?

3 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, we are.

4 Q. Has Ten West Link been presented during the
5 Arizona Corporation Commission's biennial transmission
6 assessment?

7 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it has been.

8 Q. And do you believe it would be fair to say
9 that Ten West Link has been in the region's
10 transmission planning process for the past several
11 years?

12 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it has.

13 Q. Thank you. And finally, if you would please
14 look at Exhibit DCR-11, which is the receipt of the
15 filing fee in this matter.

16 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, please.

17 Q. Have you seen this document before?

18 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I have.

19 Q. Was this receipt received from the Arizona
20 Corporation Commission to confirm payment by DCRT of
21 the application filing fee?

22 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it was.

23 Q. Did you direct the payment of the filing fee?

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I did.

25 Q. And are the contents of this exhibit true and

1 correct, to the best of your knowledge?

2 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, they are.

3 MS. GRABEL: Thank you.

4 I have no further questions for Mr. Amirali
5 at this time.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: Ms. Grabel, are you going to
7 have any testimony about the ten-year plan and that
8 this project was in it?

9 MS. GRABEL: We just admitted the exhibit
10 that --

11 CHMN. CHENAL: Right.

12 MS. GRABEL: -- evidences that, but I wasn't
13 intending to elicit any further testimony about the
14 contents of the ten-year plan. I can, if you'd like.

15 CHMN. CHENAL: I think just a little more
16 than just the ten-year plan, just something -- I mean,
17 not so much for the evidence, just for the benefit of
18 the Committee, that this project was in the ten-year
19 plan and how it was described and just --

20 MS. GRABEL: Okay, certainly.

21 BY MS. GRABEL:

22 Q. Mr. Amirali, if you will turn to Exhibit
23 DCR-10, I believe it is.

24 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, I am there, ma'am.

25 Q. Thank you. And if you look at DCR Exhibit

1 A -- I mean, 10A, excuse me.

2 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, ma'am.

3 Q. And look at how the project was described in
4 Exhibit 10A.

5 A. Yeah.

6 Q. Can you please enter into the record how we
7 describe the project?

8 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) At the time this exhibit
9 was filed, it was shortly after receiving the project
10 award, the Ten West Link project was described as a
11 114-mile transmission line that interconnects Delaney
12 and Colorado River substations via a 500 kV
13 transmission line.

14 At that time, the project length was -- the
15 proposed project route was -- closely followed DPV --
16 existing Devers Palo Verde line, but it had the same --
17 provided the same operational, as well as economic
18 benefits. This was before the proposed route -- the
19 final proposed route for the project was established.

20 Q. Thank you. And Exhibit DCR -- DCR-10B,
21 excuse me, is the Ten West Link ten-year plan for the
22 year 2017, correct?

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

24 Q. And the proposed route had not yet been
25 determined in 2017, had it?

1 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) That is correct.

2 Q. Okay, thank you. So the summary of the line
3 in DCR-10B still reflects a 114-mile line, correct?

4 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) That is correct. The
5 proposed project route did not change until -- was not
6 finalized until the issuance of the Draft Environmental
7 Impact Statement by BLM in mid-2018.

8 Q. Thank you. So when you turn to Exhibit
9 DCR-10C, the description of the line for DCRT's Ten
10 West Link ten-year plan for January 2018 does not yet
11 reflect the modified route, correct?

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

13 Q. Thank you. If you look at Exhibit DCR-10D.

14 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yeah.

15 Q. How has the description of the line changed
16 in Exhibit DCR-10D?

17 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) By that time, we had
18 received the proposed project route for the project,
19 which was 125 miles in length. The terminus
20 substations remained unchanged for the project, and
21 that is reflected in this -- in this document. The
22 value proposition for the line still remained the same.

23 Q. Thank you. And does the description of the
24 line filed in the Ten West Link ten-year plan for 2019,
25 which is shown in Exhibit DCR-10D, reflect the same

1 route that the DCRT has applied for in this CEC
2 application?

3 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it does.

4 Q. And will that description also be the subject
5 of Ten West Link's ten-year plan for 2020, which will
6 be filed by the end of this month?

7 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) Yes, it would be.

8 MS. GRABEL: Thank you.

9 I don't have any further questions.

10 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you very much.

11 MS. GRABEL: Sure.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Does the Committee have any
13 questions? We've asked a few questions, but I
14 guarantee there's going to be a lot more, just the
15 nature of this -- of the project. Any further
16 questions of -- I'm going to say Amirali. Is that
17 close?

