

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT LS-475

2 AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE

3

4 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION ) DOCKET NO.  
5 OF CG APACHE COUNTY WIND LLC AND ) L-21364A-25-0198-00250  
6 CG APACHE COUNTY SOLAR LLC, IN )  
7 CONFORMANCE WITH THE ) LS CASE NO.  
8 REQUIREMENTS OF ARIZONA REVISED ) 250  
9 STATUTES §§ 40-360, ET SEQ., FOR )  
10 A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL )  
11 COMPATIBILITY AUTHORIZING THE )  
12 CONSTRUCTION OF THE LAVA RUN ) PROCEDURAL CONFERENCE  
13 INTERCONNECTION PROJECT, A )  
14 345-KILOVOLT (KV) ALTERNATING )  
15 CURRENT GENERATION TIE )  
16 TRANSMISSION LINE, WITH )  
17 ASSOCIATED INTERCONNECTION )  
18 FACILITIES, WITHIN APACHE )  
19 COUNTY, ARIZONA. )  
20 \_\_\_\_\_

21 At: Phoenix, Arizona

22 Date: December 19, 2025

23 Filed: December 24, 2025

24

25 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

26 (Pages 1 through 25)

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC  
35 Court Reporting, Video & Videoconferencing  
36 1555 East Orangewood Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85020  
37 602.266.6535 admin@glenne-reporting.com

38 By: Jennifer Honn, RPR  
39 Arizona CR No. 50885

40 GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC  
41 www.glenne-reporting.com

42 602.266.6535  
43 Phoenix, AZ

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and  
2 numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before the  
3 Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting  
4 Committee, commencing at 10:32 a.m. on December 19, 2025,  
5 with all participants appearing via videoconference.

6

7 BEFORE: ADAM STAFFORD, Chairman

8 NICOLE HILL, Governor's Office of Energy Policy

9

## 10 APPEARANCES:

11 For the Applicant:

12 Matt Derstine  
SNELL & WILMER  
13 One East Washington Street  
Suite 2700  
14 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

## 15 ALSO PRESENT:

16 Mariana Ambrose, Repsol Renewables  
17 Curt Judy, Repsol Renewables  
18 Tom Koronkiewicz, SWCA, Senior Project Manager  
19 Erica Fraley, SWCA, Associate Project Environmental  
20 Planner  
21 Donna Powers, Repsol, Senior Legal Counsel  
22 Gourjia Odisho, Snell & Wilmer  
23 Linda Weiland  
24 Karen Glennon  
25 Mike Anable  
26 Tod Brewer, Assistant to Chairman Stafford

22

23

24

25

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's go on the record.  
2 Now is the time set for the procedural  
3 conference on the application of Apache County Wind, LLC,  
4 and -- CG Apache County Wind, LLC, and CG Apache County  
5 Solar, LLC, for an application of a Certificate of  
6 Environmental Compatibility, Docket Number  
7 L-21364A-25-0198-00250.

8 There's another docket number, but I don't  
9 remember what it is. It's Line Siting Case 250.

10 Start with appearances of the parties.

11 Mr. Derstine.

12 MR. DERSTINE: Matt Derstine appearing on  
13 behalf of CG Apache County Wind, LLC, and CG Apache  
14 County Solar, LLC.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: We have not gotten any  
16 notices of intent to be a party, so we don't have any  
17 potential parties yet. All we have is -- the only party  
18 is the applicant.

19 MR. DERSTINE: I guess on that point,  
20 Mr. Chairman, the way I read the Commission's order is  
21 that they were not reopening the case.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. We'll get to that.  
23 We'll get to that.

24 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah. Well, I guess,  
25 that's -- you know, it was -- you know, one of the

1 questions I think that I saw was, "Can we convert or  
2 become a party now?" And my view on that would be we're  
3 not reopening the case, and, therefore, the deadline to  
4 intervene and become a party has passed. And I'm not  
5 sure that any of those deadlines have gone away as a  
6 result of the remand given that the Commission's order  
7 says we're not reopening the case, we're just asking for  
8 more input on these land use and other considerations,  
9 so.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, that's not quite how  
11 I see it.

