KEARNS WEST

Salt River Project (SRP)
Integrated System Plan Advisory Group

2024 Annual Meeting

Prepared by Kearns & West

Advisory Group – 2024 Annual Meeting Overview

Meeting Objectives

- Share updates since we last met
- Share and discuss progress made towards Integrated System Plan (ISP) Actions
- Share next steps and plans for ISP #2

Topic: ISP Actions Update
Date: October 18, 2024
Time: 12:00 – 4:10 p.m.
Location: Project Administration Building (PAB) – Heritage Center

Please see the appendix for the Advisory Group member roster and attendance information. The meeting agenda and presentation are available at the Integrated System Plan (ISP) portal.

Welcome and Agenda Overview

Advisory Group members began convening for lunch and networking at 12:00 p.m. with the agenda content beginning at 1:00 p.m. Angie Bond-Simpson, Senior Director of Resource Management at SRP, welcomed the Board and Council members, reviewed the meeting objectives and led the group through the Safety & Sustainability Minute (slides 4-6).

Joan Isaacson, facilitator from Kearns & West, reviewed the agenda (slide 7), highlighting that the Advisory Group would hear updates and be able to ask questions about ISP Action Items for resource selection, regional transmission, coal transition, time-of-use programs, customer programs, electric vehicle (EV) management and the distribution enablement roadmap as well as next steps for the ISP. She also previewed the three questions that Advisory Group members would be asked to respond to throughout the meeting, listed below:

1. What excites you about the progress that SRP has made on these Actions?
2. What would you like to see more of, [or] better or different from these Actions' activities?
3. Is there anything that we did not cover regarding these Actions that you would like to discuss?

Joan reminded Advisory Group members about the worksheets they received and noted that they could submit the feedback forms with information for the SRP project team. She introduced the guides for a productive meeting and then invited the Advisory Group members to introduce themselves.

SRP and ISP Action Item Updates

Mary Faulk, Director of Integrated System Planning & Support at SRP, introduced herself and shared an overview of milestones since the last Advisory Group meeting in September 2023 (slide 10). She also shared the March 2024 update to the 2035 Sustainability Goals, which included increased reductions for carbon and water use (slide 11).

Faulk highlighted additional external factors that have changed, such as load growth, peak demand and climate policies (slide 12). Although significant unprecedented growth is being observed, it remains within the upper bounds of the studied scenarios. The forecasted demand is now within about 500 MW of the upper bound studied in the Desert Boom scenario of 12,519 MW by 2035. Faulk also described how SRP has been sharing its methodology for the ISP with industry advisory groups, other utilities and additional external groups.

She explained that strategic approaches have been emerging (slide 13) and that resource plans will be updated, which are important for understanding the ISP Actions. Faulk then gave an overview of the 10 ISP Actions and explained that presenters from SRP would provide updates on recent activities and next steps with opportunities for Q&A.

Resource Selection & Proactive Siting

Grant Smedley, Director of Resource Planning, Acquisition and Development at SRP, presented on ISP Actions related to resource selection and proactive siting (slides 15-16). He described that resource development has been busy with the 2024 All-Source Request for Proposal (RFP) garnering 100 proposals from 40 entities, which is twice the number as in 2023 (slides 17-18). He explained that the focus is now on implementation, highlighting how the Resource Action Plan Summary (slide 19) shows when projects will go online. Given the number of projects, Smedley explained that SRP is becoming more proactive on siting and working on community outreach plans as well as coordinating with the transmission planning team (slide 20).

Q&A

Question: What is the breakdown of SRP-owned generation as compared to third party-owned generation?
Response: The portion of new generation that SRP expects to own is shown in the bottom rows of slide 19. The majority of new generation that SRP is adding will be owned by third parties, given the significant need for capital to build new generation resources and the need to deploy capital for other business needs within SRP.

Question: It seems like there is an uptick in number of developers participating in the RFP process. How many are entities [with which] SRP had a prior relationship as compared to new startups?
Response: To date, we have power purchase agreements and energy storage agreements established with approximately 10 developers. Approximately 40 developers responded to our latest 2024 RFP, and we are starting to diversify relationships.

Question: For future all-source RFPs, can you explain the 975 MW of gas for fiscal year 2035 (slide 19)?
Response: That is a placeholder for a tolling agreement that is expiring.

