San Lucas Homeowners Association Special Meeting:

June 23, 2022, at Marana Municipal Complex

Responses to questions and comments received during the meeting and subsequent communication

Introduction

A special meeting was held on June 23, 2022, with interested stakeholders from the San Lucas community regarding possible impacts of the Saguaro to Marana 115/138 kV transmission line project ("project") on their community. The purpose was to listen to concerns expressed by the residents and receive their questions and comments.

Below are responses provided by Arizona Electric Power Cooperative (AEPCO) for each written comment card, email, or letter we received in response to the meeting. Several questions were repeated by multiple attendees. These questions are answered in full below; repeated questions are directed to the prior answers as appropriate. The two most repeated concerns were: (1) potential health impacts related to electromagnetic fields (EMF), and (2) impacts to home values resulting from this project. These concerns are comprehensively addressed first. Following these responses are questions received on comment cards AEPCO distributed at the meeting and questions received via email in response to the meeting.

(1) Concerns Regarding EMF

Electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) are emitted by transmission lines, as well as all of the electrical appliances and electrical systems in our homes. Utilities, scientists, and regulatory agencies such as the Department of Energy have been studying EMFs for decades. The results of this research to date have not shown a cause-effect relationship between EMF and human health. Consistent with these conclusions, EMF standards have not been developed by the federal government or the state of Arizona.

Recommended design guidelines have been established by the Institute for Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) to protect against electrostimulation levels—the point at which people perceive or sense EMF. IEEE C95.6 "Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields" specifies a maximum electric field of 5 kV/meter for people near transmission-line corridors. The electric field values of the proposed Saguaro to Marana 115/138 kV transmission line, based on the modeling conducted by a third-party engineering firm, are well within this limit. The "Maximum Electric Field" is expected to be 0.048 kV/meter, less than 1/10 of the design standard maximum, at a distance of 150 feet from the north wall of the San Lucas community and 0.018 kV/m at a distance of 260 feet from the San Lucas community.

With respect to the magnetic field caused by transmission lines, it is important to understand that the strength of a magnetic field decreases dramatically with increasing distance from the source. This means that the strength of the magnetic field reaching a house or structure will be significantly

weaker the farther it is from the transmission line or other electric source. A microwave oven, for example, produces a strong magnetic field of about 200 milliGuass (mG) within 6 inches of the oven but only about 10 mG when 2 feet from the oven. The same is true for transmission lines. For example, "a magnetic field measuring 57.5 mG immediately beside a 230 kV transmission line measures just 7.1 mG at a distance of 100 feet, and 1.8 mG at a distance of 200 feet" away from the transmission line, according to the *National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), quoting the World Health Organization*. The magnetic field values of the proposed Saguaro to Marana 115/138 kV transmission line, based on the modeling conducted by a third-party engineering firm, follow the same pattern. The "maximum magnetic field" is 14.99 mG at a distance of 150 feet from the line and 5.1 mG at a distance of 260 feet.

A related comment from a member of the San Lucas Community raised a concern about a link between EMF exposure and childhood leukemia. The commenter sites a study conducted by Gerald Draper and published in the *BMJ*, a British medical trade journal, in 2005 (Draper study). Since then, several epidemiologic studies have examined the occurrence of childhood leukemia with respect to residential proximity to overhead transmission lines that are counter to the conclusion in the Draper study. See the summary of research in *Electric Power Research Institute: EMF and Your Health 2015* and *EMF and Your Health 2019.* More recent and comprehensive studies indicate that some other factor beside magnetic fields were responsible for the positive associations reported in some of the earlier epidemiologic literature.

Again, no evidence of adverse health effects from EMF fields of the type and value associated with transmission lines at the proposed distance from the San Lucas community have been conclusively found nor accepted by the scientific community. The EMF study conducted for this project can be found at our project website at https://azgtsaguaromarana.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/AEPCO-Field-Effects-002.pdf.