12 MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: My intention is that we'll  
14 have to issue -- the focus of this procedural conference  
15 is to set -- get the next hearing set up.

16 MR. DERSTINE: Right.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Do dates, publications, all  
18 that stuff. And so from my perspective, that's going to  
19 retrigger the ability to file a limited appearance  
20 statement or request to be a party.

21 I think the letter the Commission sent out,  
22 they requested that the County become a party and put on  
23 evidence.

24 MR. DERSTINE: Uh-huh.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: So I think that's -- we'll

1 have to deal with that.

2 So my plan is to after -- we need to get  
3 the notice of hearing together. We'll get that out. And  
4 then I'll issue the procedural order that'll set the  
5 deadlines for the filing of requests to become a party  
6 and limited appearance statements. And then unless  
7 they're a party by right under 40-360.05(A)(2) or (3),  
8 then they'll have to -- intervention will have to be  
9 granted by the committee. And so that will be -- because  
10 it's a -- otherwise, they're a party by right if they  
11 file a timely notice if they fit that definition in the  
12 statute.

19 So I think the things that they had  
20 mentioned was input from the Apache County planning  
21 department. It talked about the Apache County proposed  
22 ordinances. And then they reiterated the Commission and  
23 the committee only have jurisdiction over the gen-tie  
24 line.

25 So to the extent that we do get another

1 party to the case, I think the evidence they put on needs  
2 to relate to the gen-tie line and not the solar plant  
3 because that's not before the committee or the  
4 Commission. It's just the line.

5 And then from my perspective, the deadline  
6 for the committee to act is still March 4, 2026. The  
7 180 days that was set from the initial referral of the  
8 matter to the committee is in effect. I don't think that  
9 if the -- I don't think the Commission remand affects  
10 that time line. Because, otherwise, if that were the  
11 case, then they could just keep remanding cases back and  
12 never -- run out the time to where the applicant can  
13 build under the statute. I think the statute is clear  
14 that these things need to be addressed in a certain time  
15 line because on these types of projects, it's -- time is  
16 of the essence. I mean, you have to have a decision to  
17 be able to figure out how you're going to serve your  
18 customers and the load.

19 So I guess my question to you,  
20 Mr. Derstine, is the applicant going to be putting on any  
21 additional exhibits or testimony?

22 MR. DERSTINE: You know, my looking at the  
23 Commission's order, my thought was simply to revisit and  
24 reference the testimony that's already in the record  
25 regarding the fact that the gen-tie line complies with

1 all the existing land use regulations and zoning  
2 regulations of the County and anything else that's  
3 relevant in the nature of land use and zoning regulations  
4 as they may pertain to the gen-tie project. So to the  
5 extent that we do that through a live witness or we  
6 simply refer back to the portions of the record that are  
7 already there, I'm open to either approach. Probably it  
8 would use our land use witnesses from SWCA.

9                   And I guess to the extent we have new  
10 parties who want to put on evidence of land use and  
11 zoning, et cetera, that pertain to the gen-tie line, then  
12 we'd want to have a live witness available to respond and  
13 rebut anything that we felt was not accurate or that  
14 needed to be addressed.

15                   CHMN STAFFORD: Right. And so looking at  
16 the Commission's order, like I said, they reference the  
17 Apache County -- I guess there's a letter filed by  
18 someone from the Apache County community development.  
19 And then I guess -- so I guess they would need -- your  
20 witness would be able to address that?

21                   MR. DERSTINE: Yes.

22                   CHMN STAFFORD: It's not clear for me  
23 that -- that that individual's actually speaking for the  
24 County itself.