Question: On the allocation for solar, has SRP set aside anything for the Solar Energy Offering (SEO) program?
Response: We are working to get more solar projects under contract and coordinating closely with SRP's Customer Programs team to understand customer needs.

Question: It's good to see progress made. What if SRP has to go 20% faster? Can that be done?
Response: That was one of the reasons we are pursuing a master partnership for solar to supplement our existing procurement processes. We want to look at options to go faster and we are open to feedback. The supply chain is a challenge – developers are all pulling from the same chain – and we are hoping federal incentives will help provide more options, but we recognize it will take time for the supply chain to ramp up.

Question: For solar siting, are Tribal lands under consideration?
Response: They are not shown on this map, but we are talking to Tribes. The primary reason they aren't shown on the map is that we don't have a lot of transmission on those lands, which creates challenges when looking at solar siting.

Regional Transmission

Justin Lee, Senior Manager for Transmission System Planning at SRP, provided updates on transmission planning (slide 22). He noted that the location of generation matters and that large projects have long timelines. He shared that the GIS tool to narrow down locations is providing important additional information, and that SRP has studies underway – one with consultant E3 – which include efforts to identify locations to add 1000 MW of transmission and ensure transmission from out-of-state wind resources to SRP's service area (slide 23). Lee said that SRP is looking at the best options, actively meeting with developers and considering other utilities' interest in joining. He noted that three studies are on track to conclude at the end of 2024 and another in April 2025.

Q&A

Question: What coordination is happening with other Arizona utilities to avoid siting things in the same places and competing for the same resources?
Response: Transmission involves a lot of coordination. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issued FERC Order 1000, which formed WestConnect for regional planning. In WestConnect, the sub-regional group called Southwest Area Transmission (SWAT) is responsible for building base cases. We meet with Arizona Public Service (APS) and Tucson Electric Power (TEP) to share 6-year and 10-year plans. We build a base case, which is coordinated between APS, TEP and the Western Area Power Administration.

Question: How do we improve reliability? What if a line goes down?
Response: The North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) sets standards for reliability. We do modeling to help maintain reliability. We do an N-1 analysis, then an N-1-1 analysis to be sure we are prepared for two levels of contingency. For real time operations we run a model every five minutes. There are a lot of variables, but our load pocket is condensed and we have high reliability.

Question: On the regional studies, has SRP considered Mexico?
Response: No, we have not. We are looking at where the resources are currently available. That is a good thought.

Question: Are there variables from the 2024 election that could impact outcomes, such as supply chain?
Response: The advantage of working with the resource planning group is that it lets us site earlier so we can start those processes sooner and get the orders in earlier.

Question: Rural small towns in Arizona have solar development activity. Does SRP consider that in its plans and GIS modeling?
Response: We have been meeting with counties, but there is a "chicken and egg" element. Counties are overwhelmed and do not know how to prioritize developer permit applications because they do not know which projects utilities prefer. Utilities will look more favorably at projects that have permits. We are starting to advance conversations with counties to develop potential solutions to this issue.

Coal Transition Action Plan

Smedley provided updates on the Coal Transition Action Plan (slide 25). He explained that SRP has been meeting with a Coal Community Transition (CCT) team of community leaders to provide support with identifying new economic development opportunities to mitigate the impact of coal plant closures. SRP is also considering options for repurposing the Coronado Generating Station and coordinating with the other owners of the Springerville Generating

Station to determine how to meet the final Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) greenhouse gas rules that would require retiring or converting coal generation by the end of 2031 (slide 26). He noted the challenges of losing firm capacity given increases in load.

Discussion

Isaacson invited Advisory Group members to reflect on, and respond to, the three discussion questions below. Members of the ISP project team provided responses.

1. What excites you about the progress that SRP has made on these Actions?
2. What would you like to see more of, [or] better or different from these Actions' activities?
3. Is there anything that we did not cover regarding these Actions that you would like to discuss?

Question: I am interested in learning more about how gas fits into the future resource mix, given concerns about volatility, prices, capacity, imports, etc. I want to understand SRP's thinking on the self-build resources.
Response: SRP updates its Resource Plan on an annual basis, and we are updating this year's plan to reflect some of the coal assumptions we just discussed. To try to fill capacity gaps, the ISP had new gas resources to replace coal resources that are retiring.

