

Santan Landscaping and Mitigation Community Working Group
September 8, 2001

Attendees

Melissa Apergis for Michael Apergis
Scott Morrison
Mark Kwiat
Cathy Latona
Cathy Lopez
Nan Dawson
Marshall Green
Kimberly Pugh
George Pettit
Maggie Cathey
Richard Andrews
Mark Bauman

Absent

Michael Apergis (proxy given to Melissa Apergis)

SRP Attendees

Randy Dietrich
Russ Garrett
Michelle Colores

Audience Attendees

Larry Petillo
Dale Borger
Mike Evans
David Lundgreen
Erin Paige
Lauren Reber

Other Attendees

Greg Bernosky (Ten Eyck)
Suzanne Hartnett (Ten Eyck)
Mary Orton (Facilitator)
Dave Wilson (Ten Eyck)

The seventh meeting of the CWG was conducted on the morning of September 8, 2001 in the Gilbert Municipal Building.

Mary reminded the group that its deadline for completing the on-site landscaping plans is October 21, 2001. She summarized the items on which the members have reached consensus. Those items are:

- Build a sound and security wall on the east side
- Location of the fence next to the berm along Warner Road
- Enhanced berm along north and west sides

Mary encouraged all members and audience members to refrain from engaging in separate discussions during the meetings. This will insure that everyone's attention is focused on the subject at hand.

She indicated that, because of a request from CWG members, Ten Eyck had prepared a notebook of photos taken with the crane in place to show the height of the stacks. She indicated that the CWG members could share the notebook among themselves.

Agenda

CWG members reviewed the agenda and made the following changes:

- Moved Russ's discussion on stack treatment options ahead of the approval of minutes in order to accommodate Russ' travel schedule.

Added a status report on moving the gas metering station.
Added a discussion on the budget for the landscaping and mitigation.

Stack Treatment Options

Russ presented the stack treatment concepts that the Larson Company developed in conjunction with the original CWG work. Russ was not able to find all of the Larson's original work. Some of that work consisted of simple sketches reflecting different themes. Some CWG members recalled that one of these was an agricultural theme.

The group discussed the options. Some members recalled that the original CWG had rejected these options because their impact was to make the stacks even more massive and noticeable. Others were interested in exploring a thematic approach. **After discussion, the CWG agreed that they would not revisit the stack treatment options.**

The group discussed the color of the stack. Some CWG members recalled that the original CWG chose a sky gray color. A member mentioned that colors take on varying visibility depending on the time of day, cloud cover, and atmospheric condition. The group debated whether to have SRP bring in a sample of the gray color, and whether to reopen discussion on the color of the stacks. The CWG asked that SRP bring in an example of the agreed-upon color. **After further discussion, the group agreed to maintain the color of the stacks per the original CWG decision.**

An audience member stated that trees would be a solution for 10 to 15 years out, but not before. He also pointed out that SRP needs a continual commitment to replace the trees that die off or become diseased.

Another audience member asked if it was possible to put all three stacks in one liner. Russ noted that such a liner would have to be concrete and would be more massive than the current plan for the stacks. A CWG member remarked that the current clustered plan for the stacks, chosen by the original CWG, reflects the overall desire to minimize the structures visible on the site. **The CWG agreed to maintain the stack-clustering concept per the original CWG decision.**

Gas Metering Station

Randy reminded the group about SRP's commitment (codified in the Arizona Corporation Commission's order) to either build a solid wall around the existing gas metering station, or move the station to the interior of the plant site. He explained that SRP plans to move the gas metering station to the southern part of the plant site, but El Paso Natural Gas Company must first obtain regulatory approval before any construction can take place. This requirement will delay the relocation work such that SRP would not be able to make the six-month requirement as specified in Condition #13 in the ACC order. Consequently, SRP plans to install a temporary wall in front of the gas metering station; the wall will remain in place until the station is moved to the interior of the plant site, which should occur around the first of 2002.