18 MR. AMIRALI: Sir, you may call you anything
19 you want, as long as it's not late for dinner.

20 CHMN. CHENAL: But the pronunciation, close?

21 MR. AMIRALI: It's Amirali, actually.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: Amirali.

23 MR. AMIRALI: Yeah. You know, if you go with
24 the Italian accent, it actually works.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: I'll work on that. But I

1 think the French pronunciation is Amirali, but we'll
2 try the best we can to help you with the Spanish.

3 Member Woodall.

4 Or, Italian.

5 MEMBER WOODALL: Maybe someone else is going
6 to address this. The letters of support that were
7 referenced in Item 7, I see that they support a
8 particular route, but I don't see them supporting the
9 project. Would that be accurate?

10 And Mr. Rogers, you can answer that in due
11 course.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. If there's no
13 further questions, it is 5:00. What's the Committee's
14 preference? Our hearing tonight for public comment is
15 at 6:00 --

16 And I don't want to forget, Mr. Arias, that
17 you'll have an opportunity to ask any questions at this
18 point. Mr. Amirali will be in three panels, two or
19 three panels, but I think it's more efficient if we
20 take them one at a time. So do you have any questions
21 of Mr. Amirali at this point?

22 MR. ARIAS: Chairman, Staff has no questions
23 at this time.

24 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. What is the preference
25 of the Committee? I think we are at 6:00 tonight for

1 the Phoenix public comment. Do you want to continue a
2 little further?

3 MEMBER WOODALL: Is there anywhere we could
4 get a snack or coffee or something?

5 CHMN. CHENAL: Well, we can take a break now.

6 MS. GRABEL: I think -- the Applicant thinks
7 we could probably do the virtual tour; it's not that
8 long. If that's all right. We only have like 20 or 30
9 minutes, if that, depending on the questions that the
10 Committee has. And we do have additional snacks over
11 there, and I can always call over to my office to get
12 more, if we need some.

13 There's also the restaurant in the hotel
14 across the street, to answer Member Woodall's question.

15 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you very much.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's take a five-minute
17 break -- a short break, and then come back and do the
18 virtual tour, and then we'll see where we are and use
19 the time that we have.

20 (Off the record from 5:04 p.m. to 5:20 p.m.)

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Let's go back on the record.

22 And let me remind the Committee Members that
23 the facilities will be locked tonight, so you can leave
24 your personal items and your briefcase and -- but not
25 the iPads. The iPads you need to take home tonight and

1 study this stuff; there will be a quiz tomorrow.

2 So are we ready for a virtual tour?

3 MEMBER HAMWAY: Yes.

4 BY MS. GRABEL:

5 Q. Mr. Rogers, you're already sworn in under
6 oath. Will you please state your name and business
7 address for the record.

8 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) My name is Lowell Rogers,
9 address is 3840 San Ysidro Way, Sacramento, California
10 95864.

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

13 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) I'm the president of Oak
14 Strategic, Incorporated.

15 Q. What is your role in this matter?

16 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) I'm the project manager for
17 the Ten West Link project, responsible for obtaining
18 the right-of-way through BLM property, that includes
19 the NEPA process, conducting the NEPA process,
20 developing the planned development. I'm also
21 responsible for the Section 106 compliance and cultural
22 impacts research and the environmental review.

23 Q. And you have before you a book of the
24 exhibits that we're using in this proceeding. If you
25 could please turn to Exhibit DCR-8.

1 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) Okay.

2 Q. And DCR-8 is in two parts, as you'll see.

3 One is a PowerPoint presentation, and the second is a
4 thumb drive that contains the virtual tour in this
5 matter, correct?

6 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) That's right.

7 Q. Let's turn your attention first to the
8 PowerPoint presentation. Have you seen this document
9 before?

10 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) Yes, I have.

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

13 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) Yes.

14 Q. Are the contents of that PowerPoint exhibit
15 true and correct, to the best of your knowledge?

16 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) Yes.

17 Q. And as to the actual virtual tour, was that
18 tour prepared by you or under your direction and
19 control?

20 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) Yes, it was.

21 Q. And how was that prepared?

22 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) That was prepared using
23 Google Earth imagery as a backdrop, including various
24 GIS, or geographic information system, overlays, and
25 export information from our transmission design

1 software.

