

**MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
MOHAVE COUNTY, KINGMAN, ARIZONA  
REGULAR MEETING – NOVEMBER 4, 2024**

The Board of Supervisors of Mohave County met in Regular Session this 4<sup>th</sup> day of November 2024 at 9:30 A.M., at 700 W. Beale Street, Kingman, Arizona, in the BOS Auditorium. In attendance were: Travis Lingenfelter, Supervisor District 1, telephonically; Hildy Angius, Chairman, Supervisor District 2; Buster D. Johnson, Supervisor District 3, telephonically; Jean Bishop, Supervisor District 4; Ron Gould, Supervisor District 5; Ryan Esplin, Chief Civil Deputy Attorney; Sam Elters, County Manager; and Laura Skubal, Clerk of the Board.

The following Mohave County Elected Officials, Department Heads and staff addressed specific items as noted: Tara Acton, Procurement Director; Luke Mournian, Chief Financial Officer; and Scott Holtry, Development Services Director.

**9:30 AM MEETING CALLED TO ORDER WITH INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

Chairman Angius called the meeting to order. The invocation was given by Pastor Mike Bell, and the pledge of allegiance was led by Supervisor Gould.

**OFFICIAL BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD:**

**ITEM 1: Discussion of pending or contemplated litigation claims and demands: Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to call for an Executive Session to be held November 18, 2024, at 9:00 A.M. for discussion and consultation with legal counsel in accordance with A.R.S. 38-431.03 (A) (3) (4) & (7) to discuss items noticed on the agenda with an asterisk. Motion carried 5-0 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.**

Chairman Angius stated Laura is Supervisor Johnson on the phone?

Laura Skubal, Clerk of the Board, stated yes, he is.

Chairman Angius stated okay, very good. Official business to come before the Board, discussion of pending or contemplated litigation claims and demands.

Ryan Esplin, Chief Civil Deputy Attorney, stated nothing to report, thank you.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

**ITEM 2: Committee and/or Legislative Reports:**

Chairman Angius stated number 2, committee and/or legislative reports. Supervisor Bishop?

Supervisor Bishop stated I have nothing to report, thank you.

Chairman Angius stated Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated there are some water related things, but I think we have a water report today too, so I'll save it. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Supervisor Gould?

Supervisor Gould stated Workforce Development meeting by telephone. Thank you. It seems like the volume is low.

Chairman Angius stated can we turn up the sound, please? Or talk more into it?

Supervisor Gould stated or I can use my very loud voice and tell you that I went to the Workforce Development board meeting and participated telephonically. Thank you, ma'am.

Chairman Angius stated okay, thank you. Supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated nothing, Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated okay, and I have nothing this morning.

**ITEM 3: Lobbyist report from HighGround, Inc:**

Chairman Angius stated we'll go on to the lobbyist report from High Ground.

Nick Ponder, Senior Vice President for Governmental Affairs, HighGround Inc., stated Madam Chair, Board, thank you again for the opportunity. The last time we.

Chairman Angius stated we've got to turn that up. Oh, there we go.

Mr. Ponder stated okay, sorry. Can you hear me?

Chairman Angius stated still low, one second. Okay, let's try again.

Mr. Ponder stated how about now?

Chairman Angius stated nope. Okay, is it being worked on, Laura? Okay.

**ITEM 4: County Manager's Report:**

Chairman Angius stated well, why don't we just, before we, well while we fix this, is there a County Manager's report?

Sam Elters, Mohave County Manager, stated good morning, Madam, Chair and Board members. I only have one item this morning, and it has to do with the county mobile health van. It has been busy and active around the county for the first quarter fiscal year 2025, which is July through September. The mobile health van visited eight county communities, including Chloride, Dolan Springs, Golden Shores, Meadview, White Hills, Wikieup, Yucca, and Golden Valley. Performed 95 health screenings and received 215 patient visits. So, it's really doing what it's supposed to do. It's going around the county and doing a great job. And thank you, that's all I wanted you to know.

Chairman Angius stated very good. And thank you, Supervisor Bishop, that was part of your ARPA allocation, sounds like money well spent. Thank you.

Supervisor Bishop stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated alright. Are we back to HighGround?

Mr. Ponder stated test, test.

Chairman Angius stated keep, keep talking.

Mr. Ponder stated did that work?

Chairman Angius stated yeah, it's a little better. Speak as loud as you can.

Mr. Ponder stated alright, will do. Supervisors again, thanks for the opportunity. You'll recall the last time we had a conversation was in early October, where I had updated you on a September 26<sup>th</sup> meeting that the Department of Water Resources held in Wilcox. They were updating the Wilcox Basin on the status of their groundwater supply. It made it very clear in that meeting, as we discussed in early October, that they need an Active Management Area. You may recall, there was a public vote in 2022 on whether or not an Active Management Area would be created. The public turned that down. However, the science speaks to the only option for them is an Active Management Area. So, on October 23<sup>rd</sup>, the Department of Water Resources noticed a hearing to create an Active Management Area. I will say that I was down in Wilcox on the 17<sup>th</sup>, I believe, touring a chili farm down there to try and understand their water issues a little bit better, and many of the people who voted against creating an AMA in, in 2022 have actually moved to being supportive of it. And there was public testimony to that fact in late September. So, that hearing that DWR noticed will be on November 22<sup>nd</sup> at 1 p.m. This is all important, because just as the INA that was created in December of 2022 for the Hualapai Valley Basin was the first INA ever created By DWR, this will likely be the first AMA ever created by DWR. They are beginning to notice challenges in basins across the state and addressing those challenges per their statutory requirement. So, that's what we have going on in the groundwater issue. And just a quick update on the Colorado River Reconsultation Committee. They will have a meeting on November 18<sup>th</sup>, at 9 a.m., which I will attend virtually, if possible. Their last meeting wasn't, it was all the way back

on March 6<sup>th</sup>, so it should be an interesting update that we get from the director at that time. That's all I have, unless there are any questions.

Chairman Angius stated okay, any questions? Supervisor Johnson? Supervisor Johnson, do you have any questions? Okay, well, he's still on, right, Laura? Okay, we'll take silence as a no.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you for the update, Mr. Ponder, if you're still on.

Mr. Ponder stated yep.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated so, regarding the, regarding the groundwater issue in, in 2022 just so everybody knows, the state Legislature, they basically compelled, they beefed up the statute and basically demanded that the Arizona Department of Water Resources do a supply and demand report on every single groundwater base in the state of Arizona, within a five-year period. So, starting in 2022, they're mandated by state law to come out with a supply and demand report for all of these basins. In December of 2023, they came out with the first seven, and this Wilcox Basin was one of the seven that they first came out with. They're going to have to come out with at least seven or so a year in order to comply with the statute. And in that supply and demand report for the Wilcox Basin that we're talking about, their groundwater deficit every year is around 100,000-acre foot of water that more, that's coming out of the basin. So, to put that into, sort of context, that's about the same amount of water that the Tucson metro area uses every single year. So, clearly not sustainable. The statute that governs AMAs, Active Management Areas is 45-451, and there are criteria that are already existing in state statute right now today, that if, if you encounter these, then the department has an obligation to start these processes. So, we've heard a lot of political stuff back and forth on these things, but, but this, these, these processes, are all governed by the science, and so that's why we're seeing what we see today. As we continue to see these supply and demand reports come out every year, other basins may be put in this same, in the same place. And that's why Mohave County has really been a leader on the groundwater side, to come up with a third, locally tailored, local control, you know, something that's customizable to an individual basin. Because we don't think that the one size fits all AMA is really an appropriate fit for a lot of these rural basins. So, we're continuing that. There was talk about a special session earlier this year. I don't think it's going to happen. We're going to have to work hard again in the Legislature this next year, but that's still something that is in the best interest of rural Arizona to come up with a third rural management framework for basins that have been determined to be at risk by the data so that we don't see more and more of these rural basins convert to AMAs. And then I just want to mention, also, I don't think I mentioned it last time, but on the Greenstone to Queen Creek, Colorado River water transfer, a lot of those that have been following that know that the County of Mohave we filed lawsuit. We got La Paz County, Yuma County, City of Yuma, to join us in that. Also, the, a lot of the river communities, the cities and the towns they filed an amicus brief,

a friend of the court brief, and Mohave County actually won that lawsuit against the Bureau of Reclamation. So, the Bureau of Reclamation has to do a full blown Environmental Impact Statement process to analyze that transfer, which was precedent setting. So that upped our political capital on the river when it comes to Colorado River stuff. We're thankful for that, and we're going to be working with all of our, our communities, cities, towns and counties along the river to make sure that the Bureau of Reclamation does what they're supposed to do with that EIS.

Mr. Ponder stated Madam Chair, just, if I may, to the points that Supervisor Lingenfelter brought up?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Mr. Ponder stated I think we should be very proud that we were also able to get the AG to join us in that amicus on, on the Greenstone transfer issue. And then also, when I was touring the chili farm down in, in Wilcox, the chili farmer, by the way, his seeds are in like 90% of hatched chilies that you'll find in this country. But he said to me, I want to thank you on, you know, on behalf of myself, and he means you meaning Mohave County for spearheading this issue. So, he's a farmer, he is a member of the Arizona Farm Bureau, but doesn't agree with their position on this, and wanted to thank us for what Mohave County is doing on this issue. And lastly, I will just point out there's a story, story in the Arizona Daily Star that I can send to Supervisor Elters, or to, I'm sorry, to Manager Elters, I just promoted them to Supervisor Elters, that talks about the issue down in Wilcox, and how a power line that was going in down there, just the dust mitigation, the water that was needed for dust mitigation actually resulted in the municipal well running dry. And so, that's just a story in, within a story to tell why we're doing this and why it's so important to address these issues. So, I'll share that with Mr. Elters, and so that he can send that along.

Chairman Angius stated okay, any, any further questions or comments? Okay, thank you, Mr. Ponder.

Mr. Ponder stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Chairman Angius stated so, next up, we have a very big meeting with some very big items and there's more paper in front of me than I've ever seen. Still trying to, trying to get it in order. So, with that in mind, and to make sure that people's time is being used wisely, I'm going to make a motion to put the call to public at the end of the meeting.

Supervisor Johnson stated second.

Chairman Angius stated we have a motion and second.

**Motion was made by Chairman Angius and seconded by Supervisor Johnson to approve moving call to the public to the end of the meeting. Motion carried 4-1 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting no.**

Chairman Angius stated okay, next up, you know what? I'm going to go on a limb. I'm hoping that these consent agendas go quickly too.

*The following items listed under CONSENT AGENDA will be considered as a group and acted upon by one motion with no separate discussion of said items, unless a Board Member so requests. In that event, the item will be removed from the CONSENT AGENDA for separate discussion and action.*

Chairman Angius stated Supervisor Bishop?

Supervisor Bishop stated nothing this morning.

Chairman Angius stated Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated 15 please.

Chairman Angius stated 15. Supervisor Gould?

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, Madam Chairman. Number 17.

Chairman Angius stated number 17. Supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated nothing, Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so I need a motion to approve items 5-32 minus item 15 and 17.

Supervisor Gould stated so moved.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated second.

**Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter and carried 5-0 with the following votes being recorded: Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes, Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes, to approve the Consent Agenda Items 5 through 32 minus items 15, and 17 as follows:**

#### **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSENT AGENDA (Items 5 - 32)**

**5.** Approve the 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting calendar as presented in the backup materials. – **Clerk of the Board**

**6. Sitting as the Board of Equalization:** Approve the Board of Equalization Hearing Officer's recommendations regarding Petitions for Review of Real Property Valuation. – **Clerk of the Board**

7. Approve the June 3, 2024, and October 7, 2024, Board of Supervisors meeting minutes – **Clerk of the Board**

**8.** Approve the Adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-213 – A **REZONE** of Assessor's Parcel Nos. 402-66-135 and -136 from an R-E/10A (Residential Recreation/Ten Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to an R-E/1A (Residential Recreation/One Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone, to allow for a minor land division in the Beaver Dam vicinity Mohave County, Arizona. (**Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote**) – **Development Services**

**9.** Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-214 – A **REZONE** of Assessor's Parcel No. 306-36-011E from an A-R/4A (Agricultural Residential/Four Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to an A-R (Agricultural Residential) zone, to allow for a minor land division in the Golden Valley vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. (**Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote**) – **Development Services**

**10.** Approve the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-215 – A **REZONE** of Assessor's Parcel No. 306-26-010D from an A-R/10A (Agricultural Residential/Ten Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to an A-R/4A (Agricultural Residential/Four Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone, to allow for a minor land division in the Golden Valley vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. (**Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote**) – **Development Services**

**11.** Ratify comments sent to the Bureau of Land Management on October 15, 2024, for the Arizona Strip District Office Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan Draft Environmental Assessment. – **Development Services**

**12.** Approve and sign Contract Amendment No. Four (4) to multi-awarded Contract No. 20-PS-11, Job Order Contract (JOC) for Blight Abatement Services, with Old Trails Mobile Home Transport, Kingman, Arizona (-01) and Lewis Equipment Services, Kingman, Arizona (-03); extending the Contracts for a one (1) year period through February 1, 2026, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same on behalf of Development Services. – **Procurement**

**13.** Approve and sign Contract Amendment No. (2) Two to Contracts No. 23-PS-05, On-Call Aerial Mapping Services, with AeroTech Mapping, Las Vegas, Nevada (-01); Quantum Spatial Inc. dba NV5, Colorado Springs, Colorado (-02); Surveying & Mapping LLC, Murray, Utah (-03); and Sunrise Engineering Inc., Mesa, Arizona (-04), renewing each contract for an additional one-year period through December 4, 2025, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same. Funding for projects awarded under these contracts will be sourced to board-approved budgeted funds per fiscal year, as applicable, on behalf of the Development Services and Public Works Departments. – **Procurement**

**14.** Approve continued use of NCPA Cooperative Contract 01-137, and sign True Lease Schedule 001-6859880-003 under the previously approved Master Lease Agreement 56455180-88748 with Dell Financial Services, Round Rock, TX for a total five-year lease amount not to exceed \$81,302.80 plus any applicable taxes, and total annual payments of \$17,523.92 plus any applicable taxes for the lease of 40 Dell Latitude 5430 Rugged Computers with support and maintenance for use in Heavy Equipment and Sheriff's Office vehicles. Further, authorize the Chairman to sign all documents necessary to complete this lease purchase. Funding for this project is sourced to budgeted funds 61012100-43820 and 20534303-43820 for Public Works – Fleet Services Division on behalf of the Information Technology Department. – **Procurement**

**16.** Approve September 2024 Monthly Report for Procurement Activity between \$10,000 and \$100,000. – **Procurement**

**18.** Acknowledge receipt of and refer to Public Works, a petition to the Mohave County Board of Supervisors requesting that North Cibola Road from West Mancos Drive to West McElmo Drive, located in the Golden Valley Area, a distance of approximately 0.50 Miles, be accepted into the Mohave County Road System for tertiary maintenance subject to meeting all applicable requirements and subsequent Board approval. – **Public Works**

**19.** Accept the in-kind donation valued at \$1,041.37 from Mohave County 4-H Youth Development for repairs at the Mohave County Fairgrounds small stock barn and approve a \$1,041.37 reduction of fees for the 2025 Colorado River Small Stock Show on January 18-19, 2025. – **Public Works**

**20.** Acknowledge and accept the dedication of a 10-foot Public Utility Easement abutting Parcels 1 through 5 and adjacent to Brown Drive per the Proposed Parcel Plat for Robert and Tracy Brown, also being a portion of THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 39 NORTH, RANGE 16 WEST, GILA AND SALT RIVER MERIDIAN, MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZONA, in the Scenic area, prepared by Brown Consulting Engineers, and further authorize the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to sign the acceptance for and on behalf of Mohave County. A mylar will be submitted to the Clerk of the Board for signature upon acceptance of this dedication. – **Public Works**

**21.** Approve Resolution No. 2024-212 for Mohave County acceptance of ownership of 952 feet of water transmission line extension and related appurtenances constructed by NextGen Cryo / Flowserve US, Inc. to be included in the I-40 Industrial Corridor Water System to serve the NextGen Cryo facility located on the corner of West Cryo Drive and South I-40 Frontage Road, Section 6, Township 19 North, Range 17 West of Mohave County. – **Public Works**

**22. Sitting as the Board of Directors of the Desoto Drive Road Improvement District:** Appoint Horrocks Professional Engineering Services as the District Engineer for the Desoto Dr. Road Improvement District and direct the District Engineer to produce the requisite plans, specifications, and estimate for future Board Resolution of Intention consideration on



improvements to S. Desoto Dr. and E. Magellan Dr. as accepted by the Board under the Petition to Incur Expense not to exceed \$13,160.00. – **Public Works**

**23.** Acknowledge receipt of and accept the Indigent Defense Services' annual report for Fiscal Year 2024. – **Indigent Defense Services**

**24.** Accept monetary donations with an approximate value of \$269.75 for the Mohave County Animal Shelter. Accept non-monetary donations with an approximate value of \$98.00 for the Mohave County Animal Shelter. – **County Manager**

**25.** Approve the Project Sponsor Agreement between the Mohave County Sheriff's Office and the Arizona State Parks Board in the amount of \$1,040,000.00 for the purchase of boats and equipment. Further, approve Resolution No. 2024-211, approving the Agreement. Authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign the Project Sponsor Agreement and Resolution. Direct Finance to create a budget accordingly and authorize the purchase of awarded items. - **Sheriff**

**26.** Approve Amendment No. One (1) to the Funding Agreement between Mohave County and Fort Mojave Mesa Fire District to increase the amount of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to be distributed to the district for the purchase and replacement of communication equipment. The Amendment increases the ARPA funds from \$300,000.00 to \$350,398.25. – **Supervisor Gould**

**27.** Approve Amendment One to the Funding Agreement between Fort Mojave Mesa Fire District and Mohave County for the distribution of American Rescue Plan Act (APRA) funds for the renovation of the district's fire station at 2230 Joy Lane in Fort Mohave. The Amendment increases the amount of ARPA funding from \$2.2 million to \$2.23 million. – **Supervisor Gould**

**28.** Approve awarding funds to the Arizona Youth Partnership in the amount of \$100,000 to prevent homelessness and provide youth services, prevention programs, and health education related to substance abuse, homelessness, human trafficking, mental health wellness, teen pregnancy, and challenging family dynamics. – **Supervisor Gould**

**29.** Approve the report of routine County business authorized by the County Manager for the time period of July 5, 2024, through October 16, 2024. Approve routine personnel actions taken during the pay period of September 21, 2024, through October 18, 2024, and routine Superior Court personnel actions taken during the pay period of September 21, 2024, through October 18, 2024. – **County Manager**

**30.** Approve the Funding Agreement between Mohave County and Dig It Kingman Community Garden for payment of water utility costs in the amount of \$5,074.40 and authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign the Agreement. – **Supervisor Lingenfelter**

**31.** Approve awarding American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to the Kingman Robotics Scholarship in the amount of \$24,784 to help cover costs of robot materials, registration fees, and travel for competition. – **Supervisor Lingenfelter**

**32.** Approve the Funding Agreement between Mohave County and WECOM LLC for the distribution of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds in the amount of \$54,000.00 for the grading of Superstition Drive in Valle Vista area and authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign the Agreement. – **Public Works**

**15.** Approve and sign Contract 2025-040-CTR, with Tyler Technologies, Inc.(Dallas, TX) for the Tyler Payments Implementation at an initial cost of \$7,090, upon recommendation of the Procurement Director and based on the Competition Impracticable Determination 25CI22, in accordance with the Mohave County Procurement Code, Article III, Section 8, with the contract commencing upon award with an initial term of three years and automatic one-year extensions thereafter subject to the continued renewal of Tyler EagleRecorder and EagleQuickDocs. Further, authorize the Chairman to sign any necessary and convenient documents related to the implementation of the payment software. Renewals beyond the initial three-year term will be contingent upon the Board adopted budgets per fiscal year on behalf of the Recorder's Office. – **Procurement**

Chairman Angius stated number 15 is to approve a contract with Tyler Technologies on the recommendation of the Procurement director, and so.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Madam Chair. I pulled this just because there's been some recent conversations regarding legacy software and, and making sure, you know, every maybe five, seven to ten years that we look at these softwares to make sure that the citizens are getting the best value and the best service. I know Tyler Technologies has been in use at the County for quite some time, and I just wanted to ask the County Manager if, if, if they're going to be looking at these types of softwares, because this is for, five-year, five-year term, four- or five-year term.

Manager Elters stated Madam Chair and Supervisor Lingenfelter, we have our Procurement director on the line. I'm going to defer to her and then back it up with any additional thoughts or comment. Tara, would you respond please?

Tara Acton, Procurement Director, stated yes, absolutely. Thank you, Chairman and Supervisor Lingenfelter, so we, we are working on the policy to look at these legacy systems, you are correct. Tyler is one that I think we've been using, I don't want to overestimate, but I think probably something like 30 years at this point. This particular purchase is related to the receipt of payments, and historically, actually, we were using a different, third-party payment receipt process. Tyler Technologies has changed the way that they allow interfacing, and they will no longer work with third party payment processing. So, this is something that in order for the Recorder's Office to be

able to continue to take payments, we have to move to the Tyler payment option. I was trying to look and see if this one actually had a commitment of five years. I think what we're looking at, right now is just going through the implementation process, and then we will be looking at a year-to-year agreement to continue to use the services.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Tara. So, so as this policy comes before the Board, and let's say something is adopted, the Board will be able to direct, maybe a non-renewal, if this software goes through a process of making sure that it's still the best deal out there. And the example I would give is, you know, the Development Services software, where we're moving from one to another, it's that one software change alone, over a five-year period is going to save the county over \$1.5 million, so we want to make sure that we're looking at these types of things.

Director Acton stated yes, Chairman, Angius, Supervisor, Lingenfelter, that is the goal of really looking at how do we look at each one of our software solutions and determine if it's continuing to meet our needs, if our needs have changed, and one of the things that we'll be recommending is that we don't enter into, we used to try to do these long-term agreements because it was a way to secure that we wouldn't have substantial increases, and sometimes that's problematic for us. So, we will be looking at everything on a case-by-case basis. I am going to be working with our IT director on a policy recommendation that makes it fairly simple to move forward and make sure that we're looking at all software systems prior to renewal.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated great. Thank you to you, and to all staff that's involved in that. That's all I have.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Make a motion?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated motion to approve.

Supervisor Bishop stated second.

Chairman Angius stated motion and second.

**Motion was made by Supervisor Lingenfelter and seconded by Supervisor Bishop to approve Item 15. Motion carried 5-0 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.**

Chairman Angius stated number 17.

**17.** Certify the total revenue by the Justice Courts and Clerk of Superior Court for FY2024 that exceeded the base year of FY98, in accordance with ARS 41-2421 (G), and certify the Court

collections and approve the allocation of the Fill-the-Gap collections in accordance with ARS 41-2421 (E). – **Financial Services**

Chairman Angius stated certify the total revenue by the Justice Courts and Clerk of Superior Court for FY 2024, Supervisor Gould. Someone signed up.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, yeah, thank you, Madam Chairman. A member of the public wanted this pulled for discussion. If Financial Services can give us an overview of this program. It was somewhat confusing to the general public.

Luke Mournian, Chief Financial Officer, stated good morning, Chairman Angius, and Supervisor Gould. So, this is an annual process. It's dictated by statute, and so certain fees that the courts collect each year are then redistributed to certain funds based on the statutory formula. If there's any specific questions, I'd be, I'd be happy to answer them.

Supervisor Gould stated Luke, was there a baseline, I think in the backup it said there's a baseline year of '98, that must be part of the statutory formula.

Director Mournian stated that is correct, Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated okay. I think it was Scotty McClure who had a question, might want to call him.

Chairman Angius stated Mr. McClure, did you want to come down and say something? Okay. Okay, thank you. Okay, need a motion.

Supervisor Gould stated motion to approve.

Chairman Angius stated motion. I need a second.

Supervisor Bishop stated second.

Chairman Angius stated motion and second.

**Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Bishop to approve Item 17. Motion carried 5-0 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.**

Chairman Angius stated okay, at this time, we're moving to the public hearings, but I'm going to move item 36 up, because I think that's the one that has the most people here signed up to talk.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**SCOTT HOLTRY, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR:**

**ITEM 36. Open Public Hearing:** Discussion and possible action RE: Adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-217 – An **AMENDMENT TO THE MOHAVE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN** from a Suburban Residential and Public Lands Area land use designation to a Heavy Industrial Area land use designation and a REZONE of Assessor’s Parcel Nos. 225-11-005, -006, -008 and a portion of -009, from an A-R (Agricultural Residential) zone to a M-X (Heavy Manufacturing) zone to allow for building and operating a natural gas-powered electric generation facility in the Mohave Valley vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. [**Commission recommended approval by 7-2 vote (Hubbard, Martin) with condition to limit to 4 units**]

Chairman Angius stated so, we do have a lot of people signed up to talk. I’m just going to kind of give you the overview of how I think this is going to happen. We’re going to start with the applicant, this is a public hearing.

**Chairman Angius Opened the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated so, you have three minutes to talk. But as you know, if you want to give some time to somebody else, you fill out the form. Because there are so many forms, it's been very difficult to put it together on who, you know, wants to give to, to what. So, we'll start with the applicant, and then we will take it from there. I think I will just have people stand up that want to give their time to somebody else, and we'll just play that by ear. I'm thinking it's going to work. We're all on the honor system here. So, we'll start with Patrick Ledger. So, you have 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9, people have given the time to you. So, I will give you about 22 minutes. Do you think that's enough? 22, 24 minutes.

Patrick Ledger, CEO, Arizona Generation and Transmission Cooperatives, stated Madam Chairman, I'm going to speak for about one minute, and then I'm going to ask Mr. Carlson to come up.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so, all right, well, I'm just asking the question, so that we can start the timer.

Mr. Ledger stated that should be sufficient, about 20 to 25 minutes would be great.

Chairman Angius stated alright.

Supervisor Gould stated Madam Chairman.

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Gould stated might explain to the members of the public that during the public hearing portion, we are not allowed to ask them, answer their questions, right?

Chairman Angius stated exactly. I don’t even think I opened it. I’m opening the public hearing. Right, so, because, thank you, because it's a public hearing, we cannot, we cannot answer questions after the public hearing, we'll close the public hearing, and then we'll be asking questions and have a full discussion after that. So, let's all bear in mind that we have a lot of people, and if you have

somebody that you would like to give your time to, or if somebody said something right before you that you're going to say again, let's just be respectful of everybody's time. Okay? So, 20 up to 25 minutes. Okay.

Mr. Ledger stated thank you, Madam. Chairman, Supervisors. I am Patrick Ledger. I am the CEO of Arizona Electric Power Cooperative. We are a community organization that's made up of other co-ops and other public power entities throughout the state of Arizona, some in Nevada and also in California. We're not for profit. We serve rural people, and what our, really our objective is, is to empower rural people. We provide transmission services, we build new resources, and we also provide a lot of different energy products, energy services to support smaller entities that need that support. Our focus here today is a new plant site. It's a relatively small plant site. We're looking at a zoning change to enable us to move forward with two arrow derivative units. These are very efficient, these are very reliable, these are low emission, they're safe and they're consistent, in our view, with the land use on the property that we've identified. So, for the details, I am going to now turn it over to Tyler Carlson, who will present the bulk of the presentation. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Mr., yeah, if you can speak up.

Tyler Carlson, CEO, Mohave Electric Cooperative, stated alright, can we try queue the slideshow?

Chairman Angius stated okay, slideshow for AEPCO.

Mr. Carlson stated okay, thank you. Alright, my name is Tyler Carlson. I'm up here to try to describe what we have going on here. Mohave Electric, we're not for profit as well. Distribution cooperative, AEPCO, which is a not for profit, generation transmission cooperative. This is our service territory. This stuff in yellow is our service territory. MEC's service territory includes a great deal along the river and a great deal east of Kingman. This is our energy mix from 2013, 2023, as you can see, over time, the amount of coal we're using is going down. We're actually turning more to gas, and we've increased the amount of utility grade solar. We do have some long-term purchases, and we have a fixed amount of hydro. Costs have been volatile in the last three years. These are the events that that have occurred in the last years that have made costs very volatile. It's the reason why we're actually pursuing, why we pursued the battery and solar projects that we have, as well as trying to pursue the highly efficient natural gas units that we're looking for. The potential net savings if the units were online in the summers of 2022, 2023 and this last summer would have been \$21 million which would have been to the benefit of our members. This is our, this is our peak usage, during the summer. This is our hydroelectric. This is our AEPCO, G&T and contract power, in which some of that will be going away here, we'll be talking about that. There's our 30-megawatt solar and battery that we've already built, and it's already on site. You can still see that we're exposed to the market. And that's our 30-megawatt market exposure, both the 30-megawatt solar and battery backup, to the extent in which the sun's not there, whether it be a cloudy day or at night, we need to actually provide that and as same as our 30-megawatts exposure, we're trying to get out of that high priced exposure. It has been brought up a few times, questioning about whether or not we've seen or whether or not there have been transmission

outages. Transmission outage was a big thing for us, September 4<sup>th</sup> of 2022, 18 and three quarters hours with the battery, solar and the gas units within our within our load bubble, if, if we had, if we had another storm similar to that storm that provided a transmission outage, which on the transmission system, not MEC, we would have been able to cut that amount of time down substantially. This is also a newer thing that's happening with public power safety shut offs. You can see that they're varying from, we don't have all of the hours, but you see the number of consumers, and up to about 10 and a half hours, just most recently, by PG&E. Here's our MEC local generation, already exists. It locks in the cost of solar secures the cost availability when the, against the open market. If we have power generation suppliers, we have limited resources that are available to use, and it does diversify our portfolio. We actually were able to get a grant for the 15-megawatt battery that's already in place. We also got some portion of a new era award, 90 megawatts of solar and battery that will be going in between 350 miles and 250 miles away from here, and our AEPCO coal operations are to cease. So, we need this solar and battery to replace that, the 175 megawatts of coal. Our Integrated Resource Plan, which is the solar, existing solar, our existing battery and the new natural gas, that's what we're looking for. The ACC approved our IRP, which indicated our intent to invest in renewable and natural gas. The solar and batteries are on MEC's 235, 34 acre property on Joy Lane in Antoinette, with 230 acres remaining. This is the the, unit that we're that we're buying. They have over 1400 of these units in operation, and they are rated at 98-megawatts between the two. But already, by doing some looking into our environment, that they have to actually be derated some. So, they'll be 97 megawatts. You can see that they're, they're for our particular purpose, they're highly efficient, and they are up within 10 minutes, which is really important for us to be up in 10 minutes. What we're looking for is 190, 193.5 acres, rezoned to heavy, heavy manufacturing. It's privately owned land, and it's previously, previously used for sand and gravel operation and agricultural purposes. The development will support the construction operation and maintenance of electrical generation facilities, along with all the associated facilities and equipment, which will be some lines, natural gas lines, groundwater monitoring, wells, water lines, mission control, com equipment, administrative building. Here's our location to the nearest residential lots, one from, from the northwest, it's 1.17 miles away. From the southwest, is 1.44 miles away. You recall earlier on in our earlier discussions last year that you had asked us, you had approved a site and asked us to look for something farther away, and that's what we have done. It's compatibility with close proximity parcels, gravel pits are normally zoned for general manufacturing, heavy manufacturing. The square in red is what we're talking about. The stuff in purple is the existing sand and gravel operation. There's also a heavy manufacturing gravel operation that was just approved in March or in April 1<sup>st</sup> of 2024, and that is, as you can read this, it was for mining, sand, gravel, concrete batch plant, hot mix plant in the Mohave Valley vicinity. So, it's just south of what we're proposing. The Clean Air Act, EPA, the Clean Air Act requires EPA to set national ambient air quality standards and, and pollutants called criteria pollutants, the NAAQS must include an adequate margin of safety. It's in an open and deliberative process, input from the scientific community, stakeholders and general public. The Clean Air Scientific Advisory Council advises EPA. It includes expert physicians and such, and it was last

recommendation for the more restrictive standards were February 2024. The members have various degrees, including medical, environmental engineering, biochemistry and epidemiology, and they're supported by the EPA advisory Science Advisory Board, and they provide recommendations to EPA on those standards. Here's, here's the list of the, what those folks are. And you can, you'll actually see, it says that this person is a co-director of Southeastern Center for Air Pollution and Epidemiology, Doctor Jeremy Sarnat. You have Doctor Michael Bell, a PhD in Environmental Engineering, MSC in Environmental Management and Economics, MS Environmental Engineering and Science, MS in Philosophy and BS in Environmental Engineering Science. Henry Felton, BA in Physics, MS in Environmental Engineering, Bacillus engineer. Doctor Jennifer Peel, Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, PhD and MPH in Epidemiology. Doctor Alexander Panetta Gonzalez, PhD in Yale for Forestry, Environmental studies and MA in Geography. Doctor Mary Rice, Harvard Medical School, and an MPH in Epidemiology. And Doctor Barbara Turpin, a Bachelor of Science in Engineering and PhD Environmental Science and Engineering. What you'll see here is all of the folks are very focused on environmental issues, epidemiology and health. The MEP will require air permit from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to construct, operate, and maintain. MEP will comply with all applicable ADEQ and EPA requirements for air emissions. MEPs impact will be well below the health-based NAAQS and what they're set by EPA. The units at MEP will utilize the best available technology and control carbon monoxide oxidizing catalyst bed and selective catalytic reduction SCR system, that was brought up at our last meeting. Aqueous ammonia is a reagent used in the SCR system, CO catalyst bed reduces CO by greater than 90% reduces VOCs. The air infiltration reduces ambient particulate matter, matter, and there will be continuous emissions monitoring systems. That means equipment and people there continuously to monitor, monitoring system to make sure that we are within compliance. As you can see from the NAAQS's, the circles indicate the output, and you can see every one of them are well below the standard. This is a sound contour. The black line, which is the, that is the line that EPA requires to be away from people, and that line is well away from folks. The 40 DBA number is still hundreds of feet away from, from anyone, any residential, which means the sound values be less than 40. If you look, if you look up, it says that a 40 DBA is a loud whisper, and a loud whisper will not be heard hundreds of feet away. These are the actual view sheds from Hewlett and Vanderslice, you, and these, I'll just run through them all, the view sheds of what the, what the stacks will look like. As you can see them all. MEP will follow all dark sky and outdoor lighting control, as specified with Mohave County requirements. MEP, it will, will most likely not be subject to Federal Aviation Administration because all structure be less than 200 feet and above ground. If, if Federal Aviation did indicate that we were we would need to do something, we would do it. Process waters from MEP will be piped to line evaporation ponds. Evaporation ponds are regulated by ADEQ and subject to the best available demonstrated control technology. MEP must meet aquifer quality limit at the point of compliance, monitoring wells and MEP will require an aquifer protection permit from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. MEP will utilize the existing water rights to support the facility. The majority water used at the facility will be used in the mission control



system. Any groundwater drills drilled on site must be reported to ADWR. Facility traffic will be, there'll be a temporary increase during the construction period, but after commissioning, local traffic will be comparable to current levels, approximately five to eight full-time employees will work at the facility. AEPCO will complete all required Environmental Studies, AEPCO's already done desktop screenings for the project, cultural, biological, and neither screening resulted in significant findings or triggers in the project area. NEPA, that was a question was brought up; NEPA is triggered when a federal agency intends to take a major federal action. Mohave Energy Park does not trigger a federal action that required a NEPA review. If we were triggering NEPA, we would be conducting those reviews. There's the local endorsements; you can see what the local folks who have endorsed. General plan amendment rezone request from suburban residential to public plans and heavy industrial area. The general plan rezone from AR, agricultural residential to M-X, heavy manufacturing is only requesting the rezoning on site D, in the event that Site D is approved, then the next item site C, we would ask for, to be removed. As you can see, site A and site D, site A was our original acreage, 15 acres for the units themselves, plus 215, acres for all the surrounding and the additional equipment. Site D is a total of 193.5 acres. The original was, was a little more than a quarter mile away. Now we're, closest is 1.17 miles away. And the, the condition of approval, which we agreed to at our last meeting, being Planning and Zoning, is that we are, have no intention, nor, nor do we want to, nor will we put more than four gas powered units, and no more than four natural gas generation units and all the ancillary and associated equipment required to construct, operate and maintain such generation shall be allowed at this site. And that's what we would ask, that P&Z language to be changed to. And I will, I will go back, since I raced through to get to the, make sure I raced through to get to the 25 minutes. But I will go back and talk a little bit about the, from the environmental standpoint, I think it's important to not just point out where we are and those circles, which are where we'll actually be producing, but we will have continuous equipment, continuous monitoring to make sure that we are well within those, those numbers. So that's, that's our presentation at this point. Did I miss anything? Alright, and that's it. Thank you very much.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, next up, I believe that Chairman Williams, from the Fort Mojave Tribe is present. And if you wanted to give your time, come on down, to Chairman Williams. Can you please stand? Okay, so we, okay, so you all want to give to chair, 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10. So again, good morning.