Question: In looking at the 2030s, how does technology interplay with future planning? How is innovation captured?
Response: Future resource technology selections are less certain further out in the plan. Everything in the orange (slide 19) has not yet been finalized. As we get closer, we would have greater certainty on the technology options available and we can update the plan as needed.
Response: We do not have the benefit of gradualism anymore. We are seeing the pace of greater load growth and the ISP portfolio that did not allow for firm capacity did not meet requirements for reliability and performance. Pilot projects will give us good learning opportunities that we hope line up to help with resource retirements.

Question: How does cost play into the selection of resources? Some technologies are not ready and some are very expensive.
Question: In the chart on slide 19 the numbers are staggering. How much future load forecast is certain and how much is projected? How is SRP protecting existing customers if load does not materialize and ends up building resources that are not needed?
Response: We want to take initial steps but not go too far too fast. A lot of options in the 2035 timeframe are expensive and we want to make thoughtful decisions. We are studying the certainty for future load needs. We do not want to build a system component that will not be used for the long-term or one that is too expensive.

Response: A lot of the load projections have come in the last 18 months. The projection looks at the phase of development and we are working through a process to understand risk. We expect to have proposals and recommendations by April 2025.

Question: Google and Microsoft are looking at building nuclear resources or using old facilities. Has SRP looked at working with them?
Response: We have a team that follows trends in this area. That is a brand-new development. Some of these technologies are capital intensive and there are some possibilities to partner to protect the cost.
Response: We asked customers directly and did not see interest from them.

Question: How do we invest [in nuclear resources]? Can we get resources to expand beyond the local market?
Response: National companies are more likely to partner with large multi-state utilities first. The ones you have heard about are multi-state companies.
Comment: I would like to have a discussion if it gets to that point.

Question: How does the future potential for a market – day ahead or regional transmission organization (RTO) – play into considerations moving forward?
Response: It is playing in a bit. In an RTO you look at the region more holistically. Right now, we are focused on reliability.

Question: It seems SRP needs help on procurement. Cities have a need for sustainable energy. How can cities partner in this process?
Response: We would welcome conversations with cities. We have talked about a request for information (RFI).

Question: On repurposing of coal plants (slide 25), nuclear was one of the listed alternatives. Has SRP done studies or are there surveys from the public on needs for buffers?
Response: We have not done formal surveys, but we have talked to people and heard both an openness to nuclear and concerns. Site suitability is managed by a subdivision of the Department of Energy. They did a high-level screening for the Coronado Generating Station and so far have not identified significant constraints for that site.

Question: For transmission, will SRP need to shut down lines like Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) in California due to wildfire concerns? With the trend towards decentralization, what happens if houses become 70% self-sustaining or factories produce hundreds of MW?
Response: Regarding wildfire concerns, potential shutdowns depend on the transmission routes. We have existing transmission going through similar areas to those in California that have not needed to be shut down in part due to SRP's strong vegetation management practices that help to mitigate the risk of fire.

Response: On decentralization, anything that customers can do to offset usage will be helpful.

Question: Can there be too much of a self-sustaining buildout?
Response: We try to think about that risk and be at least a bit ahead. If we see a reduction of need we might postpone some development.

Question: The presentations described some of the work between the larger utilities. What about the smaller co-ops in rural areas?
Response: We are working with them because they applied for a grant for rural electric co-operatives that provides funding for zero-carbon resource additions, and they were looking for partners. It will be important for us to partner with other utilities moving forward.

Question: How do gas resources (slide 19) fit with the net zero goal and does that mean SRP is talking about hydrogen?
Response: Those resources are in the plan because we need firm capacity. We do not know if they would convert to hydrogen.
Question: Can the Harquahala tolling agreement be renewed?
Response: It might be, but we will pursue all options.
Question: As we have been seeing with UniSource Electric, the Arizona Corporation Commission is changing how it is dealing with certificates of environmental compatibility and the legislature might be interested in changing rules. Are there things SRP would like to see in new rules? Are there opportunities for advocacy groups?
Response: SRP is aware of the potential changes in rules but is not involved in the advocacy aspect of it. If you are interested, I would suggest you contact the Public Affairs team.