2 Q. Please begin your presentation.

3 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) Good evening now, Committee.

4 My name is Lowell Rogers. I'm the president of Oak

5 Strategic, Incorporated, located in Sacramento.

6 Oak Strategic is an engineering and

7 consulting company specializing in the development of

8 energy infrastructure, including engineering,

9 environmental compliance, and public outreach services

10 for high-voltage transmission lines.

11 I hold a bachelor's degree in civil

12 engineering from the California State University at

13 Chico. I'm also a licensed professional engineer in

14 the states of California and Washington. I've been the

15 project manager or engineer involved in the design

16 routing or siting or assessment of more than

17 3,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines.

18 For the Ten West Link project, I serve as

19 project manager for DCR Transmission. In this

20 capacity, I'm responsible for obtaining the

21 right-of-way through federal lands, which includes the

22 development of the plan -- or, developing the Plan of

23 Development to inform the NEPA compliance and action by

24 the BLM. I also work with the engineering and

25 construction contractors engaged on the project.

1 This virtual tour that I'll show you is a
2 computer-generated flyover of the entire length of the
3 proposed project within the state of Arizona. Since it
4 is a virtual tour, it is representative and shouldn't
5 be considered as exactly accurate, but it is very close
6 and represents our most recent design status for the
7 project.

8 The virtual tour will show the transmission
9 line and associated structures. It will show the
10 existing Devers Palo Verde transmission line location,
11 the proximity of that line to the proposed Ten West
12 Link project. It will also show access roads that are
13 used or constructed by the project. It will also
14 represent crossings of the Central Arizona Project
15 canal, crossings of the Devers Palo Verde line,
16 Interstate 10.

17 It will also show the proximity to various
18 land uses that are in the vicinity, such as the Kofa
19 National Wildlife Refuge, the Yuma Proving Grounds,
20 Interstate 10, Colorado River Indian tribal lands, and
21 the town of Quartzsite.

22 The virtual tour will follow the same path
23 that the real tour in the helicopters will follow,
24 including stopping at hover points that we plan to stop
25 at during the virtual tour. I'll also pause during the

1 virtual tour and describe what those hover points
2 consist of. And throughout the virtual tour, of
3 course, ask questions, and we can stop and pause and
4 back up if needed. The virtual tour, as said, is DCR
5 Exhibit 8 and is accessible on your iPads.

6 Just a microphone check. Okay, great.

7 (Virtual tour plays.)

8 So as I said, this is the virtual tour.

9 We'll start the helicopter tour on the east end of the
10 project at Delaney Substation. We start on the high
11 side of the substation, which is the 500 kV side. We
12 exit out to the west and circle around the substation
13 on the north side, and then continue north towards
14 Interstate 10.

15 I'll just stop it here to show what we're
16 seeing. The lines in yellow represent the access
17 roads. The line in blue represents the Devers Palo
18 Verde transmission line. The white lines represent the
19 conductors and wire that will be used for the project.
20 And the tower types are three-dimensional
21 representations of the actual structures. You can
22 somewhat see the different structure types that will be
23 used.

24 So we have the first crossing of Interstate
25 10 here. As I said earlier, we've been engaged with

1 ADOT for crossing requirements, and we'll get -- we'll
2 fulfill all the requirements for those crossing
3 permits.

4 As we continue here, you can see we're on the
5 left side of the existing Devers Palo Verde line. You
6 can kind of see the shadowing here on the aerial
7 imagery. Again, the yellow lines are existing or new
8 access roads that will be used to construct the
9 project.

10 We're reaching our second hover point. Our
11 first hover point will be at Delaney Substation. The
12 purpose of this hover point is to simply show the
13 relationship between the Ten West Link transmission
14 line and the Devers Palo Verde line. We're on the
15 left-hand side of it.

16 One aspect of the construction of the Ten
17 West line in the area that we parallel Devers is that
18 we will use similar structure types that the Devers
19 transmission line uses, as well as similar spans to
20 match up for visual consistency, as well as minimizing
21 visual impacts. And this is a requirement that the BLM
22 put forward for us.

23 You can see the CAP canal here on the far
24 right side; we parallel it for a little while. So as
25 we restart here, we continue to be on the left-hand

1 side of the existing DPV line. This is all federal
2 BLM-owned land in this area.