Sources:

IEEE C95.6 – Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields, 0-3 kHz." 2019

Electric Power Research Institute: EMF and Your Health 2015; EMF and Your Health 2019 Update. www.epri.com.

National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Electric and Magnetic Fields. www.niehs.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/emf/index.cfm.

(2) Concerns Regarding Property Values

A review of published literature regarding the effects of transmission lines on property values indicates that the effects are marginal. A 2010 article in the *Journal of Real Estate Literature* presents a review of empirical studies on the effects of electric transmission lines on property values. The primary purpose of those studies was to address the effects of the presence of transmission lines on the value of surrounding properties. The studies range from survey-based

research that provides important context to regression analyses of sales data to less formal appraisal-based sales analyses. The surveys of market participants and real estate professionals found evidence of concern and, at least in one survey, an assumption that such concern would impact property values. Others noted the unattractiveness of the transmission lines and structures. However, most of the regression-based sales price analyses found little or no effects on price. What effects were found tended to dissipate with time and distance.

Most studies have concluded that other factors, such as location of property, type, and condition of improvements, and the level of real estate activity are far more important than the presence of transmission lines in determining the value of residential property.

A paired sales analysis conducted in Tucson by Baker, Peterson, Baker and Associates, Inc. ("Baker") indicated no diminution in value due to a single family home being adjacent to transmission lines. Additionally, based on the results from prior studies, Baker determined there is not market support for a diminution in sale prices or value of home due to proximity to a transmission line. The Baker analysis is available on the project website at https://azgtsaguaromarana.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Baker-Property-Report.pdf.

Sources:

The Effects of Electric Transmission Lines on Property Values, Thomas O. Jackson and Jennifer Pitts, Journal of Real Estate Literature, Vol. 18, No. 2 (2010), pp. 239-260.

Transmission Line Impact of Residential Property Values, International Right-of-Way Association

Written Comment Sheet 1

1) **Homeowner claimed they did not receive AEPCO's project mailings.**

   The homeowner's address was cross referenced with AEPCO's mailing database, and two mailings were sent to this address.

2) **Resident would like information on the EMF study.**

   The EMF study is available on the project website at https://azgtsaguaromarana.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/AEPCO-Field-Effects-002.pdf.

3) **How will this impact home values?**

   See response on pages 2-3, "Concerns Regarding Property Values."

4) **When was the vote taken and how many homeowners were present? Seems like out of 1,400 letters that went out no one from S.L. was present.**

AEPCO's assumption is that this homeowner is referring to the vote taken by the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee during the June 6-7 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility (CEC) Hearing. The vote to approve the CEC was 7-0 to approve. To AEPCO's knowledge there were no homeowners present in person, but the option was also available to participate via Zoom. AEPCO has verified that all Project Notices were sent to the address of the individual asking this question. In addition to the mailings, AEPCO followed every regulatory requirement for notifying the public of the hearing as well as publicized it on social media. Signs notifying passers-by in the area were also placed along the proposed route, notifying them both of the proposed project and the time, date, and location of the CEC hearing.

5) **Can this proposal be stopped?**

The Arizona Power Plant and Line Siting Committee voted 7-0 to recommend that the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) approve the project at an upcoming meeting. The ACC has the final vote on whether to approve or reject the project.

6) **When will the construction start and how long will it take?**

Construction of the overall project is anticipated to start in the third quarter of 2023 and last approximately ten months.

Written Comment Sheet 2

1) **How does this affect health and home values?**

See responses on pages 1-3, "Concerns Regarding EMF" and "Concerns Regarding Property Values."

2) **Why was resident never informed of this?**

The homeowner's address was cross referenced with AEPCO's mailing database, and two mailings were sent to this address. AEPCO followed every regulatory requirement for notifying the public of the proposed project and CEC hearing and also publicized it on social media. Signs notifying passers-by in the area were also placed along the proposed route, notifying them both of the proposed project and the time, date and location of the CEC hearing.