Minutes

Mary reviewed the changes made to the minutes from the July 28 meeting. The group made four additional corrections and approved the minutes as amended.

One member expressed a desire to see specific names in the minutes when individuals made statements or expressed opinions. She also requested the minutes be more detailed. Mary indicated that she had minimized the mention of specific names in order to streamline the minutes and the discussion of the minutes. Another member suggested some changes to the fuel tank discussion to address the concerns, and the group agreed to make those changes.

Mary will incorporate the changes indicated above and distribute the final version of the July 28 minutes to the CWG members.

Mary then asked the group if they had any comments on the August 14 minutes. The group made several changes, and approved the minutes as amended. Mary will incorporate the changes into the August 14 minutes and send the final version to the CWG members.

Budget

Randy indicated that there had been some question about the budget for this project. He felt that some review of the history of this topic would add specificity and help the CWG do its job.

Randy reviewed Conditions 7 and 8 in the ACC order, pointing out that the continuous fund mentioned in Condition 7 referenced the monies which SRP would provide to the Town, and which the Town would disburse to the HOAs over time to fund the ongoing operations and maintenance associated with the offsite landscaping. Randy felt that the wording in this Condition was not very clear but that this was his recollection of the intent of the continuous fund.

Randy then reviewed portions of the transcript from the siting committee hearings where the discussion centered on the question of adding a specific dollar amount for the landscaping to the language in the Conditions. Randy described his view that the transcript revealed two reasons for the Line Siting Committee's reluctance to cite a specific dollar amount. The first was that everyone was working with an estimated cost to perform the work cited in Exhibit 88, which was the base plan as described in the hearing process. People recognized that it was possible for this estimate to understate the actual cost to build the base plan. Both the interveners and the committee members present on that day were concerned that SRP provide sufficient funds to construct the base plan. The second reason was that some siting committee members desired SRP to go beyond the base plan and provide additional funds for the CWG to enhance parts of the plan that were most important to them.

Randy indicated that the most recent cost estimate for the base plan, which Ten Eyck had prepared, came in approximately \$1 million over the estimate used during the siting

committee hearings. The original estimate for the onsite landscaping was \$3.1 million plus \$500,000 for the trails, and this most recent cost estimate (for the onsite plan including trails) is \$4.5 million. Randy said that SRP was still committed to funding the base plan. He stated that SRP would bring an additional \$500,000 to the table for the CWG to use in finalizing the plans for the on-site landscaping.

Randy clarified that these budget figures do include the trails, but do not include the following items:

- Warner Road improvements
- Perimeter wall
- Moving the solar panels and retention pond to make room for the berm
- Other IGA requirements (canal work, etc.)
- Pit to depress the HRSGs
- Architectural fees
- \$50,000 commitment from SRP to each of the five surrounding HOAs

Some CWG members felt that they should not agree to any budget limits until they could see the estimated cost of the final set of ideas for the landscaping. One CWG member reminded the group that SRP was going to save a couple hundred million dollars by building at Santan compared to alternative sites. One member suggested that the final landscaping plans might come in somewhat higher than the dollar limit that Randy had defined, and she wondered if SRP would be willing to commit additional funds over that dollar limit. Randy indicated that they would consider that, along with the circumstances at the time.

One CWG member reminded the group that the most recent cost estimate was prepared by a trained professional. He also felt that it would be a waste of time to consider enhancements far above the \$5 million limit that SRP had just described. Another member suggested that the group focus on its landscaping plans, and if the budget is inadequate, address that issue when it arises. A member of the CWG mentioned the report by Maricopa County Assessor Kevin Ross indicating his estimate of loss in property value at 15% at stack completion.

One member asked that Dave send the detailed cost estimates to the CWG members. Dave agreed to distribute that information to the CWG members. In addition, as the group makes changes to the base plan, Dave will provide updated budget figures to the group.