Timothy Williams, Chairman, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, stated good morning.

Chairman Angius stated give 20 about, 25, 27 minutes, yeah.

Mr. Williams stated morning. Today and last night, and throughout this morning, I'll speak loud enough so everybody can hear. There was an opportunity that we had to come together, for everybody in this room to have a project. Because nobody opposes power, reliable power, independent power. We're all on the same page with that, but we oppose the location. So, there was an opportunity that was laid upon the table for MEC, and they refused it. So, therefore, we

will go ahead and conduct ourselves like we know how to do. We have the financial resources, we have the legal resources. We have resources beyond what we could have ever imagined in Fort Mohave, and it's a good thing for our entire valley. We are one of the largest employers of the entire valley in Mohave Valley now. We provide jobs; we provide all these good things. But like I said, there was an opportunity this morning.

Chairman Angius stated please, face the Board, Chairman Williams.

Mr. Williams yeah, good ol' Hildy, good old Hildy.

Chairman Angius stated this is a public hearing, so we're going to respect the rules.

Mr. Williams stated sure these are your.

Chairman Angius stated we're going to respect the rules of our meetings. Thank you.

Mr. Williams stated this is your place. We will do so. So, with saying that and bringing that to the table, we look at how this future is gonna go. What are we going to do now? Now that this is before you, we have an opportunity to delay this, give you two options that we're bringing before you. Now that MEC has denied us. If we have one month to work with AEPCO, to see if there's an alternative location that we can work together and provide this, it's a possibility, it's an option, and it may be a great opportunity for all of us in this room that are going to benefit from this possible project. That is one thing that we could do. Or the second one that we're bringing to the table is to just say no, is to simply say no to this. Very few projects out there in this county bring this, this many people together, especially on this side, where you have tribal and non-tribal standing united to come against this location, not against the power, but against the location that we have before you today. The impacts that we talk about, and they could be argued, but could argue each one of those slides that are up there. They could argue against Calpine. We can argue against this, we can argue against that, but we always prepare for future generations. What are our future generations going to be held with? What are the consequences that they are going to have? One slide up there, we'll follow the NEPA process, if we need to. You're going to follow the NEPA process. We got to follow everything. We should follow everything. Why not only if it's enacted? For time, or opportunity cost that may be out there, that you may perceive to be losing. It's not about opportunity cost today, the vote before the Board. It's about how things are going to be impacted in the future. But differently, from before, when we came before this Board, was that we brought something different in trying to work together. Trying to work together, in trying to do that. Very rare, and I've been up here before. Regatta, other items, makes things ugly within our communities. Look at us. Look at our own fire board. We pay them seven figures. Oh, my word. And then they come and support something that we oppose. My word. Might have to have a talk about that. Makes things ugly down here, and that's what we're trying to prevent. We're trying to prevent this ugliness that goes upon us, and it's a burden that weighs upon you. Think about today and what you're going through as County Supervisors and having to make this tough, very tough decision that's going to impact so many of us that are down in the valley. You look at the petitions that have

been signed, how many more people have to say we don't want this in our area before it's held legitimate and the Board would say no. But I bring that to you today. One, two, one of two things. One, motion to table. Give us a month to work with AEPCO, not MEC work with AEPCO, or two to simply say no today. Because either way it goes, we've been there, from time immemorial in our area, from time immemorial. No matter what, no matter what comes upon us, we're still standing. We will still carry on our traditions, our culture and our language. Tonight, my cousin is going to be laid to rest, and many of those are going to be here. They're going to be there with us tonight. We are Mojave people, when we still carry on, no matter what this vote goes like today and how it goes, I know that we're still going to be here. I know that we're going to still carry on. I know that we're going to still have what we have today. But like I said, strongly encourage you to take one of those two options and from a leadership standpoint, we are all leaders of this community, you are leaders, we are leaders, AEPCO, they have their leadership here. I think between all three of us, County Supervisors, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, and I have the approval of the Council, by the way, talked to every single one of them before this meeting, and the AEPCO CEO and their board, I think we can work out something great down here for the benefit of this entire valley. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, so how this is going to go now, and I'm hoping that we can do this, I want to put together, have all the people who are in favor of it speak, and then all the people who are opposed speak about it, and we'll do that same thing. If you, if I have a note that other people want to give your time, I'll ask people to stand it seems to be working out pretty well. Okay, so we will start with John Boselt, Bosch, Bosch.

John Bosch, Fort Mohave resident stated good morning. As the United States Army veteran, I'm often thanked for my service, but I think it all too infrequent that folks like yourselves, those given to sorting out the difficult issues, are thanked for your service. So, I want, on behalf of everybody in this room, thank you for hearing us out this morning. Your job is difficult, but then politics ain't for the faint of heart, is it? That's your task, and it's going to be a tough one on this call. I'm sure for all of you. I'll be very, I'll be very short. I'm here in support of the proposed site for the power plant. Redundant power in our area is essential. It's critical. Per my research, many of the arguments against are unfounded, without merit. Some have little merit. Most have no merit. We live in an area where the heat, the summer temperatures can rise above 120 degrees. God forbid that anyone in our community lose their life for the lack of power. That's the decision that you are given today. And I thank you very much for your time.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. For the record, can you please state your address? I'm going to ask everybody to state their address.

Mr. Bosch stated my name is John Bosch, president of the Obi Wan Mohawk Association. I live at 2030 East Amigo Way, Fort Mohave.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much.

Mr. Bosch stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated okay, Mehdi Azarmi.

Mr. Bosch stated say again?

Chairman Angius stated I'm calling up the next person.

Mr. Bosch stated yes, ma'am.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so I'm going to call like we do at call to public. I'm going to call three people if you can get ready and come on down, so, for the sake of time, be ready to speak. So, it's Mehdi Azarmi, Reuben McBride, and then Barbara Pape.

Mehdi Azarmi, Fort Mohave resident, stated good morning, Madam Chair, honorable Supervisors. My name is Mehdi Azarmi. My address, 5890 Highway 95 Suite A, Fort Mohave. This morning, I'm representing Los Matadors of Bullhead City, with 25 members. Mohave Sunrise Rotary Club, 50 members, and Bullhead Area Chamber of Commerce, with over 500 members. Members of these service organizations asked me to be their representative, to speak with you instead of hundreds of people showing up before you and saying the same thing. MEC is a co-op. Whatever they pay for the power they have to pass it to, the cost to us. That's how they are able to maintain a low price for all members compared to the other power companies. We encourage you to approve this item, to help community members with the lower cost of power. One last piece of information I can provide, I'm a builder in Fort Mohave. We have about 40 homes under construction. 85% of my clients are retired baby boomers from Southern California. In talking with them, they are paying anywhere from 30 cents to 62 cents per kilowatt for their power. Here, we are paying 8.5 cents to 11 cents per kilowatt. This is something for you to consider. Please help the silent majority of the people who do not want to pay high prices for electricity in this crazy inflation time we have. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you.

Mr. Azarmi stated and if I may, I like to take this opportunity, since this is going to be the last time I'm before this Board to thank Supervisor Angius, Supervisor Bishop, and Supervisor Johnson, for your services and your leadership in the past years that I've been here.

Chairman Angius stated thank you.

Mr. Azarmi stated so, thank you so much.

Chairman Angius stated did you state your address when you came up?

Mr. Azarmi stated yes, 5890 Highway 95 Suite A.

Chairman Angius stated yeah. okay, Reuben McBride, then Barbara Pape, then John Bryant.

Reuben McBride, Pima resident, stated good morning. My name is Reuben McBride. I'm a retired farmer from over in Graham County. For the last 25 years, I have served on the board of directors for Arizona Electric Power. It is my privilege currently to be serving as President of the board of directors.

Chairman Angius stated can you speak more into the microphone?

Mr. McBride stated for the last 60 years, Arizona Electric Power has served reliable, affordable power to rural areas in Arizona, in the east, in the south and over here in the west. We find it very necessary for these units to be put in to be able to continue to serve the power to the growing community here in Mohave County. Thank you for listening, thank you very much.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Barbara Pape, is Barbara here? John Bryant and Mary Coffelt.

Barbara Pape, Bullhead City resident, stated Barbara Pape, 3908 Jamboy Way, Bullhead City. Good morning to everyone. I'm here to tell, us we are at reality right now. We are increasing, our county is increasing in population. We need to take care of, of the necessities of our, and the utilities of our county. And if we don't, we are not going to be fulfilling all of us, our temperatures have been very high last, this summer, it was extremely intense to have electrical power to go down, it's just, it's hard to live in this heat. So, these people do not want to recognize what is necessary for our existence here. I love this county. I think we, the backup for this particular power is needed, and we do not need to have what's in my backyard attitude, because this is development.

Chairman Angius stated excuse me, everybody will have their turn. Please, just be respectful.

Ms. Pape stated this is development that is needed, and that is necessary. And it's sad that these people do not see this. The other issue is.

Chairman Angius stated please.

Ms. Pape stated the other issue is the fact that we have, it's in the increasing of the electric rates. Electric rates are going to, have been increasing. We can't afford it. Affordability is the other issue. We need to recognize this. And I support this, this plan, a backup plan for electrical power. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. John Bryant, Mary Coffelt, and then Matt Blitch.

John Bryant, Bullhead City resident, stated good morning. My name is John Bryant. I live in Bullhead City.

Chairman Angius stated can you state your address, please?

Mr. Bryant stated and my address is 2596 Via Arroyo. I'm relatively new to Mohave County. We've, we've lived here little over a year. To supply information to support this project, it's been more than adequately done by Tyler. All the points are well covered. It's on private property, which

is an important issue in being able to maintain it without additional costs being added. I would approve of this. I request that you consider it seriously, which I'm sure you will. I rest of my time is for the next. Thank you much.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, sir. Mary Coffelt, then Matt Blitch, and then Vice Mayor Bullhead, Vice Mayor Dan Alfonzo.

Mary Coffelt stated my name is Mary Coffelt. I live in 3695 Joann Avenue, in Bullhead City. And this project is the best thing we can have on the land that we request to have it on, and it will help everybody and that needs it, because we do need it. You know how hot it gets here, and it seems like every year it gets a little more hotter. And a lot of us might lose our electricity, and it takes quite a long time sometimes to get it back up. But they do the best they can, and I approve this. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you.

Ms. Coffelt stated God bless.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, ma'am. Matt Blitch, Vice Mayor, Dan Alfonzo, and then Kevin Nestruck.

Matt Blitch, Bullhead City resident, stated first off, I would like to thank you again for allowing us to speak. My name is Matt Blitch. I reside at 2816 Sidewheel Drive, Bullhead City, Arizona. I'm also a business member of Mohave Electric Co-operative, here in Kingman. My business resides in Supervisor Bishop's district, District 4. I'm here today as I want to show my support, strong support, for the initiative to bring natural gas power to Mohave Valley. It's a great step forward in diversifying MECs energy mix. It will also compliment the solar and battery storage operations that they're currently investing in, which helps us during the inclement weather and, of course, at night. The addition of natural gas and power generation for our community is crucial to ensure we have reliable and affordable power. This will be especially important during peak demand times in the summer, when we're short of power and have to buy on the volatile, high price market. So, just in closing, I truly support the project for its cost initiatives. It's, they're speaking of the environment, which, which my business does a lot of, which of the same with the sims, a continuous emissions monitoring system. I understand what they're looking to do. It's very responsible, and I support that project. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Bullhead Vice Mayor, Dan Alfonzo, Kevin Nestruck, and then John Nelssen.

Dan Alfonzo, Vice Mayor, Bullhead City, stated good morning to everyone present, and to our esteemed Board of Supervisors. As Ms. Angius mentioned, is the fact that I am the Vice Mayor in Bullhead City. As we're all aware, the need for electricity is soaring, and a source for revenue, I'm sorry for power is actually dwindling. A contributing factor is due to the decreasing amount of water available to generate additional electricity to other sources. In order to curtail further

diminishing sources of electricity, Mohave Electric is taking the necessary action to avoid shortages by planning for the future today. We all need planning outside of the box for natural gas units and future solar with battery storage. Energy produced with natural gas emits less sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide than any other fuel source. Mohave Electric leads the way in supporting healthy air quality for all of our communities. One of the main considerations being that MEC utilizes the most efficient, effective, economical means to establish new power sources to meet our future needs. These needs have to be met so that power can be available to all of our members of all our communities at a reasonable price, which is an insertable factor. I support the efforts of Mohave Electric so that we have power for all of our needs now, and in the immediate future. We need this facility so that all our needs can be met, especially when we're having extended summer seasons, such as we've had this past year with extreme heat and winds. We would appreciate the consideration and approval of the location for this Mohave Electric Cooperative facility. I thank you for your time and giving me the opportunity to speak.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, sir.

Mr. Alfonzo stated thank you, ma'am.

Chairman Angius stated Kevin, Kevin Nestrick, please, John Nelssen, and then Cameron Mills.

Kevin Nestrick, Bullhead City resident, stated thank you. My name is Kevin Nestrick. I have lived at 2680 Country Club Drive, Bullhead City, for 47 years. And I have served as director for Mohave Electric Cooperative for the past 46 months. As directors, each of us are required to maintain a certification, which requires at least 100 hours of educational classes. Each of us is there to serve the cooperative's members. Our primary duty is oversight of all activities within the cooperative's operations, especially reliability and affordability of electric power to our members. I am here again today to ask for your support for the energy park program, which includes high efficiency gas generation. Today's gas generation uses the most up to date technology to generate clean and affordable electricity for our members. I do at this time need to take exception to the fact that this council asked us to have conversation with the local indigenous tribe in Mohave Valley, that meeting never occurred, even at our own request for over the past five months. Nothing has happened until the final hour here today. They just didn't come to us; we went to them and did not get a response. On behalf of my fellow directors, on behalf of our management and staff, and more importantly, on behalf of the members of Mohave Electric Cooperative, we thank you so much for your consideration. Please vote to change this zoning. Thank you, and thank you for your service.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. John Nelssen, Cameron Mills, Arden Lauxman, and then Kirk Barton.

John Nelssen, Kingman resident, stated good morning. My name is John Nelson. I'm a director on the Mohave Electric board. I'm also on the AEPCO board. And I'm here to support this project. This is a very good project. We desperately need it. I don't want to be in a situation where members of my district or any other district, and I, Mohave Valley is part of my district, as I live in in the

eastern district, I live north of Wikieup, but I don't want to have, my members out there or any place else, to have to make the decision in the middle of the summer of whether or not they're going to buy their meds and, or they're going to, they're going to pay their electric bill. It the, the last summer should have taught us something, that we've got to keep, that we have to maintain these, these levels of, of reliability. We have to maintain the economic viability of, of the fact, so that our members can have air conditioning or any other thing that they need. And if we don't think now about what's going to happen, no telling what's going to happen in the future. The market is so volatile that we've got, we have to get ahead of this game. We can't, we can't play on the razor's edge anymore. Thank you very much. My name, and once again, I live at 5404 South Highway 93, Kingman, Arizona, 86401. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Cameron Mills, Arden Lauxman, Kirk Barton, and then Brenda Seymour.

Cameron Mills, Bullhead City resident, stated hello, my name is Cameron Mills. I live at 855, Warren Road in Bullhead City. I'm here to support the energy park. I believe it's something right now that'll help bring down costs, not just now, but somebody like myself, who plans on being here long-term, somebody that's young, trying to stay here for a long time. I think it's something that could help us out long-term in the future. There's a location picked for this that works. They showed us with the science, the research was done. There's a reason they picked it, and it's something that we could do now that could bring costs down and not just propose something for the future. So, I'm here to support that. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Ardie Lauxman.

Arden Lauxman, Fort Mohave resident stated good morning, Chairman, Angius, Supervisors. Ardie Lauxman, I live at 1914 East Clear Lake Drive in Fort Mohave, Arizona. I am, for the past 14 years, up until January last year, the Chief Financial Officer at Mohave Electric. I can tell you, since the time I came here from Kansas in February of 2009 the number one priority has been trying to keep power costs reasonable. And I think over the years, we've done a good job doing that. And I think that the staff that's there now is working very hard and trying to find the right pathways to keep this legacy going. We have one of the lowest rates, lowest rates in the state. We want to keep it that way. And I know it's a hot potato on where, where this plant would go, but we've done everything, or the or the co-op seems to have been trying to work with every possibility to make this thing work. And I'm an old Kansas guy, and I served on Planning and Zoning for 12 years, back there 8 years as chairman. And I feel like this area is probably one of the better areas, better than the other ones that, that were selected. And wherever the plant would end up going, if it's approved, someone's not going to like it. So, I'll make this bold statement, and everyone can laugh if they want to, but I live on the Huukan golf course. I'm not a golfer, so don't let that sway you. But if it was proper zoning to rezone that golf course, you know what, if they wanted to put it there, again, I have enough compassion and care and concern for the people of this area that it, it should go there, then, you know what, I would be silent on it, and let it go there. And I also want



to also say, that I've been involved enough in this community in the past 15 years and continue to be that I feel like I'm in touch with an awful lot of the people in the community, and a lot of them are friends, a lot of them are not real happy about it. Some of them are very supportive of it. I respect them. Doesn't make any difference whether we agree or disagree. You are a person and I have the humility and respect that everyone needs to come together and work on this to make this work right. So, I ask again, for the endeavors of this co-op to be realized through your support. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. We have Kirk Barton. Brenda Seymour, Starla Lacy.

Kirk Barton, Mohave Valley resident, stated hi, I'm Kirk Barton. My address is 20 Wild Quail Circle, Mohave Valley. I am a resident in this area who will be affected by it, and I am for it. We heard the tribe talk about growth. That's the one thing we can all agree on. Growth is inevitable. This County Board of Supervisors had an opportunity 10, 15 years ago to address growth with our road. It chose to punt it down the road. Now, if you're down in the valley, tri state area, our citizens are at risk because of all the traffic that's happening there. Now, we have another chance for growth again. One of the things I'm hearing is we're all for it, but it's the location. Why is the tribe okay with Calpine, where it's at and this not where it's at? Is it because it's not tribal land, or it is tribal land? Are we benefiting? Do we want it on tribal land to benefit? Just helps, raises the power. This is something that we need to do. We need to address the growth. It's not going away. This is going to bring more power, help keep our costs down. I'm asking you guys to vote yes on this. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Brenda Seymour, Starla Lacy, please, and then Joe Anderson.

Brenda Seymour, Bullhead City resident, stated hi, my name is Brenda Seymour. I live at 1128, Citrus Street in Bullhead City, Arizona. I'm coming today, and I want you to really think about what Tyler Carlson said in his presentation. As we could have said, we could have saved \$21 million over the last couple of years. Do you realize how much of that could have gone to senior citizens like me? I live off nothing but my social security. And when a gentleman said earlier about wanting to pay your meds or paying your electric bill, I had to do that over the, over the summertime, I had make a choice. What am I going to do? So, my meds took a back step, because I, even though I really needed them, there was nothing I can do. I had to pay my electric. If this happens again and we're not approved, is one of you going to help me pay my medical bills or my meds? Can somebody say that they can actually help me? Because I don't think you really can. As a senior citizen, I ask you to think about the seniors and your retirement community and pass this today. It's been going on for so long. It's time that we make it approved. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Joe Anderson, then Roy Loyd and Richard Tempelman.

Starla Lacy, Las Vegas resident, stated good morning. My name is Starla Lacey, address, 7113 Rancho de Taos Court, Las Vegas, Nevada. I am, I'm an environmental professional. Have been

an environmental professional for 35 years. I'd like to say I am in absolute support of this project, and I would like to donate the rest of my time to Patrick Ledger. Thank you very much.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so you had already.

Mr. Ledger stated thank you, Madam Chairman, Board of Supervisors. Just a couple of clarifications. First, I just want to make it very clear that we are. This is AEPCO again.

Chairman Angius stated one second. I don't, yeah, you will. We'll call you back after the public. You already testified, and we'll call you back after, okay.

Mr. Ledger stated okay.

Chairman Angius stated after the public, we're still in the public hearing.

Mr. Ledger stated gotcha, alright.

Joe Anderson, Bullhead City resident, stated Chairman Angius and Board of Supervisors, my name is Joe Anderson. I live at 1379 Terrace Drive in Bullhead City. I'm an elected director of Mohave Electric board. I am elected to represent a portion of the members, which are the consumers for Mohave electric, and this power plant is much needed for our members. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Richard Tempelman, Martin Snow.

Richard Templeman, Fort Mohave resident, stated Supervisor Angius and Board of Supervisors. My name is Richard Templeman. I live at 5684 South Desert Lakes Drive in Fort Mohave. I am also a director of Mohave Electric Cooperative, representing 37,000 plus members who all live in Mohave County and four of the supervisory districts. I rise in favor of the location and the proposed rezoning of this project, and I request that you, humbly request, that you do the same. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, Marshall Chambers, then Martin, oh, this is no. Marshall Chambers.

Thomas Texas Wilson, Kingman resident, stated you called me earlier and I didn't hear, my name is Thomas Texas, Wilson.

Chairman Angius stated what's your name?

Mr. Wilson stated Wilson.

Chairman Angius stated okay, are you for, or opposed, or for this project?

Mr. Wilson stated opposed.

Chairman Angius stated okay, well, we're going to get to the people who are opposed. You're probably in this list. I just didn't. Okay,

Mr. Wilson stated sorry.

Chairman Angius stated sorry about that. Alright, we're only, right now, are you Marshall Chambers?

Roy Loyd, Topock resident, stated Roy Loyd.

Chairman Angius stated okay, let's.

Marshall Chambers, Gilbert resident, stated good morning. My name is Marshall Chambers. I'm the assistant business manager for IBEW Local 769.

Chairman Angius stated what's your address, your address.

Mr. Chambers stated it's 220 North William Dillard Drive, Gilbert, Arizona. We support a lot of employees in Mohave County, not just Mohave Co-op, but also Unisource, the Griffith Power Plant, Frontier Communications, and DirecTV employees. Local 769 is supporting bringing the natural gas plant to Mohave County. All of our members in the IBEW, or I should say, the vast majority of our members go through registered apprenticeships and great training. I say this to ensure you that the power plant would, would be, it would be reliable, it would be safe and it would be efficient. The new plant would not only give the opportunity to employ employees that work at the plant in the area, it would also bring a lot of work building the plant. This could be work that any contractor could bid on through the bidding process, and frankly, would just be good for the community to have. So, with that being said, IBEW Local 769 is in support and thank you guys.

Chairman Angius stated okay, thank you. And I don't, I may have it might be in this group, but if you are in favor and you have not spoken yet, or ceded your time to another speaker, you can approach the podium in line. We're just doing, sir with the shirt. We're just doing people who are in favor now. Next we're going to do the people who are opposed. I called you, oh, well, then you put, well, then you put in favor column. So, okay, well, I apologize.

Mr. Loyd stated hello, my name is Roy Loyd. I live at 4586 Monarch Drive, Golden Shores, Arizona, and I live in a rural area. And last month, I saw a slide where the area is marked, and we are at the last area marked. So, it's like, we don't get, you know, we need power that way. So, I work for a water utility company, and our well yard's high demand on electric, and we need those for, to run the well yards. And firsthand, the area is growing, and there's a lot of people coming to the area, and especially my little town, Golden Shores, it's growing. The water will be there. I can only speak that for just my town. I don't know about everywhere else, but the water will be there. Just want the water to be there also, or the power to be there also. And ADEQ, I deal with ADEQ, regular basis, water testing, everything like that. They are a tough organization sometimes, and they do not cut corners. They do not let people cut corners, the utilities, and I think they're going to be on this project and on them if it gets built, because they have the ponds, and people are worried about them poisoning the groundwater, and I don't think it'll affect the groundwater, because, again, you have to test it regularly. And I think ADEQ is going to be on them. And yeah, so I think too, I think we can all agree on, I don't like to bash other utility companies, but I'm just thankful that I don't have Unisource. Thank you very much.

Chairman Angius stated alright, thank you. Alright, next up, please, state your name and address for the record.

Ellen Brown, Bullhead City resident, stated I am Ellen Brown, 2876 Enclave Drive, Bullhead City. I've been a resident in Mohave County since 1980. I also worked for Mohave Electric for 40, over 40 years. I am in favor of this project. I think MEC has done its due diligence in finding the best location. I think this is the third go around on the different locations that they've submitted. This really boils down to affordability and reliability. We saw what happened over the summer with the extreme heat, and they had to increase the purchase power adjuster because of going out on the open market in prior years at which, just increased our, our summer bills exorbitantly this summer. We don't want that to happen again. And also, we know that our area continues to grow, the power needs will continue to grow right along with it. So, this peaker plant, if you want to call it that, would be available to us during those peak times, during the summer when the usage is the highest. This is not going to be running 24/7, it's designed for those peak periods during the summer or emergency times. So, I think some of the, the complaints are maybe not valid. I think they've, they've proved that it's going to be safe. And the reliability, like I said, reliability and affordability is what, what it boils down to. Thank you very much.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Next up.

Deborah Johnson, Bullhead City resident, stated good morning, Board of Supervisors and Hildy Angius. I'm Deborah Johnson, 1176 Chaparral Drive, Bullhead City, Arizona. I've become a Bullhead resident back in 1993, and I am on the board of Mohave Electric as a director for 12 years. This project has been looked into with our due diligence of trying to find property in this area, going through the different concerns that the Board and Planning and Zoning put forth. This area has been found. It will be privately owned. It meets the needs. It will be clean and reliable for our community. It will meet the standards that governments require, 100%. We don't slide on any of these type of things, but we need to have approval to move forward to get all these approvals from government agencies to move forward. I feel that our future and growth in our area, this plant is needed for our peak seasons and future growth. It will supply clean, reliable and affordable power for our future needs. This is also a not for profit. It will benefit members and our community. Thank you very much.

Chairman Angius stated okay, thank you. And I want to repeat if you gave your time to the first presentation, then we ask politely that you don't share now. Who's up?

Adam Rodriguez, Bullhead City resident, stated good morning to the Board. Thank you for having me today. I'm Adam Rodriguez. I have lived, I live at 2907 Palo Bria Circle in Bullhead City. I've lived and worked in District 2 for nearly four years now. And as a general manager for a facility that employs over 320 employees, it is crucial to have dependable and reliable power to keep our refrigeration system going, allowing us to serve food throughout the entire southwest United States. It's also extremely important to keep power affordable for those families that work at the

facility, because without them, we are nothing. I'm here today to show support for the proposed plan as presented by Tyler and the team. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Next up.

Deborah Allard, Bullhead City resident, stated good morning. My name is Deborah Allard, 1770 Ariba Drive, Bullhead City. I'm here in favor of the new power plant. It is a necessity. There are a lot of elderly people that cannot afford the high rates of electricity. People have to decide whether they're going to have food, medicine, or pay their power bill. It's just gotten ridiculous. I am truly in favor of this power plant. I yield my time.

Chairman Angius stated okay, thank you. Next up.

Wayne Black, Bullhead City resident, stated hi, my name is Wayne Black. I'm from Bullhead City.

Chairman Angius stated address, please?

Mr. Black stated 267 Meander. I'm in favor. But I came here with the purpose of asking some questions. I wanted first, an estimate and duration of this project. Okay? And I cornered MEC's CEO and have talked with him. Now, to keep things simple, I've been sitting in the audience listening, and I have one question for the opposition.

Chairman Angius stated please, please, face, please.

Mr. Black stated is there a reliable alternative? I understand that your objection is the location. What is our options? Where else can we put it up?

Audience members stated Bullhead.

Chairman Angius stated excuse me. Please. Please.

Mr. Black stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Mr. Black stated there is a lot of Bullhead, it extends from the 168 south to almost Needles. I believe there's a little hill, there's, supports, the sign says, city limits. Okay? And I am all in favor of the, of the idea that if the tribal people want it built on their property, excellent. I understand that the property that we were shown is private property. Okay? Now I would like to say one other thing.

Chairman Angius stated sir, sir, please. You're addressing the Board, not the audience.

Mr. Black stated okay.

Chairman Angius stated it's part of our process.

Mr. Black stated thank you, and that is, I'm a consumer. I'm a consumer, and if I wasn't concerned about this, I wouldn't be standing here representing about 150 people at my church that asked me

to keep them up here take notes and then report back to them of what I observed and what I heard. Now, I understand that you really have a grave decision to make. All I have left to say is that I'm willing to listen.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, sir.

Mr. Black stated and work with you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much.

Mr. Black stated give me an alternative.

Chairman Angius stated sir, your time is up. Thank you so much. Okay, is there anyone else who is in favor of the power plant location who has not spoke or ceded their time? Okay, so we're going to move on to the opposition. And again, please, if you can, I know this is a highly charged issue, if you can just keep your applause down so we can get through this. There's a lot of people, and we're going to try to do the same thing, because there's a lot of people who had given their time to other speakers, which I appreciate. I know we all appreciate it. So, we're going to do the best we can. So, let's start with Kris Schoppers. Is it Schopper or Schoppers? Schoppers. And anyone who wants to give their time to Kris, please stand up. Alright, so we have two. Okay, I'll give you then. So, it's three altogether. I'll give you eight minutes and you signed up to speak. Did you sign up to speak? Okay, so when we get to your name, you're ceding your time to Kris, okay.

Kris Schoppers, Mohave Valley resident, stated actually, there's so, there's four.

Chairman Angius stated how many more? Oh, okay, so 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Anyone else? 6, 7, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, including Kris. Okay, so that's three, yeah, yeah, but about, about 18, 18, minutes. Okay, it has to do with how many people are ceding their time, ma'am.

Ms. Schoppers stated okay, so, I'm Kris Schoppers. My address, 7443 South Harquahala Drive, Mohave Valley. So, a few points I'd like to make. First is, we have, currently, as of this morning, 2,102 petition signatures of people that are also in opposition. We have submitted 532 letters of opposition as well; people that are not in favor of this location or the location site C, they're opposed to Mohave Valley. We have about 2,300 homes that live nearby this proposed site. So, it is not off in the desert, it is not away from everybody. We had about 60 residents that came and spoke and expressed their opinions about the general plan update meeting. Thank you to Scott Holtry, for holding that for us, and Mr. Gunderson. Of that the majority were from Mohave Valley, and they sent a resounding message to Mr. Holtry, regarding the update plan, that they don't want to see the change come into Mohave Valley, that it's changed from suburban residential to urban development. That's not the future that we want. I think the people, feelings of the people I've spoken to here is that they bought in Mohave Valley, with the reasonable expectation that they were buying into a rural lifestyle. Why? Because that's what the general plan states, it's all residential and suburban. There are a few exceptions of commercial, but overall, the general plan for Mohave Valley is suburban residential. That's what their expectations were. That's why they

invested their hard-earned money into that property. So, they don't want to see this kind of change. If you want to see stats, I don't know why these aren't going. Do I have to do something special to make it?