3 We're approaching our second crossing of the
4 Interstate 10. Again, all the crossings will be
5 according to ADOT requirements. You can see here a
6 couple spans. After crossing the freeway, we diverge
7 from the DPV line; and as you've heard before, there's
8 reasons why we do that. Initially, we had proposed to
9 follow the DPV line; but because it was found to be
10 inconsistent with the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge
11 policies, it was deemed incompatible. So at that
12 point, we looked at other alternative routes.

13 Here we continue westbound parallelling I10
14 now, and this corridor follows the National Energy
15 Corridor that's been established. It's also the
16 reflection of a lot of input from various environmental
17 organizations requesting that infrastructure projects
18 such as Ten West Link parallel existing infrastructure
19 where possible. And this is a result of that.

20 In this area, unlike where we parallel DPV,
21 we'll need to construct a new access road -- excuse
22 me -- a new access road along our center line. So this
23 will be a dirt access road that's about 16 to 22 feet
24 in width.

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Mr. Rogers. Mr. Rogers.

1 MR. ROGERS: Yes, sir.

2 CHMN. CHENAL: I'm sorry, I should probably
3 let you do the whole thing, then we should follow up
4 with questions.

5 MR. ROGERS: This is fine.

6 CHMN. CHENAL: I was just curious where the
7 Devers line is in relation to this at this point.

8 MR. ROGERS: Elias, would you please back up
9 to the point where the two diverge, please? Right
10 here.

11 So in this area -- okay, stop -- the blue
12 line continues on. So that's the Devers line, and it
13 continues on. This is where we diverge from following
14 that corridor; and instead of following DPV, we follow
15 the I10 freeway.

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Thank you.

17 MS. GRABEL: Chairman Chenal, actually,
18 Lowell -- Mr. Rogers, rather, you can probably refer to
19 it, too, on the map to the left to show where on the
20 real map it is.

21 MR. ROGERS: It's right there. So Devers
22 comes down here and where we diverge up.

23 MEMBER HAENICHEN: What's the logic of that
24 vis-a-vis the Devers line? Why are they diverging?

25 MR. ROGERS: They're diverging because the

1 Devers line -- if you'll look on the opposite side of
2 your place mat, that shows the DPV2. The DPV2
3 alignment followed the existing DPV line that's there
4 now. That line goes through the Kofa National Wildlife
5 Refuge.

6 That refuge is administered by the U.S. Fish
7 and Wildlife Service, and I'll get into this during the
8 environmental panel. But the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
9 Service deemed it incompatible to locate the new Ten
10 West line within Kofa, so that kicked off a series of
11 alternative analysis. And through that analysis that
12 was conducted by the BLM, they settled on this route as
13 the BLM's preferred alternative, and that's also the
14 same alternative that we're putting forward in our
15 application.

16 So we continue west parallelling I10. As I
17 said earlier, we'll be -- the yellow line here
18 represents access roads that will be used by the
19 project, existing and new. There's another crossing of
20 the CAP canal.

21 MEMBER HAMWAY: How many feet is it from
22 I10 --

23 MR. ROGERS: It varies.

24 MEMBER HAMWAY: -- or yards?

25 MR. ROGERS: It varies from about 1,600 to

1 over 3,000. And it varies as a result -- and you can
2 somewhat see it here -- it varies as a result of
3 topography, but also our interaction with Arizona
4 State Lands Department. They own quite a bit of
5 this section here. And again, I have those
6 represented in more detail on my environmental
7 presentation -- I'm sorry, the technical presentation
8 about right-of-way.

9 But we -- they wanted to, you know, maximize
10 the use of that land for future development along
11 I10 -- so in some areas we're a little closer, some
12 areas we diverge away from it -- as a best solution for
13 all of those needs and desires of environmental, being
14 close, State Lands, best use of their land, topography,
15 engineering reasons, just a variety of inputs led to
16 that decision.

17 Yes, sir.

18 MEMBER GENTLES: Maybe you just answered my
19 question, but why did the first route not mirror I10
20 and come all the way down the way it does in this
21 picture?

22 MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry, I don't understand
23 what you mean by "the first route."

24 MEMBER GENTLES: Yeah, the one that was
25 denied in '07.

1 MEMBER HAMWAY: DPV2.

2 MEMBER GENTLES: Right.

3 So it comes all the way down here, right,
4 instead of following the I10? Just out of curiosity.
5 Maybe you're going to answer that question.