25                   MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, I don't know. I mean,

1 I read the letter from Mr. Fish who is the development  
2 director that was filed on the day of the open meeting.  
3 And he urged the Commission not to grant the CEC for the  
4 gen-tie line unless or until we've obtained a CUP from  
5 the County with the -- but I think what was left unsaid  
6 is that there is no CUP required for the gen-tie line.  
7 And in reality, currently as the zoning regulations are  
8 drafted, there is no CUP required for the wind project at  
9 the end of the line because it's being constructed on  
10 state land and there's currently an exemption for  
11 renewable projects that are being sited and constructed  
12 on state or federal land. So, interesting that Mr. Fish  
13 would take the position that we have to obtain a CUP when  
14 the current zoning regulations do not require a CUP.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: I was confused about why  
16 proposed amendments to rules are even relevant. Because  
17 the rules are what they are now, and that's what's  
18 binding and in effect. I mean, for example, if -- if you  
19 were charged with DUI, you wouldn't be able to argue, oh,  
20 there's legislation that's going to lower -- that's going  
21 to raise the amount back to .1 and I'm at a .09 so you  
22 shouldn't charge me with a DUI because -- it's  
23 currently .08, I'm at a .09, you shouldn't charge me  
24 because there's a bill in the legislature that's going to  
25 raise it to .1 again. That didn't seem to make -- the

1 issue of the ordinances didn't seem particularly relevant  
2 to what's before the committee and Commission at this  
3 point in time.

4 MS. WEILAND: -- Stafford, this is Linda  
5 Weiland.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: This is not -- please be  
7 quiet. This is -- we're not taking public comment at  
8 this meeting. This is a procedural conference to get the  
9 details figured out for the additional hearing before the  
10 Commission.

11 All right. So, Mr. Derstine, so I think at  
12 the least at the hearing, other than, I guess, you can  
13 point to the existing record that's on there -- because  
14 we're not starting de novo --

15 MR. DERSTINE: Right.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: -- to address the specific  
17 things that the Commission raised in the order  
18 referencing to the -- the community development letter,  
19 the ordinances, and then maybe the fact that the  
20 committee and the Commission only have jurisdiction over  
21 the gen-tie.

22 MR. DERSTINE: I think that's --  
23 Mr. Chairman, I'd just note on that and put a pin in that  
24 issue that you raised. The difficulty here is that, you  
25 know, these zoning regulations and the amendment of the

1 zoning regulations and land use considerations -- again,  
2 I think fairly understood from the comments from the  
3 Commissioners -- go to the nonjurisdictional wind  
4 project. And while at the same time acknowledging that  
5 they have no jurisdiction over the wind project that they  
6 are essentially asking for testimony and input from the  
7 County that presumably goes to the nonjurisdictional wind  
8 project. And while trying to make the record that we  
9 don't think that that's a relevant consideration, that  
10 the zoning for the generation project at the end of a  
11 gen-tie line that is not within the jurisdiction of the  
12 Commission is not a consideration under the siting  
13 statute under .06 and should not be a consideration in  
14 granting or not granting the CEC. That -- I think that  
15 is where we are. And the Commission seemed to want to  
16 hear evidence on what's happening with the County and  
17 zoning changes with regard to the wind project. And so I  
18 don't -- I don't know necessarily how to -- how to walk  
19 that line.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Have you had  
21 any communication with the County? Is there any  
22 indication that the County will request to become a party  
23 in this?

24 MR. DERSTINE: I have not had any  
25 communication with the County. I presume that the

1 County -- well, the County did receive the Commission --  
2 the Commission's order. And to the extent that they  
3 wanted to participate, they would be on this call and --  
4 or would, you know, seek to intervene as a county and put  
5 on whatever sort of case they want to put on. So I --

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, they will have --  
7 they will have their chance.

8 But, okay, so I'm looking to schedule the  
9 hearing -- we'll have to get -- we're going to renoteice  
10 it. There'll be additional time for -- to become a party  
11 or to file a limited appearance statement if that's what  
12 people want to do.

13 So I'm looking at scheduling the hearing  
14 for, I think, at the Commission February 9 through the  
15 11th if it goes that long. Because I think what's really  
16 going to be the driver of this is whether we have  
17 additional parties or not.

18 And then so I guess some members will  
19 attend virtually. I think most of the members will not  
20 need to -- would not need lodging. I think maybe two of  
21 them -- two or three may require lodging, so you should  
22 look into making arrangements for that.

23 We need to get the virtual attendance links  
24 by the time of the prehearing conference.

25 And then we will take additional public

1 comment. We can either do it at the Commission and have  
2 a video link for people that don't live in Phoenix to  
3 call in to and make comment that way.

4 The other option I wanted to discuss with  
5 you is would you -- could the applicant set up some place  
6 in Springerville or Eagar or someplace up closer to where  
7 the people are and have a computer set up so they could  
8 do public comment by Zoom?