Question: Given how long siting can take, how much mitigation planning has been accomplished in order to stay proactive and keep moving forward?
Response: What we are doing now is a good step. Identifying resources early so we can start the siting processes sooner is important.
Response: We recently reviewed the list of projects that scored highly in our last RFP but could not be delivered due to transmission limits. We identified upgrades that would be needed and are pursuing those.

Residential Time-of-Use Pilot & Time of Use Evolution

Bond-Simpson shared updates on ISP Action Items related to time-of-use plans (slide 30). She described that preliminary findings from the Daytime Saver Pilot launched in May 2023 show customers do respond (slide 31). Next steps for SRP, she explained, are to continue monitoring, look at the potential for a similar price structure for commercial customers and bring a proposal forward for Board approval. Bond-Simpson said the potential is for hundreds of MW of load reduction.

Q&A

Question: Of the 1,000 customers in the Daytime Saver Pilot, how many had solar?
Response: Customers with solar were not involved in the pilot.

Question: Could updated time-of-use programs be incorporated in the pricing process starting next month? If that doesn't happen, then would the pilot be expanded?
Response: Currently, changing those hours in our billing system would be a manual process, which is why there isn't a comprehensive process and proposal immediately rolling out. Communicating to customers when it is beneficial and cost effective to use and conserve energy would happen sooner rather than later.

Question: Will the 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. peak hold? Any time there is a new time-of-use period, it takes a while for people to be educated on the time change and to align their behavior. If the Board is voting, encourage them to lock in the new time-of-use period for a period of time to let people adjust and to prevent confusion.
Response: That is a great comment. The team is evaluating a resource adequacy study that looks at load probability and likely hours.
Question: Are time-of-use rates the default when a new customer connects?
Response: No, they are voluntary.
Question: Is SRP looking at that in the future?
Response: We heard another utility is doing that and are studying the benefit. We are proud that our time-of-use program is voluntary, and people can opt in if it works for them.

Question: Can customers see if time-of-use is best for them based on their consumption?
Response: Today, customers have a 3-month trial period. If they do not want to continue, they opt out and then SRP gives a credit for what they would have paid.
Question: I am exploring this for my organization. Based on historical data can SRP predict what would be a good fit?
Response: Yes, we can offer suggestions.

Customer Programs & Electrification

Nathan Morey, Director of Customer Programs at SRP, spoke about programs to reduce customer demand (slide 33). He described energy efficiency efforts focused on cooling and peak hours and evolving the portfolio to include roof and window replacement, business and multifamily HVAC tune-ups and a new virtual commissioning program for business (slide 34). Morey also addressed demand response efforts – including a trial agreement with CMC Steel – and electrification activities (slides 35-36).

Q&A

Comment: This has been an incredible continued success. It has been great to see the launch of new programs.

Electric Vehicle Management

Jason Smith, Manager for Electric Vehicle Strategy at SRP, addressed ISP Action Items related to EVs. He described SRP's goal of developing an EV charging management roadmap to shift some of the EV load to lower cost hours (slide 38). The roadmap, Smith explained, extends to 2035 and considers near-, medium- and long-term recommendations and includes strategies for shaping the EV load (slide 39). He outlined next steps such as evolution of time-of-use rates to prioritize daytime charging and enhancement of education and outreach.

Q&A

Question: EV America is a disaster, and it prevents people from adopting EVs. Is SRP looking at putting in key performance indicators to make those more accessible?
Response: We can work with third-party charging companies to coordinate on planning but are limited on what we can do to manage their performance. SRP encourages these third-party chargers to take operations and maintenance costs into account. We do look at other utilities to see how they have dealt with those challenges. It is a nationwide issue.

Question: Our organization is looking at EV issues with parking. We struggle to see a business model that doesn't include high prices for daytime charging. What is your opinion on the business model for providing these chargers?
Response: People need to fit the business model to the situation. With a parking garage, consultants often try to oversell a faster charger than is necessary. If people are going to work and will be there for eight hours, they do not need a level three or level two charger. A level one will charge about 40 miles, which will cover the average commute. More than 80% of charging happens at home, which means a lot of public charging is going to have lower utilization rates. Along travel corridors, a DC Fast Charger (DCFC) makes sense.
Question: Do you believe there is a daytime charging model that works?
Response: Yes. And if we promote this model now, we are early enough in the adoption cycle that we can set muscle memory for people.