6 MR. ROGERS: It's the shortest path, and
7 that's why the original DPV line was most likely
8 located where it is. And that follows -- it's pretty
9 good topography. And at that time, the species within
10 Kofa weren't quite listed the same way, so that could
11 have something to do with it.

12 MEMBER WOODALL: Excuse me. I see
13 Mr. Amirali indicating that he may have some knowledge
14 on this subject, or perhaps I misinterpreted his body
15 language.

16 MR. AMIRALI: Ali Amirali, I'm still under
17 oath.

18 I just wanted to add one more point to
19 Mr. Rogers. At the time the DPV2 line, you know, just
20 like as I had mentioned during my testimony, the
21 co-location of -- co-location of infrastructure
22 facilities does provide the benefit of utilizing some
23 of the same -- some of the same access roads, and it
24 does have some environmental benefits.

25 Also, as Mr. Rogers pointed out, it was the

1 shortest route, and the line that was already approved
2 at a certain time by BLM.

3 BY MS. GRABEL:

4 Q. And isn't it also true, Mr. Amirali, that the
5 applicant for the DPV2 proceeding is the same entity
6 that owns the DPV1 line, so it was reasonable for them
7 to propose that same route?

8 A. (BY MR. AMIRALI) That is correct, ma'am.

9 A. (BY MR. ROGERS) So here you can see we cross
10 the CAP canal a couple times more, and we reach our
11 Hover Point Number 5. At this location, we're
12 2,600 feet away from the freeway. And this point was
13 selected just simply because it's the midway in our
14 section that we parallel I10.

15 This is also the area that has private lands,
16 Arizona State lands, and BLM land. I neglected to
17 mention before, when we diverge from DPV, we change
18 tower types a guyed-V structure. This is in the
19 exhibits, a figure of it. But it's a V-shaped
20 structure with a central foundation with four guy-wires
21 going down.

22 Continuing to parallel I10, we're getting a
23 little closer to I10 in this area. Because of the
24 topography, you can see the mountains there. But we're
25 coming up on our next hover point for our tour, and

1 this is the series compensation station. It's a fence
2 site. We talked about the technical requirements.
3 It's about 1.2 acres in size, and I'll show some visual
4 simulations of that later.

5 We continue on. Again, you can see the
6 various access roads and line arrangements. You can
7 see here in the distance, this is the town of
8 Quartzsite. And we're coming up into the area that we
9 turn and diverge away from I10. The area here is the
10 BLM's long-term visitor's area, visiting area. In this
11 area, we use a combination of existing roads and new
12 roads. We're off of the mountains here, relatively
13 flat area that will facilitate construction.

14 As we continue on, you can see in the purple
15 area, that's all the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge.
16 Again, in this section, there is no existing DPV line.
17 There are existing roads. We're using those to the
18 extent possible, building some new roads. As we come
19 up, again, there's Kofa. The blue line, that's where
20 we meet back up again with DPV.

21 As we come up here, this will be another
22 hover point to view, you know, the reentry into the DPV
23 corridor. We have a minimum separation for reliability
24 from DPV. But as we parallel, we switch back to
25 similar structures that are used on the DPV route,

1 similar structures, similar spans, similar finishes,
2 all to minimize the visual inconsistency of the two
3 lines together.

4 As we rejoin DPV, we're able to take
5 advantage of the existing access road network and build
6 small spur roads to our structures. This is the
7 proving ground, DOD-owned proving ground. There was,
8 during the environmental process, comments from the DOD
9 on how to get past the proving ground; I'll get into
10 that in more detail.

11 But here you can see that we just clip a
12 corner of YPG, and we cross it in only an aerial
13 manner. There's no physical structures on proving
14 ground lands, but we do have wires in their airspace
15 for just a corner.

16 This blue area here, that's the first of
17 three helicopter staging areas that we have on the
18 project. And what those are for is to support our
19 construction through the Copper Bottom Pass. As we
20 look at it going through the pass, this is, again, a
21 National Energy Corridor. There's existing pipelines,
22 gas pipelines through here. There's obviously an
23 existing 500 kV line road network, so on and so forth.
24 But we are still on the left-hand side of DPV on the
25 hillside.

1 And the reason why we have the helicopter
2 construction methods is to limit some road construction
3 to some of the structures to minimize visual impacts of
4 large cuts for those roads.