9 MR. DERSTINE: Yes, I'm sure we could do  
10 that.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And so we could --  
12 we could either schedule a separate public comment  
13 session -- I think I'd prefer just to do it on the first  
14 day, the 9th. We'd start at 10 a.m. And if you could  
15 have -- if the applicant could arrange to have somebody  
16 set up where you could line people up and they could get  
17 on the Zoom and give public comment to the committee from  
18 that remote location.

19 MR. DERSTINE: You're saying do that at  
20 10 a.m. on February 9?

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. So we'd start the  
22 meeting and we'd begin with public comment.

23 MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: And so people could  
25 either -- if they have their own computers, they can call

1 in through the link that will be on the notice of hearing  
2 for -- to attend to make public comment, how we set that  
3 up. It would either be -- I'm trying to think how we did  
4 that before. Is it in the notice of hearing, or is it  
5 put up after the notice of hearing, the link, the actual  
6 link? I think the link actually comes out afterwards.

7 But, yeah, they would be able to provide  
8 public comment in person at the Commission. There would  
9 be a phone number to call to give public comment. There  
10 would be the video link. And then the applicant could  
11 have a video link set up -- what's the location, do you  
12 think? Would it be Springerville? Would that be the  
13 best spot?

14 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, I would assume that  
15 Springerville's probably the best location.

16 I'd need to check with Ms. Ambrose or other  
17 members of our -- or SWCA on where is an appropriate  
18 location, whether we rent a meeting room at a hotel or  
19 something like that to set up the computer. But we can  
20 make those arrangements.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Or at -- I think someone --  
22 I believe some filing I saw someone mentioned the high  
23 school or something like that.

24 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, I just don't know  
25 about the high school in terms of having robust Wi-Fi.

1 So we just need to find somewhere that has, you know,  
2 robust Wi-Fi and be able to make the connection work.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. And that's going to  
4 be on a Monday at 10, so I don't think --

5 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: -- school's probably in  
7 session. That wouldn't be viable.

8 And then -- all right. So the public  
9 comment, like I said, again, the scope is for additional,  
10 not repetitive. So I think if people have already made  
11 public comment on the record, all of it's going to be in  
12 the transcript. They don't need to make public comment  
13 again. New -- people who have not yet made public  
14 comment will be able to, but the people who have already  
15 done public comment will not be making public comment  
16 again.

17 So you'll need to republish the notice. So  
18 it looks like if we're doing the hearing on February 9,  
19 the publication deadline for the second publication is  
20 January 10 of 2026.

21 What newspapers did you publish in last  
22 time, and would you be able to do that again for this  
23 notice?

24 MR. DERSTINE: So we used the local paper  
25 for the first publication and then had to rely on the

1 Arizona Republic to get the second publication in within  
2 the 10 days.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: What was the local paper?

4 MS. AMBROSE: The White Mountain  
5 Independent.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: And that is Mariana  
7 Ambrose? That's your client on the call?

8 MR. DERSTINE: Yes. Yes. Mariana, she's  
9 the project manager for CG Apache County Wind and CG  
10 Apache County Solar.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And so you'll be  
12 able to get both those publications in?

13 MR. DERSTINE: We will coordinate and  
14 communicate with the White Mountain Independent to ensure  
15 that we can. And if we cannot, we'll circle back with  
16 you and decide where's the -- what's the best alternative  
17 for the second publication.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: And you still have the five  
19 signs up, do you not?

20 MR. DERSTINE: I believe so, yes.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So you can update  
22 those signs with the new notice of hearing, dates,  
23 location?

24 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, we'll probably just  
25 have to replace them, yeah.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And then you'll  
2 do -- you'll send the notices, the transcripts and  
3 everything, the other documents in the case to St. Johns  
4 public library and the Round Valley library again?

5 MR. DERSTINE: Yes, the same library  
6 location.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So and then the --  
8 and the transcripts of the conferences and the hearing on  
9 the project, they're on the project website, are they  
10 not?

11 MR. DERSTINE: Yes, I believe so.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Get those up so people  
13 can -- they'll be able to see the transcript of this at  
14 the library and on the website.