Distribution Enablement Roadmap

Kyle Girardi, Senior Manager for Distribution at SRP, presented on the distribution enablement roadmap (slide 41). He highlighted recent activities to update assumptions for distributed energy resources, test advanced capabilities, enhance power quality control and maintain grid integrity (slide 42). Girardi described how automation will help in these efforts and that the roadmap will support customer decisions.

Discussion

Isaacson again invited Advisory Group members to reflect on the three discussion questions (noted above).

Question: Our organization is working on a project with another utility for charging stations. Is SRP looking at buildout of a site?
Response: We have a customer rebate for Level 2 chargers and DCFC. We do not have a program set up to do the make ready work. As EV options increase, we continuously evaluate. We haven't seen the need yet.

Question: For the distribution and enablement roadmap, what are the power quality concerns? Can SRP use inverter-based resources (IBRs)? Is the value of IBRs being captured?
Response: One recently completed Distribution Enablement project was a Study of the Value of Customer-Sited Solar and Storage. Included in the study were grid benefits that can be provided by customer distributed energy resources (DERs) including ancillaries such as power quality support. We are also studying advanced power quality capabilities that could be enabled with our new Advanced Distribution Management System (ADMS). At this time IBRs are not being leveraged for power quality support.

Comment: From our organization's perspective, I am encouraged to see SRP is working on the time-of-use program to support those of us who want to generate our own electricity. We do want to keep costs down, especially given load growth.

Question: Does SRP have a way to identify when someone has installed home charging for EVs? How will that affect the time-of-use pilot programs?
Response: Unlike with solar, customers are not required to tell us they have an EV. We are approaching that from a few angles. We have an EV community where we provide customers with an incentive and they tell us about their EV and charging infrastructure. We can see who is taking advantage of a smart charger rebate. We are also piloting software that analyzes algorithms for peaks on the system to determine who has a charger. We have an idea of who has EVs, and it will likely get better.

Question: Manufacturers are cutting production of EVs and the Japanese are moving toward hydrogen. Are EVs going to be the Betamax of automobiles?
Response: There are hundreds of billions of dollars in investment in the EV industry. The global pandemic had an effect on the supply chain and there is still a higher price point for EVs than internal combustion engine vehicles. As those supply chain challenges get resolved, technology improves and manufacturers make more vehicles people want, we expect EV adoption to increase. More customers are starting to see the benefits of EVs and we do not expect to see that change.

Comment: I appreciate that response. When we talk about transportation electrification we see growth, just less than before. We saw early adopters; we also hear about the used EV market. We also talked about more people buying hybrids. That is the bridge, because the charging is not quite there in a lot of places. Hybrids are a way to get closer.

Comment: On time-of-use programs, I appreciate that SRP continues to look at the peak and recognize that it will change over time. On energy efficiency programs, SRP has been a leader. It may be helpful for this group to go further into the specific programs, the savings and where SRP sees trends going into the future. Energy efficiency gets excluded when looking at the overall resource mix.

Question: I appreciate the strides in electrification. Does SRP access Arizona Department of Transportation (DOT) vehicle registrations?
Response: We are working on that piece of it. A federal privacy law will not allow state DOTs to provide that information to utilities. A few states passed laws that required it.
Comment: The second part is used EVs. I imagine that information is also important to track.
Response: We get this information on a monthly basis from the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI).

Comment: I continue to be concerned with demand growth. Data centers are a security issue at the national level.

Question: With respect to EVs, I worry about the business model for daytime charging, especially if we want to make it competitive with nighttime charging at home.
Response: On the business model, as EV adoption increases there is more use of chargers. Tesla has picked up prime spots and a lot of their chargers are profitable. If you get the location, you can wait for EV adoption to increase and charging to become more profitable; there may be losses in early years.
Comment: Let's suppose you raise nighttime rates to drive people out of nighttime charging. Will these people make money in distributed public charging? I worry that they won't.

Question: From the fleet perspective, how does SRP handle demand charges for the EV charging fleet?
Response: This is something that will get better as EV adoption increases. Costs are high because this is a peaky load combined with low levels of utilization. There are various demand charge management techniques – software, utilizing an on-site battery, etc. – and different solutions to the problem depending on the fleet.