Chairman Angius stated it'll come up, soon.

Ms. Schoppers stated okay. Thank you. So, this shows the different neighborhoods that are surrounding the site and the 2,300 homes. I think a visual is always helpful, especially as most of you do not live in the Mohave Valley area. So, I'd like you to take a look at that. Here's some more stats that are showing you, the breakdown of the about 2,300 homes that live immediately near the site. So, we're not talking about the three-mile radius. We're talking about the subdivisions that are adjacent to this proposed site. So, this actually will show you the larger perspective, and that's the potential three-mile impact zone, as per the EPA. So, if there was a catastrophic event, this is the area that would be affected. Now, actually moving a little bit more north and impacting even the Los Lagos at the Greens homes as well. And please note we have two schools that are in this zone, so we have our junior high school that services all of Fort Mohave and Mohave Valley, and the high school also. So, we're putting our children at risk too with this decision. As part of your zoning laws for heavy manufacturing, I'll actually need to read it M-X zoning, even the description shows that this is not an appropriate location. It talks about M-X zoning being established for using flammable or explosive materials, hazardous or commonly recognized offensive conditions. So, you even are saying that considerable consideration should be taken to the adjacent land or nearby land. This is from your Planning and Zoning ordinance. So, with that in mind, I would like to know how you think that having multiple gas peaker plants, along with multiple lithium battery storage facilities behind and around 2,300 homes sounds like a good idea. It sounds like a recipe for disaster to me; you don't have any mitigation ready for this. The Fort Mohave fire department, or the Mohave Valley Fire Department, has had challenges just with the rural fires that we've had this summer, and there have been several brush fires and home fires, where they have had to incorporate Fort Mohave, San Bernardino, Bullhead City, basically calling in the troops from everywhere to handle brush fires. So, we don't have a system in place. What do you plan to do with these 2,300 homes if, in fact, there's something that occurs at this site that requires them to be evacuated, what's the plan? Where are they going to go? I think so many of the details are missing from this Planning and Zoning application. I think that we need to see a major change happen in how things are even brought to your attention. Why are we even getting this far with it when they have not submitted a site plan or any kind of detailed explanation of exactly what this project will entail? We're not talking about a small project. We're talking about the rezone of potentially 273 acres. 273 football fields. That's a lot of land. It requires a major land amendment for Mohave Valley, even if you're looking at the 80 acres, or in this case, the 193.5 acres. We're not talking about a small project. A lot more diligence, a lot more investigation should have been done before it ever gets to you guys for a vote. How can you make a intelligent decision about this rezone without being provided all of the details? It's like throwing a dart at a dart board. It's listening to people, and I'm sure they're going to speak, you're going to ask questions, they're going

to answer questions, and then you are going to make a knee jerk reaction to what they say, without any time to actually investigate the realities of it. I hear them speaking about all the savings, yet I'd like to see that in fact, where are these savings really going to be. They have stats on how much power, and how much power they've bought. They will not make a commitment to exactly what is the dollar amount of that savings that you're projecting. Would really like to see a breakdown. I'd really like to see some kind of guarantees. The people from Bullhead City, and people, we're all on tight budgets. How did the whole EPCOR thing work out? Bullhead City was going to take over the water to reduce the cost of the water. Well, first, to give better quality water, but that disappeared, and then to reduce the cost of the water. In fact, the reality, that I've heard from many of my clients and most of the people I know that live in Bullhead City is their water rates have gone up. We're talking about an expensive project here. This money is not going to fall from the sky. So, where is this money going to come from? How are you going to possibly lower rates? And once the reality hits, it's too late. The rezone has already occurred. The major change and disaster for Mohave Valley has already occurred at that point. They haven't addressed at all on their rezone application, anything about battery or solar. The rezone application specifically says gas generation plant. I understand you might write something in about a maximum of how many peaker plants that they can have. Of course, I can see down the line. We have to have foresight, right? So, well now we need this extra because there's these other shortages. We didn't know this was going to happen, whatever the story will be, and the rezone is already in place, so it would be a really simple change. There's nothing about the lithium battery storage facilities. Why are we not having specific details about that? That should be part of the question. But if it's rezoned to heavy manufacturing, they don't have to come back to you with that information. It's already zoned appropriately, and they can just make those changes and add that in. That's what happened in Fort Mohave by the solar fields, right? They added the lithium battery storage. Did they ask for your permission to do it? No. Did they have to? Nope, but did they do it? Yes. So, history, we have to think about history repeating itself, and what are the implications. On their website, they talk about 85 of these 193 acres will be used for the gas power plant. So, they wanted 19 acres in Fort Mohave in which they were going to put up to four gas peaker plants. Now they're talking about out of 193 acres that they're going to put 85 acres of that for the gas plant. So, what guarantee is are they're not going to add more peaker plants? They have plenty of room to do it. It's a question we have to be thinking again ahead of time about these things. They have had conversation about it to some people, Los Mederos, their letter, and I apologize, some of it is cut off, but in their letter, they state that AEPCO is going to be adding at a future point, right here at the bottom, the lithium battery storage and the solar. So, why is Mohave County not asking these questions and requiring the details about this before they're entertaining the, even entertaining the idea of a vote. I think there is a true bias that has been shown here to the corporations versus the individuals. I know a comment was made of why would we expect a corporation to spend, you know, all this money to investigate the wells that they're going to have to drill, how much water they're going to really need based on water quality at that location, etcetera. Yet, I'm a realtor, when you're purchasing a property as an individual, you have an inspection period, and during that inspection period, you have to



investigate anything and everything that is a material matter to the purchase of that land during that inspection period. Which means it's going to cost you money. You're going to hire home inspector. If there's a well, you're going to hire a well inspector, termite inspector, you get the idea. And there's very well contingencies. Many people are purchasing homes with loans, so there's no guarantee they're going to get that loan, but they have to put the money up front to do their investigations and then find out well, will this really come to fruition. So, why are we not expecting this of these corporations? I don't understand. We have an individual who's become very dear to me, who has applied for an RV park near the same area. Near Perry Acres, so other side, right off of Jerome there, and this land that she's asking for is less than 30 acres, so much smaller project. It is between commercial and residential, and an RV park is quasi residential commercial, yes. So, seems like an appropriate location. This is the packet that she has to submit. This is the questions. Those are the checklists. There's a whole packet of information that's required before she can even get a zoning approval, or even get to the point of having a zoning approval made. Why are we not asking these questions and more of AEPCO? I think the lines have been blurred so much between MEC and AEPCO, they really are two separate corporations with, yes, a very incestuous relationship. I think that most of us didn't know, maybe not all of you even are aware that Tyler Carlson, the CEO of MEC, is the vice president of the board of the directors for AEPCO. How is that not a conflict of interest? It's a paid position. Why is, why is Patrick Ledger, the CEO of AEPCO on MEC's board of directors? Again, questions. So, how can. Alright, one of the reasons that they've said they couldn't pursue other projects, other locations, is because they.

Chairman Angius stated please, please keep your talking

Ms. Schoppers stated could not go after public lands. So, this is from your agenda item. This came from Planning and Zoning it's your map, where it shows that part of the land that they are pursuing is, in fact, labeled public lands. So, apparently, they really can go after public lands, because they are going after public lands. We did take a tour of the site on Friday, of where this location will be that they're going to put the peakers, but there's actually four parcels that are included in this location. So, this, where they're supposedly just going to put the peakers is at the very back. It's the very east side. So, then why do they need the other three parcels, if they're only going to put in the four peakers, and that's it? Why do they need 193 acres. It doesn't make sense, unless you look a little further into it. So, I know they like to show, and they did, the MEC service area. But again, the applicant is AEPCO, not MEC. This is going to be owned by AEPCO. And here's the fact, here is AEPCO's service territory. Do you see this little section right here? That's Bullhead City, our little tri state area. Do you see what a small section of AEPCO's service territory we actually are? We need to think about this. Why do we want to give up our precious resources of water, which we do not have. Scott Holtry mentioned during the general plan update, first time I've heard a county official acknowledge this. Fort Mohave and Mohave Valley are out of water allocations. We're out. So, why do we want to give up water for this, to AEPCO? Let them take it somewhere else. Let them take it maybe Bullhead City, they have water allocations that, they have the majority of the customers. Maybe that is where it should go. Fort Mohave and Mohave Valley don't have

the water to give, when you look at the infrastructure. So, this, again, is from their site. So, you see what they're saying about this site D is that it's right near the switching station, and very easily for AEPCO then to be able to distribute the power. I think that if, if we are so ignorant to believe that this power that they're going to generate is going to all stay in our area, is really ridiculous. We need to open our eyes. So, in closing, what I'd like to say is history repeats itself. I know this is not the Griffith Energy Plant, but can we take a moment to reflect back on that? So, the Griffith Energy Plant, so at one point they had to shut down because of the prices of gas got too high. They couldn't even produce power because it wasn't cost effective anymore. So, I get, yep, these are peaker plants. They operate differently, but this is part of history. They talk about how secure it's going to be. So, two years after the, the Griffith plant was put in, and they also have a large evaporation pond, they had leaks. Well, they found one leak. This is from an article on Griffith, we can all look it up online. They found when they went out to address the one leak, there was actually 10 leaks. 10. They did not get reported to ADEQ in a prompt manner like they were supposed to. Actually, ADEQ fined them because it was several months later that the report was, was finally sent to ADEQ. Now they withdrew the fine because they said, okay, well, they did address it quickly. But the fact is, there's no guarantees, and there's going to be a huge evaporation pond. And please, somebody get some solid figures on the water. They have changed their stats. They haven't given anything in writing. It went from 100 homes about, although 100 homes don't live off of only RO quality water, so maybe 300 homes then, conservatively. And then at the Planning and Zoning meeting, we were told it's 480-acre feet. For how many? One peaker? Through 2, 3, 4? Is that before the RO processing? Is that after the RO processing? Where is this water going to come from? We don't have the water. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, thank you very much. That was a very well thought out. I know that there was a lot of questions in there, and I'm sure we'll get to the answers after the, we're still in the public hearing. So, I just if you're, if you're going to come up and repeat the same questions, we've written them all down. I was submitted some so, just wanted you to know that. So, here we go. James Schoppers. Who, who? I'm sorry, what's your name? Okay, alright, one second. Got this. Jon Garcia? Is there a Jon here? And then, is there, is there a Jon coming back? Alright, LP Bryan, then Kiona Kormet. Excuse me? You get, you gave the, did you already give to, okay, but did you give all already to Chairman Williams? No, okay, all right. Well, let's go. I'm just trying to Jamie, who should, who's going to talk on behalf of a lot of you. Do you know? Who? Different people. Okay, so, Ashley, okay, Ashley Hemmels, okay. And how many people are ceding their time to Ashley? Two, I think there are three, and that's four, so you can have 10 minutes.

Ashley Hemmers, Mohave Valley resident, stated good morning. 2550 Spirit Mountain Drive, Mohave Valley, Arizona. I'd first like to make note that we are hand delivering formal opposition from the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe to the county, to Mohave County Board of Supervisors, in a hand, in a hand delivered letter. Also, I'd like to. Bring your attention to a map. So, this map shows the service area. It also shows a few things in terms of reservation land. So, when you look at where the designated applications are, it actually abuts reservation land, which is why Fort Mojave

tribal members stand in opposition to this area. And I'd like to bring your attention to that, because our history is really important, especially with the United States enactment of the Dawes Act. So, if you look at the land on the map, what you'll see is you'll see parcels of tribal farm, private farm, tribal farm, private farm, and that's through the establishment of the Dawes Act. And that Dawes Act issued to the tribe that we would be responsible for maintaining collaborative partnership with local jurisdictions and authorities to use the land in similar ways. And I bring that attention, to your attention because we're here for a land amendment issue for use of land. And so, when we were settling this through the Dawes Act, we agreed part of the tribe with the United States, on behalf of the County and the State that we would use the land in similar ways. Now, a business is asking for an exception to change the intent of that settled land dispute in those settled ways. And one of the things that we've noticed is that this was taken directly from the agenda booklet today that even in their application, if you read here, they've submitted, let me see if I can turn that around, the application they've submitted is an incomplete application before you, which means that they didn't complete the application to say if it was in compliance with the general plan or if they would be submitting an amendment or an addendum. And they did this in both of the applications for the new sites that were printed out this morning. And we know that they know how to fill out an application, because in the original application for the beginning site in Mohave Valley, they did fill it out completely, and they listed that it was not in compliance with the general plan. Now I bring that to your attention because the item before you is whether or not to pass a land amendment that is in compliance with the general plan. Now I understand that they are asking for an exception and for you to make those changes. But one of the other items I'd like to bring before your attention in Mohave Valley, specifically, all Mohave Valley residents do not receive power from MEC or AEPCO. Actually, one in every three Mohave Valley residents do not receive power, so they will be impacted by this decision that you're making, and receive none of the benefit, all of the impact, none of the benefit. And so, this map, the gray area shows the service boundary for other power authorities in Mohave Valley. And we think that's really important, because what we are looking at is a project for a land amendment that will critically change a general land use plan that has already addressed land disputes in the area between the tribe and private use in a way that we would agree upon to utilize the land under a general plan, so that they are similar, so that we do not have further land disputes in this area. And so that is really important in thinking about the decision you have today, because you have a choice, you can maintain the County's rule and accept that this exception does not follow the general plan. It does not comply with the general plan. It also does not, it does not, it's not what Mohave Valley residents want. We have over 2,000 signatures, all from Mohave Valley. We spent the time this summer and this fall talking to residents in Mohave Valley. We didn't extend that to Bullhead City or Kingman or Wikieup, or other states or, or the U.S., because this is a Mohave Valley issue. Mohave Valley residents want to live in the ways that Mohave Valley has been living and has been accustomed to living, and so we're asking you to side with the residents, because the choice is to side with us or reopen already settled land disputes, land disputes that have happened through the Dawes Act, land disputes that have been agreed to through the general plan. And yes, it is private use, but

private use for a designation of agricultural or residential, not private use for urban development, rezoning, redesigning the critical landscape for Mohave Valley residents. And we hope that you vote against this land amendment issue and stand with Mohave Valley, and stand with the public, the residents that live both on and off reservation, and also stand with the Native Americans that have been here since time immemorial, so that you can say, hey, you know this project doesn't comply with the general plan. And we're asking that of you, ironically, at the beginning of Native American Heritage Month. How would you like to be remembered today? We're not saying no, against the power. We're not against gas. We're asking you to protect our rural lifestyle and look into other areas where this project has, can be successful and beneficial to the majority of people that it serves in Mohave County. And there is land available for that that is already designated for heavy manufacturing throughout the county. That's all we're asking in terms of location, to stand with Mohave Valley residents. Stand with the Native Americans, Fort Mojave, Mojave people, in Native American Heritage Month and, and keep, keep the critical agreement that was made on the use of this designation. Thank you so much.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. I'm looking for somebody that is speaking for people. Is there? Kris is there? Who's speaking? What's, what's your name again? Martin Snow, yeah, I did call your name, but then I said, oh, wait, that was the wrong one. Okay, come on down. How many people are ceding their time to Martin Snow? One, two, okay, just one, if I call your name, just say you've already seated your time. Two, three, okay, you have about seven, eight minutes.

Martin Snow, Mohave Valley resident, stated okay. My name is Martin Snow, 1970 Plantation Road, Mohave Valley. Before I get started on what I prepared, I just want to say to the last person who was supporting this plan, Bullhead City does not continue all the way down to Needles. It stops at Fort Mohave and Mohave Valley are separate towns, unincorporated, which I think a lot of people would agree with, we moved here mainly because we didn't want to be part of an incorporated city. In fact, if I had the option, I would detach from the power and water grid, drill my own well and have solar. Alright, so I want to say good morning to the Board. I wanted to address a few concerns I have mostly involving the site C and site D plans regarding procedural integrity, possible conflicts of interest, and a few other worries as far as what we have.

Chairman Angius stated this is site D.

Mr. Snow stated right, okay, I'll stick to site D then.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Mr. Snow stated I believe that some of these things threaten public trust and governmental transparency, and I believe they deserve immediate scrutiny. First, I want to believe that recent actions by the Mohave Valley Fire Department chief and the fire board may have overstepped their own authority in the fact that they have voiced public support for the Mohave Energy Park and its parcels as a whole when they have said in meetings with the public that they directly will be benefiting from these plants by the tax revenue generated. I also believe that there is some concern

that grants given to AEPCO, particularly a nearly half a billion-dollar grant as part of the recovery program earlier this year. They stand to basically be in a position where they shouldn't be in support of something publicly, because they directly benefit from it. Secondly, I also believe that there are a couple of conflicts of interest here in that Supervisor Bishop, who is the chairperson for the Department of Health for the County, had postponed a presentation by an epidemiologist also with the County department of Health last Monday, which would have directly brought up concerns pertaining to the health risks of this project, and at the same time, the reason it was tabled was because it would have, not there was not enough information to continue with it. Further, I think that there's been a concerted effort to limit public discourse on this topic. There's been multiple times where agenda, agenda meetings, dates had been changed outside of session. Which, according to the rules of order, item two, clause B, require to be done during a meeting by a vote, majority vote. These are issues that really threaten transparency, and I think that they remove a degree of accountability. Lastly, well, not lastly, at the October 9<sup>th</sup>, Planning and Zoning committee meeting supporters of the Energy Park did not disclose public potential conflicts of interest. It was a procedural oversight where anybody who was speaking in support had not disclosed that they were a part of, or associated with people who would be benefiting from either MEC or AEPCO or any of the contractors involved there. I also think that it is somewhat of a breach of ethics in that up until last Friday, where it was recently revised, there was also an attempt to remove the call to the public at the end of this, before it was recently put back in. I want to urge an investigation into recent administrative decisions. Residents who were notified about this were limited to a very small area, and any public documents that were provided or the website provided by MEC only state in vague detail, and as far as notification provided, it was limited to the required 300-foot range around the property. If you'll notice any of the maps that were shown by previous people, they're farms. There's no people within 300 and feet. I mean, either way, my main concern as far as procedural issues go, is that promotional materials that were for the application for site D have an imbalance for the way that they're being handled in the for and against. Mainly the cards that were submitted for support of the project only include the basics of the name and that you support them, not that they covered any particular parcels. And because of that, the site D application contains almost entirely all of the supporting letters that were submitted for the original site C. However, when asked the, when, when it was asked to the public, we were told that any of the opposition letters, as well as signatures that were taken, whether by form of online petition or by actual letters from site C, could not be also used for site D, they would have to be redone. Now that is on top of the fact that there are some letters of support for site D which were submitted before site D was applied for. That includes the Valley View Medical Center, which had a letter of support dating back to 2021, which is buried about 1,070 pages in on the application for this. I also want to slightly release what I was going to say next in that I believe that there was a degree of imbalance in the transparency with the people who are speaking today, we were originally told that we'd be limited to a maximum of 10 minutes, regardless of the numbers of supporters we got, and I'm glad to see that it wasn't that case. In finality, I believe these issues really demand transparency before it causes a true issue in the breach of trust with the public, and to know that

the people here are truly in support of the people who live in Mohave Valley, who will be most affected by this. I believe that if we can't come to some kind of an amicable decision to move this to another site or to stop this process altogether, I for one, would be willing to take any process necessary after this, whether it be legal recall vote or even moving to a place where I'd be in a right district to run against anyone here who votes for this project. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated alright, so Cheryl or Roy Hagemyer, are you speaking together or people giving you time? Okay? Who's donating their time to Roy? 1, 2, 3, 4, okay, 5. Are you standing to give your time to him? Okay, so that's 5, 3, 15, about 12 minutes. Roy.

Roy Hagemyer, Mohave Valley resident, stated okay, Roy Hagemyer, 2090 Royal Court, Mohave Valley, Arizona. Bottom line is, Mohave Valley does not want this mess in our neighborhood. I think that's well documented. But Bullhead City seems to be overwhelmingly in favor of it. So, I would say it's time to move it to Bullhead City. There's M-X manufacturing there by the airport, ready to go. And I want to touch on something that Chairman Williams said, you have made this ugly. You have divided Mohave Valley and Bullhead City. There's angst between these communities, and that should not be. We stand arm in arm with the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe. I want to talk about water, and I believe that everyone here knows just how important water is to us, even more so with the drought that we're in. But the question has been asked of AEPCO, and there have been several very, extremely vague answers given. In reality, this is a truth about these peaker plants. A water wasting peaker plant refers to a power plant designed to quickly generate electricity during peak demands, which often use large amounts of water for cooling and environmental reasons, a system called once through cooling, leading to a significant water withdrawal from natural resources, making them considered water wasting due to the high volume water used and discharged back into the environment with elevated temperatures, which can cause harm to aquatic ecosystems and contribute to water scarcity in regions with limited water supplies. In the Fort Mohave presentation that I attended earlier this year, prior to the moved to Mohave Valley, Patrick Ledger stated that they would be using about 100 homes worth of water per year, with no more explanation than that. That would come to about 10,950,000 gallons of water per year. Is that for actual consumed water, or is that water needed after it's been treated for use? Then at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, Tyler Carlson stood up and stated they would be using 480-acre feet of water per year. That's 156,408,685 gallons of water. Now we don't know if that amount of water is for before they treat it or after they treat it. We don't know. If we assume that, because we don't know what the real amount of water is, is the 480-acre feet before or after the RO process. Because it takes four gallons of water to create one usable gallon of RO water, best case scenario, that would leave you about 51,614,866 gallons of water for good, RO water, and would leave 117,306,513 gallons of waste! That's 6,517 swimming pools that hold 18,000 gallons a piece, and not one drop of that water goes back into the ground, as does with agriculture in Mohave Valley today. We cannot afford to allow this water to be wasted in this very, very dangerous plan. And where does all this water come from? Well, as of today, all of this supposed water is allocated on paper at the Mohave Valley Irrigation and Drainage District. Do they know how much water is in

the ground? No, do they have any idea the condition of the aquifer in Mohave Valley? No. There is so much speculation today that the, the water level in our aquifer has deteriorated, the quality of the water has deteriorated. So, assuming there's plenty of water to supply this water guzzling peaker plant is that flat, isn't this flat out foolish and dangerous? Currently, there's no extra water to be allocated to anyone. And unless you find a farmer who owns the water and is willing to part with it for a very high price, you might find some. And AEPCO and MEC and their brochure stated their proposed project would not consume any more water than is currently allocated to the agricultural land. Much of the water of the agricultural land returns back into the ground. This is a water sucking disaster. No water goes back into the ground unless it's tainted water, like happened at Griffith. It's dangerous and it's irresponsible. And I have to say, I'm appalled that this county has required nothing of this applicant in regard to a real plan of what they are doing. They are simply taking the word of a group of people who have zero credibility. There have been misrepresentations made, manipulation of data and ideas, many false and misleading scare tactics, which we heard again this morning to entice residents of Bullhead City to endorse this very bad idea. In addition, the applicant has never given true numbers about anything. The present verbiage on water is this, as part of the real estate agreement of the private seller, AEPCO will acquire a portion of the existing water rights allocated to the land, including in the project site. The transaction does not include a request for new water rights, and the project will also utilize efficient error derivative turbine technologies. Therefore, the project will not consume any more water than it's previously allocated in the acreage. In addition, they state they're getting a hydrologist to check for the best place to put a commercial well. Why does the County not require any of this in writing before they vote on this matter? Why does this county not require MVID to certify there is sufficient water for this type of high polluting project? Why? Because the powers that are, that be, want, don't want to know the truth and the reality of this mess prior to approving it. We never learn, do we? They failed with the Griffith plant, and they are getting ready to fail again with this one. Water is a critical issue, and we cannot allow this water to be wasted on a patch to a broken system. This project must be firmly rejected for the safety of Mohave Valley residents and for Mohave County as well. By the way, we heard a report from Nick Ponder this morning in regards to water. You listen to him at every one of these meetings, ground water is a scarcity. They're dying of thirst. down in the lower parts of Arizona. Are the five of you ready to put this county in financial jeopardy? This project may very well bankrupt Mohave County, with 200 homes losing their well water due to the aquifer being drained by AEPCO on the tune of millions of dollars. Are the five of you ready to reimburse the residents of Mohave Valley for the loss of property value, as required by Proposition 207 to the tune of more millions of dollars? Are the five of you ready to use taxpayer dollars to defend multiple lawsuits from abuse of power, conflict of interest, obstruction, intentional hiding the material evidence to get an approval vote, rule breaking, illegal proceedings and much more? Are the five of you ready to deal with another Hinkley, California, or PG&E right here at Topock? Every one of you who votes yes will be held accountable, not only in a court of law, but as elected officials. We, the people, are tired of being run over by rogue elected people doing what is best for their special interest friends, and this is going to stop. We are going to bring

this to a halt. Let me close with this. Proverbs 29:1 & 2. He who often is reprov'd yet stiffens his neck will suddenly be broken beyond healing. When the righteous increase, the people rejoice, but when the wicked rule, the people groan. And boy, We the People are groaning right now.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so there's someone named Kim Qualey that people have given their time to. Oh, Cheryl, do you want to come down now? Well, it doesn't, doesn't work that way. So, we have 1, 2, 3, right? Okay, it's nine, about six or seven minutes.

Cheryl Hagemyer, Mohave Valley resident, stated seven minutes?

Chairman Angius stated seven minutes.

Ms. Hagemyer stated okay. I am Cheryl Hagemeyer. I live at 2090 Royal Court, Mohave Valley, and I am.

Chairman Angius stated yeah, into the mic.

Ms. Hagemyer stated I am honored to say I am not part of anybody up there on the board. I don't belong to MEC or AEPCO or anyone else that they have all said that that they are in bed with. I would like to say that the county officials and business of professionals are abusing their power here in Arizona. We have people in this very room that have broken rules for their own gain, and the people of Mohave Valley are really ticked off. We elected you, the Board of Supervisors by district to work together with each other and to listen to and tell the truth to your constituents. I pray for each one of you to listen, and I mean, really listen to us and our concerns, and do the right thing by voting no. MEC and AEPCO have not been forthwith. Every time one of their expensive brochures come out at the three meetings that we've had with them, they have different things in them. They've even said that they were going to originally frack the water back into the ground, and then all of a sudden, when we said it was fracking, they start telling us that we don't know what we're talking about, and we're starting rumors. So, there's a lot of mistrust with us right now, because we can't get answers, and it's totally why we don't trust anybody. The bottom line is, Mohave Valley is not the best place, and there are so many people in Bullhead City that want it, so why don't you use some of that land that's out there, that's for sale, right off of the parkway and right by the airport, that's already zoned heavy manufacturing. There's been a lot of misleading and collusion, and it's at an all-time high. You can hear the things that other people are saying. Why is the general plan so incomplete? Why can these big companies come in and grossly having complete applications to put who knows what on our land? No one can tell us how much water is being used, and that is our main concern right there, that one, and health. And if they were going to originally put two to four peaks on 19 acres, why are they now asking for 80 acres and 193 acres? Why do they need so much land? Is it for a buffer? I don't know how big a buffer you need. Do the math. It is because they need the existing, is it because they need the existing agricultural water rights? Tyler said that in the PNZ meeting, they were only needing 480 feet a year, and he made it a big deal by saying that it was not that much, like only 480-acre feet. Are they going to run our wells dry? Can you understand our concerns? Tyler gets up and says, I don't know where



all these rumors are coming from. Well, you can see what we've dug up. And if MEC is a publicly owned, not for profit business, why does Tyler Carlson make \$1.3 million a year in 2023 numbers? Probably more now for being the CEO of MEC. Furthermore, he is the vice president of AEPCO board, and oh yeah, he makes \$250,000 for that job too. So, he is all in. No wonder he gets to be the applicant for MEC and AEPCO at the Planning and Zoning fiasco. This info made me research other co-ops like East River Electric Company in South Dakota. They are well over two times the size of MEC, 93,000 homes and businesses and 250,000 consumers, and their CEO makes \$343,000 a year. So, Jon Martell works for AEPCO as their executive director of services, and he is also on the board, he is also a board member for the Chamber of Commerce in Bullhead. And all these names that I'm going to be saying are all connected all over the place. Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission, John Hassett has a huge conflict of interest. He is the vice chair from the Chamber of Commerce board, and lo and behold, they endorsed this project. Do you see a pattern here? He is also a 1.1, he also had a \$1.1 million contract with the County for medical examiner services, which you Supervisors approved, and in the Mohave County Procurement, Procurement questionnaire for the contract, it was asked if it was a conflict of interest. Well, that is a big fat yes. Then you fired him, by canceling his contract.

Chairman Angius stated ma'am, we're not talking about the medical examiner. Please stay on, on topic.

Ms. Hagemyer stated I'm trying to make a, I'm trying to make you understand that all of these things are like little favors being done for everybody in the county, except for the people who don't want this peaker plant in Mohave Valley. And to end, our help is in the name of the Lord who made Heaven and earth, Psalms, 124:8. So, I hope you all really listen to us, and we urge you to not be deceitful and to vote no for this peaker plant to be in Mohave Valley, we would be willing to work with you all, including Mohave Electric and AEPCO, to find a better solution, work with the Indian tribe. The whole thing is just not going to work out in Mohave Valley. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated okay, is there? Is there anyone who has something more to add to this, because there's still a lot left, as something maybe we haven't heard or, because I would really like to get to the answers to the questions that you have. Yes. Okay, okay, Jamie Morgan, and how many people are out there for Jamie that haven't already stood for somebody else? Okay, Jamie, you got three minutes. There's one part, alright, got five minutes.

Jamie Morgan, Mohave Valley resident, stated my name is Jamie Morgan. I live at 10554 South Lead Lane in Mohave Valley. I have here, I'm short, so it's going to be hard. I have here documents that we want to show in regards, it's a review of health concerns and issues that occur within power plants near neighborhoods. This is the first one, and then we have present considerations, Mohave Energy Park proposal and future intent to add solar and battery. The role of presentation is to provide information, and these are all our health concerns. I'm just going to kind of go through them quickly, because I only have a few minutes here. Common emissions and pollutions at, at all natural gas peakers are nitrogen oxide, sulfate dioxide, ground level ozone and particulate matter.

These are, some of these pollutants are associated with adverse health effects, and these are listed here. And considering that the people that are at the highest risks are children, and we have in proximity to this plant, a high school and a junior high, they're up on the most highly at-risk, children and not to mention the elderly in our community. And then some of the, associated with respiratory effects. Anyone who has cardiovascular, people have neurological problems, pregnancy, birth outcomes, these are all associated with this type of plant. So, with the different gasses that are admitted, these are again the different health effects. We have so many people here in our area who specifically live out here because they have respiratory problems already. They can't be in high humidity, so they come out here for the dry heat. The greenhouse gas emissions that result from the extraction and burning of fossil fuels are major contributors to climate change, and with the fact that they're going to be burning fossil fuels, they got gas. The other public health concerns are the construction phase versus operation phase. So, during construction, we're going to have all kinds of dust and everything in the air, that's going to be more water. We don't have enough water to keep dust down. We have the drilling, excavating, storage, transportation, the piping of natural gas. This project fairly illustrates the value of adequate, detailed and robust environmental reviews and health impacts, assessments for any similar large project. And then I also have, so Supervisor Jean Bishop tabled the board of health agenda items on basis that there wasn't enough information prior to the Board of Supervisor meeting. How can she decide to vote on it today? She intentionally withheld the information from the public. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, anyone who's speaking on behalf of several people who haven't already stood up. You sir, what, what's your name? Come on down. And is he taking your time? Okay, five minutes.

Gary Okay. My name is Gary Stuck. I live on 649 Gordon Drive, Mohave Valley. And I live near this area that will be affected by this pollution. And this is near public, this is our public lands, and it will be by schools and our neighborhood. And as you've heard, it's going to be very bad for the elderly and the children and everyone that lives nearby. And as you are all worried about the water table, it will destroy the water table and leave us with no water. And I would like to ask each one of you to think to yourself and ask this question of yourself, would you like this power plant next to your house or in your neighborhood? How would you feel? And if you feel it's okay, then please propose that it goes in your neighborhood.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Mr. Stuck stated now.

Chairman Angius stated oh, you're, more.

Mr. Stuck stated okay. Now, I was only, I only found out a bit, about this meeting last night. We were not notified of this meeting. I attended the Willow Valley board meeting on Saturday, and not a single person knew about this meeting. So, I think you need to notify all of those affected by this, and not just the people in that 300-foot radius. Okay? Now, I've been an engineer for 40 years,

graduated from Columbia with an MSEE. And as a young engineer, I worked for the Utah Power and Light Company. And what I did there was work on how the power distribution and the power grid connects together most efficiently. Now it appears as though you may need some help with that, because it doesn't need to be located near the residence that you put the power plant in. This can be hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of miles away and connect to the power grid, and you can put this so far away in the middle of nowhere that it affects nobody. Okay? Now I volunteer to help the engineers locate this and connect to a power grid that you can supply the power generated this, when and if it's needed. So, please take me up on this. It sounds like they need help doing this. Okay? I already mentioned the groundwater and the power table, but did Mohave County do a full-blown environmental assessment of this? I don't think so. As you've seen, they haven't. So how could everything not be completed before this is voted for? And as they mentioned, they already have power plants 350 miles away and so forth. Put it there. Now I'll give you another example. So, there's a nuclear plant that powers Phoenix and the surrounding area. Well, did they put it in Phoenix? No, they put it far away from Phoenix, away from everyone, for safety and environmental reasons and other reasons. Okay, you don't need to put a power plant right next to the users or neighborhoods. In fact, you don't. Follow the nuclear plant example, how, what would have happened.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Stuck stated okay, so this is a vote for all of Mohave Valley and all of Willow Valley. No, please.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Anyone else have a burning desire offer? Come on down. Did you cede your time to somebody else? Okay.