Third Oil Tank

Randy spoke briefly on the issue of removal of the third oil tank. He indicated that SRP was not prepared to answer that question at this time, and that we would have an answer by the time we reach the end of this process. However, SRP has instructed Ten Eyck to proceed with two plans for the southwest corner of the property, one assuming that the southernmost tank would remain and an alternate assuming that it would be removed. The CWG members reminded him that they had a deadline of October 21 for finalizing the plans for the on site landscaping. Randy indicated that SRP would make

its decision by that date, and by having Ten Eyck prepare two plans, no time should be lost.

He also indicated that SRP is removing all the oil from the northernmost two tanks.

Continued Review of Draft Conceptual Landscaping Mitigation Plan

Dave continued his review of specific details of the landscaping plan for the CWG members, systematically walking through the draft plans for each of the four property boundaries and requesting feedback on that plan from the CWG members.

Landscaping Details – West Side

Dave began by describing the base plan for the west side of the property. The berm incorporates a 3:1 slope along the outside with a gabion wall on the inside, per the earlier agreement of the CWG. There is a scattering of vegetation on the side of the berm facing away from the SRP property, similar to what one would see along the freeway berms in town. The existing oleanders and trees along the west side would form a screen for the base of the berm.

A CWG member asked if prior plans had included a berm with a 40-foot height. Dave didn't recall seeing that in the original plans. He pointed out that the early plans prepared by EPG included 2:1 slopes, which would be too steep. He stated that in his opinion a 40-foot berm would be too big and out of scale for the neighborhood. Dave had investigated adding five feet to the 25-foot berm and found that the additional height would require a switch from gabion walls to concrete walls. Because concrete would cost four to five times more than the gabion wall, he didn't think that increasing the height only five feet was cost effective.

An audience member stated that it would take 10 to 15 years for the trees on top of the berms to achieve their full height. He initiated a discussion of the best type of pine trees to use for height and screening. He also asked whether there would be enough pine trees available in Arizona to accommodate the needs of this project. Dave said that he had found 300 48-inch box trees when he had made inquiries related to the Kyrene Expansion Project a year ago. He noted that these trees would be in the neighborhood of 15 to 20 feet high when planted, and would grow to approximately 40 feet in 10 to 15 years.

A CWG member suggested that we contract to grow the trees that will be needed for Santan once we know how many are needed.

Dave pointed out that his sketches reflected a 20- to 25-foot spacing between trees on top of the berm. The berm will meander in width at the top. One member wanted sufficient spacing between trees to prevent a hole from appearing when a tree dies. An audience member asked if SRP would have another site where we were growing trees for transplanting when an on-site tree dies. Dave indicated that this question had not yet been addressed, but he felt that it would be good to have some variability in tree size over time. A member pointed out that the larger the tree, the more shock it

undergoes when transplanted. He said that smaller trees would surpass a larger transplant in growth since the smaller tree would better adjust to transplanting.

Dave noted that there would be additional planting in front of the third fuel tank, if it remains, to attempt to screen it from the community to the west. However, if the retention dikes remain, there is not room for the berm to continue to the south in front of the remaining fuel tank. A CWG member pointed out that the existing tree line does not shield the third oil tank from Western Skies, particularly from traffic exiting Black Diamond Boulevard onto Val Vista. She pointed out that if the southernmost tank stays in place, there would be no room for a berm on the southwest corner of the property to mask that view. The group brainstormed some ideas for improving the view for Western Skies. Ideas included the following:

- Build a wall in front of the existing south tank.
- Move the tank to another location on the property and extend the berm.
- SRP could buy a triangular section of property just south of the railroad tracks and just east of Val Vista; trees planted there could perhaps provide the needed visual mitigation for Western Skies.
- Keep the middle oil tank and remove the ones to the north and south. The existing trees on site provide a better visual screen for the northern two tanks.
- Put higher trees in front of whichever tank is left.
- Change the shape of the dikes (from square to something else) to be able to install a berm in front of the tank.
- Removal of all diesel tanks.