5 As we go through, you can see the roads going
6 to the structures. We'll get to some that don't have
7 those orange lines. Those are the helicopter-only
8 constructed areas. You can see we're entering into a
9 section of them now. The green area here, that's all
10 Colorado River Indian tribal land. You'll enjoy this
11 part of the helicopter tour; it's beautiful.

12 So here we turn, again, still parallelling
13 DPV on the left, utilizing their access road network.
14 That's California in the distance there and the
15 Colorado River. In this area, you'll see it's kind of
16 a broken plain, a lot of ravines that we'll go through,
17 again, matching structure locations with the existing
18 DPV as possible. A little more difficult here because
19 of these ridge lines. And there's the Colorado River.

20 That concludes the virtual tour.

21 Yes, sir.

22 MEMBER HAENICHEN: How did the original DPV
23 line get passed, because it went through the Kofa
24 Reserve --

25 CHMN. CHENAL: Can't hear the question,

1 Member Haenichen. I'm sorry.

2 MEMBER HAENICHEN: I'm sorry. I should use
3 this.

4 How did the original line, the blue line, get
5 by the Corporation Commission?

6 MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry, I don't have the
7 specifics for that. It's quite old.

8 MS. GRABEL: Member Haenichen, I can answer
9 that. It does relate to the age of the project. The
10 statutes that require the environmental considerations
11 were not in place at the time the original DPV line was
12 built, and so likely the Arizona Corporation Commission
13 would have given a CEC without those kind of
14 guidelines. I think the statute was in 1976, and DPV
15 well proceeds the 1976 time frame.

16 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you.

17 MS. GRABEL: Do you have more to add to that,
18 Member Woodall?

19 MEMBER WOODALL: There may have been a
20 Utilities Division order addressing how such matters
21 were handled prior to the adoption of Title 40, Section
22 360. There may have been, I believe, but I don't think
23 there is -- is there a CEC for the original line
24 anywhere?

25 MS. GRABEL: I don't know the answer to that.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: I don't believe there is,
2 but it would be on fiche, and we have limitations on
3 fiche, so -- okay.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: Member Villegas.

5 MEMBER VILLEGAS: Mr. Rogers, going back to
6 the YPG area, Yuma Proving Grounds, I noticed there was
7 a letter from the Department of the Army listing a
8 couple of concerns that they had in regards to this
9 project. Has anything been done to address their
10 issues, or have you had any conversations with them?

11 MR. ROGERS: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely
12 we've had a lot of conversations with the proving
13 ground and DOD. And through that series of
14 conversations and through the alternative analysis that
15 the BLM put forward, the proving ground was concerned
16 with two areas of YPG. One of the areas was not
17 selected as the preferred alternative; the other area
18 is that corner that we clipped.

19 And through discussions and kind of
20 explaining constraints, we were able to settle on the
21 solution of simply an aerial crossing, with no
22 structures physically on their land.

23 MEMBER VILLEGAS: Just a follow-up. Is that
24 documented in our paperwork here?

25 MR. ROGERS: That is addressed in the FEIS.

1 MS. GRABEL: And Member Villegas, we're also
2 presenting extensive testimony on that subject during
3 the environmental panel.

4 MEMBER VILLEGAS: Thank you.

5 MS. GRABEL: Mr. Rogers -- just to address
6 any questions you might have with respect to the
7 scoping report and the comments submitted in 2015, 2016
8 time frame, the project, as you will see, responded to
9 all of those in developing the proposed route. And
10 Mr. Rogers, in the NEPA portion of the environmental
11 panel, will go into tremendous detail as to why the
12 route is why it is in direct response to those
13 comments.

14 MEMBER GENTLES: They may answer my question
15 during that time, because my question is around the
16 Colorado Indian Nation as well --

17 MS. GRABEL: Yes, absolutely.

18 MEMBER GENTLES: -- their concerns.

19 MS. GRABEL: Yes, Mr. Rogers will be
20 addressing that as well.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Any other questions
22 from the Committee on the virtual tour? I thought it
23 was well done. It's going to be fun to see it from the
24 air.

25 And just so we're clear, we will take off

1 from the Quartzsite area. We'll go, I guess, directly
2 to the beginning -- to the Delaney Substation.