Robert Jacobo, Fort Mohave resident, stated no, I did not. Alright, well, my name is Robert Jacobo, 6084 South Scorpion Lane, Fort Mohave, Arizona. But also, the most important of my credentials is that I'm a alumnus of D Street Elementary School in Needles, California, Vista Colorado, Elementary school in Needles, California, Mohave Valley Elementary school, Mohave Valley Junior High, River Valley High School. I've lived in this area for over 30 years. And so, my friends today, we ask ourselves, and we find ourselves at a crossroads, a moment that really calls for courage, unity and love for our land and people. This is not just another meeting, and what stands before us today is a choice, a choice to protect our way of life or allow it to be altered forever by forces far removed from our communities. We have a chance to be the heroes of our story, to stand together against those who seek to exploit our land for profits. The powers who wish to urbanize our sacred spaces are just betting that we lay down and we don't fight back. But I say we stand tall, and we prove them wrong. The communication we received from AEPCO and Mohave County Board of Supervisors has been less than honest and less than transparent for the most part. They failed to include us, the people whose lives will be directly impacted. They did not consult properly with the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe as they should have, respecting the traditions and asking of the indigenous wisdom that has been a part of this land since time immemorial. We are the ones who

can set things right. Imagine standing up to the big corporate giant, being remembered in history as the community that protected its heritage. Imagine being a part of a story where the underdog triumph, where the people of Mohave Valley stood together and said, not here, not us. This is our chance to ensure our children know what it feels like to breathe clean air, the freedom of open land and to take pride in their home. The way forward is relatively simple, to protect our people, to protect our future, and by denying this rezone, we stand for what makes us human, our connection to our land, our respect for one another, and the belief that every voice matters. So together, we can show that no corporation is greater than the will of the people. I urge you today to vote to deny the rezone. Let this be a moment when we say enough is enough. You are all here, standing or sitting here today, and the heroes of today are definitely in this room. So let us protect, let us preserve and let us lead vote no to the rezone. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Sir, your name, please?

Tyler Bovma, Golden Valley resident, stated good morning. My name is Tyler Bovma. I live at 4950 West Apache Way in Golden Valley. I also work in Mohave Valley. And I would like to refocus this discussion just a little bit. The discussion all morning appears to have been about the value of increasing or improving power supply and reducing the cost of power supply. That's not the purpose of this meeting. I think most people in this room would support those ideas. The purpose of this meeting is the rezoning of the lands from the least expensive version of land, which is agricultural, to the most profitable version of land, heavy manufacturing and industrial use. That's the question. I've spent 42 years in public service, and because of that, I've learned that there are rarely difficult decisions that will do no harm and that require people such as yourselves to make those hard decisions of, how can I do the least harm. The U.S. Constitution and the state constitution place high value on people's personal property rights. That is trumped by government's ability to look at compelling public interest and say, we need to have a plan to protect people's property, to protect our people. That is done through the planning and zoning process. That process doesn't kick the can down the road. That process looks at, how do we protect people's properties and our people by ensuring that the influences over property surrounding us follow that plan. This county has a comprehensive plan and a zoning structure. The zoning is agricultural out there for a reason. By voting to support this project, you will be changing from agricultural to heavy manufacturing and industrial purposes. Once that is done, that 273 acres is open to be repurposed for those purposes, in addition to the power plant that they are proposing to put on, you would be opening up that land to be used for all kinds of reasons to future buyers, people who that land could transfer to. That is unacceptable. That will introduce into the community, harm. Harm to the people, harm to the lifestyle. In making decisions, I've learned that the best way to look at a question is to ask yourself, am I doing the right thing, the right way, at the right time, and for the right reason? Increasing power production is the right thing. However, doing it in this method, which says, let's go out here and put it in these people's backyards, instead of locating it in already existing areas that are zoned for that purpose, is not doing it the right way. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. No singing today, okay, Ms. Esposito.

Jennifer Esposito, Kingman resident, stated thank you. Jennifer Esposito, editor of the Mohave Free Press, Kingman, 321 East Snavelly Avenue. At the last meeting, I said, if you did the wrong thing, I'd publish it and tell 10,000 people, and I will. But I'd like to draw your attention to what I put up here. This is from Ms. Skubal, the Clerk of the Board. I'll read it to you. Don't worry. Okay, this should not even be on the agenda, because it should never have passed out of Planning and Zoning. They did not do their statutory duty, and I'm going to tell you why. Okay, it says, purpose, the requirement for Planning and Zoning Commission is contained in state statute, ARS, 11-802, as are the Commission's duties, the Commission's primary duty is to advise the Board of Supervisors in managing the orderly growth and physical development of Mohave County, and to, this is the important part, protect the health, safety, morals and general welfare of its citizens. The Commission will make changes to further the public interest but will not alter plans or review regulations solely for an individual group or organization for their personal caprice, convenience or profit. Now, the Planning and Zoning board has been remiss in following the statute on this, on multiple rezone proposals. So, I'm asking you today to hold yourself to their standard that they're not following. Alright, don't grant a rezone of the general plan to benefit a corporation at the, at the detriment of the residents and their water supply and their health and their safety and their property values. As the map showed, the service area is very small, and yet they want to put this here. Now, I understand, I object to the location, I'm not about, you know, providing power, just like everyone else says. I mean, I'm friends with the chairman of the corporation commission and him, and I've talked about these kinds of things. But the reason that an environmental impact study is not required on a major rezone for a corporate entity for these kinds of things, is because you the Board don't require it here in Mohave County. But it should be done before something like this is even considered. It's not about putting stipulations, oh, you can only have four, like the guy before me pointed out, once you rezone it, all bets are off. Mohave County says, well, that stuff all comes after the rezone is granted. How many times have we heard that from Planning and Zoning? So, whatever you do today, I will tell 10,000 people, and then I will spread it all over the internet, and then I will use my media contacts. Thank you very much.

Wesley Davis, Mohave Valley resident, stated good morning. Wesley Davis, I'm a resident of Mohave County. My house lives, I my family live right next to the power plant. I'm opposed to it for reason beings, the last 30 years, I've worked in the industry, I've worked in the power industry, I've worked in the oil fields, I've worked in capacities with chemicals. And what you're doing here is you're exposing all our people, all our residents, to harsh chemicals, to disasters. And EPA, each of these governments and each of these places I've worked at had heavily, been heavily guarded by government oversight. And each of them have failed, and failed, and failed, and failed. And the environment now that I live in, my physical being is at risk. I live every day to go to, I have kidney failure because of these overexposure of chemicals. So, now I speak on my behalf of my family and the future of the children, the future of our children, our great grandchildren. I stand here before that, because it's for them. I already have damage to my body. How much longer do we have to suffer for this? For money? My health is not, give me as much money as you want, my health is more expensive than that, worth more than that. So, my sitting here, the aquifer; I've seen

every disaster happen with this, with government oversight. You know what? They cover it up, every time it's covered up, time after time, until someone stands up and says something about it, and then you guys have to sit there and say, well, why didn't this happen, we have government oversight, cannot be trusted. I myself don't trust them, because of my grandchildren that are going to be living here, drinking the water, that's where I'm at. And pray to God that you make this right decision. And you know what? If that's the case that you have a lot of people that want it from Bullhead City, from Wikieup, Wikieup up is a good place. It's far away from everybody you know, let's, let's look at that. Kingman right here next door. You guys have the power. You guys have the biggest gas coming through here. Have you guys looked at that? If you want it here, put it right next door to, to here. If you guys want it. We don't want it. So, I ask this, and I oppose, and all I say is, please consider us, because we live here. Not only that, everything here is about life, not about power. If they want power, please, give it to Bullhead City and thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much.

Art Luboch, Mohave Valley resident, stated 8543 South Ocotillo Lane, Mohave Valley, Arizona. I want to thank Supervisor Gould. When we had a meeting at Willow Valley that he sent somebody over there. There was also people from Mohave Electric who told us that they sell 60% of that power to other states, not for us. That is what they told us at this meeting. They were there, and they said it, Mr. Gould had a super, had a representative there, that they're going to sell the power off. They're not, it's not all for us. They're going to sell it off for profit. That's what they're going to do. I live on, I live on a property of an acre of land, and I live on a well. So, if they start draining all the water out of the aquifer, all the homes around me, which is about 100 homes, that are all on wells the aquifer will dry up and we will have no water. What are you going to do for us then? You gonna truck water in and dump it in my well. This thing is the wrong thing. There's many places you can put it instead of putting it right by schools and, and doing things to hurt, for young children. I have grandchildren now. There's other, and there's, my next-door neighbor is a teacher. We go to church with people that have little kids that go to those schools. I don't want to see a plant there. You have hundreds of places that you can put it. If the people in Bullhead want, want to plant so much, put it there! You don't want it next to your house, do you Hildy? I don't think so. Would you put it right into your backyard? No. Yeah, you would? How much do they? You're only worried about getting elected to the Senate. You're not worried about this county anymore. You're worried about getting elected to the Senate. That's your worry. I think the only one up here that's worried about us, that I know of is Mr. Gould. The rest of you people could care less about the regular people. You're all, you took this picture down because he voted against it. You people are just worried about yourselves and your agendas. You're not worried about the people that live in this county.

Irene Evanston, Mohave Valley resident, stated good afternoon. Irene Evanston, 2340 Spirit Mountain Drive, Fort Mohave Department of Emergency Response and EPA. Right here, I have a map that was given by Mohave County Planning and Zoning with the industrial heavy manufacturing sites already currently in place in Mohave County. So, here you could see, in

Bullhead City, around the airport, there is heavy manufacturing zones already established, also along I-40. In a meeting, public meeting in June, MEC representative spoke at a public meeting and stated that Griffith would not work as they do not service this far out. However, it's almost in the center of their service area with the map provided by MEC. In Mohave County, we have, we have a lot of wildfires, especially in, in our area. And the emergency response that the Tribe collaborates is with Mohave County. So, we also know that there is three established hazmat technical teams, one in Colorado City, one in Kingman, Arizona, and Bullhead City. So, on record, public record, MVFD fire chief has spoken about the lack of resources and its response to assist. So, if we look at this project and amending the land to heavy manufacturing for this particular project, we are looking at devastation for Mohave Valley residents. We are looking at the lack of response that it takes to not only service the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe and residents, but the Mohave Valley residents, as Mohave Valley residents often experience lack of resources during those times of heat exposures and resources for cooling stations, especially in Mohave Valley. So, we talk about the weather, we're talking about these power plants. We're also talking about keeping things cool. But what if the climate gets too hot and this whole power plant fails? Then what? How are you going to take care of Mohave Valley residents as a whole? If we already know the resources are pretty scarce. I believe this Board has heard May 6<sup>th</sup> that there is not only a county, a city, and a state, but a national, a national lack of resources for the following departments that would be for EMS, that would be for fire and that would be for law enforcement. So, before continuing with this land amendment, it would be appropriate to look at all of the resources for Mohave County and look at these areas that we have.

Chairman Angius stated thank you.

Diana Francis, Golden Shores resident, stated thank you for allowing me to speak. Diana Francis, 4919 Tule Drive, Golden Shores, Arizona. I bought my land in 1967, I've lived there full-time since 1980, 44 years. I have my own well. I had the reasonable expectation that I'm going to be in a rural area. City people can like the city, good for them. I don't care about all that. I like the rural area. I don't want my way of life destroyed. I don't want my well to go dry, as a lot of other people. If these AEPCO people, whatever, want to service an area, and their biggest service area is far from here, why don't they build there? They're not wanted here. And perhaps if the, the CEO of AEPCO and MEC actually took less money, maybe those power rates would be a little lower. 100,000 plus a year, that's ridiculous. That's my opinion. I'm entitled to it, and I appreciate you all listening, and I wouldn't want to be in any of your shoes. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Okay, anything else that hasn't been said already?

Early Lohff, Fort Mohave resident, stated hello, my name is Early Lohff, and I live at 1328 Chaparral Road in Fort Mohave, Arizona, since 2006 when I came here so that I could breathe clean air. And it, once they start to build the facility, and they will be able to build whatever they want heavy manufacturing, and it's going to destroy our little piece of paradise out here. The emissions are particularly, particularly harmful to people. Everyone keeps saying that they're going

to get low-cost energy. Well, peaker plants supply power that is high in cost and high in greenhouse gas emissions. There are significant concerns about environmental justice with these high emitting plants in low-income neighborhoods. First, there's air pollution. Gas plants emit NOx, nitric oxide. And NOx is not your friend. Cardiovascular problems, respiratory problems, asthma and even cancer, according to the EPA. Well, NOx degrades local air quality. Exposure to NOx and other gas infrastructure air pollutants are associated with respiratory illness, increase in childhood asthma. Gas power plants are unreliable in extreme temperatures. Droughts can force plants that depend on water for cooling, to cut output or completely shut down. There's water contamination producing, transporting, and burning gas to spoil waterways, compromising wildlife ecosystems and drinking water supplies. Gas infrastructure has serious land impacts, including destroyed wildlife habitats and tribal cultural sites. For farmers, gas pipeline construction degrades soil quality, which reduces crop yields. Policy makers tend to overlook these environmental and public health threats when making plans to modernize the electrical grid. Planners need to factor in the harm that goes to the public health and not ignore it. These emissions are harmful to people living near power plant within a three-mile radius and is consistent with environmental justice studies. Gas power plants threaten the health and well-being of residents of the communities where they are located, and government policies let gas developers off the hook for cleaning up their pollution. You were elected by the people, to support the people, and I pray that what you do today. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Mr. McClure.

Scotty McClure, Bullhead City resident, stated Scotty from Bullhead. I signed the petition. I'm against this. And I'm from Bullhead. I think you ought to put it in Bullhead. They're the ones that are going to use it. I'm going to use it and I'm going to pay my bill. You have property there already at Landon Drive. How about putting it up at Laughlin Ranch? You got 10,000 acres out there, I'm sure we wouldn't hear from any of those people. How about south of the college or across the street from it, west of the college, which is state park land. I climbed telephone poles for 16 years, and I'm going to tell you what, a lot of them were from rebuilding a car, take out a pole or whatever, they'd put it back up. So, I did a lot of plant extensions and all that. This, where the plant is trying to be put now, on September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022, when we had that outage, it would have not been back on any sooner had those plants been put there. Why not put it in Bullhead? Then it would have been, boom. And I'm really proud of the guys getting it back on in 18 hours. But I'm telling you what, it would have not made a difference had those plants been down there, or you put it down by Phoenix or anywhere else, it wouldn't come online any sooner. Put it in Bullhead, you need to listen. How about up Secret Pass? You're already burning emissions up there and pollutions with the garbage that you're burning every day, where the garbage trucks go. You got all those CNC concrete plants; they could give us some property. You can put them anywhere in Bullhead. Why don't you listen to the residents down there in Mohave Valley and the Indian Tribe. They're the ones that are going to have to live with these emissions and pollutions. Toby Cotter says, we have water for 120,000 people. We're only half there, for, what've we got 42,000 people. So, we have the water there,



already. So, there's just no excuse for this not to be power plants put in Bullhead. I want my electricity, but just not down there with my friends. I have friends down there and they have kids. You have no right to pollute their families.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Anyone else have something different to offer so we can really get to the. Okay. Okay, we got two more, and then we'll close the public hearing.

Thomas Lohff, Fort Mohave resident, stated hello, I'm Thomas Lohff.

Chairman Angius stated well, I said, if there's anyone else who has something more to add. Okay, alright, alright. Well, no, no, we're closing the public hearing just on this item 36. Yeah, that's okay. Which item? Okay, well, that's later on. Okay, that's later on. We're still on Item 36. Yeah, when you're when it's the issues up, we'll call you up.

Mr. Lohff stated hi, I'm Thomas Lohff, from Fort Mohave, Arizona, here. I was born in 1952 raised in 1960. Raised to respect the government, to believe that the government was helping us out, and I heard about the Zoning Commission and this commission here, and I figure you're using common sense to use your decisions. But that's not what happened in the Zoning Commission, they elected to put a power plant right in the middle of a bunch of residents. That's not quite right in my book, that's, in fact, it's kind of pitiful. But I'm thinking they're like not using common sense, because it's kind of like having the hen house guarded by the fox. You know, where did all the chickens go? Well, it's common sense that you don't put a power plant in the middle of a bunch of residences. Oh, I had a lot more to say, things like, it's not a good idea to have a power plant, and a bunch of residents, wasn't there a power plant across the river and it polluted areas you couldn't believe. And it's still polluted to this day. They didn't clean it up, nothing. And now you're going to let them come over here and have a power plant somewhere off to the side where no one will see it, you know, off the grid kind of, so to speak. And they're never going to clean it up, even if you do find pollution there. And of course, you probably won't find pollution because the EPA is involved. The EPA is this big organization that allows averages, all kinds of averages. That continuous air monitor system they said they have, or they're going to install, or whatever, you think that's a good idea. But no, it runs 24 hours a day, and it picks up clean air as well as bad air. It runs whether the plant is operating or not. It's unbelievable that they would, a lot of do, and who runs that? The company runs that. EPA doesn't run it, the company does.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, sir, thank you very much. Okay, Armin.

Armin Stange, Fort Mohave resident, stated good afternoon, Supervisors. I mean, we hear the water, air pollution, but nobody talks about the 100-megawatt peaker plant. Then the 100-megawatt peaker plant falls under the jurisdiction of the government. Why are they doing it under 100-megawatts? Because there is no control. That's one of the things. The other thing is, you know, I thought about it, and why doesn't Mohave Electric go to the residents with enough roof space property to put up solar panels, put up a bigger array on solar panels, on the people that want it, put it back into the system. This way, it's a win-win for everybody. I think it's a good idea. And

last and least, I really would appreciate all you Supervisors vote in line of Supervisor No, and that's the only Supervisor, but that's the right thing for us. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, did you, you didn't cede your time to anyone, correct? I'm sorry. Oh, is that that letter that you, was on your thing? Okay, what's her name?

Donna Oshiro, Mohave Valley resident, stated he lives on Cyrus. His name is Shawn (Zamora). I'd like to start by asking a few questions of the Supervisors. We would like to know if the people of Mohave Valley paid for a forensic auditor. How many of you, by the show of hands, would voluntarily allow an audit of your business and personal finance, financial accounts to prove to us that there is no back door deals going on, or We the People, have to obtain a court order. We are not happy with the thought of this going through today. We came to this part of the valley to live a peaceful life with beautiful views, good air quality, the river, the miles of open trails to ride on, no to the toxic storage gas plant taking away all of that. A fire of this lithium battery storage facility would decimate this valley. Ted Martin, the fire chief for Mohave Fire, told Shawn, not me, Shawn personally at the mailboxes in Cimarron Lakes where he and I both reside, that, and I quote, if there were a fire of lithium batteries, they will just let it burn, let it burn. They would let it burn? Fill the valley with toxic gasses. He would be added to this list for the forensic auditor. I, for one, will move from this county following a yes vote today. I will not subject my family to be within a mile or so of this kind of toxic environment. That's why we moved here from California to begin with. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, I'm going to close the call to public and, excuse me, oh, the call public. I'm sorry. I'm going to close the public hearing. Thank you.

**Chairman Angius Closed the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated and so, it is 12:30 now, and we're going to take a break, a half hour break. There's been a lot of comments, a lot of accusations, criminal accusations, moral accusations, and we're going to get everything answered this afternoon, because some of this stuff just cannot, you can say it out loud, but cannot stand. This is what, the you're signed up for the call to public Sharon, and that's going to be after the meeting, after this meeting. Yes, you do. You have to wait, actually, till the end of the meeting, the end of the whole meeting. Yes, you do. Okay, so we're going to take a half hour, and we'll be back. It's 12:30, we'll be back at 1:00.

---

Chairman Angius stated if everybody will make their way back to their seats, please. Okay, you ready? I'm going to call this meeting back to order. So, before the break, we heard a lot of stuff, a

lot of information. We heard accusations, both about the County and about the applicant, and I heard threats. And I am just going to say, on behalf of myself, I do not respond well to threats. If you want to do something, go right ahead, but it is not going to factor into my decision. Okay, so the first one I want to have up is Scott Holtry. He's going to talk about the process, because I think that there's a lot of confusion about what the process of Planning and Zoning is, and the transparency and everything that you guys brought up, I just want to get you guys the right answers.

Scott Holtry, Development Services Director, stated Madam Chair, members of the Board, thank you. Just getting into the process. This is the first step in the process, is rezoning the property. We do not require them to go through a major site plan review. There is no environmental impact statements that are required on the County's part. I did want to bring up just a few things that were brought up in the meeting. Sorry about that. One of the things that was brought up is about the application, the application was incomplete. On our part, the County staff part, the application was complete. One thing that we look at is, is it in compliance with the general plan? And that, that's one of the notes on the application. And in this instance, it is not in compliance with the general plan. That's why they are amending the general plan to, from a suburban to the heavy manufacturing. Another thing that was brought up was the notification. A few months ago, the Board changed the notification requirements to require that it is a one-mile notification for manufactured or the heavy manufacturing zone. So, the notification requirements for this property was one-mile from the subject property. The 300-foot notification requirement is still in effect with the state. So, the state has a requirement that anybody within 300 feet objects, then it requires the fourth-fifth vote by the Board of Supervisors, so that one is still in effect. But we require them to notify everybody within one mile of the subject property.

Supervisor Gould stated (inaudible)

Director Holtry stated correct, the mile does not factor into the calculation of that 300-foot. The 300-foot, 20% of landowners opposed, owning 20% of the land is a state statute. So, if, if there was 20% owning 20% of the land opposed to the project within that 300-foot then it would require that fourth fifths vote.

Chairman Angius stated (inaudible) I'm so sorry, what is the bar we have now? I mean, is that going to come into play?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, members of the Board, it is not. It's actually impossible for them to reach that 20% because most of the land within 300 feet is owned by AEPCO, unless they oppose their own project, then they're not going to be able to reach that percentage.

Chairman Angius stated and that's by statute?

Director Holtry stated correct.

Chairman Angius stated and we changed it to even bigger, I think last year we changed that.

Director Holtry stated that was just for the notification, so we notified everybody within a mile.

Chairman Angius stated yeah, gentlemen talked about not getting a notification. And I, you know, it's been, we've been talking about this, it seems, forever, probably a year and a half. I'm sorry that you didn't know about it before.

Director Holtry stated the other thing that was brought up was the application, and not requiring a site plan, but requiring it for maybe an RV park. I believe that's false. We, we allow anybody to come to the County to apply for a rezone, and the application is the same for an RV park or for manufactured home or the heavy manufacturing zone. As long as they fill out all the requirements within that application, then we process it and move it to the commission and then to the Board. The packet that was shown for the RV park, that's our site planning packet. It does have quite a bit of requirements that will come after the rezone when they are applying for permits and making sure the site is adequate for what is being proposed.

Chairman Angius stated what is that process when they do that? Is it again, an open process?

Director Holtry stated the site plan process is an administrative process. So, it comes to Planning and Zoning, and then we route it to all the different agencies that would have a say in it. So being, it'd be the fire district, it would be the Public Works, it would be Environmental Quality. So, anybody that would have a say on the regulations for that project, and that's who that site plan would go to.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Director Holtry stated as far as the public lands, I believe it was, it had to be quite some time ago that when we received our shape files, the shape files for the County maps showed that a portion of this parcel was publicly owned. And I believe that's why the land designation by general plan, shows public lands, but it is not public lands. It is all private land, privately owned by the applicant. But the designation that you see on the general plan amendment will show that it's going from public lands, because that's the designation that was given 10, 15, years ago when the general plan was put there. But I believe that was due to an error in receiving the map showing that it is public lands, but it's not. Last thing that I wanted to kind of touch on that was brought up was the notification or the opposition letters. We, when we got notified that they were going to be doing a second location or a third location, I guess we did notify both the applicant and the opposition that the letters that they were submitting for the site C or site C, B, okay, we got them all mixed up here. The letters that they were submitting for the, the other location that's on this agenda would not automatically go to this item. We couldn't just assume that that everybody that was opposed or were for the power plant on the other location is going to be opposed or for the power plant on this location. So, we did inform both the applicant and the opposing party that they needed to resubmit those letters with specifications on which property they were opposed or for. Any other questions that you wanted me to answer?

Chairman Angius stated I do have a question, but we'll go with the Board first. Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, Madam. Chairman. Scott the, whether their protests addressed a particular property or the general idea, does that have any, doesn't legally, doesn't make any difference does it? It's just whether, whether the Supervisors consider that legitimate or illegitimate?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Gould, I believe you're correct. Yeah, it would be legally, it wouldn't matter. But as far as the, if we were looking at opposition for that 300-foot notification that then it does apply.

Supervisor Gould stated yeah, if it was one of the inside of the 300 foot one, then it actually is statute, but the other one is just the sway the opinion of the Board.

Director Holtry stated correct.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, sir. Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Anybody else? Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair, nothing for staff.

Chairman Angius stated okay, Supervisor Bishop? Supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated nothing.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Just one last question, how do we make sure about the concerns about water?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, that's a good question. If, as far as our planning process, everything that they would have to go through on water would have to either go through the state or the Mohave Valley Irrigation District, so it does not go through our divisions. The, and I think it would be more of a legal question if, if, if there's something that we could put on the on the zoning, if, that they would have to show how much water, or they couldn't go over so much water, that would be something that the Board could maybe do. But as far as any wells that they're going to be put placing on the property that has to go through the Arizona Department of Water Resources, or if they're using any of the allocations that the property is already allocated for through the Mohave Valley Irrigation District, then they would go through the Mohave Valley Irrigation District on that.

Chairman Angius stated okay, any, anything else from the Board? Okay, thank you. Might be called back later if we have another question. Okay, let's have the applicant come up. Hi, there.

Mr. Ledger stated Hi.

Chairman Angius stated you heard a lot of information this morning that I'm sure you're going to address. But before that, I went last, this weekend with a few people from the no side, and I wanted to show them the new location, because I think, I think it's a good location, and I just wanted them to know that we're all in authority on where this place is. So, we're all coming from the same place.

So, they submitted some questions that I think are good questions that really get to the point of it. And so, if I may, I want to ask you these five questions.

Mr. Ledger stated certainly.

Chairman Angius stated and then we can go into what you want to say, and then we'll go to the Board. Okay.

Mr. Ledger stated thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated how many locations are included in what's being labeled as the Mohave Energy Park? Maybe, maybe Tyler Carlson needs to come up with this too?

Mr. Ledger stated well, so just for clarification, Arizona Electric Power, AEPCO, is the applicant. We will own, we will operate, so this is essentially our plant site. We're doing it on behalf of Mohave Electric Co-Op, that's why Mr. Carlson has been engaged. He's also a member.

Chairman Angius stated can you speak up, please?

Mr. Ledger stated sure, he's also a member of the Board of Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, and that's not a bad thing, and that's not a conflict, that's a good thing, because we're member owned. Right? So, all of the co-ops that are part of our community organization have representation on our board. It's a democratic process, and that's why Mr. Carlson is on our board. So, just for clarification. So, with respect to the sites, obviously, the two sites that we're looking at right now are Site C and Site D. Site C is the prior application that we intend to pull off once we have approval on Site D. Site D is a property that is approximately 193 acres or so. It's sort of a rectangle, and we've identified that in our application, that is what we're focused on. There's only one plant site on that parcel, or that future parcel, and it will be limited to four units and associated facilities, period. That's it. We've also heard some discussion and concern about additional solar and battery. We're not putting solar and battery on that property. We're putting a plant site, a natural gas plant site, on that property, and we'll begin with two units, and the infrastructure, and at some point there will be a phase two, and it'll be two more units.

Chairman Angius stated so, you're starting with two?

Mr. Ledger stated yes, that's 98 megawatts, two units, which will produce 98 megawatts. You saw in the presentation materials that Mr. Carlson provided, the specs on these units. They're 97-98 megawatt units together. That's true anywhere, except where you have higher elevation, where you actually get a little bit reduction in the output. We operate a unit just like this at Apache Station in Wilcox. There are units like this all over the state, and there are multiple utilities that are putting in additional units. These are not the same as a nuclear plant or a coal plant. They're not the same as a combined cycle plant, and I'll just point out the Griffith plant and the South Point plant are both combined cycle plants, very different, much higher water usage. They do have once through, and they have different kind of cooling requirements; we don't. There's only one purpose for the water there, and we'll get into that, I'm sure.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so one of the questions I heard over and over again. What?

Mr. Carlson stated did you want, sorry, you wanted to ask about what the sites having to do with Mohave Energy Park.

Chairman Angius stated yeah, Mohave Energy Park.

Mr. Carlson stated here is the existing solar and battery that I described in the, in the presentation. 30-megawatts of solar, 30-megawatts of battery exist off of Antoinette. That's a piece of that, of this, but what we call the Mohave Energy Park, and this is the supplement, the gas supplement to that, but that's already been built, already zoned, already done.

Chairman Angius stated that's already done.

Mr. Carlson stated that existing solar.

Chairman Angius stated it's not going to be another one.

Mr. Carlson stated no.

Chairman Angius stated so the question then came down to, why do you need so much acreage?

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, and let me get to that. So, we operate a station in Wilcox, near Wilcox, Cochise, Arizona, called Apache Station, and we've been operating that since 1961. We have about 4,000 acres there, and that's to make sure that we have a buffer around the plant so it's appropriate for that size of a facility. I understand that the South Point plant has about 320 acres around its facility, and that seems appropriate for that plan as well. In an abundance of caution, we want to have an appropriate buffer around that plant so that we can manage the plant site appropriately. Security, make sure that it's closed, closed off to the public, make sure that people are, people are safe, our plant staff are safe, and that we have all of the equipment that we need. We are going to be building a small substation that will also be on the property. That substation, by the way, will tie to distribution facilities. Distribution facilities are not facilities that go out to the rest of the grid. The Calpine plant, the South Point plant, ties to transmission. That goes out to APS and it goes to California, it goes to the rest of the world. The Griffith plant operates very similar. They have transmission. It's going out to the world. Those were both developed by for profit merchant generators for sale. This is not for sale. This is going to Mohave. This is not a merchant generator. This is a not-for-profit co-op developing a plant for the benefit of its member consumers. And so, we're only tying to the distribution system. That means it's going directly to your house or your business or commercial folks around the area.

Chairman Angius stated okay. The next question, and I, you may have answered, and I'm not sure, maybe Ms. Schoppers can explain what she meant by this. If there's more than one location, where are the other locations? Is, are you talking about for the Mohave Energy Park? Did you get the answer that that you needed, that the one they have now off of Joy Lane, is that, is that the right answer?

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, and again, I guess I would refer back to what Tyler mentioned. So, Mohave Electric Co-Op has some of its own facilities on a site, including some solar and some battery. This is part of an overall plan, this new Mohave Energy Park site, but this will be for the natural gas facilities, and only for the natural gas facilities.

Chairman Angius stated just out of curiosity, how often does it fire up? Because I think South Point, I could be wrong, I'm sure somebody will correct me if I am, is all the basically all the time.

Mr. Ledger stated right.

Chairman Angius stated but what is your?

Mr. Ledger stated so, our analysis suggests it'll be 20 to 40% of the time. It will operate as a peaker. It is not a base load resource. One of the things that I think that people are confused about is, why the billboards, why the solar and the battery and the natural gas? What does that mean? Does it mean that we're going to put all of this at this site? And the answer is no. And in fact, you're going to limit us from doing that. We're okay with that. Okay? We are serving a large population of rural people around the state, and we have been traditionally a coal burning utility. We are moving away from coal. Okay, we've already retired one of those coal units where we've agreed to retire another coal unit. The way that you have to make, in order to serve the same way as a coal unit, you have to have a diversity of resources, and you have to have enough power to do it. Okay? So, one of the things that we're going to be doing in conjunction with some additional peaking plants, one is here, we're also building the very same two-unit combination of LM 6000s at Apache Station, that we're building there and we're building here. So, when people say we'll just build it over, there we are. We're building in both places. But in addition to that, we have pledged ourselves to building some very large solar and battery projects, and we've been able to get together most of the public power entities in the state, including a lot of the tribes. So, we are going to have tribal participation from lots of tribes in this state to some very large solar and battery plants, not here, in other, in other areas, but that will be part of our mix. So, when you add these natural gas facilities and the new solar and battery facilities, we're going to be able to lower our emissions, lower our carbon impact, and by the way, the USDA has provided us with about a half a billion dollars to help develop those resources. Now you whether that's good or bad in your mind, nevertheless, we are getting a tremendous amount of support from the federal government in developing those renewable assets. We cannot operate them alone. We have to have a diverse fleet, and so having some, some units that can come on during peak times or in emergency conditions are going to be really important for this region.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Next question, so the third question is a little redundant, but we're going to say it, where and how many peaker plants do you intend to install as part of the Mohave Energy Park? We'd like to know the maximum total number. Think you said it, but re-say it on the record.



Mr. Ledger stated yes, on the record. We are going to be developing in two phases. The first phase will be two units, two LM 6000s, they will be approximately 49 megawatts. Okay, each. Okay, so that's 98 megawatts total for phase one. We expect to develop phase two in the next several years, that will be exactly the same, 98 megawatts. When we talk about our water needs, we're trying to address all of those water needs now, all of the infrastructure we need now, so that we have, so we don't so we don't have to reinvent it, to spend more money, it's much more efficient to develop the infrastructure now for that second phase, that's what we're doing.