Several members indicated strong opposition to any of the three existing diesel tanks being left on the property. One member felt that if SRP left any tank it would be best to leave the north tank, although someone else pointed out that the Western Skies view would be of the HRSGs if the middle or north tank were removed. Randy pointed out that the north tank is the exact site for the new cooling tower. He also indicated that several other tanks and auxiliary buildings will be located near the location of the middle tank. He was not sure that they could keep the middle tank, but he promised that SRP staff would investigate such a possibility.

Dave indicated that he would investigate the use of steeper slopes for the berm in the area of the oil tanks to help fit in a berm on the west side of the middle tank if it is the one that remains. He said we definitely should not remove any existing vegetation on the west side to accommodate this problem.

An audience member expressed concern that the existing diesel tanks violated EPA and Arizona requirements. Randy assured him that all regulatory requirements were being met.

Another member asked if we were risking disease by planting only one type of tree. Dave said that the design would include various types of trees so that a particular disease would not wipe out the entire tree screen on top of the berms. An audience

member said that it was crucial that the ongoing maintenance plan help produce healthy trees with long lives.

Landscaping Details – South Side

Dave reviewed the plans for the south side of the property and indicated that there was limited space in this area for significant improvements. He also indicated that transmission lines to the southeast limited the height of trees that could be planted in that area. Randy indicated that SRP would have to modify the railroad spur coming onto the Santan property to provide for a larger radius curve. SRP found that this was necessary at their Kyrene facility to accommodate rail shipments for the large pieces of equipment associated with the new generating plants. Dave indicated that the plan on this side was to supplement the existing landscaping with a berm, as tall as possible, in the open spaces. No planting was possible on the landfill on the east side of this section.

A CWG member asked about the possibility of trail along the railroad right-of-way. George said that public feedback was not positive for trails along railroad tracks.

A member pointed out the different plant zones referenced on sheet 5 of Exhibit 88, and wanted to make sure that the height of the trees planned in this area matched the exhibit. Dave said that his plan was consistent with Exhibit 88. He also indicated that the proposed trees would help mask the existing raw water tank for views from south of the property.

The member suggested that the southern boundary be a special area for landscaping, and that the CWG should insure that the highest trees possible be used in these special areas. Dave said that he could recommend taller trees in such zones, but that the CWG would have to designate those special areas. The group decided that Dave would complete his description of the complete on-site plan before the CWG made any decision on which areas should have special treatment.

A CWG member raised the issue of noise for residents south of the railroad tracks. One member suggested that a sound wall was needed for this purpose. Mary reminded the group that the CWG would make a decision on a 10-foot perimeter wall that was part of the ACC conditions. Another member felt that noise would not be a major concern for those residents and the CWG should spend its limited funds on enhanced vegetation instead. Another member agreed that sound is a concern; he indicated that he hears the plant today and he lives a half-mile from the property. Some CWG members asked if the acoustical consultant could be available for the meeting when the sound wall will be discussed. SRP will investigate bringing the acoustical consultant to Arizona for the meeting or at a minimum having him available via conference call. The group agreed to discuss the perimeter wall when the acoustical consultant was present.

A member asked about materials on the berm that could absorb sound. Another member replied that freeway walls reduce noise close to the wall, but there is no effect

farther away. Dave confirmed that the gabion walls would do a better job of absorbing sound than a solid wall.