3) **Why isn't there an alternative route that wouldn't affect homeowners?**

As part of selecting a route for this project, AEPCO analyzed multiple alternatives. Based on AEPCO's analysis, two primary routes were identified. Both alternatives followed section lines pursuant to the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) guidelines. One alternative was located 1 mile north of San Lucas and one was just north of the San Lucas community. The northern alternative was removed from consideration due to significant potential to impact cultural resources, specifically the Marana Mounds Complex. Both the Rural Utilities Service

(RUS) and the Arizona Historic Preservation Office agreed that the southern alternative would significantly reduce potential impacts to cultural resources.

4) **Chance of line falling or getting hit?**

This transmission line is designed to comply with National Electric Safety Code (NESC) and Rural Utilities Service (RUS) standards, which include protection against extreme weather conditions that the structure and wire may experience. This includes wind speeds defined in the NESC, which has been adopted by the state of Arizona as the required design code for transmission lines. These wind speeds exceed what a typical monsoon storm would produce. In addition, the distance from the poles to the community wall will exceed the height of the pole.

5) **Long term health effects?**

AEPCO is assuming this question is referring to the effects of EMF. Based on an analysis conducted by a third-party engineering firm and the distance to the line, the line would pose no health effects. See also response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

Written Comment Sheet 3

1) **Yes EMF results.**

The EMF study is available on the project website at https://azgtsaguaromarana.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/AEPCO-Field-Effects-002.pdf.

2) **Health issues.**

AEPCO is assuming this question is referring to effects of EMF. Based on analysis by a third-party engineering firm and the distance to the line, the line would pose no health effects. See also response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

3) **Transparency.**

AEPCO is not clear if this comment is a question or a request for further information. During the project planning phase through the regulatory approval process, AEPCO has been fully transparent regarding the project details and project impacts. Project details are on www.azgtsaguaromarana.com; if this resident would like additional information or clarification, please let us know.

4) **View.**

AEPCO is not clear if this comment is a question or a request for further information. Visual impacts will depend on the exact location of the proposed line and disposition of structures in

relation to individual residences. There are a total of 49 lots along the northern edge of the San Lucas community.

5) **Resident plans on growing their family. EMF causes infertility.**

There is no evidence that EMF exposure at the levels associated with this project causes infertility. See response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

Written Comment Sheet 4

1) **When you only received 4 feedbacks out of 1,400 letters sent out, should that have been a clue that something went wrong? How many people typically respond to the same amount of letters with something so intrusive to their property?**

The initial mailing of 1,420 initial letters was intended to notify all residents within 1 mile of the project that there was a proposed transmission line in the area and to direct those residents to project-related information on our project website and virtual open house. During the first month after AEPCO's initial mailing, 170 users visited AEPCO's project website. By June 6, 2022, 718 users had visited the project website. AEPCO does not have any numbers documenting a "typical" response, but according to our third-party engineering firm, which has conducted public outreach for other utilities, the participation AEPCO experienced in this process was typical.

2) **I have migraines, and many things can be a trigger. I know when it will rain the day before due to high pressure. How is this high voltage electrical line not going to impair me further? EMF =Radiation**

No consistent relationship between extremely low frequency fields and self-reported symptoms like fatigue, headache, and concentration difficulties have been demonstrated by exposure to EMF. See response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

3) **The houses along the wall will reduce in value. This will have a ripple effect on the entire community.**

See response above on pages 2-3, "Concerns Regarding Property Values."

Written Comment Sheet 5

1) **Concerned about EMF.**

See response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

2) **Concerned about property values.**

See response above on pages 2-3, "Concerns Regarding Property Values."

3) **Concerned about health concerns.**

AEPCO assumes the health concerns are related to EMF. See response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

4) **We never received the "letter" or "postcard".**

The homeowner's address was cross referenced with AEPCO's mailing database, and two mailings were sent to this address.