Question: How does SRP foresee on-site solar generation? Is customer solar behind the meter an opportunity or a liability? Our organization has parking, a street and then a load [to serve]. The utilities do not allow us to do on-site solar because there is a street between us. Can there be changes in on-site solar and policies?
Response: The distribution strategy is one of enablement. We will interconnect customers who meet our standards. We want to make sure the grid is ready for interconnection.
Response: The RFI for distribution is for in front of the meter resources (slide 42). We have a lot of load growth and aggressive plans to put renewables on the system, and programs and power purchase agreements for transmission-connected renewables. We collected responses in August and are looking at the information for planning pilot opportunities.
Question: Can you share the results of the RFI?
Response: The plan is to go to the Power Committee. The responses are confidential information. We intend to synthesize and share what a pilot could look like going forward.
Comment: In California, we are looking at virtual net metering and the issue of having to sell energy at different rates. If that can get that addressed, it would solve a lot of problems.

Next Steps and Action Items

Isaacson recognized key themes from Advisory Group member feedback, highlighting comments on partnerships for implementation, the challenge of planning when so much change is occurring and the role of emerging technologies. She also noted themes around evolving needs for changes in customer behavior (e.g., time-of-use plans, EV charging, energy efficiency) and how SRP is considering costs and discussion of different business models for EVs.

Duncan Kraft, Planning Analyst at SRP, thanked the Advisory Group members for their contributions, reminding that they can make requests for follow-up on their worksheets, or via the project email address (integratedsysplan@srp.com).

Kraft outlined the next steps for the ISP project team, including an ISP Actions update to be presented on November 21, 2025, to the Power Committee and an ISP progress report to be published on the ISP website. He added that SRP is using this fiscal year to plan and organize in anticipation of ISP #2. While the timeline has not been finalized, Kraft said that SRP has been sharing knowledge and lessons learned from the first ISP with many other utilities and working towards identifying advancements that can be leveraged in the next iteration.

Finally, Kraft shared an opportunity to participate in the Long Duration Energy Storage Symposium on December 3 sponsored by Arizona State University and The Southwest Sustainable Innovation Engine. He described the symposium's focus on the role of energy storage in decarbonizing the grid, noting that SRP had event flyers available and would send invitations to Advisory Group members early next week. The Advisory Group member from Arizona State University invited fellow members to reach out with any questions or to request an invitation.

Appendix

Meeting Attendance

Advisory Group Member Organizations (members in attendance on 10/18 are indicated in **bold**)

Arizona Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
A New Leaf
American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
Arizona State University (ASU)
Arizona Public Interest Research Group (PIRG)
Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)
Chicanos Por La Causa
City of Phoenix
CMC Steel Arizona
CommonSpirit Health
CyrusOne
Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)
Intel
Local First
Mesa Public Schools
Pinal County
Profile Precision Extrusions
SRP Customer Utility Panel (CUP)
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC)
Southwest Energy Efficiency Project (SWEEP)
Western Resource Advocates (WRA)
Wildfire

Key SRP Staff

Angie Bond-Simpson, Senior Director of Resource Management
Bobby Olsen, Senior Director of Corporate Planning, Environmental Services, and Innovation
Duncan Kraft, Planning Analyst
Grant Smedley, Director for Resource Planning
Jason Smith, Manager for Electric Vehicle Strategy
Justin Lee, Senior Manager for Transmission System Planning
Kyle Girardi, Senior Manager for Distribution
Kyle Heckel, Senior Engineer of Integrated System Planning and Support
Maria Naff, Manager of Integrated Planning
Mary Faulk, Director of Integrated Planning
Maxwell Burger, Senior Analyst for Predictive Analytics
Nathan Morey, Director of Customer Programs

Key Facilitation Team

Christian Mendez, Kearns & West
Gillian Garber-Younts, Kearns & West
Joan Isaacson, Kearns & West

SRP Board and Council Observers

Jack White, SRP Board Member
Larry Rovey, SRP Board Member
Mark Mulligan, SRP Council Member
Rocky Shelton, SRP Council Member
Suzanne Naylor, SRP Council Member