Landscape Details – East Side

Dave explained that he has incorporated a small berm (three to four feet tall) along the boundary. The equestrian path will be to the west side of the berm, putting it farthest away from the homes in Cottonwoods Crossing. The pedestrian path will meander through the middle of this corridor. The group discussed a barrier along the transmission line corridor on the north side of Warner Road. **The CWG reached a consensus that the plan should incorporate such a barrier that would prevent any pedestrian or horse traffic north along the transmission line corridor through Finley Farms South.**

Dave asked for ideas from the CWG members on the sound/security wall along the east boundary. He indicated that the existing wall, which constitutes the back yard wall for the Cottonwoods Crossing residents along Wanda Drive, is approximately six feet high. A member of the audience expressed a desire for this security wall to be nine feet high. Mary suggested showing the Wanda Drive residents the options for a higher wall and asking them what they prefer. A member asked if the security wall was part of the baseline costs and Randy indicated that it was not.

Dave pointed out that the width of the trail area north of the substation area is 150 feet, and that the equestrian trail could therefore be located a good distance away from the Wanda Drive residents. A member pointed out that even on horseback, a person would not be able to look into anyone's back yard if from this distance from the fence. Loren Reber indicated that she had done that very test recently, riding on horseback down the service road along the east property boundary, and she was unable to see into the backyards along Wanda Drive. Another audience member added that the Town has not experienced any crime problems along recreational trails. A CWG member indicated that there had been incidents in neighborhoods adjacent to trails.

Landscaping Details – North Side

Dave reviewed the plan for the north side, showing the access from Warner Road for the well sites in both corners of the property. The berm is planned across the north side of the property. He pointed out that there would be more elaborate landscaping on the berm opposite Key Biscayne Drive, and possibly a slightly higher berm at that point, because of views of the HRSGs. There will be a service road along the toe of the berm, as well as retention ponds for runoff from Warner Road in this area. He indicated that he was waiting to receive the Town's requirements for the retention area.

The plans include a five-foot sidewalk along Warner Road. Dave indicated that it is not possible to move the sidewalk up on the existing berm due to ADA regulations and the flood irrigation for the existing trees. A member asked if Dave knew the added cost for a sidewalk that would meander through the existing trees on the north side. Dave indicated that he did not have an estimate for such a change. He further stated that putting the sidewalk south of the existing vegetation complicated the location of the

service road and roadway retention ponds, reminding the group that they wanted to retain the existing oleanders in this area. It was also pointed out that the sidewalk becomes a public access.

Another member indicated support for a sidewalk close to the street since it avoids the existing trees. There were differing opinions by the CWG members about whether a sidewalk located south of the existing trees affects the Town's liability. There was enough support by CWG members that Dave will prepare a cost estimate on moving the sidewalk to the south. A member asked that Dave be prepared to discuss the impact on the existing trees, as well.

Dave pointed out that the entrance onto the SRP property in the northeast corner would be used for construction purposes during construction of the plant. He indicated that there would be right turns only (both entering and exiting) associated with this entrance. Consequently, there will be no median break in Warner Road at that point.

Dave showed heavier ground cover and shrubs along the median on Warner Road. He felt that it would be best to stick with the Town plan for trees in medians, as there was little need to provide screening this close to the plant property. George indicated that there is no deadline for planting in the median so there is time to discuss the plant palette for the median at a future CWG meeting. Dave indicated that he had not yet looked at what existing trees might be removed from the south side of Warner Road. His current plan calls for standard lighting in the median. Mike Evans stated that the Town does have an approved palette for plantings in street medians but there are provisions for exceptions.

Next Meeting

CWG members listed the topics that they wish to discuss in future meetings:

- Plant palette for Warner Road median
- Address the view of the oil tank from the west side
- Perimeter wall (with an acoustical consultant present)
- Off-site landscaping plan
- Identification of the special areas on the property boundary
- More detail on the on-site plans

The group agreed to postpone the off-site planning until the on-site plan was completed. The group will discuss the perimeter wall discussion when the acoustical consultant is present. The remaining items will be on the next meeting agenda.

The next meeting will take place from 8 AM to noon on September 22 at the Gilbert Municipal Building. The meeting following that was set for 6 to 10 PM on October 8 at the Gilbert Municipal Center.

Mary asked for any public comment. An audience member thanked the CWG for letting them speak during the meeting. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.