Written Comment Sheet 6

1) **Safety of the line in proximity to the houses. Is there a fire hazard if a line falls on a house? Is the concern for health impacts such as cancer or concerns for inaudible impacts to hearing?**

As an initial matter, the line will not be placed close enough to any home for it to fall on a residence. The poles near the San Lucas community would be a maximum of 95 feet in height but located at least 150 to 260 feet away from the closest home. Moreover, the steel monopoles being used for the proposed line have a very strong safety rating, and it is very unlikely that one of these poles would fall.

Moreover, high-voltage transmission lines are sectionalized by breakers, which stop the flow of electricity when a fault occurs, and other protective equipment.

The question relating to cancer is addressed in the response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

AEPCO is not aware of any concerns related to inaudible impacts to hearing.

2) **Housing values are a significant concern. As housing in AZ continues to rise all homeowners in San Lucas will suffer significant devaluing.**

See response above on pages 2-3, "Concerns Regarding Property Values."

3) **Inadequate alternative options are being offered. There is always another way that will not sacrifice people and their homes.**

Because of constraints imposed by the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) and potential impacts to sensitive cultural resources, the route supported by the Arizona Power Plant and Line Siting Committee is the best alternative route to address electric service reliability concerns in the area.

Email Comment 1

1) **Is the rule from State Trust Land, noted at the HOA meeting, set by ARS statute, legislation, or just agency guidelines?**

AEPCO assumes this question is related to the Arizona State Land Department's (ASLD) requirement to follow section lines, roads, or existing infrastructure when proposing a new transmission line. AEPCO is unaware of any state statute that governs ASLD's requirement to follow section lines. However, this is a standard request by ASLD consistent with its obligation to act as a trustee for state land, and ultimately the agency has the authority to grant or deny right-of-way applications. ASLD has a fiduciary duty to the trust to maximize the value of its land for educational dollars. AEPCO is in the process of requesting easement terms that would allow AEPCO to place the line as far north on the easement away from the community wall as possible (approximately 260 feet).

2) **Have there been any instances where State Land Trust allowed infrastructure (of any kind, not just power lines) that was neither by existing infrastructure nor on a section line?**

AEPCO is a not-for-profit generation and transmission cooperative, so we have no information with respect to non-transmission projects. Because ASLD has a fiduciary responsibility to the trust, following section lines is always a mandate.

   a) **If yes, then why was a route just south of the Marana Mounds not an alternate route for this power line?**

   Again, ASLD has a standard to site projects on section lines and that requirement would apply to an overland route south of the Marana Mounds complex.

   b) **If not, are there any regulations, guidelines, etc. that require a cost/benefit assessment for this rule that, when invoked, results in greatly impairing the finances of citizens? Can this one guideline supersede the loss in millions of dollars (cumulative) of San Lucas families? Do they understand home equity is the main or only source of retirement funds or family wealth for many or most of San Lucas families?**

   AEPCO is not aware of any requirement to complete a cost/benefit analysis for any rules governing the development of transmission line infrastructure and cannot speak for ASLD.

3) **Why was the communication from Trico so completely lacking? Not included in LiveWire, notice with a bill, and couldn't even bother to come to the HOA meeting. I understand AEPCO was supposed to represent them, but it seems the effect was just to shift any adverse reaction to some company most of us have never heard of.**

AEPCO provides wholesale power and transmission services to Trico, but this is not a Trico project; it is an AEPCO system reliability project. AEPCO is the applicant for the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility (CEC), which permits us to build the project. As such, at no time did AEPCO "represent" Trico. The HOA invited AEPCO to the HOA meeting as the project proponent. Trico benefits from this project and supports the project, but AEPCO is the responsible entity. Trico did post notices on its Facebook page when the letters and postcards were mailed to stakeholders in January and March.

