

E-01575A-08-0393

E-01345A-08-0393



0000090263

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMIS

ORIGINAL

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

47
60

Investigator: Richard Martinez **Phone:** 7000 NOV -7 P 4: 12 **Fax:**

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

AZ 0000 COMMISSION
SECRET CONTROL

Opinion No. 2008 72832 Date: 11/6/2008

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
N/A Not Applicable

Complaint By: **First:** John S. **Last:** Bodey

Account Name: John S. Bodey **Home:** (000) 000-0000

Street: 0000 **Work:** (000) 000-0000

City: Sonoita **CBR:**

State: AZ **Zip:** 85637 **is:**

Utility Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Division: Electric

Contact Name: **Contact Phone:**

Nature of Complaint:

Docket Nos. E-01575A-08-0393 & E-01345A-08-0393.

Received the following email:

11/5:

Forwarded is a recent communication re the proposed SSVEC power line to Sonoita. Please pass this on to the ACC (see my previous communications).

Thanks very much,
Dorothy Sturges

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rosanna Kazanjian
Date: November 3, 2008 8:55:50 PM GMT-07:00
To: Dorothy Sturges
Subject: Fwd:

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

11/5/08

Begin forwarded message:

From: "John & Marilyn Bodey"
Date: November 3, 2008 8:35:53 AM MST
To:

DOCKETED BY

3 November, 2008

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Fellow Sonoita Hills Subdivision Resident,

On October 21 the Sonoita-Elgin community liaison committee prepared a letter, see attachments above, summarizing the power line discussions heard at the Sonoita Crossroads Community Forum meeting held on October 11. Since then I have been waiting to hear Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) response to that letter. But since no response has been received I have decided to share with you all that I currently know.

In October, a second letter was prepared and hand delivered by Marshall Mcgruder to the Arizona Corporation Commission Commissioner William Mundell asking that the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee apply its expertise to our power line routing issues. We are seeking their help in providing a Hearing Officer or Committee to mediate and resolve our issues with SSVEC. Nothing new has been heard regarding this request.

But, in response to another request we have been informed by the Arizona Corporation Commission that the Sonoita 69kV transmission line issue is going to be docketed under an upcoming SSVEC rate hearing.

So, I do not believe the lack of response from SSVEC should be interpreted to mean that discussions are finished and all we can do now is wait for the trucks to come and install the power line. I do believe SSVEC would like us to think that we have no other options. But, I do not believe that we have heard the last of this issue yet and as before I encourage each of you to stay tuned and not make any important decisions regarding your response to the proposed power line routes until we are satisfied that we have done all we can do and have heard all there is to hear from all parties.

Cordially, your neighbor,

John S. Bodey

11/06 - Additional information emailed to ACC once staff called customer to let him know that his Opinion would Docketed. Customer also sent in a copy of a map (which staff can't scan into our UCF database but I staff has attached to this file). This map photo illustrates the four routes that SSVEC has at one time was proposing to its members but since has dropped all of the other three routes and have determined that SSVEC will only use route number three.

Average cost estimated for Option 3	\$ 1.575 million
Average cost estimated for Option 1A	\$ 1.701 million
Cost difference between options	\$ 126 thousand, less than 10%

SSVEC-

No existing overhead power-line on north/south alignment of Hwy 83

Alignment on ridge of hill - high visibility to community/visitors

As a majority of these properties are lots of 3 acres or less and oddly shaped, limiting their development capability, the additional easement on each lot creates less usable area on the lot for development. Additional impact to the LCNCA...to upgrade this distribution line to a 69kV sub-transmission line will require re-application to the federal management of the LCNCA.

The Sonoita Estates neighborhood has a higher density of existing build-out this entire neighborhood will be impacted, along with the Rancho Vista area, and a portion of the Sonoita Hills Subdivision.

3 - Pros (page 10)

Designated easements for utilities within the Sonoita Hills Subdivision have been established since the late

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM**

1960s.

Use of existing corridor where impact of power lines is already established The 69kV line would be installed parallel to existing parcel lines, therefore minimizing the impact on full usage of property.

