

ORIGINAL  
Katherine Nutt



0000104460

E-01575A-08-0328

**From:** Cristina Arzaga-Williams on behalf of Kennedy-Web  
**Sent:** Friday, October 23, 2009 2:46 PM  
**To:** Katherine Nutt  
**Cc:** 'sksandra@aol.com'  
**Subject:** FW: ACC Docket Numbers E-01575A-08-0528 and E-01575A-09-0429-2 A 11: 17

RECEIVED

K, print out and also send to docket control  
C.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

**From:** S SCOTT [mailto:susanscott15@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 5:36 AM  
**To:** Mayes-WebEmail; Newman-Web; Kennedy-Web; Stump-Web; Pierce-Web  
**Subject:** ACC Docket Numbers E-01575A-08-0528 and E-01575A-09-0429

Arizona Corporation Commission  
DOCKETED

Commission Chairwoman Mayes and Commissioners Newman, Pierce, Kennedy and Stump

NOV - 2 2009

Subject: Continuing Problems at SSVEC

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

Re: ACC Docket Numbers E-01575A-08-0528 and E-01575A-09-0429

It was very disturbing to read the Sierra Vista Herald article announcing that the Arizona Corporation Commission has agreed to reconsider SSVEC's rate case. While the rehearing is unsettling for ratepayers in the Sonoita, Elgin, Canelo and Patagonia areas who so strongly believe in the third-party, independent feasibility study, what was most disturbing were the comments the article quoted from SSVEC's chief spokesperson, Jack Blair.

What in the world is going on at SSVEC and with Jack Blair in particular that he would state that our comments to the Commission were "... **distorted facts, unfounded rumors, half truths, blasphemy, doctored information and outright lies.**..."? Does SSVEC management not understand that as an electric coop, its members own this company? Having spent 25 years in the Human Resources field and retired as Director of Human Resources at Levi Strauss & Co., if I had a subordinate make such unsubstantiated statements about its owners, he would have been removed from his position and possibly terminated.

And now we are hearing about SSVEC depleting their REST funds; that there are hundreds of people in line to get rebates for renewable energy installations who may never get their rebates. In addition, it appears that SSVEC spent well above market rate to install solar panels on schools in Cochise and Santa Cruz Counties and that some of those systems are still not working months after installation.

I even understand that Mr. Blair has proposed not completely meeting the Commission's REST goals for SSVEC in an ongoing SSVEC REST case. Maybe Mr. Blair should realize that REST funds come from ratepayers and are to be used for cost-effective projects, not as his private "slush" fund. In fact, the SSVEC REST and DSM spending programs appear to be ripe for a prudent investigation.

Does this utility really deserve a rate increase after all these dubious actions? I do not think so.

At a minimum, I believe that the rehearing on the rate case is premature. Community members are diligently working on alternatives to the 69kV line. We believe our efforts will prove that there are viable alternatives to SSVEC's proposed line. I urge you to hold SSVEC to your original schedule on the feasibility study with public participation through June 2010 and for the Commission to make any decisions after it is completed.