4) **Was the initial postcard, the only point of public comment, shown to any average resident who wasn't connected to the industry, prior to distribution to assess it for clarity? I'm a college graduate, and I couldn't even understand what I was supposed to comment on. How would I make any intelligent comment about how to assemble all those segments into a planned route? There were few street names, no distances shown between San Lucas and segment 50, no indication of the rules that must have been known at the time (State Trust guidelines, NEPA, etc.).**

The first mailing sent to residents within 1 mile of the potential project area was a letter that included two proposed alternatives near the San Lucas community. The purpose of the letter was to inform the public of the project and direct them to our project website to obtain additional information. The postcard was a subsequent mailing to notify the public of the proposed route and inform the public of the dates of the CEC hearing. Information on the project was disseminated in multiple other ways, including targeted Facebook ads, AEPCO's website, Trico's website, Tucson Electric Power's website, and the Town of Marana's website. The project website provided multiple ways to contact project staff if there were any questions on what was being proposed or if the information appeared confusing.

5) **There are existing lines that are clearly seen at a distance north of San Lucas, why couldn't this line run along the same stretch? What are those lines?**

It is AEPCO's understanding that the line to which this commenter is referring to is a Trico line, but AEPCO does not know the voltage of the line or what property rights Trico holds with the ASLD. Using the area of the line referenced was not considered, primarily because it would bisect the ASLD administered lands and impact the Marana Mounds complex.

6) **Why couldn't the new line come west from Saguaro substation, cross I-10 there and then the planned substation located coming south toward the Marana substation?**

Building a line west from the Arizona Public Service (APS) Saguaro Substation and simply connecting the Saguaro Substation with the existing Marana Substation does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed project. For reliability purposes, the need for this project is

to connect the proposed Adonis Substation with the existing Marana Substation. The Adonis Substation will primarily be provided electricity through AEPCO's system via the Marana Substation. The connection to the APS Saguaro Substation is backup/redundancy to maintain electric service to Marana if service is disrupted to or at Marana Substation.

Email Comment 2

1) **We have been active on this issue since the first postcard came out, called to question the proposal and favored the option away from directly behind my wall in my backyard. I was told to bring my comments to the hearing. At the hearing I heard that it was voted 7-0 because you didn't get many complaints, but we were told early on during our phone call that we were to bring comments to this hearing. This is what I shared with neighbors as well.**
   AEPCO is unaware of any confusion related to the public's ability to provide comments to the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee during the CEC open hearing June 6-7. By "bring my comments to the hearing," AEPCO assumes the commenter is referring to the in-person comment period that was open to the public. No member of the public provided in-person comments during the hearing. The meeting was also broadcasted via Zoom, where comments from the public were also solicited, and none were received.

2) **There is a power line a distance from my back wall and we would like to know if that right-of-way can be used and why it hasn't been an option. We want to know why these lines have to be in my backyard when you have done a good job in the past keeping overhead wires out of the neighborhood.**

   It is AEPCO's understanding that the line to which this commenter is referring to is a Trico line, but AEPCO does not know the voltage of the line or what property rights Trico has with the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD). Using the area of the line referenced was not considered, primarily because it would bisect the ASLD-administered lands. The selection of the proposed route near the San Lucas community was based on potential impacts to sensitive resources and constrains imposed by ASLD.

Email Comment 3 (submitted via project email)

1) **This is in regards to the proposed plan to build high power tension lines super close to homes in San Lucas. I have seen the proposed plans and I am highly against them being installed so close to homes. They should be at a minimum 1,800 feet further from the homes north on San Lucas. If they are moved further away this will help home values stay closer to the same value they are without them and it reduces the risk of cancers especially in children. I bought my home in San Lucas because it was not near these power lines. To hear they are planned to be installed so close to homes is quite upsetting. I wish they were not to be installed at all but understand to support infrastructure it may need to be installed. I am asking it be moved north a minimum of 1,800 from San Lucas or put somewhere else away from the homes in San Lucas.**

Health risks associated with the proposed transmission line are addressed above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF." Because of constraints imposed by the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) and potential impacts to sensitive resources, this line cannot be permitted or constructed 1,800 feet north of the San Lucas community.