15 And you got the turnaround for the  
16 transcripts is three days.

17 Now, you'll do more social media outreach  
18 for this hearing, the same scope as you did for the prior  
19 one?

20 MR. DERSTINE: We will. Do we call it a  
21 remand hearing? What do you want to --

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah.

23 MR. DERSTINE: -- call this?

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah. I'd just say remand  
25 hearing.

1 MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Because it's not -- you're  
3 not putting on your direct case again. That's already  
4 done. It's just going to be to receive additional input.  
5 I think the Commission really wants the County to  
6 participate in the process.

7 MR. DERSTINE: Right.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Whether they do or not is  
9 up to them, so.

10 And then so they will get notice of the  
11 hearing again. So they'll get a certified mail. It will  
12 go to the County, Apache County, and you'll send it again  
13 to Springerville, Eagar, St. Johns, State Land  
14 Department, and the Arizona Department of Transportation.

15 MR. DERSTINE: So it will be the same  
16 notice to the affected jurisdictions, the same notice  
17 that the County received as part of the original siting  
18 hearing. We'll reissue notices to the affected  
19 jurisdictions giving them notice of the remand hearing  
20 and dates.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. And I would -- I'll  
22 have them include the Commission Decision with that.

23 MR. DERSTINE: As an attachment to the  
24 notice? Okay.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: So that'll explain what's

1 going on, what's expected, what the scope of the matter  
2 is. It's not a hearing on the application. It's a  
3 remand hearing to get additional input on county and  
4 municipal land use concerns, impacts on the plans.

5 And we'll have a prehearing conference  
6 scheduled for Monday, February 2, 2026, at 11 a.m.

7 Depending on how -- if we get people  
8 interested in becoming parties, we may need to schedule  
9 another procedural conference to kind of work out  
10 logistics of how the hearing will go and address exhibits  
11 and testimony. I think we've had to do that in some  
12 other cases where we've had multiple parties. We didn't  
13 want to wait till the prehearing conference to finalize  
14 it. We had a procedural conference ahead of time to --

15 MR. DERSTINE: So the deadline to file the  
16 notice of intent to be a party and an application to  
17 intervene as a party would be the day before the  
18 prehearing conference of February 22?

19 CHMN STAFFORD: February 2.

20 MR. DERSTINE: February 2, I'm sorry.

21 Yeah.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: I'd have to do the math on  
23 that. It'll be -- it's five days before the hearing for  
24 limited appearances. That's business days. And then  
25 it's 10 days to become -- a notice to request -- notice

1 to become a party. And that's 10 business days. I'd  
2 have to get the calendar out and look at it, but --

3 MR. DERSTINE: Will you issue a procedural  
4 order that sets out those deadlines for --

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

6 MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. All right. And I  
8 will get the notice of hearing -- if we get that out and  
9 you have it on Monday, we'll be able to get the  
10 publishing done.

11 MS. GLENNON: Mr. Chairman --

12 MR. DERSTINE: Do you need us to send you a  
13 draft notice of hearing, or is that something that you  
14 and --

15 CHMN STAFFORD: No, I'm going to do that.  
16 I'll do that -- I'll do that myself. I'll get the -- I'm  
17 going to work on that today. Hopefully, I'll have it  
18 today. But if I -- if I can file today, I will. If it  
19 has to get filed on Monday, I'm just trying to figure  
20 out -- I mean, because you need to get it published twice  
21 before January 10, so I guess the sooner that goes out,  
22 the better.

23 MR. DERSTINE: Yep. Okay.

24 MS. GLENNON: Mr. Chairman, this is  
25 Karen --

1 CHMN STAFFORD: I'm not taking any public  
2 comment.

3 All right. Do you have what you need to --  
4 other than the actual notice of hearing, Mr. Derstine?

5 MR. DERSTINE: I believe so. And we'll  
6 make arrangements for the -- for the public comment  
7 session in Springerville or wherever we find is the  
8 appropriate location for that, and we'll update that  
9 information.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So what -- how  
11 I'll handle that is --

12 MR. DERSTINE: Would it be on our  
13 website -- on our project website?

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah. In the notice -- in  
15 the hearing -- in the hearing notice, obviously it will  
16 say public comment will begin at 10 on February 9.  
17 People can do it remote either by the video at the  
18 Commission -- the line at the Commission or in person.  
19 And that the applicant will have a location set up in  
20 Springerville for people who are in the area that don't  
21 have access to the Internet to come make comment so they  
22 can be shown at the Commission where the committee will  
23 be.

