

**ORIGINAL**  
Antonio Gill



**Sulphur Springs Valley  
Electrical Cooperative  
E-01575A-08-0328**

**From:** Antonio Gill on behalf of Pierce-Web  
**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2009 3:54 PM  
**To:** 'Deborah Fain'  
**Subject:** RE: SSVEC rate case, docket # E-01575A-08-0328

Good Afternoon Ms. Fain,

Our office has received your comments and I will file them to the docket.

The Commission has received a filing from Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative requesting a connection moratorium. The moratorium application is filed under docket# E-01575A-09-0453.

You may track the progress, filings and meeting schedules for the case on The Commission's webpage by searching for the above referenced docket number at the following link.

<http://edocket.azcc.gov/edocket/>

Kindest Regards,

**Antonio Gill**  
**Aide to Commissioner Gary Pierce**  
**(602) 542-3933**  
**(602) 542-5560 Fax**  
**1200 West Washington**  
**Phoenix, Arizona 85007**

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

NOV 16 2009



**From:** Deborah Fain [mailto:dfain@sbbiaz.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2009 3:31 PM  
**To:** Pierce-Web  
**Subject:** SSVEC rate case, docket # E-01575A-08-0328

Commissioner Gary Pierce  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
Docket Control  
1200 West Washington St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Re: SSVEC rate case, docket # E-01575A-08-0328

I am a resident of Patagonia, and a member/cooperator of SSVEC. I have read Mr. Huber's letter to Commissioner Newman concerning the 69kV line and moratorium and am very disappointed. It is inaccurate and argumentative.

I oppose the installation of the 69kV line until all other less invasive, less expensive and less obsolete alternatives are first explored.

It appears that almost all the information provided by SSVEC is presented as unsubstantiated claims. As a business person I am not in the habit of accepting "statements" as fact no matter the title or position of the person making the statements.

According to Mr. Huber's letter dated 2 October, 2009 "the facts are the substation transformer has exceeded its capacity multiple times and that there are voltage issues that need to be resolved." We are

simply asking him to prove it. Prove the 69kV line will be the best and only way to solve the problems (if they in fact exist).

I am a small business owner (making me one of Mr. Huber's "silent majority"). Contrary to Mr. Huber's statement, I support the feasibility study and outreach for public input to find the best solution for our area. My support is based on my belief that the members of the cooperative deserve to have all the facts before making a decision ... or before allowing their cooperative's management to make a decision that is inconsistent with the membership wishes.

I am concerned and alarmed that SSVEC (rather than ratepayers) is using intimidation techniques and threats of moratorium to discourage people who want to build in our area. This tactic is instigating animosity among neighbors and others who own land but do not intend to build here for many years in the future.

According to statements publicly made by SSVEC, the controversial 69kV line would not have been completed until late spring 2010. I am curious if moratoriums were already anticipated (but not mentioned) or if they are a "new development" in the debate between the cooperative and its members?

Mr Huber, in paragraph 2 of his letter, claims Patagonia residents have sent a petition to SSVEC for reliability. A "petition of reliability" is not synonymous with "a petition for installation" of an ugly, possibly unneeded high voltage line.

In the same paragraph Mr. Huber claims 270 hours of outages per year for a 10 year average. I experience outages of seconds in duration which tend to occur perhaps every month or so. Consequently I am very surprised at Mr. Huber's claim. I cannot understand how a total of less than 30 minutes PER YEAR equates to 270 hours of outages? Perhaps one year 10 years ago was so high that it forced the average up for the next 9 years? The recently installed lightning arresters and pole replacements have already greatly improved reliability WITHOUT installation of an ugly and possibly unneeded high voltage line.

Mr. Huber continues to refer to "averages" that can easily be distorted by previous, unusually high measurements (e.g. the average of 83 new/expanded services per year) when if viewed as a trend demonstrates decreased demand.

I anxiously await SSVEC "working with the community in a cooperative manner towards resolution of the power quality, reliability, and capacity problems in the area." However I am not willing to sacrifice quality of life of the residents until all options have been evaluated.

I unequivocally support the ACC rulings and concern for the ratepayers in the SSVEC area. Please continue to insist on a third party Feasibility Study and Public meetings. It is the only fair way to resolve this contentious situation in NE Santa Cruz County.

I urge you to let this process continue, so all facts and solutions are evaluated and we receive the best energy supply solution for our future.

Sincerely,

Deborah Fain  
Patagonia Resident  
Owner Monitor Construction Company