Email Comment 4 (submitted via project email)

1) **My first concern relates to safety. Numerous studies have shown increased rates of leukemia in communities near high voltage power lines (Gerald Draper, 2005). I am a healthcare provider who practices at Marana Healthcare and it is a well-known fact that children are far more susceptible to cellular damage/defects than adults. This is because when DNA is wound up tightly in the chromosome it is more resistant to radiation/EMFs. However, when it has to unwind to facilitate cell replication it is far more vulnerable. Due to children's rapid growth (increased cell replication) they are vastly more susceptible to all forms of radiation. This is not new information; I remember learning about this 15 years ago while getting my Bachelors in Science. Since then the data has been getting more alarming about the risks. When I first started working in the ER we used to CT scan most children who had suffered any sort of trauma to their head. Now we realize how much damage we did and have significantly cut down on the amount of imaging we subject children too. These power lines are very close to our homes and I have very young children (1 and 3 yrs old). There is no doubt they would be at increased risk from this project. I have seen pediatric cancer numerous times in my career, the thought of my children being at increased risk for this is my number one concern.**

   See response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

2) **My second concern is regarding decreased home values. Obviously having dangerous, ugly power lines next to your house will decrease a home's value. Like most Americans the majority of my wealth is locked up in my home. This is wealth I need to retire with dignity and help my children with college. It is wealth I have accumulated from working years in healthcare, which have been very challenging, especially the past couple years. Every study agrees that high voltage power lines next to your house significantly decreases your home's value. Decreases in home values vary, this article found houses adjacent to powerlines decreased in value by 44.9% (Mothorpe, 2018). This would immediately put me underwater on my mortgage and devastate me and my family financially. I'm too old to recover from such a devastating blow and the effects would be multigenerational.**

   What makes this most difficult for me to accept is that this devastating event in my life would not have been caused by a natural events or disease. It would being caused by a power company, and the people who work there, who made deliberate choices to harm my children and devastate my family's finances. I hope you consider my concerns and perhaps try to put yourself in my family's shoes.

   See response above on pages 2-3, "Concerns Regarding Property Values."

Email Comment 5

1) **Was a route directly across from the Saguaro Substation crossing I-10 considered, to then come directly South to feed the proposed TEP substation? (Instead of first coming South towards San Lucas and then crossing I-10 as is currently planned)**

   No, building a line west from Saguaro to the proposed TEP substation does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed project. For reliability purposes, the need for this project is to connect the proposed Adonis Substation with the existing Marana Substation. TEP's participation in this project is to save costs and reduce environmental impacts associated with building an additional high voltage transmission line in the future.

2) **Assuming this route is approved (if we are unsuccessful getting it moved/stopped)**
   a) **How long will construction take?**

      Construction of the overall project is anticipated to start in the third quarter of 2023 and last approximately ten months.

   b) **What dust control measures will they implement during construction?**

      Appropriate dust control measures will be employed during construction. If a fugitive dust permit is required by the town of Marana or Pima County, AEPCO will obtain the requisite permit.

   c) **How often will there be vehicle traffic along the service road for the poles/lines?**

      AEPCO assumes this question relates to after the initial construction is completed. The steel monopole configuration proposed will require the line be patrolled annually.

Email Comment 6

1) **Resident is concerned about disruption from construction and the copious amounts of dust and airborne soil. The construction will negatively affect those with respiratory medical conditions, as well as generating a large amount of noise pollution.**

   Appropriate dust control measures will be employed during construction. If a fugitive dust permit is required by the town of Marana or Pima County, AEPCO will obtain the requisite permit. Construction noise will be mitigated as much as possible, and construction activities will be conducted during normal working hours.