Chairman Angius stated alright? We'll get back to the water. I want to go through these questions.

Mr. Ledger stated sure.

Chairman Angius stated make sure that they're answered. Where and how many lithium battery storage facilities do you intend to install as part of the Mohave Energy Park, we'd like to know the maximum total number.

Mr. Ledger stated zero.

Chairman Angius stated okay, zero.

Mr. Ledger stated we are installing lithium batteries in other areas, and again, with the backing of the federal government and with the backing of more than 40 different public power and cooperative utilities around the state, because it's much cheaper to do it that way than to do it on rooftops or to do it in small chunks. We're going to be, we're going to have really the most low cost solar and battery projects in the region, by coming together, that's what our company does, we bring everybody together, and we develop resources that benefit everyone.

Chairman Angius stated this is, a lot of this is just mandated by the government as part of the green energy right? You, you kind of have to do this. No?

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, not entirely, no. I mean, this is a choice that the board has made. We've done a lot of analysis. We understand there are probably, you know, there's a limited time frame for coal, but we can invest more heavily in larger natural gas facilities, actually. But by instead of, you know, investing those large combined cycle units like Griffith and South Point, we're investing in small, little arrow derivative units, in addition across our system to solar. And you combine those, and you can, you can have a pretty reliable base, baseload like resource mix that gets you where you need to go, and that puts us in a very good position if there is the kind of mandates that we're all concerned about.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Have your questions been answered? I will go talk about the water after, but I want to open it up to the Board for their questions. Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Madam Chair. So, just to make sure that I understand exactly what you talking about, MEC already has the solar and the battery storage project, now, is that correct?

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated and how big is that site? Do you know?

Mr. Ledger stated I think it's 230 acres. So, what's our total there? Total acres.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated asking for acreage?

Mr. Ledger stated it's about 400 acres of land, and there's about 230 acres left to be developed in that area.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated so, what I'm hearing from you is, that location is incorporated as a part of your Mohave Energy Park.

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated is that correct?

Mr. Ledger stated yeah.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated and so any additional solar or battery storage that your company is anticipating or contemplating in the future would be an expansion of that project on that land, on that 230 acres.

Mr. Ledger stated it would be, yes, that's, that if it was going to go anywhere, it would go on land already owned by Mohave Electric Co-Op, and it wouldn't go on this property, no.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated sure, you have to forgive me if I ask some questions that seem like they've been asked.

Mr. Ledger stated no, it's okay.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated many, many times we've heard so much information, that in this seat, we have to ask questions, to say, okay, is this propaganda, is this, or is this real? And that's what I'm, that's what I'm doing. I've heard about the water. I am concerned with water all over the county, but with this, with this site D, there is a water right attached to the land already. Is that correct?

Mr. Ledger stated that's right.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated you know how many acre feet of water is attached to the land?

Mr. Ledger stated well, I think I will refer back to our water needs, which are 480-acre feet for four units.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated for four units?

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, so there was some confusion about that as well. And I just want to reiterate what we've been saying pretty consistently here for several months. 480-acre feet for four units.

So, if we look at each unit, that's a little over 100 acres, acre feet. And you know, we did initially talk about, we tried to convert it to like household use, so that people could understand it. If everybody uses an acre foot on their rural property, and that's about 100 acres per unit, so 480-acre feet for the total plant requirements.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I understand that. My question is, what's the water right that comes with this property?

Mr. Ledger stated there will be water rights on this property.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated you know, the acre foot is?

Mr. Ledger stated yeah.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated what I'm trying to get to is, is the water right that is attached to the land that you're purchasing as a part of site D, is that going to cover the water requirements for this project, or do you have to go out and outsource more water?

Mr. Ledger stated it will, it will more than cover.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated okay.

Mr. Ledger stated water needs.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated that's what I'm asking for.

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated and so any wells that you drill is going to tap into that water right.

Mr. Ledger stated that's right.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated correct?

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Chairman Angius stated we have a point of order first.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated sorry.

Supervisor Gould stated in that area, the water is allocated. (inaudible)

Mr. Ledger stated right.

Supervisor Gould stated (inaudible) so it's allocated.

Mr. Ledger stated I will concede that point. These are allocations to particular parcels, and we intend to transfer those allocations to the industrial use.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yeah, so.

Mr. Ledger stated so that.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated you explained it, so, there's that water allocation, and then you they'll have to whoever the seller is in this instance, anywhere in that area, when you sell a parcel of land and it has a water allocation attached to it, they have to basically sign that over to the next user. Is that correct?

Mr. Ledger stated right, we will be purchasing that allocation, but it's subject to additional redesignation for industrial purposes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you.

Mr. Ledger stated all of what we're purchasing may not transfer for industrial purposes, but an adequate amount will to make sure that we have the water we need. And if I, if you don't mind, Supervisor Lingenfelter, I, I just want to point out that we are a fairly large user in the Wilcox basin. So, you heard about that today, but we are among the very most responsible users in that area, and what we have done over time is essentially retire the water rights around us from farmers, so that we don't affect those folks. And we have, we have a long-term investment and a long-term interest here, so we absolutely want to be respectful of the surrounding water rights.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you. For the sake of everybody's time, if you would just limit your responses to my questions, I had a pretty to my questions, I'd appreciate it. Otherwise, we'll be here all day long, I'm sure. Why are you moving away from coal?

Mr. Ledger stated there are a lot of reasons for it. It's regulation.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated the Biden administration would love us to all adopt the climate justice thing. But how do you, how do you go to war against an abstract noun?

Mr. Ledger stated so, we have been litigating for many years to maintain our coal resources. We've been paying those down as quickly as we can, anticipating that we'd be in the position we're in now. We still have a coal pile. We intend to continue to operate until the end of 2027, but we're affected in multiple ways, mostly from the EPA. The EPA, by the way, is very effective at what they do, and right now, it is becoming less and less feasible to continue to operate our coal facilities. So, it does make sense for us over the next several years, especially with that grant money that we've received, to make a transition to low impact natural gas, and solar and battery.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated our federal taxpayer dollars, hard at work. I only got one more question for you, sir. I actually went out and I looked at Site D.

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated and I thought of all of the sites that have been contemplated, that one seemed to be the best or whatever you know. Take that as you want it. My question to you is, if Site D and Site C are denied, will the applicant proceed on site A, which already has been approved and is much closer to anybody.

Mr. Ledger stated yes, yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated that's logical.

Mr. Ledger stated it is. We need the power folks. Site D has already been operated for many years as a sand and gravel operation. In my view, it seems consistent with the zoning designation that we're requesting. Seems totally appropriate. It's farther from people. It's, in our view, a very good site. I just want to point out, if you could zoom in on this chart that's on the table, these are facilities like this around the state, very similar, and you'll see the distance from those facilities to the surrounding residences. Somebody mentioned that you don't put a nuclear plant in the middle of.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated not to interrupt you, but I didn't ask that. I asked if, are you going to use Site A if these are denied?

Mr. Ledger stated well, this seems relevant to me, because.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yeah.

Mr. Ledger stated our site will be farther than any one of these away from people.

Supervisor that's all I've got, Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated Supervisor Bishop got anything?

Supervisor Bishop stated (inaudible)

Audience members stated can't hear you.

Supervisor Bishop stated hey, you can hear me now. So, how does, how does this differ, as far as toxins released in chemicals? How does it differ from South Point? And it's kind of basically the same, same general idea of producing electricity with negative results as far as health concerns. Can you go into that a little?

Mr. Ledger stated no, I think both South Point and this facility will be, will easily comply with the NAC standards. I think in several categories, ours, our emissions would be substantially lower than South Point there. This is older equipment. We're going to have a full SCR. This is, in my view, overall, a cleaner, emitting resource. The other thing to mention is, this is much smaller than the South Point plan, so that, that plant is obviously going to be emitting a lot more, because it's much, it's a much larger facility.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, so in the world that we live in today, we, we are exposed to a lot of different toxins and chemicals, and an example of that is the land in the same area that this peaker plant is proposed to go in there, they have fields, farm fields that are sprayed with pesticides and, and fertilizers and stuff. So, that also goes into the air and goes down into the water tables so, you know, it's just, it's hard to get a perfect condition as far as air quality, but we do have standards with the EPA and the ADEQ and everything.

Mr. Ledger stated yes, we do.

Supervisor Bishop stated I just wanted to point that out, but.

Mr. Ledger stated if I may, Supervisor Bishop?

Supervisor Bishop stated yes.

Mr. Ledger stated we will be applying for an air permit. So, that is one of the many permits that we're going to be applying for once we receive the redesignation. Those are mostly public processes; the air permit certainly is. So, the public, that will be transparent and the public will have an opportunity to weigh in on that air permit.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, thank you for pointing that out, because there was a presentation that was on the agenda at the last board of health meeting. And I did continue that because it was very slanted. It was just kind of one sided, and, and MEC had not been notified so that they could do, be there and see what was presented and present the other side. So, that's true, I did continue that because it was, it was at the last minute, and none of the board members had time to really study the issues. But you know my last question for you is, is concerning to me, because I know we asked that MEC meet with the Tribe and try to work out some of the issues that, that the Tribe had with this.

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Bishop stated and we hear today that, that was requested and it never happened. Can you explain?

Mr. Ledger stated okay, so let me correct the record there. We did have a meeting with the tribal council and Chairman Williams. We appreciate, it was a very cordial meeting, we appreciate that opportunity. That was some months ago. They had an opportunity to ask us about our intentions, about the plan. We did walk through that with them. We did also invite them to meet with us and work out maybe some potential details. There have been back and forth more than 50 different emails and correspondences, but we were not able to get the meeting together. We certainly made an effort to do that. I will tell you that we would have been willing to meet at any time during that period. I will also tell you, however, that we're continuing, we certainly will continue to be willing to meet with the Tribe. We're happy to work through details. We've offered an opportunity to participate in the, in the unit, in the in the facility for the tribal utility. We're happy to engage them on that issue as well. We want to be good neighbors with the Tribe. We have great relationships with other tribes in the state. But I think we have done, certainly our, we have exercised a lot of goodwill in making an effort to develop those, a meeting that might bear fruit, and it just wasn't something that happened.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, thank you, and I appreciate you continuing to work with the Tribe, or do your best to work with the Tribe. That's all I have.

Chairman Angius stated Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, Madam Chairman. Sir, do you think it's coincidental that two of these peakers add up to 97 megawatts.

Mr. Ledger stated no, I don't, emphatically do not. And let me just explain to you why, okay. So, these LM 6000s are becoming the industry's standard. We operate one today, we have staff and engineers that understand how to operate these. There was an effort, maybe five or six years ago to go to what are called reciprocating engines for these peaking power plants, but they proved to be unreliable, and expensive to operate. So, what utilities have done, and you will see, and you you're welcome to call up APS or TP or other utilities, this has become the industry standard. They are looking to put in LM 6000s because they can be moved quickly. They are very efficient. They are standard in the industry, and we already operate them. So, this was not designed to do anything other than get peaking power that we're familiar with in place quickly. I will note that the two peakers that we're going to be putting at Apache, because it's a 4,000-foot elevation, will operate at 40, about 42 megawatts each, instead of 49.

Supervisor Gould stated sure.

Mr. Ledger stated and that's because there's less oxygen, and I'm sure you understand.

Supervisor Gould stated so are you only putting two in at a time so that you don't break that 100-megawatt limit, which would require you to go to the line sighting committee to have them approve your location?

Mr. Ledger stated we're putting in two at a time because we're a, despite what folks say, we're a relatively small company. We're one of the, we're the smallest of the larger companies. So, to give you a sense of that, we're 1/10 the size of APS, or maybe 1/3 the size of Unisource TP. We have tranches of financing that we get approved, and that allows us to go forward. We put that financing in place, and we move on to the next tranche. We also want to make sure that we don't create a rate shock situation for our members. And so, what we'll be doing is we'll be filing a rate case on the two new units at both Mohave and Apache, and we'll do a separate rate case in the future for any future phases that we might have.

Supervisor Gould stated since you brought up rates. Do you have an idea of what the rate increase will be to cover the, this peaker plant?

Mr. Ledger stated so, the number that you saw, the \$21 million is an energy savings, okay. So, the cost of investing in a large unit like this, it's a sizable number, but that is like a mortgage, that's a number that you're investing in on a yearly basis. You amortize that cost over a long period of time. So, what you're getting in return is low-cost energy. So, if you have to go to the market and buy power that's more expensive than the energy that we can produce, or if you have to take the power from Apache Station, from units that were built in 1964, which we, we're still operating units from 1964, which are half as efficient as these new units. In either case, that power is going

to be a lot more expensive. And what, what you want to compare against is our capital cost in a capacity charge, and the capacity charge on these units is very favorable. In other words, it compares very well to any other option that's out there. In fact, it's cheaper. One of the reasons that it's cheaper is that we are putting in place refurbished units. These are not brand-new, brand-new GE units, first of all would take us 10 years to actually bring in, because there's such a demand right now, but they would also be roughly twice as expensive. So, these units we, we planned years ago to put in these refurbished units. We have an arrangement with the developer, all American made, and they have basically reconstructed these at a plant in Missouri. They are going to be the same, guarantees. They're going to be just as efficient, but they're going to be a lot less expensive. And the reason that's important to us, I'm straying here, but the reason that's, that's important to us is we are not focused on return on investment. The way an APS or a Unisource is, we are focused on the lowest cost to our members, and these, this is the lowest cost. I promise you, of all the options that are out there, this is the lowest cost, new efficient generation available.

Supervisor Gould stated so, back to my question, do you have an, you guys have an estimate of what the rate increase is going to be? You just mentioned that you're going to the Corporation Commission for a rate increase.

Mr. Ledger stated right. So, the rate increase is not necessarily tied exactly to what Mohave is going to pay. This is a, this is an increase that goes to our membership across the board, okay? So, it's about a 7% rate increase, most of that has to do with new, new costs associated with everything else that we do. So, I think everybody's, understands that there's been inflation. Our labor costs have gone up. Some of that may be tied to additional capital costs as well.

Supervisor Gould stated sure, enough, and I understand that this power would be cheaper than buying power on the spot, on the spot market and during the peak, but there, you are taking a mortgage in your speak, to pay for the thing so you have to service that mortgage, so there's going to be a rate increase? Yeah, previously, I'd heard, you'd told me, not you personally, but someone from MEC had told me that you were going to pay for it with cost savings, and I don't think that that's feasible.

Mr. Ledger stated well.

Supervisor Gould stated I think you're closer to your 7% rate increase.

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, I don't, I would just caution that it's not a one to one. There will be cost reductions.

Supervisor Gould stated sure.

Mr. Ledger stated we collect these differently, and without getting into the minutia, we have something called a fuel adjuster. And so, when we get, get into energy costs that are higher or lower, that goes directly to our membership, okay? And then they pass that on to their member customers. Alright, so if we're buying in an expensive market, that energy flows almost directly to



the members, if, if I can make investments on the fixed side that lower the energy cost, you may be paying more on the fixed cost, okay, and that is what's, that's what the rates govern, are the fixed costs. But on the energy cost, if I can lower that, you should see there, should be some off setting cost, excuse me, cost reduction on the energy side. So, what gets passed on to the rate payer on the energy side should be lower. If it's a one to one, I can't guarantee that. I can't tell you exactly, but our effort is to keep the overall cost structure as flat as we can.

Supervisor Gould stated the, your fuel adjustment has to go before Corporation Commission also, I believe.

Mr. Ledger stated it goes through an approval process, right.

Supervisor Gould stated so, I've got some questions here. So, you were talking about 480-acre feet of water for the four peakers. That's both, that's total water pumped out of the ground?

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Gould stated that's not treated water.

Mr. Ledger stated no, that includes the treated portion.

Supervisor Gould stated okay, so that's total, your, that's total. How much of that ends up as wastewater in the pond?

Mr. Ledger stated I don't.

Supervisor Gould stated its either going to be evaporated off.

Mr. Ledger stated a lot of it's going to end up, that's right.

Supervisor Gould stated it's going to end up in the pond.

Mr. Ledger stated that's right.

Supervisor Gould stated so that's going to go, that wastewater will then go into evaporation ponds?

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Gould stated so those are double lined evaporation ponds?

Mr. Ledger stated I believe so. And again, that will be an ADEQ permit. We're going to have to go through that permitting process.

Supervisor Gould stated sure.

Mr. Ledger stated and that will be transparent to the public.

Supervisor Gould stated so you don't have to go through a full NEPA environmental process on that?

Mr. Ledger stated no, because this is not, there's no federal nexus here. And that's true of any, any facility in the country that doesn't have a federal nexus. So.

Supervisor Gould stated so even if you took federal money?

Mr. Ledger stated if we took a federal money.

Supervisor Gould stated that doesn't make it a federal process?

Mr. Ledger stated if we took federal money for this project, there might be, but we're taking, the federal grant money is going to solar plants.

Supervisor Gould stated interesting. Let's see. So, are you going to use any of that, what you have \$485 million grant on the Mohave Energy Park?

Mr. Ledger stated no.

Supervisor Gould stated so, you're not using it on, off Antoinette either then?

Mr. Ledger stated no. We did receive a grant, and it was mentioned in the materials for a battery project that's already been completed there, that was called a PACE grant, also through the USDA. That did offset the cost of those batteries.

Supervisor Gould stated and generally, your energy storage is going to be where the solar panels are since batteries are DC and photovoltaic panels are DC and you don't have the conversion loss?

Mr. Ledger stated yes, yes, that's exactly right.

Supervisor Gould stated so, I think that was the, now that's, I've got that one. So, you, your ads were talking about a ten-million-dollar local benefit. Could you expand on that?

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, I think it's mostly it's in a tax benefit. I, you know, I think there, I don't have the details in front of me. Tyler might want to speak to it, but I think it mostly has to do with tax benefits, right. So, one of the questions was about the local first responders, some of the local districts. Obviously, because this is on private land, it will be taxed and there, thank you.

Supervisor Gould stated and in Arizona, power plants are centrally assessed, so the Department of Revenue will give us a number.

Mr. Ledger stated that's right.

Supervisor Gould stated give the Assessor the number to tax that at.

Mr. Ledger stated that's exactly right. So, we're expecting about five, \$5 million in property tax benefits. The local economic benefits will be a combination of local suppliers and local labor.

Supervisor Gould stated so, five of it was property taxes then?

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Gould stated okay. And I believe that was it. Thank you, Madam Chairman, thank you, sir.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Supervisor Johnson, do you have any questions?

Supervisor Johnson stated yes, thank you, ma'am. Now, AEPCO is the one that's building this plant and owning the plant?

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Johnson stated so how do I know you're going to be given the power to MEC?

Mr. Ledger stated what was the question? I'm sorry.

Chairman Angius stated how do you know?

Supervisor Johnson stated what, how do I know that you're giving the power, you're going to sell the power to MEC, or just not going to spot market it?

Mr. Ledger stated right, because it's tied to the distribution system. That means that we're not going to be able to get it out to a market hub. It's tied directly to your system here in Mohave County. Supervisor Johnson stated so, you're saying MEC does not buy off the grid?

Mr. Ledger stated we buy off the grid for the needs that Mohave has, in addition to what we import on transmission systems to, and deliver to Mohave, that comes from both Apache Station and it comes from the market hubs around the state, sometimes in California. What this will do is displace, you'll no longer have to buy as much power from Apache Station or from the market, because it will be here, available for you when you need it. That's exactly how it's going to work.

Supervisor Johnson state that's exactly it. So, you're hooked to the grid, correct?

Mr. Ledger stated the Mohave.

Supervisor Johnson stated you can buy from the grid.

Mr. Ledger stated I can buy from the grid and deliver it in a one-way transmission system to, to Mohave, yes.

Supervisor Johnson stated you're saying that your power cannot be sold through the grid.

Mr. Ledger stated we do not have rights out to, out from Mohave. We have rights coming into Mohave on the transmission system. Because for many, many years, 40 plus years, we have been delivering power to Mohave County. This is a long-term relationship. It has worked very well. And the only difference now is we're going to, some of that power is going to be actually produced here. So, some solar, that's Mohave, the Mohave side, and then some natural gas peaking that will be produced here.

Supervisor Johnson stated so, what you're telling me is that, the part I'm not understanding is, if you're hooked to the grid, say it's a solar plant or whatever you're going to hook in, you can get it, you can sell that power anywhere. For some reason, you're saying that the power you're building and generating goes on the grid but can't be sold anywhere else.

Mr. Ledger stated I would put it a little differently. So, if we're not having to import power, as much power into the Mohave area, and there are other resources at Apache Station that we could sell, we might do that, but we're not selling resources from this plant. No.

Supervisor Johnson stated well, that's what you're saying. But I mean in theory, you can sell that power.

Mr. Ledger stated no, not in theory, because we have unidirectional transmission rights. This will be, this will be connected to our distribution system. It makes a lot more sense if we're going to sell power, to sell power from other areas and sell it on the transmission system into places like Palo Verde. We do that to lower our members costs. There may be, from time to time, power that we have available from Apache Station or from other say, some, some of our future solar resources. But right now, and for the foreseeable future, that's not what we have here. What we have here is a load that is served by AEPCO, and we serve it either, you know, by delivering power on the transmission system to Mohave's distribution facilities, either from the market or from Apache Station. And what happens when you have a resource in this area, whether it's the Mohave solar or it's AEPCO natural gas, is that will offset the amount of power that we have to deliver. That's going to lower your transmission costs. Those, the costs of that new resource should be lower on a fuel basis, than the market and probably most of Apache resources. That's how it's going to work.

Supervisor Johnson stated I'm not buying that story, but we'll move on.

Mr. Ledger stated well, I'm happy to show it to you.

Supervisor Johnson stated you're saying, you have, how come you're doing all the answering for MEC?

Mr. Ledger stated we've got folks that can show you the schematics, the details, the contracts, happy to do that we, we, we are representing what is actually happening.

Supervisor Johnson stated the slides you showed before said that there's 30 megawatts shortage right now of power that is generated by MEC to cover their load.

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, want to hit that, Tyler? Maybe we can bring up that slide?

Supervisor Johnson stated it was one of the first ones, first or second.

Mr. Ledger stated slide seven, I believe. So, Mohave has a contract with AEPCO for certain capacity. They provide certain capacity from their solar facilities. They also have a load that continues to grow. So, when we talk about exposure, what that means is they don't have enough resources, either in a contract or on the ground to serve that additional exposure. So, that's the part

where you got to go to the market. Okay? So, what we tried to demonstrate here is to give you a sense that Mohave needs this resource locally. It's important to note that the solar does not operate all the time. It's not always available, so both the 30-megawatt exposure and the 30-megawatt solar is going to need to be replaced by something. And Tyler also mentioned that one of our largest units, one of our coal units, as of 2027, the coal assets will be retired. Okay, this isn't, this is a typical kind of low growth that we're seeing around the state. In fact, this is a little bit slower, frankly, a little bit lower than the low growth that we're seeing in other places. Around Phoenix, around Tucson, it's, it's growing rapidly.

Supervisor Johnson stated so, what you're saying is you're going to put 97 megawatts in so that'll give you a 47-megawatt, difference, from the 30 that you're short.

Mr. Ledger stated yeah, as I understand it, about 60 megawatts will be needed directly for, for the existing exposure. You're going to need to cover future exposure from load growth. You're going to have to cover, cover solar when solar is not operating appropriately. And in the very near future, you're going to, we're going to be reducing our Apache resources and replacing that both with these units and with solar in different locations.

Supervisor Johnson stated we've gone from 30 to 60 so far, you said, but even if you're going with your 60, that still leaves you with 37 megawatts over which isn't much growth. Then when you add the 97 in, that's going to be a little over 100 megawatts, which isn't much, much more for growth. I guess my last question would be, why would we approve the first site if you drug us and the public through this for so many months?

Mr. Ledger state okay.

Chairman Angius stated what's the question?

Mr. Ledger stated so the first site was approved, and we understood that there was, you know, a lot of opposition, because it was fairly that site's a little bit closer, quite a bit closer to residential areas. So, we were asked to look for some other sites that might be more appropriate. You also would have more view shed on the first site. It would be more obvious. So, we, we have made an effort over time to find locations that are farther from the public, where the view shed is reduced, where the any impact of noise is, is basically mitigated. The second site, the problem there was not so much those factors as it was in actually building the site. So, the engineering was going to be more expensive and difficult because it was so close to the aquifer. So, by moving this to an existing sand and gravel operation that's a higher elevation, will be very stable, it's an existing, you know, similar industrial type facility, so it's consistent with the zoning that we're requesting. It's actually much farther away from the public. The view shed is excellent, you saw those images. Those images are very accurate. So, you're very, it's going to be very difficult to even see the plant from the closest residential areas, and then when you look at the sound impact, it's very favorable. So, in terms of the sound impact and the EPA standard, that really won't even go off our property. So, when you get out to 40 decibels or so, we don't believe you're going to hear this. So, that's the,

that's the overall reason, it's better for, I think the public, it's more appropriate from an engineering perspective. And that's what we were asked to do. We, we made no there's no intention ever to pull people into this sort of contentiousness. We're trying to do our job, and to do it the best we possibly can.

Supervisor Johnsons stated who were you asked to do that by? I don't understand that.

Mr. Ledger stated what's that?

Supervisor Johnson stated who asked you to move it? The Board approved your, your zoning.

Mr. Ledger stated as I understood it, there were folks on the board that would, had asked us to look for other sites. There were, there were a lot of other folks that were looking to see if there were better sites. We found a better site.

Supervisor Johnson stated the motion was to approve your site, so anything else is just on you for doing this. How do we know now that if we don't, if we approve this site. You're not going to find another site and say, well, you know, somebody else asked us to move, we go through this whole process again.

Mr. Ledger stated well, all I can tell you is that we have the second site as the next, as the next agenda item, and we have indicated over and over again we're pulling that off the agenda. We will not seek approval. We will not seek approval for any other site.

Supervisor Johnson stated are you going to go and rezone the original site back to what it was?

Mr. Ledger stated I think the question there is, we want to make sure that the zoning at the original site is consistent with a solar and battery designation. The future over on that that entire 400-acre parcel is basically so that Mohave can continue to build out their solar resources over time. So, I think any designation that's consistent with that, I want to make sure, check with Mohave.

Mr. Carlson stated yes, that, that the existing site, the, the M-X heavy industrial, will not be needed if this site is approved, and it will go back to the energy-overlay, which was the site, which was the zoning at the time. So, if that helps answer that particular question, and was Patrick talked about earlier, is that it was even it was approved, but it were, it was Board, Supervisors themselves that asked us to please consider another site, and we agreed that we would consider something farther away. So, yes, you're right, the, the Board of Supervisors did approve it, but they also asked us to do something different, look at something different.

Supervisor Johnson stated well, what you, what you said, I will not support this site unless it's contingent upon the other site being reversed. And just because a Supervisor or somebody asked you to look for another site, that wasn't what the motion was or the vote. So, we've drug this out now for months for no other reason.

Mr. Ledger stated I understand your concern, Supervisor Johnson, we will absolutely concede to that condition.

Supervisor Johnson stated thank you, Madam Chair, it's all I have.

Chairman Angius stated alright, thank you. You know, just to clarify this, we did ask you, there was a lot of contention, that site was closer to residential. And so, like we said, Supervisor Lingenfelter and I went to that site, we took some people. It is a good site; I believe it is. So, when you say you showed that, that picture of the sight line and how, how high, how much of the stacks are, you think you're going to see from there, from, from any sort of given area, because it's behind the bluff.

Mr. Ledger stated yeah.

Chairman Angius stated it's kind of hidden.

Mr. Ledger stated you may see, maybe a third of the stack. There are bluffs on almost all sides. From most angles, you will not see the plant, other than maybe about a third of the of the stack peaking up, it will be difficult to see.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Alright.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yeah.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated again, so, what I just heard, if these two sites are not approved today, the applicant will just use Site A, which has already been approved the zoning.

Mr. Ledger stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated okay. I need, I need that information for my vote.

Mr. Ledger stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, Madam Chairman. I believe if you go back to Site A you're going to get sued, and the county is going to get sued over the improper way that the county's handled that rezone by mere, rather than putting you guys through a zoning process, we merely removed the conditional use that should have, that expired two years before that. So, I just want, give that a little thought.

Mr. Ledger stated well, I think we can address that today, Supervisor Gould, if we approve this Site D, we will pull that request or that zoning designation and we'll allow it to go back to the renewable overlay, or whatever it was.

Supervisor Gould stated was never renewable overlay.

Mr. Ledger stated okay, well, whatever it was.

Supervisor Gould stated it was M-X with a conditional use

Mr. Ledger stated okay.

Supervisor Gould stated and I believe it was A land before that.

Mr. Ledger stated again, to the point when it was happy, happy to rezone it back to the purpose of that property, which is for solar and battery.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you. Thank you. Chairman.

Chairman Angius stated yeah. What? Scott Holtry, from Planning and Zoning.

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, members of the Board, I could just speak to the zoning on the Site A, it does have the energy overlay currently for the entirety of the parcel. The, so the, that's including the M-X zone that currently is zoned for that industrial park, the or the power plant. If the zoning goes away, that heavy manufacturing zoning goes away, the energy overlay for that area would continue, so it would have that energy overlay.

Supervisor Gould state thank you, Madam Chairman. Director Holtry, what was it zoned in '18 before it was originally rezoned M-X? Did it have the energy overlay? I believe it was A-R.

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Gould, I believe it's R-E 10A, was the zoning.

Supervisor Gould stated okay.

Director Holtry stated and it currently still has that zoning, but there's an overlay that is on top of it, which is that energy overlay. And then the M-X zone was a separate.

Supervisor Gould stated so it's like an Oreo?

Director Holtry stated there's lots of layers to it, yeah.

Supervisor Gould stated thank you, sir. Thank you, Chairman.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I've got a question for Attorney Esplin. Attorney Esplin, you were, you sat through the entire process that this Board went through on Site A. Do you see legal liability for the County and the processes that it used for Site A? Just.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated I see there's issues that either sides can argue, but we would certainly do our best to defend the Board's actions and you know, how a Board, how a court would rule, that would be for the court to decide. Generally speaking, courts, courts defer to Boards when it comes to zoning decisions. That's generally what, what, what you'll see from courts is they defer to this legislative process that you see here. If there's technical parts of it, they may invalidate for that. But I can't say for certain without looking at the complaint and so on. You also have to consider that time has gone by. You know, you can't just sit on things and wait. So, whatever



happens, we don't know, I don't know what the court would say, but we'd be ready to defend the County's actions.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, sir. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated I have a question. Wouldn't MEC or AEPCO have the lawsuit because they bought the land under a different designation, thinking that it was our, so it seems like, you know, there'd be a lot of lawsuits flying if that was the route everyone's going to take, so. Okay, well, thank you.

Mr. Ledger stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated call you back up if we need you. I just have one more, we hadn't really addressed some of the environmental things that were brought up. Can I have, is Irene Evanston, still here from the tribe? Is Irene here? Thank you. It seems that the Tribe really has the history here on what the impacts are, because you have a very large gas power plant on Indian land that the power doesn't stay here. So, when you, when you had it built, or brought it in, or whatever the process was, did you have sort of the kind of transparency and stuff that we're doing here today?

Ms. Evanston stated I actually was not involved in that process, however, Chairman Williams could speak to that.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Mr. Williams stated thank you. Thank you for the question, no transparency, we're Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, just like you, if I was sitting in your seat, I would have told you not to turn around, and that's the way it goes. When you're in our jurisdiction. We operate differently, and we have different rules that we follow when it comes to this. And I don't know why this has turned to a South Point issue when this is not the issue that's at hand today. The issue at hand today is whether or not you're going to approve this item or not.

Chairman Angius stated I understand that.

Mr. Williams stated the tribes are different.

Chairman Angius stated many things that have been brought up, and so since the history is already there. You, there is already one there, and, and you're and Irene. The reason I brought her up, she said something about emergency, you know, if something happened, they wouldn't be able to respond. But so, in 21 years since your, the South Point is up there, have you ever had anything go wrong?

Mr. Williams stated to this point.

Chairman Angius stated have you ever had any complaints about noise or people, you know, getting sick and getting cancer?

Mr. Williams stated I know where you're trying to go with this.

Chairman Angius stated I'm just asking a question.

Mr. Williams stated and I'm not going to get involved in that type of discussion with you, because you're trying to skew our property and what we're trying to do as a Tribe.

Chairman Angius stated I'm just trying to get information.

Mr. Williams stated and so that's what my response is to that item.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Williams stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated I appreciate it.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Chairman, Chairman Williams.

Chairman Angius stated Chairman Williams.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Chairman Williams, for being here today, I appreciate it. So, my district, District 1, is up north, all of Mohave County, up north, all the way to the Utah border, so I'm not as familiar with your, that part of Mohave County. I've driven by on my way to Topock, or whatever, the South Point. And I think it's fair to talk about that, because I think this Board has heard a lot of different power plants brought up today. We've heard about coal power plants. We've heard about natural gas power plants. We've heard about nuclear power plants. We've heard about all these different comparisons. So, I did a little research, but I want to ask you directly, so I know with MECs AEPCOs solar plant, the Tribe seemed to be supportive of that. I read that there were tribal dances and things like that when that site broke ground. And I don't know the Tribe's business relationship with the power plant, how that came on, into being. I know that the solar is not on tribal property, but correct me if I'm wrong, the South Point plant is indeed on tribal property, and I think they pay you a tipping fee, but I need to be corrected on that if that's inaccurate. So, I guess I'm just having a, I'm trying to put it all into context. So, what was your relationship, if you can, with the South Point project, and why were you supportive of the solar and battery at MEC, when that went in many years ago, and what is different between those two locations and what is being proposed today?