24 But the details of that we'll have to get  
25 from you later, but I'll -- the notice will have to be

1 updated. That'll be updated later because you don't have  
2 that today for us.

3 MR. DERSTINE: Correct.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So what we'll  
5 do is it can be updated on the project website. And if  
6 you can -- we can probably get that in the procedural  
7 order perhaps. If you can --

8 MR. DERSTINE: We'll see if we can run that  
9 down today and get that information over to Tod --  
10 Mr. Brewer and -- so you have it in terms of the location  
11 for the public comment session.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So then that  
13 will probably get included in the procedural order, but  
14 we won't have it in time to get it in the notice of  
15 hearing but it will be referenced in the notice of  
16 hearing.

17 MR. DERSTINE: Sounds right.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Is there  
19 anything else we need to cover, Mr. Derstine?

20 MR. DERSTINE: I don't think so. You  
21 indicated at the outset that the driver on the timing for  
22 this is the 180 days for the Commission -- for the  
23 committee to render its decision. I know that we, you  
24 know, based on what the Commission did at open hearing,  
25 indicated that we were waiving the rights under the

1 statute. I don't know that the 180 days can be waived,  
2 but I would be curious your thoughts on that. If the  
3 driver is the 180 days for this scheduling, is that  
4 something that the applicant can waive that would give  
5 the committee more time to schedule these hearings,  
6 et cetera?

7 CHMN STAFFORD: I don't think so. I think  
8 the statute says that we have to act within that time  
9 frame. Otherwise, the applicant has the ability to  
10 build. Now, I think -- I think under the statute you  
11 would have the right to build, but I don't think that  
12 it's actually a remedy that's really available to the  
13 applicant.

14 MR. DERSTINE: Right.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. Because my  
16 understanding is that you're not going to be able to --  
17 that's kind of a -- it's a remedy that's not really  
18 enforceable. I mean, what I heard, I heard you say not  
19 that you waived it, not that the applicant waived it, but  
20 that they're unable to exercise that right even if  
21 it's --

22 MR. DERSTINE: Or that we would not  
23 exercise whatever right we had to proceed.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. Well, the  
25 committee's going to act within the statutory time frame,

1 so it will be up to Commission.

2 MR. DERSTINE: Understood.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: They still have their 30 to  
4 60 days after we render our decision to render theirs. I  
5 don't -- I don't think that they can evade the statute by  
6 if they -- for example, if they sent it back to the  
7 committee again, we would be outside the 180 days to act,  
8 and I don't think we'd be able to do it again.

9 MR. DERSTINE: Thank you for that. Yeah,  
10 appreciate it.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: That's not how I read the  
12 statute, so. We have -- we're still within 180 days.  
13 Like I said, March 4, 2026, is the deadline for the  
14 committee to act. I don't think that's changed.

15 MR. DERSTINE: Very good.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Is there  
17 anything else, Mr. Derstine?

18 MR. DERSTINE: No, I don't believe so.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Do you have everything you  
20 need, Tod?

21 MR. BREWER: I do, Mr. Chairman. Thank  
22 you.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Well, I will  
24 get that notice of hearing issued. We'll see if we have  
25 additional parties.

1                   With that, we are adjourned.

2                   MR. DERSTINE: Thank you.

3                   (Proceedings concluded at 11:00 a.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA )  
2 COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

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

6  
7 I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the  
parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the  
outcome hereof.

8  
9 I CERTIFY that I have complied with the ethical  
obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(F)(3) and  
ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) and (2).

10 Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, December 22, 2025.  
11

12  
13   
14

---

JENNIFER HONN, RPR  
Arizona Certified Reporter  
No. 50885

17  
18 I CERTIFY that GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC, has  
complied with the ethical obligations set forth in  
19 ACJA 7-206(J)(1)

20  
21

22   
23

---

GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC  
Arizona Registered Firm  
No. R1035

25