2) **The pleasant views of the mountains and desert to the north of the community, will be permanently marred by the power lines crossing those views.**

   AEPCO realizes some visual impacts will occur as a result of the project but will take mitigating measures to reduce these impacts to the community.

3) **Resident is concerned about additional health problems caused by the electromagnetic field unavoidably developed by high tension lines. Strong, artificial EM fields, such as those caused from power lines, can scramble and interfere with the human body's natural EM fields. This EM field interference can harm everything from sleep cycles and stress levels, to the human body's immune response, and can even negatively affect the human body's DNA. Additionally, on a non-biological level, these EM fields can also interfere with and negatively affect the electrical operations of all manner of electronics and electrical devices in the home. The closer to one is to the source of the EM fields, these high-tension lines, the more severe the effects are.**

   See response above on pages 1-2, "Concerns Regarding EMF."

4) **Resident requests a flyer be distributed among the residences regarding potential life changes.**

   This document discusses the concerns expressed by the residents and will be provided to the homeowner's association for dissemination and posted on the project website. If residents have specific questions unanswered by this document, they are welcome to reach out to AEPCO any time.

Email Comment 7

1) **How loud will the powerline be when energized? Resident has been under powerlines early on quiet mornings in the middle of the desert and can hear an annoying buzzing sound, will that be the case with these power lines as well? Will they be able to hear them while relaxing in their quiet backyard?**

   Under normal conditions, the maximum calculated audible noise for the single circuit and double circuit configurations at a 37.5-foot offset is -8.3 dB(A) and 4.8 dB(A), respectively. At a 50-foot offset under fair conditions, the maximum calculated audible noise for the single circuit and double circuit configurations is -9.5 dB(A) and 3.8 dB(A), respectively. A negative dB(A) value represents a noise that is below the threshold of the human ear; therefore, the transmission line will have no audible noise to the average human ear. There will be no noise associated with this line detectable from residences in the San Lucas community.

2) **How close to our back walls and the drainage wash behind our houses will these lines be installed? It's not clear from the map they provided in the mailing. Will it be along the fenceline directly where the State Trust Land starts, which is about 20 yards from their back wall?**

   Ultimately the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) will determine how wide of the easement they are willing to issue, which will determine the distance the line is constructed from the block wall. AEPCO will continue to work with ASLD and plans to request a 300-foot

easement. A 300-foot easement would allow AEPCO to construct the line 260 feet from the block wall.

3) **Will there be an access road built, and an easement purchased by the power company from the Arizona State Land Department? If so, does that mean that there will be more traffic behind our houses, from both the utility company and the public?**

   An easement will be obtained from the ASLD, and roads will be required to access each structure location during construction. It is anticipated that AEPCO will construct spur roads from the existing dirt road to access the structure. After construction, AEPCO will inspect this line once a year. Given new roads associated with construction only go a short distance from the existing road, AEPCO does not anticipate they will be used by the public.

4) **What will be the decrease in home values that the whole community should expect to see? Will it be a greater decrease for those of us with our backyards facing the new powerline with direct view of the powerline itself? Does the company plan to compensate those effected for their loss?**

   See response above on pages 2-3, "Concerns Regarding Property Values." AEPCO does not plan to compensate landowners.

5) **Is there a reason that they cannot run these powerlines underground to minimize the effects on our mountain views and possibly limit the sound pollution caused by them?**

   The primary reason for not placing the new transmission line underground is cost. A third-party professional engineering firm provided a cost estimate of over $20 million to place underground .91 miles of line. As stated above, there will not be sound pollution associated with this project.

Email Comment 8 (submitted via project email)

1) **How close will the line be from the San Lucas community? The simulation makes it look like it follows right along the back wall. Is this accurate?**

   It is anticipated that the line will be between 150 feet to 260 feet from the San Lucas flood wall.