Mr. Williams stated thank you for asking your question in a different tone, and wanting to understand what our position is on different areas. What I have to say about that, and when it looks at look at power all together, we're part of the Ten Tribes organization. I've chaired, the Ten Tribes partnership with over 20% of the Colorado River allocated to tribes. I've been a part of several of those meetings, Vice Chair and Chairman, and continue to speak over in Santa Fe just recently on these matters. So, water is extremely important, you know, to us. And so, you look at the

relationship that's happened over the years, and knowing and understanding what the deterioration hydroelectric power is, and possibly could be into the future. Therefore, I'm sure a lot of people in this room have talked about the post 2026 guidelines, and what it's going to bring to not only Mohave County, but going to bring to our Tribe, because we have senior water rights on the reservation. And so, with that, we have a small solar plant over there on the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation. So, that's where it comes back to location, and that's why we keep emphasizing the part where it's not against power. It's not against the power production. It's against those types of locations in certain areas that really bring it to the to the core, and sometimes, no matter how much we say it, because no matter how much we go about it, you won't understand our point of view. We won't understand your point of view sometimes. But when it comes to these types of issues, that's where it comes to, look at, we had South Point, that was a different leadership group back in 2001. And they did everything that they could at that time in order to ensure that we would have the longevity and we would have the self-sufficiency, because ain't nobody paying our bills. Self-sufficiency in order to continue on as Mojave people. And they did that. And now we move into the point to where, because we have a gas plant, when we knew, this was going to come up, when this first came up. You know, well, you have one. Well, why can't we have one? Well, what about this? What about that? We have to attack issues as they come about us. When they come to us, we address them just like this one. You're evaluating them. I mean, there were some very good questions that were brought up by the Supervisors. And us, we went through a NEPA process. We went through the full federal process in order to get something done. We go through all of these things because it's the right thing to do. How the decommissioning is going to go, all of the, all of those things that they should have answered, that they're not able to answer today should already be answered in order for you to make a decision. Just my own opinion, humble opinion, when it comes to that. And so, that's where it comes to again, we've said it time and time again, we are for power, but we just want to make sure they're in the right locations.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, so if I heard you right, and sorry for those that are losing patience, but this is a very weighty decision, and I need to ask all my questions, so just thank you for your patience. I, I'm just trying to put it into context, why there was support for those two energy projects and not for this one. And what I'm hearing is that it was a different leadership group, and that's a fair statement, right?

Mr. Williams stated different leadership in 2001, and these, and these current solar projects.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated okay

Mr. Williams stated I mean, it was still, it was still us, but again, it goes back to the location. Look at, they put something over there. What did we bring up to the table? We didn't.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I've only got one question. So, when you, you came up and people donated their time to you, and you spoke this morning, right, and thank you, everybody for being here for so long, appreciate it, it sounded as though you had a site in mind. Are you, are you asking

for additional month for the applicant to come and talk to the Tribe because you have a tribal site in mind?

Mr. Williams stated oh, man, it, you know, we came to the table this morning, and that, let me, I'm glad I got to come up here. I'm gonna completely rescind that. I'm asking for a no today. I didn't know the, how much collusion, you know, takes place over here. So, that's really not going to be beneficial to us, to be working with, you know, MEC/AEPCO/, you know, that's, it's unfortunate. It really is. I truly came here this morning, talking to the council, talking to membership, coming with a good heart, looking for a possible solution. But any of that, it has to be completely off the table now, you know.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated so, just to make sure I heard you right, are you saying that doing business with them is no longer on the table?

Mr. Williams stated no, right now on this site? No, no.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated okay, that's all I have. Thank you.

Mr. Williams stated anything else?

Chairman Angius stated any other questions for Chairman Williams? Thank you very much. Alright, well, here we are. Thank you again, everybody. The long day. No, no, we're done. Sir, sir, we've already had the public hearing. Thank you. I have a feeling that no matter how this vote goes, this is not over, no matter which way it goes. So, I have to make my decision based on the facts that I've been given, and that is what's going to dictate my vote. So, with that, I'm going to ask for a motion, but we are going to put something else in the motion, right? There was some, some extra language that needed to be in the lane in the motion about. Okay, so right now, the motion is, adoption of Board of Supervisor Resolution number 2024-20. What, you can't hear me? Discussion and possible action, adoption of Board of Supervisor Resolution number 2024-217, an amendment to the Mohave County general plan from a suburban residential and public lands area, land use designation to a heavy industrial area land use designation and a rezone of assessors parcels, numbers 225-11-005, -006, -008, and a portion of 009 from an A-R zone to an M-X zone to allow for building and operating a natural gas powered electric generation facility in Mohave Valley vicinity. The Commission recommended approval by 7-2 vote, and part of this is that they're only limited to four peaker plants altogether. Does this cover that?

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated Chairman Angius, if that's what you want to put in the motion, you need to put that in the motion.

Chairman Angius stated Scott?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, that's already in the conditions right now, that was placed by the commission.

Chairman Angius stated so, we don't have to add it?

Director Holtry stated so you wouldn't have, if you, yeah, if you just wanted the limit to four units that's already in the condition.

Chairman Angius stated for anything else, okay, was there anything else that we.

Director Holtry stated the only other thing would be, is if you want them to rescind the other zoning.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Director Holtry stated prior to this one vesting, then you can add that as well.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Does anybody care to do that, to rescind.

Supervisor Bishop stated Chairman Angius, I'd like a legal opinion as to whether or not we can do that with this agenda item the way it's listed.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated it would be one of the, is this, can you hear me? Okay, it'd be one of the conditions. Is that what you wish to do? Yeah, if it's a condition, you can make that as a condition if you wish.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Anything else Board? Alright, so do you want to put that in? If we wish, you want to put it into this one? Or is it something that can.

Supervisor Bishop stated I think it should be in the motion, if it's legal, and I just got that clarification that it would be.

Chairman Angius stated so we're going to add that, if approved.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated just to be clear, it's not going to be in this motion, it's going to be one of the conditions, correct?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, I think you would need to add it as a condition through a motion, I believe.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney stated so you want to add that condition.

Director Holtry stated we currently, we, we currently, already have a condition in there that it's limited to four, that was put on by the Planning and Zoning Commission. But if you want it to not vest, the zoning won't vest, until.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated the rescission.

Director Holtry stated rescission of the other parcel.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated and you made that as an additional condition.

Director Holtry stated we can, yeah, I could give you the.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated yeah, add that to the motion, add that condition to the motion, would be my recommendation.

Director Holtry stated the other parcel number is 221-35-024, that's just a portion of that parcel, but that's, that's where the other approval is.

Chairman Angius stated so.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated if I could just jump in here, just to be clear, I mean, there are, and there are two different companies here, two different things. So, the other, the other entity, has to either agree or there's got to be something that has to happen to that. So, what I'm saying is it's dependent upon somebody else acting, or something else happening. And so, if this passes, it still may not be a done deal for this one. They still have to wait for that other one before this.

Director Holtry stated yeah, that's correct.

Chairman Angius stated okay. So, okay, and so we're going to add to this motion, if passed, applicant must rescind the zoning granted on, on parcel, 221-35-024. Okay. Okay, that's a motion. I need a second.

Clerk Skubal stated who made that motion? Sorry.

Chairman Angius stated I did.

Clerk Skubal stated you did. Okay.

Chairman Angius stated do we have a second? No second.

Supervisor Johnson stated second.

Supervisor Bishop stated second.

Chairman Angius stated you second it?

Supervisor Bishop stated sure.

Chairman Angius stated okay, we have a motion and a second we're going to do a roll call vote. Clerk?

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I'd like to explain my vote. First of all, I thank everybody on both sides for participating in this, for spending your Monday with us today. I know that emotions are charged. I've taken a lot of time to evaluate all four sites, A, B, C and D, and I sincerely believe that, that D is a superior site when it comes to A, between the two. I think it's a superior site in all, in all ways. But I'm going to go with the people, and we're going to go, I mean, my vote is going to be to support the site that's the lesser of the two, in my opinion. So, I vote no.

Chairman Angius stated okay?

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Angius.

Chairman Angius stated please, please, we're in the middle of the vote.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Angius?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated yes.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Bishop?

Supervisor Bishop stated so, before I vote, let me make a comment. I've listened to all the pros and cons and the information, and I think the reliability and the dependability of, of this location is, is what I'm considering right now. I think this is for MEC consumers. They did what we asked, MEC did what we asked. They have a large buffer now. It's a more remote location, far away from any residences. It's only going to operate as a peaker plant to prevent potential rolling blackouts in the area that has extreme heat, and that concerns me greatly, because of the health issue; in the summertime without air conditioning. I really think this peaker plant is necessary. And so, I vote yes.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Clerk Skubal stated and Supervisor Gould?

Supervisor Gould stated no.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Well.

Clerk Skubal stated motion passes 3-2.

Chairman Angius stated motion passes 3-2.

**Motion was made by Chairman Angius and seconded by Supervisor Bishop to approve Item 36 with the condition of the recission of the portion of parcel 221-35-024. Motion carried 3-2 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting no; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting no.**

Audience member stated it ain't over.

Chairman Angius stated go ahead. Have at it. Have at it.

Audience members stated recall Hildy. Recall Hildy.

Chairman Angius stated alright, enough. I let you have your way. Fine. So now.

Supervisor Gould stated do you want to take a break?

Clerk Skubal stated do you? We're gonna recess for five minutes.

Chairman Angius stated everybody to file out and do your conversation.

---

Chairman Angius stated we're going to go on to item 37.

**ITEM 37. Open Public Hearing:** Discussion and possible action RE: Adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-144 - An **AMENDMENT TO THE MOHAVE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN** from a Suburban Residential Area land use designation to an Urban Development Area land use designation and a **REZONE** from an A-R (Agricultural Residential) zone to an M-X (Heavy Manufacturing) zone for a portion of Assessor's Parcel No. 225-09-052 to allow for a natural gas-powered electric generation facility in the Mohave Valley vicinity Mohave County, Arizona. [**Commission vote resulted in a tie vote (3-3)**]

Chairman Angius stated which I believe we have a statement from MEC.

Mr. Carlson stated yes, I know that, Tyler Carlson.

Chairman Angius stated wait, but.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated it's a public hearing, you got to open a public hearing.

Chairman Angius stated okay, I open the public hearing.

**Chairman Angius Opened the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated we're not going to do the whole public hearing, we're just, he's going to.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated item 37, and we haven't even had item 37 yet. I mean, if, it's item 37, we need to open a public hearing like you would.

Chairman Angius stated alright, I'm opening up a public hearing. Now, I'm going to listen to.

Mr. Carlson stated yes, Tyler Carlson, Mohave Electric Cooperative. This has to do with Site C.

Chairman Angius stated right.

Mr. Carlson stated and we, we remove, or whatever we need to do to no longer go after Site C. So, Site C is not in our purview at this point. So, whatever it takes to actually have to take that off,



whatever you need us to say we're not interested in moving forward with Site C, and we also still agree with the earlier provision that talked about Site A going back to its.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Mr. Carlson stated so that's where we're at.

Chairman Angius stated so he, he doesn't, so can we just take no action?

Clerk Skubal stated okay, so he's a formally withdrawn now.

Chairman Angius stated yes, okay, we take no action. Do we have to make a motion?

Clerk Skubal stated yes.

Chairman Angius stated oh, okay, so I'm going to close the public hearing.

**Chairman Angius Closed the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated a motion, without objection, remove item 37 from the agenda.

Supervisor Bishop stated I'll make a motion, we remove item 37 from the agenda.

Chairman Angius stated first, we've never done that. Okay? So, we have the motion.

Supervisor Gould stated second.

Chairman Angius stated second. okay, thank you. I think that's probably the best technical way of doing it. Thank you. The public hearing again for this. Okay.

Mr. Ledger stated Madam Chairman, I move to withdraw the motion item 37 or, I'm sorry that the item off the agenda, which would be item 37.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so I can do this without objection, I'm going to withdraw item 37. Okay.

Supervisor Bishop stated no motion needed?

Chairman Angius stated no, apparently.

Mr. Ledger stated thank you.

**Item withdrawn by applicant.**

Chairman Angius stated okay, next number, we're back to 33.

**ITEM 33. Open Public Hearing:** Discussion and possible action RE: Adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-216 – An **AMENDMENT TO THE MOHAVE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN** from a General Commercial land use designation to a Suburban Development Area land

use designation and a **REZONE** of Assessor's Parcel No. 316-13-171 from an A (General) zone to an A-R (Agricultural Residential) zone, to allow for a minor land division in the Dolan Springs vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)**

Chairman Angius stated and this is discussion possible action adoption the Board of Supervisor resolution number 2024-216, which is an amendment to the Mohave County general plan from a general commercial land use to a suburban development land use designation, and this is in Dolan Springs vicinity. Open the public hearing.

**Chairman Angius Opened the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated let's see what we got here. James Jones, you still around? James Jones, I don't see him. Is there anyone who wishes. Is he here? Oh, I, okay. Can you, alright? So, I'm asking James Jones if he's here. James Jones, okay. Is there anyone I think that he's the only person who signed up to speak on 33. Anyone wish to speak on 33? Hearing none, I'm going to close the public hearing.

**Chairman Angius Closed the Public Hearing.**

Supervisor Bishop stated Madam Chair, motion to approve.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated second.

Chairman Angius stated motion and second. Any further discussion? Hearing, none.

**Motion was made by Supervisor Bishop and seconded by Supervisor Lingenfelter to approve Item 33. Motion carried 5-0 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.**

**ITEM 34. Open Public Hearing:** Discussion and possible action RE: DENY the adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-218 – An **AMENDMENT TO THE MOHAVE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN** from a Rural Development Area land use designation to a Rural Industrial Area land use designation and a REZONE of Assessor's Parcel Nos. 313-01-037, -038, -039, 313-90-001, - 007, from A-R/36A (Agricultural Residential/Thirty-Six Acre Minimum Lot Size) zone to an S-D/M (Special Development/Manufacturing) zone to allow for a Photovoltaic Solar Project interconnecting to the Peacock Substation in the Kingman vicinity, Mohave County, Arizona. **(Commission recommended denial by unanimous vote)**

Chairman Angius stated number 34. I'm going to open the public hearing.

**Chairman Angius Opened the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated and I'm going to first have, so Mr. Chetkauskas left, correct? And he's giving his, his time to somebody, I think that's how that's going down. We're going to have Rachel, Rachel Walker, come on down.

Rachel Walker, Director of Permitting, Mission Clean Energy, stated thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Rachel Walker, and I'm the director of permitting at Mission Clean Energy. I live at 2205 Decatur Avenue North. Thank you for the chance to apply for a general plan amendment from a rural development area to a rural industrial area for our 250-megawatt solar project. This request is consistent with the general plan policies to amend the map for future development. The project will connect to the Peacock Substation located on Blake cattle property, just south and north of the Peacock Substation. That's where the project will be located. The project makes sense for Mohave County, for the following reasons. Number one, this project is being developed entirely on private property owned by Blake Cattle Company. The land will be, will be leased so will remain in the hands of this family. Private property rights are very important to this community and this family has lived here for many generations. This project is what they want to do with the property. Private property rights are a core value of Mohave County. The landowner is, excuse me, the landowner is here today and will be making his own statement. Number two, the project brings real benefits to Mohave County, and to the people living closest to the project. We listened carefully to the October hearing, and we come today with the following concrete commitments. We will improve and upgrade six and a half miles of road from Highway 40 up to and along the western edge of the project. These improvements will cost millions of dollars. We are making sizable financial contributions to Pinion Fire Department. We're contributing \$100,000 to the fire department. We will make water available with our landowner to folks who live closest to the project in, in fire response, and we are entering into a development services agreement with Pinion Fire. It's our second commitment. We will keep open the right of way, both north and south and east and west, which are currently used for ATV use and also for horseback riding, we will keep those right of ways open for that continued use. We will be fulfilling all of our tax obligations on the order of \$17 million. That's \$17 million that will go to the Hackberry Elementary School, the Mohave County Community College and to other Mohave County services. Number three, this is a very big project, and it produces power that is needed in this community. We've heard a lot about power today. This, the power from this project is available for sale. It's available to local utilities who are interested to purchase the power.

Chairman Angius stated did somebody give you their time as well? No, I don't think so. Okay, yeah, three minutes it's a public hearing.

Ms. Walker stated thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. So, Peter Furlow, Trecia Christopherson, okay. Christopherson's, I think there's a husband and wife. Oh, sorry, I'm so, sorry, okay, I got it.

Trecia Christopherson, Kingman resident, stated I'm Trecia Christopherson. I reside at 1503 South Blake Ranch Road. This is Debra Blake. She resides at 1505 South Blake Ranch Road. And this

is my little brother, Ryan Christopherson, and he resides at 150-1, -7 Blake Ranch Road. I'll go first. So, my dad just recently passed. Bill Blake was one of the most in tune people I've ever known with land and animals, to the fact that my stepdad could take two sticks and walk find water. He's also never been known to make rash decisions. He's slow to decide and even slower to speak. And the land and the community out there, are, and were his legacies. He largely developed that community himself, and even into his last days, graded the roads that people use today to get to their homes. Major concerns that I've seen being voiced are that people wouldn't get to drive the horses or ATVs across my dad's land, and the company is saying that they'll still be able to do that. Also, that it's unsightly. I mean, I don't know anybody who's driven out there to see, but we see encampments that are people's homes that could be considered unsightly. My dad didn't discriminate, and he graded roads right up to those places. This was a project that my dad was working on as he battled the biggest battle of his life, which was what took him out, which was leukemia. If this was something he didn't believe was safe and sound for his land, his legacy, the animals he wouldn't have spent his last days fighting.

Ryan Christopherson, Kingman resident stated my name is Ryan Christopherson and my address is 1507 South Blake Ranch Road. My family and I have been residents of Mohave County for 80 plus years, operating our family business, Blake Cattle Company. We've also owned, and we own and operate Ranch Water Services. And we once ranched the land, all the land out there for many generations. Blake Ranch Road was even named after our family's name. My father, my mother, and my mother is now the current owner of this property being discussed where the solar development is being proposed, and we will continue to be the owners through the entire life of the project, if it is approved by the County. We are leasing the property to Mission Clean Energy, after careful consideration over several years, we've decided to lease this land to Mission Clean Energy. A decision was made based, balanced at the base of the best use of the property with being good neighbors to a few residents who can call this area of Mohave County home. The solar development has sparked a lot of conversation, and I understand that there are concerns. My family and I had all the same concerns before entering into this lease agreement with Mission Clean. My late father, Bill Blake, gave his decision a lot of thought, just as he did with every decision affecting our family, family's land and the land we've managed for generations. We had all the same questions and concerns as those that are discussed today. In fact, my father used to own much of the land where people are opposing, the landowners now live, and knew the uniqueness of this area well. After carefully evaluating all options, we are, we were, and still are very confident that this location is the perfect for solar development. First, it's situated away from densely populated areas of the county. This, plus the topography of the land ensures that the, there is minimal visual impact on the few by, few nearby residents. Additionally, the Peacock Substation is located on the property, therefore the infrastructure required for the solar development can be accommodated here without significant disruption to our local ecosystems or existing and land uses. I hope you'll agree with this assessment and see that this project respects the land, benefits the county and residents, and respects my family's wishes on our private land. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Angius stated thank you.

Debra Blake, Kingman resident stated hi, I'm Debbie Blake, the widow of Bill Blake. Excuse me, it's only been a month. Bill and I were married 30 years, and this is a man who I feel has more integrity and more concern for other people than most people I have ever met in my entire life, of 70 years. He takes care of everybody out there. He doesn't just sell the land and say, you know, piss off if you have a problem. If you call us, we try to come out and help. We help rebuild fences that cattle have knocked down, not our job. We grade the road out there after big rains, not our job. We do everything we can to help our neighbors, because that's what Bill's whole life was about. He believed in giving, and I love my husband, and I want to emulate him. There is nothing about this project that is going to be harmful. Bill, Bill went to college. He learned what every plant is that grows out here in this desert, and how it benefits what animals, what you don't want, what you do want. He knows, like Trecia said, how to winch water. Different ranchers around the county have called on him to find their wells. He does this just, he's just so in tuned. You wouldn't find him saying an unkind word about anybody in his life. I mean, many of you have been here as long as him, and he just never has done anything to harm anyone. So, knowing this, I'm asking for support. My husband is gone. We're no longer running cattle because we're too old and I'm crippled. I can't do it anymore. We have the water company, and it's the only thing keeping us afloat, and it's not much. We are not bringing in income. We need this project for ourselves. I'm asking you to consider that, knowing my husband and the way he was his whole life, he's never put anyone in harm's way. And we're not trying to, but we need this project to go through to help us. We need help right now, so I'm just asking you to consider that. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Alright, I'm doing, is, is I kind of maybe messed this up, but is Mr. Chetkauskas still here, or the person who's going to speak on his behalf? That's you? Okay, so you're speaking on his behalf, opposed? Okay, I just want to make sure that that was there. I promised him I do it, okay. Next up is Peter Furlow, and then Brian Scholl.

Peter Furlow, Associate, Quarles Law Firm, stated Brian ceded his time to me. So, if I could have six minutes, that'd be appreciated.

Chairman Angius stated okay, five minutes.

Mr. Furlow stated five is better than three, so thank you. Do we have the, oh, here's the clicker. Just make sure that this works first. Okay, hello, good afternoon. My name is Peter Furlow, 2 North Central Ave, on behalf of the applicant and the landowners here today. You just heard from the Christopherson and the Blake family. I don't think I need to add to that. I think what they said did a good job covering Bill Blake's story and impact on Mohave County generally. What I do want to say, though, is that they own 500 acres within a mile of this site. They own 5,000 acres in Mohave County. So, the question is, of all of that land that Bill Blake owns and that he owned at the time he was negotiating with Mission Clean, why did we choose here. It's two-fold. So, first Peacock Substation, which was mentioned by Rachel, is internalized to the site. That's super important, if you're going to pick a different location that's not near substation, the additional

infrastructure and transmission lines that you have to use to connect to the site can be much more disruptive to surrounding neighbors than just the simple panels that are going to be low set on the site. Second the topography. You can't really tell as much here, but to the west of this site, a lot of it is more highly raised or higher topographically. So, the visual impact to the neighbors to the west is minimized as much as possible here. And the third reason is, is the low density, the sparse density surrounding the site, if you'll notice. To the east, it's state land. Nobody's living there. To the north, mostly state land. To the west, into the southwest are where these folks who are here today, who wrote letters are coming from. But just for context, if you want hard numbers, actually constructed homes, there are 21 constructed homes within a mile of the site. Just to give you reference for, for how low dense, low density, it is surrounding the site. The current zoning on the site is A-R 36 A. What does that mean? You heard from the Christopherson's that the agricultural part of that A-R 36 A is not viable, so that leaves residential by right. Residential by right in A-R 36 A, as it sounds like it's 36-acre minimum on this site. That would mean by right, they could subdivide, have 62 homes at 35 feet, which is a three-story home, and those could be set back by right, per Mohave County code, 15 feet from the property line. So, why we're here today is to make the argument that this solar use, this renewable energy use that Bill Blake wanted on his private land is the highest and best use that has the lowest impact on the few, but still obviously here surrounding neighbors. The site is 2,300 acres, 1,700 of that will be developed. Our request is to go to rural industrial area and then a special development manufacturing. On the last case, I noticed there's a bunch of the neighbors talking about, well, could this turn into some other form of industrial use? We're happy to put a stipulation or a condition, however you want to word it, that solar, solar and battery energy use are the only uses allowed on this site. That will also align with the general plan designation of rural industrial as your general plan states that renewable energy is basically the only industrial use that's compatible in these rural areas. For a bit of context, I can go over this just very quickly, but I know that a lot of people on the Board have commented in the past that kind of feels like Mohave County is getting inundated with these renewable energy projects. Just for, for hard numbers, this is from the moratorium map. So, this is from the County map that was presented, less than 1/1,000 of a percent of Mohave County's land is actually being used for, for solar energy. This is the conceptual site plan that was showed at Planning commission. The first adjustment that we made, directly in response to those neighbors that do exist is, if you notice, this is what was shown. Those areas circled are where panels are. They're directly up against the west side. We are happy to, we're happy to put a condition stipulate to, I know this isn't site plan approval this is for the zoning, but we created an additional 500-foot buffer, so five times what is required by code. What does that look like? It means that the closest currently constructed home or home that could be constructed on one of those subdivided lots is not going to be any closer than about a quarter mile from the panel. So, what does that look like? I'm going to show you. So, this is from a half mile. As you can see, you cannot see the panels. This is, again, from a half mile. Can't see the panels. If, if that's my time, that's my time.

Chairman Angius stated we'll call you back after.

Mr. Furlow stated okay, and I'll have the presentation if you want me to go over any of the other portions.

Chairman Angius stated okay, thank you. Alright, so is there anyone else who is speaking in favor of this project? Okay, so now we're going to go to the people who are opposed. And again, if you're speaking for a bunch of people, let me know. And if you hear something that, if you want to say something that's been said before you can say what she said, okay. So, let's start with April Loomis. April Loomis, I think we may have lost some people. Oh, okay, alright, let's have Hakon come down, because there's a few people who have, oh, I see giving my time to Hakon, right. So, you have 1. How many people, stand up are giving their time to Hakon? Ooh, okay, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, how much time are you going to need? How much time are you going to need? Yeah, just if you could, we are strapped time.

Hakon Swenhaugen, Kingman resident, stated okay, thank you. Okay, there we go. Okay. Okay, I'm ready. Oh, Hakon Swenhaugen, 10257 East Austin Loop. The video is playing. Okay, so ladies and gentlemen, council members, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak regarding our position on this proposed solar farm asking to be, asking to be built in our backyards. Please forgive me if I get a little animated or show some emotion during my presentation, because this is something that at our core, we are absolutely opposed to. And I know that you can hear our hearts and our words. I have no ill feelings towards the Blakes. I absolutely understand their position. They're only trying to secure their legacy. I get it, but so are we. And they, I hope that they don't hold it against us when we are in such opposition to secure our well-being, the land that we already purchased from them or are currently purchasing from them. So, okay, so the video. Sorry. What you see here, everything you see here, well, it'll be gone. All the green will be gone. There's a house here. We took this video because we tried to show just how close this project is going to be to where we actually live. Yes, it will be unsightly for us who have to live there. It's unfortunate that the people who sold us our land say that our residences are unsightly to them. We live there, they don't. They sold the land. The good thing for them is that they get all their land back at the end of this deal. Meanwhile, for us, if we want to move, if we want to change our plans, we get to deal with maybe not even getting market value because of the way it's going to look. And that's all we have, is what we've invested our entire lives and livelihood into. All of these things, okay, also, when you destroy such large areas of established vegetation, and when you bulldoze the terrain, you absolutely change the natural washes and the amount of water that will run unchecked through the new and much more forceful velocity of the water current. It is unsafe and it is illegal to alter or change the pathways of natural washes. Please tell me how bulldozing 23,800 acres of established vegetation will not alter the washes or amount of water that will flow through them. We have two entrances and exits total in the area. This project is going to block one of them. So, I mean, I know they said that they're in talks with Pinon Fire right now, that's great. It's unfortunate we had to ask them for that. It's unfortunate they didn't take that upon themselves to think, you know, maybe the people living in this area should have some protection against the fires that may be caused from our project. We had to push for that. It's also unfortunate that the records that they

use from the tax scrolls to show you, to try to convince you that nobody lives out there. It's from 2007, why would you use 17-year-old tax records to push this through? I don't know. Call me crazy, but there's just a number of things that are lining up in my mind that seem a little bit nefarious. Job creation, while it's true that there will be many construction jobs initially for this project, the simple fact remains that other than a security guard and a couple technicians to maintain these, these panels, that's the only jobs that you're going to have. How do I know? I managed the wind turbine farm right here behind Nucor for three years. I was involved in building it. The company I worked for told us to tell all the locals that the power made at that station was going to benefit Kingman residents. Later, we found out that it goes to California. Many of the projects here go to California. This company also has no proof of any pending or existing contracts for lower power consumption, for local power consumption, they haven't shown us that they have people interested, or where is it going to go, what percentage they. And I get it, they don't have it built yet. But to get it pushed through, shouldn't they have something, something along those lines. Maybe come knock on our door that you know, for those of us that live out there, make a personal connection and say, hey, look, we're thinking about doing something out here. You for it? Are you against it? What can we do to work with you, since you have to live next to it? That wasn't a consideration. Now, they want to buy us out. Only some of us, though, they don't want to, they don't want to take care of everybody in the area. They want to build animosity and conflict, and its bottomless pockets. So here we are trying to defend what we have, and we've got this major corporation, you know, coming after us, well regarded people in the community that everybody respects. I'm not happy to say this kind of stuff, you know, but we're going to defend ours just as they're coming as hard as they can at us, it's all we got. So, basically, this project if passed will displace local Arizona residents. We will not be able to sell our properties at market value. We will be at a major fire and flood risk for those who have to stay. And the power created doesn't even benefit Arizona residents in any way. I know that as elected officials voted in by Arizona residents, your main duty is to protect and make decisions that will best benefit us, your constituents, the ones who believed in you enough to vote for you to represent them. Please do the right thing here and make the standard decision to deny and shut down this project in its currently proposed location. We're not against solar power. We are against destroying our backyard so that California residents can enjoy the power produced at our expense. Please do the right thing. Protect your constituents. They haven't shown you anything that's going to benefit us in any way. 23,000 acres, and they get it all back at the end. There's only one group of people suffering with this deal here, and that's those of us who already bought property from them. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. John Kulp, and then James Jordan, and Brooke Pollock. They did? Very good, thank you.

John Kulp, Kingman resident stated I'm at 9800 East Dubois, just down from Blake Road, Kingman. I'm not convinced with what these people are saying. The numbers don't add up as for the footprint versus the output. There are other options available. Nuclear is one of them, but I know that's a taboo subject. But for the footprint, there's not enough power coming out of these



things. As stated, before in the prior issue, 400 acres produces a conditional 30 megawatts, maybe. We need to invest our money and our land in things that are more viable and produce more electricity. Plus, they're an eyesore. I own property in Newberry Springs, California, and solar panels, that's why I'm here. The solar panels expansion is ridiculous. They've ruined that whole valley. People complain of dust. There's a fire danger, the erosion, it's not good. It's not going to be good at that location. Newberry Springs is relatively flat. There are washes, as explained by the gentleman prior and yeah, they're going to have to excavate it. In driving here, I don't know why the solar industry is not looking at parking lots honestly. That way we can all drive on a hot day, get in and out of our cars in comfort, without a hot car to sit in afterwards, acres and acres, miles upon miles. Drive up to Vegas, drive into Los Angeles, which I do frequently, there's acres and acres, miles and miles of black top. That environment is already gone. Anyway, stand in opposition to this measure. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, Sandi Fellows. Stuart Erny, have you, have someone spoke for you already? No, okay, come on down. And then Jennifer, is Jennifer Esposito still here? Okay.

Sandi Fellows, Kingman resident, stated my name is Sandi Fellows, and I live in Cedar Hills. I've owned my property on Blue Dog Road since 1997 and have lived there for 16 years. So, this is my dream, I'm living my dream. We have a special community that's desirable to live in, on property that is at least 10 acres. We have good water, clean air, a minimal amount of crime, and excellent neighbors that watch out for each other. We're surrounded by beautiful views and scenery. We can walk out of our homes and go for hikes with our children or ride our horses. The applicant states that this project, as proposed, will have minimal environmental impact, minimal impact on the neighborhood, and that this project is designed to preserve, protect and enhance our vistas and scenic areas. 2,267 acres of land topped with over three full sections of solar panels is not a minimal environmental impact and would negatively change the neighborhood from what residents wanted when they purchased property out there. Disturbing over 2,000 acres of topsoil will cause everyone in the surrounding area to be susceptible to valley fever, which is a documented threat for Arizona. We have a number of documented creatures living and nesting in this area that are currently on the endangered species list and in danger of losing habitat. Few, if any, long term jobs will be held by members of this community once this project is established. Once the property is rezoned to special development manufacturing, it will allow any number of industrial, and manufacturing uses to take place in the area. This proposal will lower our property values and quality of life. Many of us has lived and worked our entire lives in Mohave County, we cannot afford to move, nor do we wish to. We can't keep allowing these developers to permanently alter our communities. They make millions of dollars, but live elsewhere. Once these massive old growth juniper and pine trees are gone, they and the life and habitat they provide will be lost forever. I believe future generations would prefer to experience the beauty of nature than acres of solar panels. I'm opposed to this request. It's not a good fit for our area. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Kristy, that was, were you Kristy? No, no, I'm talking to the lady that just left. So, you're, you're Stuart Erny.