3 MR. ROGERS: I can describe it.

4 CHMN. CHENAL: Why don't you just -- yeah,
5 describe the tour, if you don't mind, Mr. Rogers.

6 MS. GRABEL: You might want to do so with
7 reference to Exhibit DCR-9, because it actually gives a
8 tour background, protocol, and then a tour summary with
9 kind of direction.

10 MR. ROGERS: Oh, there it is. Just to
11 summarize, though, we'll meet at the RV center,
12 transport you to the airport at Quartzsite. From
13 there, we'll fly to the first part of the project here.
14 We'll follow the project, not stopping anywhere, but go
15 to Delaney. Then we'll follow the tour, stopping at
16 the hover points as described, back to the Colorado
17 River, to the border. And then we'll backtrack along
18 the project back through Copper Bottom Pass. Once we
19 exit Copper Bottom Pass, we'll fly directly back to the
20 airport.

21 CHMN. CHENAL: How far away is Las Vegas, I
22 mean, flight time? If we have extra time before the
23 4:00 hearing, do you think we can --

24 MR. ROGERS: Plenty of time to lose some
25 money, sure.

1 CHMN. CHENAL: -- take a detour?

2 All right. Any further questions?

3 (No response.)

4 CHMN. CHENAL: All right, thank you. Thank
5 you. Very helpful.

6 Ms. Grabel.

7 MS. GRABEL: I do have one thing I'd like to
8 put into the record quickly.

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Sure.

10 MS. GRABEL: So with respect to Member
11 Haenichen's request that I know the rest of the
12 Committee was interested in, in the no-wires
13 alternative and the impact on the generation analysis,
14 it is not actually contained as an appendix to the
15 FEIS. On further analysis, we discovered that it
16 wasn't actually included in the FEIS, but a summary was
17 prepared that is in the documents you have that begins
18 on Page 736 on your iPad.

19 So if you go to Exhibit DCR-2, click on --
20 I'm sorry, Exhibit DCR-1, click on Exhibit B2, which is
21 the FEIS, and then within that document search for Page
22 Number 736, that starts the summary of the no-wires
23 alternative, which is rather lengthy.

24 And if you want to see the full document,
25 it's many, many pages long, it exists on the CPUC

1 website. And tomorrow we will give you a one-page
2 exhibit showing you how to access the website and how
3 you can find the document and the page number of the
4 document on which you can read through the actual
5 analysis.

6 MEMBER WOODALL: And if anyone is interested
7 in paper, I have the whole thing printed up. And I
8 will bring it, in case there's a fool like me who wants
9 to look at it.

10 MS. GRABEL: That does not surprise me in the
11 least, Member Woodall.

12 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, Member Haenichen.

14 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Ms. Grabel, can you
15 explain the origin of the term "no-wires"?

16 MS. GRABEL: I believe it means that if we do
17 not meet the needs that we want with a transmission
18 project, that's the no-wires alternative. So it's not
19 a transmission line, is there another solution that
20 would give us the same benefits or outcome.

21 MEMBER HAENICHEN: Thank you.

22 CHMN. CHENAL: All right. So again, that's
23 Page 736 of Exhibit 1?

24 MS. GRABEL: Correct. Of Exhibit B2 to DCR
25 Exhibit 1, and Page 736 on the iPad, correct.

1 MEMBER WOODALL: The drive that we have
2 behind Exhibit B is what?

3 MS. GRABEL: That is the virtual tour. That
4 is a thumb drive of -- a thumb drive.

5 MR. ANCHARSKI: Member Woodall, are you
6 referring to the application or the exhibit?

7 MEMBER WOODALL: Yes, I am. Oh, I'm sorry.

8 MR. ANCHARSKI: The application is Exhibit B,
9 so it is on that thumb drive. If you have the paper
10 copy --

11 MEMBER WOODALL: I have a paper copy of the
12 application. I'm just wondering, do I have any paper
13 anywhere that would show where this summary was done;
14 and if so, where would it be in the paper?

15 MS. GRABEL: The summary is done in the FEIS.
16 So yes, you do have a paper thing. It's Exhibit B2.

17 MEMBER WOODALL: I don't see a B2. Well, I
18 see -- they're saying they can be found at this
19 website.

20 MS. GRABEL: Oh, I see.

21 MEMBER WOODALL: That's why I was asking if
22 this thumb drive was that. Is that what it is?

23 MS. GRABEL: Yes.

24 MEMBER WOODALL: Okay. Well, I don't care.
25 I'm just going to -- I don't like that. Anyway, you'll

1 give us -- you'll give me a paper copy of the summary;
2 is that correct?

