

E. 01575A.08.0328



ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM RECEIVED

Investigator: Reg Lopez

Phone: [Redacted] Fax: [Redacted]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Opinion No. 2009 75078

Date: 1/29/2009

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

Complaint By: First: Gail Last: Getzwiller

Account Name: Gail Getzwiller Home: [Redacted]

Street: [Redacted] Work: [Redacted]

City: Sonoita CBR: [Redacted]

State: AZ Zip: 85637 is: E-Mail

Utility Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Division: Electric

Contact Name: [Redacted] Contact Phone: [Redacted]

Nature of Complaint:

\*\*\*\*\*CHAIRMAN MAYES  
REFERRAL\*\*\*\*\*

Arizona Corporation Commission  
DOCKETED  
FEB 04 2009

From: [Redacted] On Behalf Of Steve & Gail  
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2009 12:45 PM  
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Newman-Web; Pierce-Web; Kennedy-Web; Stump-Web  
Subject: Sonoita - SSVEC 69kV update

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

Dear Madam Chairman and Commissioners,

Despite community opposition, SSVEC is continuing to sight poles for the 69kV line through the Babacomari Ranch, Sonoita Foothills and along Hwy 83.

The SSVEC presentation by Deborah White to the Sonoita Hills subdivision on Jan. 17 brought to light the following facts:

- 1) SSVEC proposed to use a 2-piece fiberglass pole for the 69kV and bury the service to each house, if they sell them the easement.
  - 2) When asked if no one sold them additional easements, what would they do? Deborah White said they would be coming through with or without the easements.
  - 3) SSVEC is bringing this upgrade to improve Current demand reliability only- not for future development purposes.
  - 4) SSVEC's existing easement along Hwy 82 to Sonoita was only for the existing line, it is not upgradable. (Is this true?)
  - 5) The most important factor in choosing this route was cost.
  - 6) SSVEC began negotiating easements with property owners in Sonoita Hills months before any Public Information Meetings. So they intended to use this route from the very beginning.
- ITEM #3 AND #5 ARE SIGNIFICANT IN MY VIEW. If this is only for our reliability and cost is the most

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**  
**UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM**

---

important factor for this upgrade, shouldn't more options be reviewed that may be more cost effective?

1) As we understand, SSVEC has the ability to add 3 lines to the existing poles - that would double the availability to our area. (Patagonia has never had their line upgraded for reliability; poles are not even equipped with lightning arrestors.)

2) We plan to meeting with an engineer to formulate a proposal for an alternative energy generating plant for this area that would help solve our reliability problems, from a renewable energy standpoint.

3) SSVEC's \$7.9 million budget for upgrading service for 2,400 meters. (Translates into \$3291.67 per meter - many locations have more than one meter)

We would like to see cost, reliability, renewable energy, and all community priorities considered for the future of our area. I do believe that SSVEC owes it to the community to look at other options before this line is erected and spoils our landscape and economics - forever.

Thank you for your time and interest in helping with this matter.

Sincerely,

Gail Getzwiller

Save the Scenic Sonoita/Elgin Grasslands

[REDACTED]  
Sonoita, AZ 85637

[REDACTED]  
\*End of Complaint\*

**Utilities' Response:**

**Investigator's Comments and Disposition:**

I called the customer, acknowledged her e-mail and advised I was calling on behalf of Chairman Mayes @ the Arizona Corporation Commission. I provided my name and tel#. I asked if she needed any answers from SSVEC regarding her January 26, 2009 e-mail. Customer replied she just needed to make the Commissioners aware of the info obtained from Dorothy White. She was aware that there is no separate docket for the 69kV line and that this is being associated to SSVEC's rate case. I concurred. I advised I would have her comments docketed towards the SSVEC rate case. I extended thanks for taking the time to express her opinion in this matter. I asked and she concurred that she was aware of the Public Comment Meeting to be held in Sierra Vista, Az on February 11, 2009. Customer appreciated call.

I e-mailed this OPINION to Trish Meeter @ ACC's Phoenix Office to have this docketed towards Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. under docket E-01575A-08-0328. I also e-mailed copy of closed file to Sheila Stoeller, Antonio Gill, Jennifer Ybarra, Katherine Nutt, Trisha Morgan and CEWalczak. File closed.

\*End of Comments\*

**Date Completed: 1/29/2009**

**Opinion No. 2009 - 75078**

---