

**COMMISSIONERS**

Lea Márquez Peterson - Chairwoman  
Sandra D. Kennedy  
Justin Olson  
Anna Tovar  
Jim O'Connor



**LEA MÁRQUEZ PETERSON**  
**CHAIRWOMAN**

(602) 542-3625 office  
(602) 463-3814 mobile  
LMárquezPeterson-Web@azcc.gov

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**  
**OFFICE OF CHAIRWOMAN LEA MÁRQUEZ PETERSON**

July 30, 2021

Hon. Senator Kyrsten Sinema  
317 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Hon. Senator Mark Kelly  
516 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Hon. Representative Tom O'Halleran  
318 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative David Schweikert  
304 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative Ann Kirkpatrick  
309 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative Ruben Gallego  
1131 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative Raul Grijalva  
1511 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative Debbie Lesko  
1214 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative Paul A. Gosar  
2057 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative Greg Stanton  
207 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Hon. Representative Andy Biggs  
171 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Senators and Representatives,

I want to thank you for considering the benefits of infrastructure investment for the State of Arizona and your willingness to engage meaningfully in that discussion. Although there are many aspects of the pending infrastructure bill that I support, I write to you to express my concern with Title 1 § 1001 "Siting of interstate transmissions facilities."

This section includes provisions that will take away states' rights and relinquish local control over the process for transmission line siting. Specifically, the provision tasks the Department of Energy ("DOE") with designating National Interest Electric Transmission Corridors ("NEITC") and gives the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") authority over objections at the state or local level for any and all interstate transmission lines located within the DOE's determined corridor.

Arizona's economy is positioned well to reap the benefits of a transition to a cleaner and more technologically advanced energy economy. As Chairwoman of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("ACC"), I have proposed as an overarching goal that our largest for-profit electric utilities generate 100 percent zero-carbon emission energy by 2050. I support certain aspects of the infrastructure bill and the broader objective it espouses. With Sections 1001, 1002, 1003, 1008, and 1009, Arizonans have an opportunity to be leaders of a conservative approach to enhancing grid reliability, ensuring just and reasonable rates, and developing a more robust transmission infrastructure.

As you know, Arizona has some of the most abundant supplies of domestic solar natural resources in the nation. When paired with adequate and cost-effective energy storage, these resources should be capitalized on for the future health and prosperity of our economy. Additionally, the state of Arizona and its electric utilities comprise some of the most critical infrastructure gateways for the West. Our state hosts the largest nuclear power plant in the nation (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station) and two of the most actively traded wholesale energy market hubs in the Western Interconnection (the Palo Verde Hub and Four Corners Hub). We also play a critical role in the development of major interstate merchant transmission lines in the West, such as the Ten West Link, SunZia Transmission Project, and Southline Transmission Project, which were approved locally and did not require federal oversight. The ACC's local approval of these projects has facilitated the development of a robust transmission system and the promotion of new energy technologies to support Arizona's growing economy.

It is important that as Arizona's delegates you ensure that no mechanism in the overall infrastructure package can result in the net export of Arizona's tax dollars to the benefit of other states that are not economically aligned with Arizona and its interests.

It is also critically important that as Arizona's delegates you view with skepticism any proposal included in the overall package that could be used as a stepping stone toward the involuntary regionalization or nationalization of the Western electric grid and power market. As we have seen in recent months, rolling blackouts in states like California and Texas have resulted in catastrophic reliability and affordability outcomes for American lives and businesses due to the failed energy approaches of those states.

Nationalizing the grid to connect states such as Arizona with those like California and Texas, without giving our state control over the terms of engagement, could result in similarly catastrophic outcomes for our residents and business, especially during the hot summer months. At the Commission, I have opened an official inquiry to evaluate the pros and cons of Arizona joining a Regional Transmission Organization in the West. Western states must seriously consider the issue of voluntary nationalization and regionalism before making any hasty decisions that would relinquish control of the grid to a higher, more bureaucratic authority.

Arizona's existing line siting process is robust and includes a multi-agency Line Siting Committee. It has succeeded in siting the aforementioned transmission projects with significant public input at the local level, without relinquishing local control. Our process ensures that the final siting of transmission lines within our borders are not only aesthetically pleasing but also environmentally compatible with Arizona's values and economically advantageous for the communities through which they will pass.

Taking the opportunity to provide direct public engagement and involvement in the process away from Arizona's local leaders and residents, in order to send it to federal bureaucrats in Washington, DC, would only exacerbate the objections that communities already have for the siting of transmission lines. It's hard enough to convince citizens to support transmission lines through their communities when the siting process takes place locally, let alone to convince them to support a project that will be heard and decided in Washington, DC.

In summary, I urge Arizona's delegates to oppose Title 1 § 1001 "Siting of interstate transmissions facilities" and demand that the language be omitted from the overall infrastructure package.

Sincerely,



Lea Márquez Peterson  
Chairwoman