3 MS. GRABEL: If you look at your iPad, you
4 have the summary through your iPad. Oh, you want a
5 paper copy of the summary?

6 MEMBER WOODALL: It would help me a lot.

7 MS. GRABEL: Sure, absolutely.

8 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you so much. Because
9 I find it challenging.

10 MS. GRABEL: Sure.

11 MEMBER WOODALL: Thank you very much.

12 CHMN. CHENAL: Is there anything further we
13 should discuss before we break? Because at 6:00, we'll
14 start the public comment session.

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN. CHENAL: Ms. Grabel, why don't you give
17 us a preview of tomorrow, what witnesses you expect.

18 MS. GRABEL: Certainly. Tomorrow we expect
19 to present our technical panel. We will begin with
20 Ms. Judy Chang, the expert witness who will testify as
21 to the economics of the project and can answer a lot of
22 the questions you have with respect to the CAISO as
23 well, and differences from DPV2.

24 After Ms. Chang, we will go back to
25 Mr. Amirali, who will further give testimony about the

1 differences from DPV2 and certain other benefits of the
2 project. And hopefully, we'll also get to Mr. Rogers,
3 who will then talk about the infrastructure and the
4 rights-of-way and things of that nature.

5 If we have additional time, we can turn to
6 Mr. Rogers' environmental presentation.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. This will have
8 effectively -- we'll have tomorrow and then Friday for
9 testimony, and then we also have the ACC Staff's
10 witness.

11 Monday is really not going to be a hearing
12 day. It's going to be a tour day and a follow-up
13 question period at 4:00 on Monday, but that's not going
14 to be for more than an hour.

15 And then we have Tuesday where we can maybe
16 get into additional testimony, depending on what we
17 need. Then we come back the following week; we have
18 Thursday and Friday set aside. I don't know if you
19 have a sense yet of whether that's going to be
20 sufficient time?

21 MS. GRABEL: So far we're on track with the
22 schedule. I'd hoped to finish the Panel 1 today; I
23 did. If we can finish Panel 2 tomorrow, I think we'll
24 be in very, very good shape.

25 I've also agreed that Commission Staff can

1 put their witness on. She's here, but I believe they
2 want to do that in February.

3 MR. ARIAS: Chairman, if there is time on
4 Friday, she would be ready to go on Friday.

5 MS. GRABEL: And that's fine. We're amenable
6 to letting her go out of order.

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Okay. Yeah, just decide what
8 you believe is best, and we'll take witnesses out of
9 order for their convenience. That's no problem at all.
10 Okay, good. We'll see if we finish tomorrow
11 with your technical panel.

12 Any further questions from the Committee?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN. CHENAL: Any further items that we
15 should discuss? If not, we'll adjourn and we'll
16 reconvene in five minutes for a 6:00 public comment
17 session. Thanks.

18 (Off the record from 5:55 p.m. to 6:09 p.m.)

19 CHMN. CHENAL: Good evening, everyone. This
20 is the time set for the public comment session, evening
21 session for the Ten West Link project.

22 We traditionally take public comment the
23 evening of the first day of the hearing for each
24 hearing site, so we'll do it tonight and we'll do it
25 Monday in Quartzsite.

1 Is there anybody in the room who would like
2 to give any public comment? If you do, we'd like you
3 to come up and just give your name and contact
4 information and make your comments. We'd be delighted
5 to hear what you have to say.

6 (No response.)

7 CHMN. CHENAL: Is there anybody?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN. CHENAL: Going once, going twice.

10 Okay, looks like everyone who's in the audience is
11 associated in some way with the Applicant or others, or
12 they don't want to give public comment.

13 So we'll wait just a few minutes, but, you
14 know, we have -- it's already 10 after 6:00, so I just
15 don't know if we want to have an open mic here while
16 we're waiting as people show up.

17 MEMBER WOODALL: I didn't realize the time.

18 CHMN. CHENAL: Yeah, it's 10 after 6:00, so I
19 think we should just adjourn this part of the
20 proceeding, and we will see everyone tomorrow at
21 9:00 a.m.

22 So we're adjourned for this evening. Thank
23 you very much, everybody.

24 (The hearing recessed at 6:11 p.m.)

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 29th day of January, 2020.

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