REBUTAL-

Power lines exist along Hwy 83 north of Rancho Vista. Only about 6/10 mile of new poles would have to be installed for Option 1A vs 2 miles of new poles on Option 3
Power lines would drop down into a valley north of Rancho Vista and not be visible to the community.

If the power line runs down the east side of Hwy 83 the new easements are through 2 large lots, then connect to the existing power line easements.
Cut the corner along Lower Elgin Road and not go into the LCNCA.

There are more individual lots along option 3 than 1A and the potential build-out is greater, more homes could be impacted in the future.

Extended easement is required. Many home/property owners have stated that they won't give SSVEC the additional easement.

Option 1A: Only 6/10 mile along Hwy 83 has no power lines vs Option 3: 2 miles along the north boundary of the Babocomari has no power lines.

SSVEC -

Access for that portion of Option 3 along the SIDB will be obtained through the Sonoita Hills easements, as well as by existing roads on the Babocomari Ranch.

the 69kV sub-transmission line will run perpendicular to the ridge lines along the southern boundary of the Sonoita community. This perpendicular alignment will shield the entire power line from full view of the community by allowing it to drop from view into valleys along the corridor.

REBUTAL-

Access for Option 1A can be off Hwy 83 or along easements obtained for the power line. More properties will be impacted with Option 3.

To go from one valley to another along the Option 3 route, the power line must go over the intervening hills, thus planting a power pole on each ridge line, all of which can be seen from the entire Sonoita community and Hwy 83.

Letter from SSVEC

October 21, 2008

Ms. Deborah White
Right of Way Services Manager
Sulphur Springs Valley
Electric Cooperative, Inc.
P.O. Box 820
Wilcox, AZ 85644-0820

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Dear Deborah,

On behalf of the Sonoita-Elgin community liaison committee, we want to thank you for the comprehensive information packet SSVEC sent to co-op members regarding the Sonoita Reliability Project. The community appreciates what SSVEC has done, and acknowledges their efforts to work with the community.

As a result of SSVEC distributing the information, the committee met and prepared a presentation for the Sonoita Crossroads Community Forum meeting held on October 11. This meeting was a plenary meeting open to the general public. Approximately sixty (60) people turned out for this meeting. The SSVEC project was one of several issues on the agenda. A committee member made the presentation and led the discussion on the current status of the project. A poll of those present voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Route 1a option. However, the overall feeling of those present was dissatisfaction with the routing options. All options deface the verdant viewscapes of the Sonoita area. These viewsheds are an integral part of our heritage and tourist industry and any route can create a negative economic impact on the community.

Attached is the list of arguments SSVEC made in the letter regarding the proposed Routes 1a and 3 and counter arguments raised by the committee. This is the basis of the presentation made to the public at the Forum meeting.

Again, as we communicated before and as the community reinforced at the Forum meeting, Route 1a is the preferred route. Especially, since the difference between the cost estimates is negligible. We ask SSVEC to please take the community's preference as the major deciding factor in determining which route option to implement.

We look forward to hearing your response. Please contact me, Sheila Dagucon, at _____ or at _____ if you wish to set up a discussion time with this committee.

Sincerely,
on behalf of the committee

Sheila L. Dagucon,

Cc: Ron Orozco
Joe Furno
Anselmo Torres
Creden Huber

1A - Cons (page 9)

No existing overhead power-line on north/south alignment of Hwy 83 Power lines exist along Hwy 83 north of Rancho Vista. Only about 6/10 mile of new poles would have to be installed for Option 1A vs 2 miles of new poles on Option 3

Alignment on ridge of hill - high visibility to community/visitors Power lines would drop down into a valley north of Rancho Vista and not be visible to the community.

As a majority of these properties are lots of 3 acres or less and oddly shaped, limiting their development capability, the additional easement on each lot creates less usable area on the lot for development. If the power line runs down the east side of Hwy 83 the new easements are through 2 large lots, then connect to the existing power line easements.