Stuart Erny, Kingman resident, stated yes, ma'am.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Mr. Erny stated are we ready?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Mr. Erny stated alright, Stuart Erny, I live at 3065 North Stephan Road, Kingman, Arizona. I'm not going to say I'm an expert with solar farms, or anything like that. What I'm going to tell you about is I worked many years with batteries, and what can happen with batteries. Of course, when I first started out, they were just lead acid batteries, which we all know were pretty volatile. And later on, the equipment I worked with went to lithium batteries. Well, they too, still can catch fire. They can blow up. And the fire department, if they build one there is all fine. That's great for the community, but they will not fight any kind of fire because of the toxicity of the air that's around them. You have to have respirators and all that. So, and it's just a matter of time before they do it. It's, I mean, because it happens. I mean, it may not happen in a year, but it might happen in 2 or 3, 4 you don't know. That alone will cause a massive, if you've ever been around like a car battery sounds like a shotgun. You ever been around these large batteries sounds like a bomb going off. And that's not the only thing that catches, the electronics, the inverters, generators, whatever else they have, will also catch fire. And nobody's going to mess with it in the fire department or the people. Another problem is, is they're probably going to have to have security lighting and stuff, I would imagine. So, that's going to light up the sky at night. It'll be a big bright spot. And of course, the environment gets bulldozed over, and it's like a scar on you. It never goes away. It's there forever, and it's pretty much, you know, it doesn't pass the smell test either. This has got California wrote all over it. AI is coming, and we're not going to stop it. And they've already said it's going to need more and more power. In California, of course, don't want to build this stuff, this much on their land, they want to come and take over Arizona and the rest of the states that are close to them. That's how they work. So, in my opinion, again, that's all it is, don't know for a fact, but I think that's what it's all about. And personally, I think the state of California is a cancer on Arizona, and I think they're trying their best to change. They come to these small towns because they think they can get away with this stuff a lot easier than they can going maybe to Phoenix or a bigger city with more regulations. They think they can overpower little places. And if you don't realize, it's hard to even visualize, but 2,300 acres plus of solar panels is humongous. It's not; you're talking about your parking lots, this building, and thank you for your time.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Jennifer Esposito, then Don Martin, Thomas Texas Wilson.

Ms. Esposito stated thank you. Jennifer Esposito, 3211 East Snavely, Kingman. As luck would have it, I happened to find this lovely meme on the internet. So, if you don't know what a photovoltaic farm looks like, there you go. That's what a photovoltaic farm looks like. And what was best about this meme was what it said on the top. That's why I saved it. It said nothing about this looks like it is saving the environment. It looks like clearing the land and covering the

environment in a corporate product. And that's basically what it is. I mean, I don't see how the community benefits from this. We put a solar moratorium on for, what, six months. And then we said, no, no, you, you can only do this kind of stuff in certain zoning. So, now everyone's going to say, oh, but now we want that zoning, right? I mean, that was the obvious conclusion to the previous Board actions. And, while I am a huge proponent of property rights, there seems to be a grievous misunderstanding about what property rights are. Everyone says, well, I have property rights, I could do it, I want to do anything I want to my property, that's property rights. No, property rights means, you have all the rights that came with your property, with the zoning it had when you bought it. If you, if that's not how it worked, there'd be no need for general plans and requests for rezones and all this other stuff. You have the property rights for the property as you bought it. Now, this Board seems to have made a statement on, you know, these types of projects and being only in a certain type of zoning. And as we previously discussed, once you change zoning, that opens that property up to a variety of uses under that zoning. And as Mr. Holtry reaffirmed what I said on the previous project, oh, well, all that other stuff comes later. You just get the rezone, because that's how it works here. Give us the rezone. We'll give you the details later. Okay, that's a process problem that this county has, but even Planning and Zoning, who gets it wrong, a lot, apparently recommended unanimously that this was a no on this project. And I don't mean any disrespect to the family, but green energy isn't green, no matter what the name of the company wants to call itself, and you don't know where this power is going to go. Oh, we can hook it to the Peacock Station, but where's it go from there? So, again, if you, if you give in on this one, it makes you look extremely disingenuous on the moratorium and the amendment to the County plan that you made that said that you were going to limit these types of projects to very tiny, little pre-approved areas. So, are you going to give me something else to write about tonight or not? Just curious. Thanks.

Chairman Angius stated Don Martin, Thomas Texas Wilson, and then Alexzandra, Limus, Limes.

Don Martin, Kingman resident, stated good afternoon, Chairman and Supervisors. I'm Don Martin. I live in Kingman, but I probably, this particular deal hits me really close to home, because I've been here for 50 years, and I've recreated on that area over there that they're proposing to put in, and I knew Bill Blake. I knew him, and I have condolences for the family. He's a super guy, and I really wonder, and it saddens me that we're losing another Mohave County cattle family that's been here for a long, long time and done so much for our county. But as, as I've gone on record before, I am totally, absolutely against solar projects in Mohave County. Once they are established, it's going to be like a domino. It's going to start falling left and right. And we know, we know what's going to happen when you put solar out there, it destroys the landscape. Like I said, I've recreated out there for 50 years. I've seen elk, deer, javelina, antelope, I've seen all this stuff that's out there, and I've enjoyed recreating out there in the past. And I know things change, but this is something that is, while it says it's not permanent, it is permanent. When you scrape that land off, and you take two and a half miles of beautiful country, and you turn it into a solar farm out there nothing, nothing that has been there for the last hundreds of years is going to be there. They're gone. They're

eliminated forever. And, and like I say, I wish there was something else. This is really hard for me, because I, I empathize with the family I truly do, and, and I wish they could do something else, but I cannot in good conscience, because I've said it before, I will fight every solar project that they want to put on our lands, but this is private lands, and I get that. And that's why it's so tough for me personally. If this was public lands, I'd be going berserk, but I understand they have a right to do what they want to do, but I just wanted to go on record to saying, I don't support these huge solar projects on land in Mohave County, and it's going to create a blight out there that will change the east side of the Peacock mountains forever. And it's not something I don't, that I personally don't think Bill Blake would like to know that his land that he worked on so long is being used in that manner. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, Don. Thomas Texas Wilson, Alexzandra Limes, and Susan Tatter. Oh, okay, thank you. And you are Alexandra? Oh, okay, great. And so, same thing with Thomas Texas, Wilson, is he here? Okay. Perry Griffin, did, great, thank you. And Judy Jordan. Okay, come on down.

Judy Jordan, Kingman resident, stated I just, my name is Judy Jordan, and I live at 10690 East Austin Loop. I had moved out there two years ago from Lake Havasu. And just as a little side note, I love Kingman. I was one of those Havasuans that, Kingman, I wouldn't live in Kingman. I love Kingman. So, anyway, just to let you know. But this is, I just want to real quickly show you something. This is what is going to hurt a lot of things. Can you see that on my phone? Will you be able to get that? This, these are deer that come up at night to drink water. And, you know, I think about all those petals out there. And this is just a little bit, we have javelina that come up and all kinds of things. I just wanted to say, I have never been one of those Greenpeace people that's go, you know, I got tree hugger, I gotta save the trees, but all of a sudden, it's in my backyard, and it's like, solar is great. I have nothing against solar, I just don't want it my backyard. Not only that, my son, that had to leave, James Jordan, he just bought 40 acres that this, that's right in the corner, it's going to be surrounded on two sides. He signed the final papers. The next day, the signs went up. So, you know, there's a lot, but we want to make our family home out there. And my oldest son is going to buy land out there. My other, I have four sons. Three of my sons are going to be living out there. And I just want to say, I hope you really think about everything else, other than just people making money. And I'm not against money, but thank you.

Chairman Angius stated Kristy Erny.

Kristy Erny, Kingman resident stated hello, Kristy Erny. I live at 3065 North Stephan Road. Okay. Excuse me, I'm nervous, okay. First of all, I just want to say, it sounds really funny that you would, anyone would want to put a solar farm right in the middle of a mountain range, a ranch, and a neighborhood; and that's where we live, in the middle of a mountain range. It is, they were talking about the amount, it's over 2,000 acres, just shy of 1 million solar panels, is what I've been told is going to go up there. They're ugly. They're black, they're nasty looking. They mar the beauty of the, the high desert landscape. They devalue our home values, our property values. They disrupt

the local wildlife habitats and migration routes. They drastically alter the, they drastically alter the ecosystem by increasing rainfall and amplifying the effects of erosion. The fire hazard is real. We don't have a fire department out there. If a fire breaks out, we're in trouble. You know, it goes quick out there, and the wind is crazy so it can eat us up, puts us in danger. The batteries, my husband spoke on they're, they need to be cooled. This company says that they're not going to use any water except what they have brought in to clean the panels. Well, they're going to have to cool though, have a cooling system for those batteries. Only way I know to cool things, uses water. They say that they're not going to drill wells. Maybe not now, but in the future, after they get everything, they'll do what they want. As far as the panels being solar, being solar friendly, there are many things about them. There is, I'm going to read from my phone, okay, so I don't mess this up. Okay, okay. Stafford magazine also points out that solar energy has a higher carbon footprint than wind and nuclear. Ray Wise, a professor, geochemistry at the Scripps Institute, oceanographer, Institute of Oceanography, explains that a number of solar panels release nitrogen trifluoride. It's called NF<sub>3</sub>. The chemical compound is 17,000 times worse than carbon dioxide. So, it's not, not, not as good as they say it is, as far as being friendly to the environment. Okay, thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, is there anyone who wishes to speak for or against while we're still in the public hearing? Oh, okay, come on down. Just give your name and address, please.

Rick Raber, Kingman resident, stated so, my name is Rick Raber, and I live at 11750 Blake Ranch Road, on the other side of the freeway from the Blake family. And we buy our water from you guys, you know, and they have a great reputation and all that. But we also purchased this land for, for its ranch environment. My mother has a house, same thing, out there on, on their side of the freeway. We just talked our cousins, or they asked us, and we found land for them right where this is going on, and they just bought 40 acres out there too, and are excited about moving out here. I don't know how to explain to them that a solar farm is going to be built. Anyway, we're very grateful to the Blake family, but to, to say, in this solar farm, well, don't worry, we're going to let everybody still ride their horses and all this stuff. I don't know anybody that wants to go for a horseback ride along a solar farm or even along a road that borders a solar farm. I drove to Vegas for a year, and they have solar farms out the bazoo out there, but they're all out. None of them are in Vegas or even in Henderson. They're out, way out in the middle of nowhere. They have great big solar farms. Well, now we have one in our own neighborhood. So, anyway, that's all I wanted to say.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much.

Demaris Raber, Kingman resident, stated I wasn't prepared to speak, but I feel like I have to. Demaris Raber, 11750 East Blake Ranch Road, that was my husband. Few other things that are really important. Okay, we all moved out there because of the beauty. You wake up every morning, you hear the birds singing. You see, there is some javelina. You see lots of deer; this year we've

had more deer than ever. I can't imagine what you, they're thinking is going to happen to the wildlife out there. We're not talking, all morning we've been listening and it's you know 200 acres, 193 acres of what's going to happen. We're talking over 2,200 acres. What is going to happen to this wildlife? You're going to take away, not just our livelihood, of why we all moved out there, our kids, our grandkids. We all plan on being there forever. And most people are like, man, it's right in my own backyard. You know what? My house faces the other way, so this is my front yard that I'm going to look at. The mountains, and the greenery we see every morning is going to be gone, and the devastation I can't even imagine what is really going to happen to all this wildlife, but there has to be a lot more talk about this than somebody just making some money. My condolences to the Blake family.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, sir.

Quinn Halter, Kingman landowner, stated Quinn Halter, 622 Windy Canyon Road. I'm a land surveyor. I've surveyed a lot of these solar sites in Nevada, and they minimize, they say, well, we're not going to do this, we're not going to do that, because we want to minimize the environmental impact. And I can tell you right now, that's all shenanigans. They decimate it before they even start driving the posts in the ground to put the solar panels up. Everything's gone. Everything is just dust and dirt, because that was the whole spiel when we started it. Oh, this is green. We don't grub the land. We just drive the post right into the raw land. Don't hurt nothing. And I'm telling you right now, I wish I had pictures of the sites I've been on, and then I also live in Boulder City, while I build my house out here, and they put one, a solar plant just outside of Boulder City, and they said the same thing. Well, we're not going to do this and that because minimize the environmental impact. Every time the wind blows, drive through Boulder City and tell me it's, it's good to breathe that air. It is so nasty, and it's like clockwork, soon as that wind kicks up, because they don't water it, they don't plant vegetation, they don't do anything to minimize the impact, or to minimize the impact. They don't do anything. And so, for years, because the, the panels block the rain so you don't build that crust that naturally would form when it does rain. And anyways, hope you come in with the right, come up with the right decision.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Did you give your name and your address? I'm sorry.

Mr. Halter stated yeah, Quinn Halter, 622 Windy Canyon.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, anyone else? Okay?

Drew Price, Kingman resident, stated yes, ma'am. Drew Price 11420 East Austin Way, Kingman, Arizona. The transmission lines go across about 20 acres of my property out there, and I've had it since '96. That land is good for nothing but wildlife. That's all it's good for. When the rains come, all the roads that Mr. Blake and all put in years ago, most of them are washed out because they're not maintained. The County don't maintain, the County will maintain a road that was put in properly. Unfortunately, years ago, in the '60's, when they first started selling these properties out there, they never, only maintaining they do is when the road gets so dang bad they can't get to their

corrals, that's it. That's it. As far as, they leasing the land now, as a cattle, they make Blake's cattle out there, their cattle, but it's cattle. They're still roaming out there, but it's they're leasing it to other ranchers. So, it's still a business, and they've still got all that land. But an environmental impact study would have squashed this right off the get go, right off the get go, because that land is nothing but mountainous washes, 15, 20-foot junipers and palo christi's and nothing but wildlife. That's, you can't farm that land out there. So, it's got to be a no, please.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, I know you want, you're the with the applicant, correct? So, we're going to close the public hearing and then call you up for questions. Okay. So, I am going to close this call to public. Does anybody want to hear from the applicant?

Supervisor Bishop stated public hearing.

Chairman Angius stated I closed, oh, did I say call to public again, it's getting late, public hearing.

### **Chairman Angius Closed the Public Hearing.**

Supervisor Bishop stated I would like to hear more from the applicant.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Audrey Copeland, Head of Development, Mission Clean Energy, stated My name is Audrey, I'm the Head of Development at Mission Clean Energy. Can you guys all hear me?

Chairman Angius stated yeah.

Ms. Copeland stated first, I know it's been a really long day for the Supervisors here, so we are going to try and kind of keep things tidy and brief, but also make sure that we convey all the factual information. I wrote down a little bit of a list here. I've heard from the family and heard from some of the folks today that there's a sentiment that Mr. Blake Cattle only entered into this. Mr. Blake, when you know this happened after he had passed away, and that is simply not true. We've been working with the, with him since 2023. So, we did want to clear that up. We know that's important to the family, and this is a project that he had, was interested in. He had been looking at different uses of this land. He'd been thinking about what he can do longer term. Another point that was raised was around bulldozing the land. I think at the Planning Commission, it was incorrectly stated that we were going to bulldoze the land, that is not true. The technology that is utilized today, and this technology has improved over time, so Supervisors, you must keep in mind what was done five years ago, possibly for installations that you see operating today, has changed. The technology that we use is a terrain following tracker. So, it follows the terrain. We do not grub the site. We only do that where we're going to put piles. We do have to establish roads to access the site. There is an existing road. We will improve that road. We are going to invest in improving that road, and then we're going to follow the natural terrain and topography. Do you want to, see where the deck is, I'll show a picture. He can bring up some pictures here in a second. So, because we don't actually, you know, flatten the site, as was mentioned, the hydrology will stay as it is. We're not changing the topography, and that allows the water in a storm event to move as it would

normally move across the site. There are scours on the site. There is evidence that when it rains here, as I would imagine, it rains really hard, and water is going to flow, and it will flow across the modules, under the modules, and across the site. Another, could you go to the terrain following trackers slide? Let's see. So, it's going to take a second to load. Looks like there's a little bit of a delay. But just wanted to share an image. So, this is the current technology. And again, this is not how solar installations were done five years ago, eight years ago.

Chairman Angius stated excuse me, please. Got to be respectful.

Ms. Copeland stated I used to, when I started in this industry, it used to be for trackers that you would have to flatten the site. And it was a really exciting day when the first terrain following tracker came out, because that meant we could look at other locations that aren't pancake flat for the installation of these projects. Another kind of point going to the site layout, we are going to kind of box in the portions of the site that are, in a minute here, so in this slide, you can see here that we have sections of arrays, so you have this north, south line that's here. That's the existing transmission corridor that exists there. We don't actually have rights to that transmission corridor, that's owned and operated by the utility, that will remain available for whatever use folks are doing today that is, I suppose, overseen by the utility. And then within these array segments, we're going to fence them off to allow for free flow of folks through this, the property area. So, that is something that we can help and work with the landowner here to, to help maintain some of that. It is worth noting, it is their private property. I've heard a few mentions today of folks sort of referring to it as a recreational area. We understand that the utility line, and we won't be standing in the way of that, but it is worth noting that it is their private property. It does sound that they, like the family, has been very gracious in creating access and space to the community. Another comment made here was sort of on fire. We will address that with, we have a consultant here, we, we take that very seriously. We did talk to Pinion Fire service, and the fire chief was really excited about a guaranteed services contract, where we would guarantee service to our site, which would also have some tangential benefits to the local community. We understand today, from the fire chief that this area is actually not covered under the fire district. There's been some comments today about local power, and what is local power. Every electron that's generated here goes straight onto the transmission system. The transmission system is connected to the distribution system, so that's the lower voltage lines that run throughout your neighborhoods, and that every electron that's generated here is used as it is consumed in route by the various loads that exist in the pathway. So, from here, this power goes to a part of the county, where it then steps down to a lower voltage, some of that power, and is utilized locally in some of the communities. Mohave Electric and Unisource and others that are utilizing power, purchase their power from various projects locally, and more broadly, in Arizona and even potentially from California, although I'd have to kind of look into that. But just noting that power contracts are a little bit separate from where power generation goes as it is utilized in real time. Another comment was lighting. So, when we do these projects, we think carefully about lighting. We do not want to have 24/7 light, lights on all night. We, in these kinds of communities, we put in light that has very low kind of impact, and we put it



at just the perimeters of the fencing for security. So, we have special lighting. We think about the wildlife, we don't want it kind of going off all night, and we certainly aren't leaving on lights all night. That's part of, kind of the later building permit process. I think those were most of the points here. I think another comment was environmental studies, because this substation is owned by WAPA, which is a federal entity, we would eventually go through the full NEPA environmental process, if we were successful with this project. That is a very rigorous process where we would be doing additional studies, wildlife monitoring, mitigation plans, thinking about how and when we are constructing the project, thinking about the nesting season for various species. So, I think that covered a lot of it. I know you guys are looking a little tired there. It's been a long day.

Chairman Angius stated let's see if anyone has questions.

Ms. Copeland stated questions, yeah.

Chairman Angius stated anybody have questions for the applicant? Did you, Supervisor Bishop?

Supervisor Bishop stated I have a few questions.

Ms. Copeland stated sure.

Supervisor Bishop stated you say that your company will improve six and a half miles of roads from I-40 to the proposed site. What does that entail? I mean, because.

Ms. Copeland stated yeah.

Supervisor Bishop stated part of it is already a paved road, County maintained, and I think Stephan is partially, partially maintained.

Ms. Copeland stated yeah, you're correct. The first part of this road. If you can go back one slide there, Peter, is, is paved. We would start at where the unpaved portion of the road begins, which is a very short distance up this road. And then the improvement we're talking about, we're not going to be putting in a full paved road. We're going to put in, on the next slide is a good visual of this. We're going to do some grading. We noticed as we were driving, our engineer was here a few weeks ago, a month ago, that there, the road in some areas is just, really just, you can barely get by it. So, we'd have to do a little bit of grading to improve that, and then we would do gravel and compaction. All of this would obviously be at the County's approval and discretion. Right?

Supervisor Bishop stated right.

Ms. Copeland stated so this is not a private road, it's public road, but it is something that we need for our project, and we think does have tangential benefits to the community. Not all development comes with everything is, you know, not going to help. This is something that we would do, and we would also be maintaining it because we need it maintained for our future access. In order to have this project here, we have to have the ability to have the access, the emergency access, the fire access, the safety and so, we have to continue to maintain this road. This would obviously be part of our agreement with the local fire service in the area.

Supervisor Bishop stated so, most of this road that you would be upgrading, once you get past Stephan or partially up Stephan it turns into a two-track road. It's very rocky, sharp rocks. I wasn't sure I was going to make it out of there without changing a tire or two,

Ms. Copeland stated is the presentation showing?

Supervisor Bishop stated so do you intend to widen it to a two-lane dirt road and haul in gravel?

Ms. Copeland stated so, we're going to, we're going to have to potentially widen the road a tiny bit. We'll have to get into the details there, but it'll look pretty similar. The width of the road as it is today, is sufficient for our use. There's a couple portions of the road, again, according to the engineer that was just here, that are really going to be hard to navigate. Right? So, we'll have to flatten and grade those.

Supervisor Bishop stated are you putting in culverts? Or do you have any idea how?

Ms. Copeland stated yeah, so we would, there are some areas where water flows across the road really quickly. We're going to have to put in some kind of features around that, and so on this right-hand side, you can see an example of what that would look like. I don't think you're seeing the slide deck, actually, if anyone can show it.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, and then.

Ms. Copeland stated ah, there you go. So, the right-hand side here, if that shows up on your screen.

Supervisor Bishop stated that's very nice.

Ms. Copeland stated yeah.

Supervisor Bishop stated yeah. So, once the construction is completed, and then you're in the maintenance phase of this project, how often would you maintain the roads that you've improved?

Ms. Copeland stated so we would need to provide them, maintain them in a state that they could be navigated by a fire truck at any point in time. So, in terms of the exact maintenance schedule, I don't have that fully written out. I imagine this road is going to require fairly regular maintenance in order to maintain it with the kind of rains that happen in the area.

Supervisor Angius stated okay, which brings me to my next question, the battery storage. Where is that located on the?

Ms. Copeland stated in the site, it'll be right next to the Peacock Substation. So, we will locate our project substation next to the Peacock Substation, and then we'll step it up into the Peacock Substation grid infrastructure. So, you can't really see it super well here, but it's in the bottom left, just north of the Peacock Substation.

Supervisor Bishop stated so the terrain there is pretty, pretty low vegetation. There's not a lot of the larger trees there that everybody is concerned about.

Ms. Copeland stated this is a preliminary layout.

Supervisor Bishop stated there's tons of trees, but they're smaller trees. They're not the big, beautiful, historic trees.

Ms. Copeland stated as a solar developer, we don't like to remove trees, because it costs a lot of money to remove trees and stump them. You have to take out the full root system. So, we try and move around on sites topography, so we're staying out of some of the higher topography areas. And then in terms of the final location, we'll do a tree survey, and we'll site around that in terms of our final kind of project substation and battery location.

Supervisor Bishop stated so that's the case in the entire acreage, if there's.

Ms. Copeland stated we're going to end up doing a tree survey, and then figuring out our plan from there and how we construct the site.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, that's good to know. The battery storage area, will it be contained in with, with a block wall, or how do you secure those batteries and keep them, if a fire or an explosion happens to contain.

Ms. Copeland stated yeah, so there, I'm going to cede the floor to our fire expert, who works on battery projects all over the country, and he can introduce himself, but I'll give you a short brief answer, and he can give a few more details. We'll keep it brief, but essentially, the batteries are contained in metal containers. They look very much like shipping containers is sort of the form factor in both height and length. And if a battery fire were to occur, which is rare, they are, they burn within their metal enclosure. And they're designed with setbacks between the enclosures to keep that to just that one location. And I think Brian can tell you a little bit more on the batteries, and then I can get up for any other questions that you all have.

Supervisor Bishop stated thank you, Audrey.

Ms. Copeland stated yeah, thank you. Thank you, Supervisors.

Brian Scholl, Battery Safety, Energy Safety Response Group, stated thank you, Madam Chair, Supervisors. So, my name is Brian Scholl, excuse me, I have 23 years in the fire service, and I work for a company called Energy Safety Response Group. We're a group of fire service professionals that help with safety planning and training. So, like they said, these batteries are basically a cabinet. And they're highly tested and highly regulated, meaning that they go through rigorous, full-scale fire testing to make sure they don't propagate, meaning they don't go cell to cell, module to module and cabinet to cabinet. And if they don't do that, then they get listed. All these buyers will be listed, which means they won't propagate. And that's the idea behind these. And I'm the one that also gave training to the, Chief Jackson, earlier, I think it was on Halloween, and I'm also the one that will be up here doing all the training to get those guys ready.

Supervisor Bishop stated so you'd be doing the training for Pinion Pines Fire Department?

Mr. Scholl stated yes, ma'am.

Supervisor Bishop stated who would be the responding fire department and the one that, that they will have an agreement with?

Mr. Scholl stated yes, ma'am.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay. As far as the solar panels exploding, I've heard that mentioned, is, does that happen? And when it does happen, what's the response?

Mr. Scholl stated Supervisor, I have never heard of solar panels exploding. When I do my training on solar panels, if one does have an electrical short or some sort of fire, the idea is to let that single panel kind of consume itself, and then we'll protect exposures. But I've never heard of a solar panel exploding.

Supervisor Bishop stated I hadn't either, but it was brought up, so I thought I'd clarify that. Okay, with, with the potential for any kind of a fire, whether it's lightning or an electrical or whatever, there seems to be only one way into this solar project and one way out. Is there, is that correct, or is there an alternative way to exit that area, should there be a fire?

Ms. Copeland stated we haven't gotten to the stage of the development process with sort of the building permits and fire department engagement that would normally come on alternative access routes. We have projects where only one site access is required of similar scale, by those particular counties. Here, I think we would work on alternative routes. One of those routes would be potentially, there's a road that runs to the east that is on Arizona State Land Department Road route. We've worked with Arizona State Land on other projects, and so we would engage them around that particular road access. Again, it's probably mutually beneficial, because we'd be maintaining that road, and that road already runs all the way to the site. And I don't know if you've got, is that the road? Is there another road? Yeah, yeah.

Mr. Christopherson stated I mean, everybody that lives out there would tell you it's extremely rough, but it does go across and into Hackberry, Hackberry Road.

Ms. Copeland stated so, I think this particular topic of the fire access routes, we would work out with the fire department. In this case, it's Pinion that oversees this particular area. And so, if they required a second route, there's ways to make that happen.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, we talked about the vegetation.

Ms. Copeland stated yeah.

Supervisor Bishop stated and it's pretty sparse in that area where the battery storage will be, that could be debated, but I've been out there, and I have property out there, so I kind of know a little bit about the area. There are some areas on the western part of, of the land that we're talking about that's absolutely gorgeous, and they have older mature junipers and pinion pines. What are your

thoughts on, on that part of the western area, on, on the vegetation, and how will you do the higher slopes when it, when it comes to the installation of the panels?

Ms. Copeland stated yeah, so the layout of the site is very much built around the topography. So, as you move west on this property, you get to much higher sloped areas. Those were areas that we ruled out early on as being suitable. So, the areas that you're left with, it's a little hard to kind of, without looking exactly on the map. We're not building on the topography areas, and that tends to be where some of those larger trees tend to go and like to grow. So, that is the short answer without, kind of, you know, looking at a map together, it would be hard to say with absolute clarity. If it's a big enough tree, we're probably not going to remove it. It depends. So, I think again, we're working around the natural landscape and the topography. So those trees tend to seek sort of that higher elevation, and then you have the smaller vegetation in the flat areas.

Supervisor Bishop stated so, the visual that I'm getting, and please correct me if I'm wrong. Is I'm seeing the larger, more beautiful areas not being disturbed so much because they're on higher slopes, and then probably bulldozing a lot of the high chaparral areas and the smaller trees. And then solar panels being installed, and then replanting vegetation?

Ms. Copeland stated yeah, so we would.

Supervisor Bishop stated what kind of vegetation would you replant?

Ms. Copeland stated we would, we, so if we are, so, I think there's a few questions in there, kind of breaking them down, no, it's great. I think one of them is, what would we do with the existing site? We try to minimize the amount of vegetation that we are removing. So, there will be some of that in order to put in the posts that house the modules. Right? From there we would work on, we can work on a vegetation plan. That's a common thing we do in terms of replanting vegetation around the exterior, maybe in areas that that have, that have, you know, less vegetation today. So, our goal is to minimize the amount of land disturbing work that we do. It is for in the environment at sort of a principled level, it'll be covered under NEPA, but also just from a cost and practical level. Right? Every big tree that we pull out, every inch that we grade, is, it adds cost to the project, and so the terrain following trackers are really important technology in terms of keeping, keep making these projects economical. So, there is an incentive also to not disturb higher sloped areas and things like that, yeah.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, and then I guess my final question is, what is the decommissioning plan? I mean, you're leasing this property for 30, 40, years, but what happens at the end of the lifespan?

Ms. Copeland stated great question.

Supervisor Bishop stated when you give the property back to the Blake family?

Ms. Copeland stated and I think, do we have a slide on decommissioning? So, it's about a six-month process. We remove all of the posts, all of the panels, we remove every little bit of solar

that is on the site, and then we try to return that site as close as possible to the existing kind of look and feel. So, there could be some vegetation, you know, replanting during that time. But remember, once we install the panels, we're not out there clearing underneath the panels. We're doing what's required, sort of minimally, to maintain the site, so the vegetation on the site will, will grow under the panels over that period of time.

Supervisor Bishop stated there's no sterilization of the land that we all?

Ms. Copeland stated we're not, we're not, we're not sterilizing the land. We're leaving the land as much intact. And actually, there's case studies from properties that have been used for farming, so it's a little bit different. But I just want to explain where they see solar as a really great way to regenerate the soil. Because this is, this is a true, a true, I've got, I've got a little bit of a crowd here in the background, but this is actually true, because you let the land go fallow, and during that time period, the land can replenish the nutrients. So, the goal here is not to destroy the landscape. We are putting modules down, there will be, there will be some vegetation that is removed in that process in order to make that happen. And then we are not continuing to clear and grub under those modules, outside of just keeping vegetation to, you know, from growing over those modules for the life of the project.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, well, I'm still pretty undecided in this, but I'm keeping an open mind, because I do have property out there. And I do love the area, and I know we need,

Chairman Angius stated can everyone please keep it down, please?

Supervisor Bishop stated we need alternative energy. We have to have alternative energy. And if we're going to, we're going to be forced to have it, we'd like to have it out away from the population. And I know this is affecting 21 people within a mile, so it's really a hard decision. It's not an easy.

Chairman Angius stated please, everybody had their chance. Please, excuse me. Excuse me. Please.

Supervisor Bishop stated thank you. So, I'm just trying to say, I'm open minded here. I'm listening to the people that live out there, my part time neighbors, and I'm listening to the Blake family, which we've known all of our lives, that live up in this area. We're listening to the professional people, and we're going to make a decision here today. So, I don't know if it's going to be the right or the wrong decision, or one that the majority will agree with or not, but it's a hard job up here. So, we appreciate your understanding and listening to Madam Chair when she tells you to please be quiet. That's all I have.

Chairman Angius stated okay, anyone else? Supervisor Gould, you got anything?

Supervisor Gould stated no.

Chairman Angius stated Supervisor Johnson, you still with us?

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair, I'm here.

Supervisor Bishop stated wake up.

Chairman Angius stated do you have any questions?

Supervisor Johnson stated no, not for not for them, no.

Chairman Angius stated oh, okay. Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Madam Chair, I would have questions for staff, not the applicant.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Okay, if there's nothing else, if we have questions, we'll bring it back.

Ms. Copeland stated okay, thank you for your time.

Chairman Angius stated thank you very much. Okay, let's bring up, staff.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated thank you, Madam Chair, Director Holtry, good afternoon. Could, first and foremost, in reviewing the backup materials, I saw that both staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission are recommending denial. I'm asking to start, if you could explain staff's rationale for recommending denial.

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, Supervisors, staff received this application, and when we looked at it, a lot of times what we look at is the surrounding property, what it's zoned, what the general plan is. In this area, it's completely rural residential. It's a rural development area, and the zoning is the A-R 36 A in most, most parts of it. Our analysis of the property would be that placing a manufactured zoning or a heavy manufacturing or rural manufacturing zoning in this area would be considered spot zoning, because there is no other like uses in the vicinity. That's why we recommended to the Commission that it was not proper for consideration. The Commission followed suit with recommending denial. I think they took in a lot of the comments that were received from the public, but I can't state exactly what their decision was based off of, but they did end up recommending denial, unanimously.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated okay, I've got a question related, related to the revised county ordinance. The moratorium that was temporary eight months, was lifted after we revised the ordinance. And am I mistaken? I thought that there was a provision within that ordinance that basically said that we frowned upon utility-scale projects within a one-mile radius of residential, is that inaccurate?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, Supervisor Lingenfelter, I think we did have a provision in there when we were looking at special use projects or special use permits, because we had both the provision of allowing solar facilities in industrial zone properties, but then we were looking at properties outside of that, doing a special use permit. And there was a provision in there for the one-mile radius. But because we did not adopt the special use permit process, it's only in locations

that are zoned for industrial use. And so, that's why, instead of going for a special use permit, we're requiring them to do a rezone to industrial, and staff was not in support of that.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated so staff, staff was not supportive of that. And then it looks as though the Planning and Zoning Commission was unanimously recommending denial. Is that accurate?

