

Site Selection Infrastructure Briefing — Sample

SAMPLE DELIVERABLE — Illustrative example — not a client engagement or live market data. Sites, findings and scenarios are fictional and shown to demonstrate structure and method.

Decision question

Which of three candidate sites should a manufacturer advance for a new facility requiring roughly 120 MW within four years?

Executive findings

- Site A offers the strongest long-term cost position, but its timeline depends on a substation upgrade with no committed in-service date in the utility's published plans.
- Site B has the clearest near-term energization pathway, but limited headroom beyond the first phase.
- Site C sits in a territory with a pending rate case whose outcome could materially change forward energy cost.
- No site is clearly superior on all criteria; the decision turns on how leadership weighs schedule certainty against long-term cost.

Evidence and source dates

Source type	Used for	Date treatment
Utility integrated resource plan (public filing)	Planned generation and load assumptions by territory	Filing date recorded per source
Transmission operator regional plan	Planned upgrades near each site and stated in-service windows	Plan vintage recorded per source
State utility commission docket	Pending rate case and rider proposals	Docket status as of review date
Interconnection / large-load queue records	Competing requests near each substation	Queue snapshot date recorded

Infrastructure dependencies

Site	Depends on
Site A	Substation expansion (uncommitted); Transmission line reconductoring; Utility large-load study
Site B	Existing feeder capacity (phase 1); Future transformer addition (phase 2)
Site C	Rate case outcome; Regional transmission project timing

Assumptions

- Load requirement of roughly 120 MW with a two-phase ramp.
- Published utility and transmission plans are treated as indicative, not commitments.
- No private utility correspondence was available for this sample.

Uncertainty

- Upgrade timing at Site A could move by several years in either direction.
- Rate case outcomes at Site C are unknown until a commission order.

- Competing large-load requests could absorb Site B's headroom.

Scenario comparison (qualitative)

Scenario	Site A	Site B	Site C	Read
Schedule priority	Weak	Strong	Moderate	Favors Site B if the first phase must energize on time.
Long-term cost priority	Strong	Moderate	Uncertain	Favors Site A if the schedule can absorb upgrade risk.
Adverse regulatory outcome	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Site C's position deteriorates if the rate case is filed-as-proposed.

Open diligence questions

- Will the utility provide a written capacity and timing indication for Site A?
- Can Site B's phase-two capacity be reserved, and on what terms?
- What is the expected decision date in Site C's rate case?
- Are there competing large-load requests not yet visible in public queue data?

Decision implications

- If schedule certainty is paramount, advance Site B and research phase-two options in parallel.
- If long-term cost dominates, advance Site A only after obtaining a utility timing indication.
- Defer Site C until the rate case outcome is clearer.

Stock & Milster provides independent research and decision support. This sample is not investment, legal, or engineering advice.
stockmilster.com