Additional impact to the LCNCA...to upgrade this distribution line to a 69kV sub-transmission line will require re-application to the federal management of the LCNCA. Cut the corner along Lower Elgin Road and not go into the LCNCA.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

The Sonoita Estates neighborhood has a higher density of existing build-out....this entire neighborhood will be impacted, along with the Rancho Vista area, and a portion of the Sonoita Hills Subdivision. There are more individual lots along option 3 than 1A and the potential build-out is greater, more homes could be impacted in the future.

3 - Pros (page 10)

Designated easements for utilities within the Sonoita Hills Subdivision have been established since the late 1960s. Extended easement is required. Many home/property owners have stated that they won't give SSVEC the additional easement.

Use of existing corridor where impact of power lines is already established Option 1A: Only 6/10 mile along Hwy 83 has no power lines vs Option 3: 2 miles along the north boundary of the Babocomari has no power lines. The 69kV line would be installed parallel to existing parcel lines, therefore minimizing the impact on full usage of property. Option 1A runs parallel to exiting property lines.

Access for that portion of Option 3 along the SIDB will be obtained through the Sonoita Hills easements, as well as by existing roads on the Babocomari Ranch. Access for Option 1A can be off Hwy 83 or along easements obtained for the power line. More properties will be impacted with Option 3.

the 69kV sub-transmission line will run perpendicular to the ridge lines along the southern boundary of the Sonoita community. This perpendicular alignment will shield the entire power line from full view of the community by allowing it to drop from view into valleys along the corridor. To go from one valley to another along the Option 3 route, the power line must go over the intervening hills, thus planting a power pole on each ridge line, all of which can be seen from the entire Sonoita community and Hwy 83.

October 21, 2008

Ms. Deborah White
Right of Way Services Manager
Sulphur Springs Valley
Electric Cooperative, Inc.
P.O. Box 820
Wilcox, AZ 85644-0820

Dear Deborah,

On behalf of the Sonoita-Elgin community liaison committee, we want to thank you for the comprehensive information packet SSVEC sent to co-op members regarding the Sonoita Reliability Project. The community appreciates what SSVEC has done, and acknowledges their efforts to work with the community.

As a result of SSVEC distributing the information, the committee met and prepared a presentation for the Sonoita Crossroads Community Forum meeting held on October 11. This meeting was a plenary meeting open to the general public. Approximately sixty (60) people turned out for this meeting. The SSVEC project was one of several issues on the agenda. A committee member made the presentation and led the discussion on the current status of the project. A poll of those present voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Route 1a option. However, the overall feeling of those present was dissatisfaction with the routing options. All options deface the verdant viewscapes of the Sonoita area. These viewsheds are an integral part of our heritage and tourist industry and any route can create a negative economic impact on the community.

Attached is the list of arguments SSVEC made in the letter regarding the proposed Routes 1a and 3 and counter arguments raised by the committee. This is the basis of the presentation made to the public at the Forum meeting.

Again, as we communicated before and as the community reinforced at the Forum meeting, Route 1a is the preferred route. Especially, since the difference between the cost estimates is negligible. We ask SSVEC to please take the community's preference as the major deciding factor in determining which route option to

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

implement.

We look forward to hearing your response. Please contact me, Sheila Dagucon, at _____ r at _____ if you wish to set up a discussion time with this committee.

Sincerely,
on behalf of the committee

Sheila L. Dagucon,

Cc:
Ron Orozco
Joe Furno
Anselmo Torres
Creden Huber
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

n/a
End of Response

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

11/06

I called customer @ 1129 hours to let him know that we did receive his Opinion and that it would be entered into our database for the record and would be docketed so that the Commissioners would have an opportunity to read his comments. File Closed.

11-7 E-mailed this OPINION to Carmen Madrid @ ACC Phoenix Office to docket Opinion # 72832 under Docket Nos. E-01575A-08-0393 & E-01345A-08-0393.

End of Comments

Date Completed: 11/7/2008

Opinion No. 2008 - 72832