Director Holtry stated correct.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated okay. This is a this is a tough one. My respect and my condolences to the Blake family. They've been in town for a long time, and this is no slight to them. It's tough because Mohave County is very large, and if you'll recall, the reason that we did that temporary moratorium on utility scale projects was because after the Biden's Inflation Reduction Act, we got inundated at the County with these really large utility scale projects on federal land. The County can file to be what's known as a cooperating agency on those projects that are located on federal land. But aside from entering comments, we have very little sway over what the BLM does or what the Biden administration, or whoever is in charge at the time, does on federal lands. So, we know that there's going to be some very large solar and wind projects located on federal property within Mohave County. We don't have really a say in that, besides our cooperating agency comments. And that's where it's tough. I do believe very strongly, I think everybody on this Board believes in private property rights very strongly, and we're guaranteed our private property rights, but I don't think that we're, we're guaranteed zoning determination. And so, that being the case, we know that we're going to have 10s of 1000s of acres of renewable projects on federal land within Mohave County, and this is in my district, District 1. I think that the way that we protect what rural Arizona looks like today, you know, that's how we assure that we know what it's going to look like tomorrow. And so, I can't, I'm not willing to, to vote against the department recommendation or Planning and Zoning on this. Thank you. That's, that's all my questions.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated thank you, Madam Chair. Mohave County is facing an energy shortage. Right now, Unisource can only provide 10 megawatts if we need power, and that's not giving us what we need at all. We've got over close to 1000 megawatts of needs right now. While I'm not a solar proponent, if this plant, if this facility, goes through, it puts that much more power onto the grid that hopefully Unisource or MEC could buy at a cheaper rate. It saves the MEC people. It saves me as a Unisource customer, from paying the 15% of what it would have cost them to build it. Looking at their plan, I believe it minimizes any kind of terrible footprint on the property. I understand what Supervisor Lingenfelter saying. These people own 1000s of acres, and I'm listening to people come up that are against it, saying, well, we like to use their land for free. These people pay their taxes on their land. The Blake family say, well, I'll still give you access to my land, which I wouldn't do if I was the Blakes, I mean, it's my land, I pay for it. Anybody who's ever owned a piece of land knows that all the people that live in some little residential things seem to think they own, or they have the right to go on your property. I believe this is a good project. It's located right by that, that station that makes sense. I'm in support of it. Thank you.



Chairman Angius stated okay, thank you very much, Supervisor Johnson. Any other questions from the Board? Okay, then, if there's nothing else, I'll need a motion.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated let's see, I'll make a motion, deny the adoption of BOS resolution number 2024-218, in compliance with the recommendations from staff and the PNZ Commission.

Chairman Angius stated okay, we have a motion. Do I hear a second? Well, I'll second it. Alright. So, we have a motion and second, let's have a roll call supervisor.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated yes.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Angius?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated no.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Bishop?

Supervisor Bishop stated let me have a minute here to think, this is a tough one. I agree with Supervisor Johnson. We need the energy, it's a perfect location, except for the visual. I'm, I'm not, I am happy with the extension of the buffer zone for a quarter of a mile from the residential areas. I'm, I'm going to vote no.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Gould?

Supervisor Gould stated no.

Clerk Skubal stated no passes, 3-2.

Chairman Angius stated okay, so we're going to need another motion. So, what we just voted.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated what we just voted down was the denial of the zoning.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Johnson stated motion to approve.

Chairman Angius stated I need a second.

Supervisor Bishop stated second.

Chairman Angius stated we have a motion second, roll call.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Lingenfelter?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated no.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Angius?

Chairman Angius stated no.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Johnson?

Supervisor Johnson stated yes.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Bishop?

Supervisor Bishop stated yes.

Clerk Skubal stated Supervisor Gould?

Supervisor Gould stated yes.

Clerk Skubal stated it passes, 3-2.

**Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Bishop to approve the adoption of BOS Resolution 2024-218. Motion carried 3-2 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting no; Chairman Angius voting no; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.**

Chairman Angius stated okay, all right, everybody again, thank you very, very much for coming, coming by. So, did you understand? Did you understand what happened? I'm, excuse, listen, listen. Can we, do we have sheriffs in here? Do we have sheriffs? Excuse me, I need. I thought the sheriff was going to be here. We don't have one sheriff's deputy here?

---

Chairman Angius stated we still have a meeting. Believe it or not, we're still going. We're on Item 35.

**ITEM 35. Open Public Hearing:** Discussion and possible action RE: Approve the adoption of Mohave County Ordinance No. 2024-13 – An AMENDMENT TO THE MOHAVE COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE sections to allow six (6) or more chickens as an accessory use for a residence to be in compliance with the newly revised Arizona statute. **(Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote)**

Chairman Angius stated and I'm going to open the public hearing.

### **Chairman Angius Opened the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated approve the adoption of Mohave County Ordinance number 2024-13, an amendment to the Mohave County zoning ordinance section to allow six or more chickens, back to the chickens, as an accessory use for residents to be in compliance to the newly revised Arizona statute.

Supervisor Bishop stated this is easier.

Chairman Angius stated huh?

Supervisor Bishop stated this one's easier.

Chairman Angius stated this one's a little easier. Commission. Right? Yeah, didn't we do this already? Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote. I do have, alright, I have Scotty McClure, but is he still here? He's not here anymore. Okay, Jennifer Esposito and Jeff Esposito in that order. Alright, not in that order.

Jeff Esposito, Kingman resident, stated I see it's the same old circus. Alright. Well, let's take a look at HB 2325, shall we? The, it reads, a county may not adopt any law, ordinance or other regulation that prohibits a resident of a single-family detached residence on a lot that is one half acre or less in size from keeping fowl in the backyard of their property. That's what it says. Simple, cut and dried. And then it goes on to list eight things that a county may do. Well, this county decided that they're going to may, and Scott Holtry did it, but I believe it was Miss, Miss Wilma Jean Bishop here, because she doesn't like roosters. She thinks we can take our hens for stud service. She said that from the dais. So, out of these eight points that they, the state regulation listed, a couple of them, the county wrote down on their proposal, and we it's, it's simple, keep your chickens, you know, away from the road. Have, have good enclosures, keep it clean. But you know, you take my roosters away. Who's going to protect them? Are you going to come over and protect my roosters? I mean my hens. And then, then you have the gall to, to attempt to limit the number of hens that I can have? Where does it say on HB 2325 to limit the number of chickens? Nowhere. You're proceeding to do something over and above that, that is just ungodly. Take your names off the animal shelter, will you? They don't belong. The, if I can only have six chickens, I'll get maybe two eggs a day. Which, which, that's insane? Why have chickens? Do not limit the chickens. Do not take the roosters away, send them to Wilma Jean Bishop, if we do, we'll send them to her house, along with the illegals too.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Jennifer Esposito.

Ms. Esposito stated thank you, Jennifer Esposito, address on record over and over and over again. Okay, so here's the deal, on the last go around, on the chicken thing, I explained to you that our continuing resolutions for the original Butler subdivision show in our title insurance that poultry, not chickens, poultry are grandfathered in. Alright? So, if you decide you want to ban roosters, you're making me think that I should just open a rooster rescue. I don't know how many I can fit

on a 1200 square foot lot, but maybe I can make rooster condominiums or something and take all the roosters to Butler where you really can't touch them, because we're grandfathered in. Alright? Now, the problem that you have with this, as my husband did point out, is that roosters protect the hens from chicken hawks, and from owls and things like that. They really do. But what we're not talking about is chickens in the city. We're talking about unincorporated Mohave County, and so because there's nothing in this state statute retroactive, every single person that has a chicken or a rooster right now, if you are to enact this as it's written, would be also grandfathered in, then you would find yourselves in the untenable position of psychically knowing who had a chicken today, this morning, or who had a chicken that they acquired this afternoon, whether that chicken was illegal or technically, I guess this would take effect in 30 days or whatever, but you have no way of knowing how many chickens or roosters are allowed under a grandfather clause and how many are. So, then you have to find yourself in the position of, is the County's job in the interest of the taxpayers, counting chickens. I mean, you can't regulate most of what goes on out here. Everybody knows everything is complaint driven. And we've done, we've actually made some progress in, in scaling back wasteful expeditions into the rural areas for frivolous complaints and whatnot. So, is your job going to be counting chickens? Because if it is, then I'm going to suggest to everyone in Mohave County Cluckers, and Kingman Area Homesteaders, and whatever that, they put a nice big sign out front- get a warrant, get a warrant, get a warrant- because you have no business trespassing on somebody's property to count their chickens or their roosters if you have no probable cause that they got them after the enactment of the ordinance. I mean, I shouldn't have to explain this kind of things to you, but apparently, after the rest of the day, I feel compelled that I do. So, what I'm saying is comply with the bare minimum of the state law, nothing more. Leave the roosters alone, because I know I'm not getting rid of roosters. I'm also not going to let you count my chickens without a warrant. Maybe I'll go out and get a few more. How would you know? But the bottom line is, I am legally allowed in the New Butler, in the original Butler subdivision, to have emus, to have ostriches. Okay? And I've told you before, you keep going there. I'll do it, see in court. You know, I'll do that too. Alright, I mean, I'm done with this absurd stuff that keeps coming out of Development Services. You have better things to do. There are serious problems in this County. Stop counting chickens.

Chairman Angius stated anyone else want to speak to item 35? I'm going to close the public hearing. What? Oh, okay, sorry about that. Come on up. Are you going to come up to speak about the 35? Just state your name and address, please.

Imelda, Mohave County resident, stated hi, my name is Imelda. 20 years ago, I'm moving here thinking that everything was going to be smooth, thinking I bought, first of all, I bought, like, from the other side of Oatman, I bought three acres. My dad said, you know what, don't do it. But I say, you know what, I'm gonna do it. I'm gonna risk it. Because everything is going to, don't get me wrong, I don't have nothing against nobody here in this country, but I love Kingman. But sometimes, you know, like Jennifer said, and there was another guy that was still standing at the back. Some people, you can hand them everything in their hand, they don't want to work. So why

are we supposed to be here doing, do everything by ourselves? And who's going to help us? To be honest with you, nobody. We have to do everything on our own, especially, you know, all the projects that's going on right now. Who's doing that? We're the ones that providing everything for everybody. And who's helping us? We're the ones that willing to do the work instead of other people.

Chairman Angius stated excuse me, I don't want to, I really don't want to interrupt you.

Ms. Imelda stated no, no, that's it. That's all I wanted to make that's all I wanted to say.

Chairman Angius stated okay, because this is about the chickens. I think maybe you signed up for calls public, maybe?

Ms. Imelda stated no, no, I signed up for the chickens and from the other one. But I like, I say, you know what? A lot of people, they don't, they're, they don't have no respect, no integrity. But, oh, I wanted to say, you know what, the, they need to, like, stay out of people's like, properties or anything. And there's a way to be nice to people, but if they're not nice to people, who's gonna, who's gonna take care of that? Not us.

Chairman Angius stated alright, ma'am. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Imelda stated that's it. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Okay, anyone else? 35, chickens. Okay, I'm going to close the public hearing.

### **Chairman Angius Closed the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated Scott?

Director Holtry stated Madam Chair, members of the Board. The chicken ordinance is not one that we wanted to bring back. Just a real brief history. When we first brought the chicken ordinance to the Board, we allowed for chickens in you're A-R properties, your larger properties, but the R-O, the higher density properties, like R-O, R-1, did not allow for chickens. So, we were trying to allow for chickens in those areas. We mimicked the city on what they did with a one chicken per 1000 square foot lot size that you had and did not allow for roosters in those areas. In the, the higher, denser, higher density areas. The A-R zone, R-E zone, those still allow for roosters, chickens, emus, whatever you want. This ordinance is coming to you today because a recent bill was passed by the legislature that requires these, a minimum of six chickens. And so, when we passed the ordinance, we said, one for 1000, there are lots in Mohave County that are less than 6000 square foot. And so, it would be contrary to the state statute. And in order to be in compliance with the state statute, we needed to come and revise that to allow for a minimum of six chickens on residential lots, or 1 for every 1000 whatever is greater. And happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Any questions? Yes, please, Supervisor Gould.

Supervisor Gould stated so, Scott, this actually increases the number of chickens that people can keep on small properties.

Director Holtry stated that is correct.

Chairman Angius stated okay, anyone else? Okay, pleasure of the Board?

Supervisor Gould stated motion to approve.

Supervisor Bishop stated second.

Chairman Angius stated motion and second.

**Motion was made by Supervisor Gould and seconded by Supervisor Bishop to approve Item 35. Motion carried 5-0 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting yes; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting yes.**

Chairman Angius stated we did 36 and 37.

**BUSTER JOHNSON, MOHAVE COUNTY SUPERVISOR, DISTRICT 3:**

**ITEM 38. Open Public Hearing:** Discussion and possible action RE: Adoption of BOS Resolution No. 2024-208 – An **AMENDMENT TO THE MOHAVE COUNTY ANIMAL CONTROL ORDINANCE, NO. 2022-04** to include adopting the “criminal negligence” element to the dog biting section of the ordinance.

Chairman Angius stated 38, I'm opening a public hearing.

**Chairman Angius Opened the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated this was brought by District 3, discussion and possible action, adoption of Board Supervisor resolution number 2024-208, an amendment to the Mohave County Animal Control ordinance number 2022-04 to include adopting the criminal negligence element of the dog biting section of the ordinance. Okay, we have a couple of people signed up. They're still here. We've got Jennifer Esposito; I think that's all I have.

Ms. Esposito stated Jennifer Esposito, again. Okay, so as I stated in the past, I was the executive director of legislative affairs for a national dog registry. The reason that I know so much about law and can litigate and pro se is because I spent all my time before Facebook, in Yahoo groups like pet law, talking with lawyers who specialized in dog bites. I did in depth analysis on dog bite statistics, animal behavior, the reasons why dogs bite, which are multi-faceted. The problem that I see here is, in order to be guilty of a crime, you're sort of asking for, like, a mens rea sort of thing, like a guilty mind, like intentionally sick my dog on somebody, right? But then you say, well, criminal negligence. It becomes a really weird gray area trying to decide whether it's criminally

negligent because the, the UPS, driver opened the gate, or granny forgot to shut it tight, or the kid like, like, really, do we not already have statutes that, that properly sort of address this, this situation. It just seems like, you know, a few years ago, I had to point out to you guys, and I was right, that you had an illegal search provision in the animal control ordinance, and you did the right thing then. You repealed the entire ordinance in totality and replaced it with one that mirrored the state code. Then shortly after that, you went back in and carved out an exception for basically one complaining resident downtown who didn't want cows fed and watered or something, and now you're going back in and you're second guessing again, the state law. And which, you know, no offense Mr. Esplin, but better lawyers than you at the Capitol probably weighed in on most of those state statutes. So, all I'm saying is to try and apply a criminal negligence sort of argument to the multitude of reasons of why dogs occasionally act like dogs when we wish they wouldn't, or whatever, it goes way beyond the scope of what causes the problem. I mean, most of the time dogs are repeat offenders of running at large, they're unneutered males, they get away with things time and time again. They decide everything's their territory. You know, there's interspecies aggression, intraspecies aggression, food aggression. There's read Aggression In Dogs by Brenda Aloff. This Board, nobody sitting up here, I guarantee you and I used to wear the suit and let dogs bite me for a living, so I'm going to call myself an expert on this subject, and I'm going to say that none of you are. So, keep it simple stupid and stay with the state law, and don't start trying to go back in and carve out exceptions that go beyond your area of expertise. Alright, I think that what we have is fine, and we don't need to start going in and making all these sorts of things that only complicate our judicial system and clog up the courts and create more problems than they solve. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated okey doke. Anyone else wish to speak? Are you coming down, Armin, about this? Okay?

Mr. Stange stated Armin Stange, Fort Mohave, aka the German. So, you want to criminalize dog biting? What happened to the guy what comes from my property and my dog bites them? That's his problem in my book. When I go out with my dog, I get attacked, my dog protects me. Why criminalize it? That's the perpetrator's fault, not mine. But what you gonna do about it? Honestly, you shouldn't do anything about it. Then the dog was doing his job, but was the dog to protect my property and my person. Thank you.

Chairman Angius stated thank you, Armin. Okay, anything else? I'm going to close the public hearing.

### **Chairman Angius Closed the Public Hearing.**

Chairman Angius stated Supervisor Johnson, you brought this to the Board.

Supervisor Johnson stated yes, I did, ma'am.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Supervisor Johnson stated I'd make a motion to approve, unless anybody has any questions.

Chairman Angius stated okay, anybody have any questions?

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes, Supervisor Lingenfelter.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated perhaps staff or Supervisor Johnson could correct me if I'm wrong. But in my research, Mohave County would be the only county out of the 15 counties that would do this. ARS, 11-1025 basically says we're already a strict liability state. So, you get bit by someone's dog, they're responsible for that already, and I don't see any merit in further criminalizing dog ownership. So, I'm not going to support it.

Chairman Angius stated okay, anyone else? Supervisor Bishop, I know you're a dog lover.

Supervisor Bishop stated I am. So, I think maybe we should look at the ordinance and maybe strengthen the area where we can hold somebody criminally negligent for abuse or neglect more so than dog bites. I mean, there's personal protection dogs that are trained to bite to protect their owner, and there's like, like was mentioned, if someone comes into your yard and gets bit, I don't think they should be held criminally responsible then, because there's, there's no intent. So, yeah, I just think our, our laws when it comes to animal enforcement is these people that abuse their animals or neglect them. I'd like to see stiffer penalties for that. But as far as dog bites, if you can't show criminal intent, I don't, I don't think that's the way.

Chairman Angius stated well, we have a motion on the, the floor.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Johnson stated is Mr. Schoppmann there, or Mr. Smith? Or are they online to go over the problems we're having? Because I think we're off what this is supposed to cure. It was brought to me by the County attorneys, and they're saying where they have people that abuse the system you know, where their dogs are out of control; they're having a hard time getting control of them.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated Chairman,

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated Chairman Angius and Supervisor Johnson, you're correct, and thank you for bringing this, Supervisor Johnson. It was from our office. We've asked Supervisor Johnson to bring this forward. So, a couple things, the Board has already approved a criminal dog biting ordinance, it's already in there. You approved it the last Board meeting, or excuse me, the last time we came we brought this forward. What we're asking is adding to, just changing it so that it's criminal negligence, so that it can be properly prosecuted. That's why we're adding that mens rea element so that, so that it'll be properly prosecuted. It's already on the books. It's already on there, but the ordinance is already there that you guys approved previously. What



has been changing is just, we're saying, acting with criminal negligence, and then defining criminal negligence, which is defined by statute, by state statute. So, you, you've already, you already have on the books a dog biting ordinance, criminal ordinance, you approved at the last Board meeting, or last time we presented this.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Attorney Esplin, can you remember the date that we approved that? Because the only thing I remember setting is a public hearing for this item.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated it was about a year or two ago.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated you don't have to find it now, but if you'd send that to the district office, I would appreciate it.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated sure, I will, yeah.

Supervisor Bishop stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Bishop stated Mr. Esplin, is that the reason why we can't prosecute people fully for abusing animals, neglecting them is that the same?

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated no, we do prosecute for those too. That's a different ordinance, and we do prosecute that. That's an ordinance, it's, it's animal cruelty, and our office prosecutes that. Both the ordinance and also state statute, and we do prosecute for that. And to answer Supervisor Lingenfelter's question, it was June 20<sup>th</sup> of 2022, that's when the, this Board approved the dog biting ordinance. And the one, the statute, the 11-1025 that's for that's for civil liability. And so, what the problem that, that animal control has had for many years is, so someone will, someone will allow their dog to bite somebody else, and we didn't have any criminal charge for that. We had no, no, no crime for that. It was always the civil thing, and nobody would ever be able to take advantage of that. And people would complain about it, and they get frustrated about it. And so that's why this Board approved the criminal part, the criminal ordinance on June 20<sup>th</sup> of 2022. And what we're asking now is to make sure that we can properly prosecute it by adding this mens rea element to it.

Supervisor Bishop so, Mr. Esplin, does that mean that you could be prosecuted if your dog bites somebody on your own, on your own property?

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated if you act with, if the person acts with criminal negligence, if the if the dog owner, with criminal negligence, just allows somebody else to, allows the dog to bite somebody else, then certainly could be prosecuted for it.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay, but not if they jump your fence and come into your backyard?

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated why not? I don't understand. Like, if you, if you have your dog, if you have your dog.

Supervisor Bishop stated if my dog is contained in his own backyard and a perpetrator jumps my fence, comes into my yard and my dog bites him, am I criminally responsible?

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated no, you didn't act with criminal negligence. No, no, no, it's only if you act with criminal negligence. You didn't act with criminal negligence. If you act with criminal negligence and you allow your dog to bite somebody else, and it.

Supervisor Bishop stated so, if I go out there and I say, sick 'em Sam, go bite him, then it's criminal negligence.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated no, it's not saying that either. No, if you're defending yourself, if you're defending your property, there's, there's defenses to criminal charges. I mean, that's basic, you know, criminal laws that you can have a defense. I assault you, but it was in self-defense, that's a defense to that. There are defenses to that. If you used your dog to defend yourself, defend your property, then it's not going to be a criminal offense.

Supervisor Bishop stated okay.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated it's a criminal offense if you act with criminal negligence, if you allowed a dog to bite somebody else. But that's not with criminal negligence. You're protecting yourself. You're protecting your property.

Chairman Angius stated excuse me, we'll ask questions.

Supervisor Gould stated Madam Chairman.

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Gould stated there's a state statute that says you can't be held liable for injuries to somebody in the commission of a criminal act of your home, your property.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated and I'm not saying that you're I'm not.

Supervisor Gould stated I'm not contradicting you.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated thank you.

Supervisor Gould stated I'm just saying that there's, if somebody breaks into your house and they.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated correct.

Supervisor Gould stated something bad happens to them, you can't be held responsible for that because it was in the act, commission of a crime. So, what if you knew your dog would attack people and somebody hopped your fence and they attacked?

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated I still don't think you would rise to level of criminal negligence, because you're taking care of your dog. The dog's in the fence. That's not criminal negligence. Criminal negligence would be, look at the definition of criminal negligence, and if you meet those criteria, then it would be. Let's say, for example, you're out walking around and man, you know that dog's going to go after somebody, and they haven't done anything. They haven't provoked anything. And if you didn't do what you were supposed to do to take care of that dog, then you could be prosecuted for it. Because you didn't take the responsibility.

Chairman Angius stated so, if, let's say you're walking your dog on a leash and dog gets loose, somehow, you're still responsible, if that dog bites somebody, even though there was no intent when you take them out on the leash to take a walk.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated so, so you're, you're still liable under 11-1025, that's the state statute. That's the civil liability, absolutely, but not, not criminally. It's not a criminal offense. You didn't act with criminal negligence. If, if, if the if the leash, if you, if the leash breaks. I mean, you're trying to take care of your dog, your leash breaks, and then it's not criminal negligence.

Chairman Angius stated okay.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes.

Supervisor Johnson stated Madam Chair?

Chairman Angius stated yes, wait, Supervisor Lingenfelter's speaking.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated just one more question for Attorney Esplin, are any of the other 15 counties, have they criminalized this?

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated I don't know, but I would, I would be surprised, I don't think there's any other ones, but I don't know. I haven't looked at it.

Supervisor Lingenfelter stated I've tried to research it, and I couldn't find any of the other of the 14 counties that have criminalized this.

Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Esplin stated and I don't doubt that at all. I don't, I'm not doubting that one bit.

Chairman Angius stated okay. Supervisor Johnson.

Supervisor Johnson stated thank you, Madam Chair, it was explained to me that, you know, there are people who do not control their dogs, and they have violent dogs, and they're getting multiple

times when the dog is attacking people, whether they have it on leash or off leash, it is for those where they can actually do something about it's not for, you know, your dog just happens to, you know, somebody upsets it, or teases it and they bite them, or anything like that. This is for the people that are abusing the safety of everybody else around them. You know, where they have a violent dog and it's attacking people. That's all, thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Okay, we do have a motion on the floor to adopt as written. Do I have a second?

Supervisor Bishop stated second.

Chairman Angius stated we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

**Motion was made by Supervisor Johnson and seconded by Supervisor Bishop to approve Item 38. Motion carried 3-2 with Supervisor Lingenfelter voting no; Chairman Angius voting yes; Supervisor Johnson voting yes; Supervisor Bishop voting yes; and Supervisor Gould voting no.**

Chairman Angius stated alright, I think that is the end of our agenda at 4:30. What's your record.

Supervisor Gould stated like working for a living.

Chairman Angius stated alright, we're going to go to the call to public now.

Supervisor Gould stated get a gold star for making it all the way through.

Chairman Angius stated yeah, yeah. We're doing the call to public now. Wait until you're called, and then we'll do like we've been doing all, all the time, okay.

Supervisor Gould stated we'll roll your time over to the next meeting. How about that?

Chairman Angius stated glad you said that. Alright, so call to the public is, a public body may make an open call to the public during a public meeting subject to reasonable time, place and manner restrictions.

#### **CALL TO THE PUBLIC:**

*Pursuant to ARS 38-431.01(H) a public body may make an open call to the public during a public meeting, subject to reasonable time, place and manner restrictions, to allow individuals to address the public body on any issue within the jurisdiction of the public body. At the conclusion of an open call to the public, individual members of the public body may respond to criticism made by those who have addressed the public body, may ask staff to review a matter or may ask that a matter be put on a future agenda. However, members of the public body shall not discuss or take*

*legal action on matters raised during an open call to the public unless the matters are properly noticed for discussion and legal action.*

Chairman Angius stated and first up, we have Mr. Greg Befort.

Greg Befort, Yucca resident, stated Supervisors, for the record, Greg Befort. I'm a little disappointed Supervisor Angius left as, must be something I said. I'm here to continue my discussion where I left off last time. For those of you that can't put any of this in context, I understand that. Go back and look at my videos on desert sage podcasts, and otherwise you're going to have an emotional and irrational reaction to some of the things that I that I've said here, just like Supervisor Angius does. This is about the resolution that she brought forward. Four of you approved dealing with a lie about the conflict in Israel. I won't go into detail. Go back and watch the history my presentations on that. This is about the Greater Israel project. Read some books, especially history, on the conflict and what's gone on there, and the Zionist agenda for Greater Israel and the map. And where I left off last time was, here's a map of Greater Israel. You know, Benjamin Netanyahu sold this at the UN, had people walk out on him, but he sold that. Here's a map from 1800 showing it. Here's a map of the IDF soldier's patch. This has been, this is geopolitical, military and strategic economic interests, which is why that nation state was created. Had nothing to do with God's blessing or the holy land. Had nothing to do with it. You asked yourself, why does this occur? Well, you take a look at the top picture here. This is our Congress giving stand, 50 standing ovations for every lie that Netanyahu told. The bottom picture is the UN, they walked out on him. The international community walked out on him. So, how can that happen? How can this guy be invited to our Congress several times, be allowed to speak, get standing ovations? And I told you before, because AIPAC owns Congress. And it's not just me saying that. Go look at the interview with Tucker Carlson, and the Congressman, with Massie. These people are bought and paid for. And if they're not, they're given the Epstein Mossad intelligence honey pot experience where they're, they're, they're blackmailed and bribed into supporting Israel. Which is why we're giving them billions of dollars. Same thing with the Ukraine agenda. It's a Zionist agenda. Our Congress, there's 37 Jewish members of Congress, 10 senators on the Democrat side, 35 Democrats, and 2 Republicans on Congress side. That's an over representation. These are cabinet level positions in the Biden cabinet, to include the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence; Mayorkas, Alderman, these are cabinet level positions. I'll be back.

Supervisor Bishop stated thank you. The next speaker is Cheryl Hagemyer. This call to the public, we're not giving time to other people. Cheryl, do you want to speak? Hildy's not here, so it's my rules.

Ms. Hagemyer stated of course she's not, because she doesn't want to hear what we have to say. But I would like to just thank Supervisor Ron Gould and Supervisor Travis Lingenfelter for their no vote. Even though we didn't win. It's not over 'til the fat lady sings. And for you and Hildy and

whoever Buster Johnson for selling us out, thank you, Buster. I just want to let you guys know that we will be back.

Supervisor Bishop stated thank you. Jamie Morgan, give your name and address, please.

Ms. Morgan stated my name is Jamie Morgan, and it's 1054, 10554 South Lead Lane, Mohave Valley. Thank you, Ron Gould, for hearing us and backing us, as far as standing behind your constituents, we're grateful for that. Same with Travis. I don't agree with this. I moved to a rural area to be able to have a farm, to be able to see the stars at night, not have excess noise pollution, not have.

Chairman Angius stated we already talked about this. This is a call to public about things that were not on the agenda.

Ms. Morgan stated and this is something that is very important to me, I'm not going to be able to have my agricultural area that I moved to because it's being rezoned. I moved away from the large cities to this area to enjoy the farmland, to enjoy this area. And it's really sad to see that our elected County members, the majority of them, aren't listening to their constituents. You're, you're not listening to us. It, besides the noise and the pollution and all of the things that are going to come with this rezoning.

Chairman Angius stated ma'am, we've already talked about the zoning. I have to stick to our rules. This is a call to public, and it's about something, that we've already.

Ms. Morgan stated isn't this to the public? Am I not the public? Does this not matter to me?

Chairman Angius stated it says that it's only for issues that were not on the agenda. I'm not trying to be mean, but if I let you do it, I have to let everybody do it. We have to stick to the rules.

Ms. Morgan stated okay?

Chairman Angius stated thank you. Is Sharon Haugen still here? Kris Rodarte is not here. Scotty McClure is not here. Carolyn Strecker, is she still here? Armin, you want to come on down? Well, I don't think that's the way it works, but alright. Jeff Esposito. Jennifer Esposito, and then is Diana Francis, here? She left, okay.

Ms. Esposito stated Jennifer Esposito, and unlike Don Martin, I can make it to the end of a long meeting and still have energy to spare. So fine, put the call the public at the end and make me wait, I'm still here. But here's the thing, tomorrow is the most important election of our lifetime. And I don't say that lightly, I really don't, because, you know, I, that's why the front page of my newspaper said- a republic, if we can keep it. So, I wanted to take this opportunity to remind you that if it doesn't go the way the red team wants, that I believe it was four of you with Ron Gould being the only no vote, voted to keep us in the George Soros backed ALEC voter database mess. Okay, so while we have the Trump campaign, vote early; Turning Point USA, vote early. Right? Everybody. G, AZ GOP, vote early. Alright, that's great. Supervisor Lingenfelter, he said, just vote

harder, get more people to the polls. But you know what? All of that is a distraction from voter fraud, because what happens when we outsource our real time voter database to, to east coast companies is that bad actors are looking at that. And they know how many republican ballots have been cast here in ruby red Mohave County. And they're trying to calculate what they can do. Now, if all of you had come to that hand count road show with Mark Cook, it wasn't really about hand counts. It was about the multiple attack vectors on our election system. And people say, like Don Martin, we have no problems here. It's all good. Well, let me tell you, it's not all right. I think some of you might know who Penny Holden is. She bought her house from a democrat over a decade ago. In the last election cycle for president, she started getting absentee ballots for that Democrat. So, she went to the County Recorder, Lydia Durst, and she said, hey, this woman hasn't even lived in Arizona for a decade. Doesn't live at my house, and this woman's name was put on the inactive voting list. I talked to Penny in the last few hours, and she said she got another absentee ballot for the democrat in Mohave County that doesn't live in Arizona and hasn't for a decade. That's because we sell our database to outside, third party actors, and we pay them to do it. We have two counties, they keep that, that data in house, right, I mean, we could do it, but four of you sold us out. Okay? So, if things don't go well, and it's so close, right, everybody's saying it's so close, Arizona is tied. Arizona is maybe a little, we don't know, so close, right, that's plausible deniability for I'm sorry it didn't go the way you wanted. But in reality, you sold us out, and you told them how all of us lined up, rushed to the polls. All the sheep voted early, and now they know. Think about that tonight and say a prayer for this country.

Chairman Angius stated okay, thank you. There's nobody else signed up, so this meeting is.

Mr. Hagemyer stated I signed up.

Chairman Angius stated oh, well, I didn't. Did you? One second, one second.

Mr. Hagemyer stated I wouldn't have stayed here all day.

Chairman Angius stated I was wondering, because I had your thing, and then it was turned over. Okay, sorry about that. It was not on purpose. I have Greg, then Cheryl and Pastor Roy.

Mr. Hagemyer stated alright, you have probably heard the story in the Old Testament of King David and his adulterous affair with Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, the Hittite. And how David tried to cover up this affair with Bathsheba. She was pregnant. What's he do? He kills her husband. In 2 Samuel, chapter 12, the prophet Nathan goes to King David, and he tells him of a man who had a little ewe lamb, a poor man with, that had a family. This little ewe lamb was a member of his family. And this rich man, he had a whole flock of sheep, and he needed to entertain one night, so he went over next door, and he took that little ewe lamb, and he slaughtered it and he served it to his neighbors. And Nathan looked at David, and David goes, that man should die for what he has done. Then the prophet Nathan looked at David in the eye, and he said, you are that man. Hildy, you have pushed to destroy Mohave Valley to give favor to your rich friends at AEPCO and MEC. You are that person. You're willing to sell us out in Mohave County to people that move there for

a reason. And obviously people here just don't care. You just don't care. You're going to destroy my lifestyle. You can destroy my home. You may empty my well. And it's a sad situation. And one more thing, Hildy, shame on you for the way you treated Chairman Tim Williams today. That was absolutely horrible. And by the way, the local MEC customers that are going to get all this power, they're going to pay that \$85 million I can guarantee you, because AEPCO is not going to give it to them for free. And I've been told to let you know that we will see you in court for a very poor, very illegal, horrible decision today.

Chairman Angius stated okay, Cheryl Hagemyer.

Ms. Hagemyer stated up again?

Chairman Angius stated oh, I'm sorry I didn't take. So, is there anyone else who wants to speak?

Ms. Hagemyer stated (inaudible) your name on the power plant?

Chairman Angius stated you know, here's the deal, I vote the way. Oh, we got, oh, I adjourned the meeting. You're lucky. Thank you. Yeah, I'm going to adjourn before I say something that might.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Supervisors this 4<sup>th</sup> day of November 2024, **Chairman Angius adjourned the meeting at 4:51 p.m.**

## MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

---

Hildy Angius, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Laura Skubal, Clerk of the Board