ORIGINAL

Jennifer Ybarra

0000106891

E-01575A-09-0429

From: Save the Scenic Sonoita Grasslands [sonoitagrasslands@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2010 5:49 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Newman-Web; Kennedy-Web; Stump-Web
Subject: SSVEC - Letter to Members

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
JAN 20 2010
DOCKETED BY

Docket : DOCKET NO. E-01575A-08-0328

Dear Chairman Mayes and Commissioners,

I wanted to thank you for the consideration you gave to the Net Metering Program for the SSVEC territory, it is great to have our program finally implemented.
I have learned a lot during the last 2 years about our electric utility company and the Arizona Corporation Commission and how they work.

In my remarks at the Net Metering Hearing on January 13th in Phoenix, my statements included;

"I would also like to again bring to the Commission's awareness that SSVEC has been using Cooperator Resources to mail propaganda (copies of 2 letter were submitted) and use automated phone calls to unduly influence its members before the Public Hearings scheduled to follow the ACC ordered Independent Feasibility Study."

In these letters they are telling the Cooperators that the ACC has no jurisdiction over what SSVEC does, however they are cooperating with the ACC anyway, because they are such good guys. Comments from some people in the area that have read these letters include, "SSVEC could put the line in tomorrow if they wanted to."

"Why? is SSVEC able to spend Co-operator dollars on propaganda mailings and mass phone calls?

An Audit of the SSVEC REST Program is at the very least in order, where is the money coming from to pay for producing and sending this propaganda?"

In the SSVEC letter dated January 10, 2010, SSVEC claims *" the Navigant Feasibility study concluded that the problems created by our existing line must be solved immediately and that the plan SSVEC has chosen is the best solution."*

However the Study says, on page 3: ***"Notably, full feeder outages that interrupt all customers served by the V-7 feeder has been very low- less than one per year over the last 5 years.....New supply alternatives which reduce line exposure by creating new feeder segments would improve reliability by 15 to 30% beyond current levels."***

Page 4: "*.....**alternatives were analyzed from a technical, economic, and environmental perspective. From an economic perspective, distributed generation (DG) and demand reduction in the form of electric heating conversion produces the lowest cost."***

Will there be an opportunity to educate the Cooperators in this same manner, of opposing or expanded findings? Will SSVEC be required to distribute unedited letters of alternative solutions to the membership? SSVEC is tainting the public opinion with false statements and accusatory statements about it's cooperators.

They repeatedly say there are only a few people opposing this 69kV line, when there were over 50 people at the August 17th ACC Hearing and I believe about 35 spoke and maybe more presented letters. Hundreds of signatures have been submitted over the past 2 years.

SSVEC is sending out propaganda at a cost to it's customers to unduly influence opinion against alternatives, against alternative energy, and against the ACC.

Can there be an investigation into where the funds are coming from for these activities?

Can SSVEC be made to be more responsive to the intervenors in the cases before the ACC?

SSVEC arguments put forth, that they are too busy to answer data requests - does not hold water - since they are able to spend time on these types of activities.

Thank you for your consideration,

gail getzwiller

sonoita, az 85637

520-455-5020

Jennifer Ybarra

From: Save the Scenic Sonoita Grasslands [sonoitagrasslands@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2010 6:50 AM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Newman-Web; Kennedy-Web; Stump-Web
Subject: Re: SSVEC - Letter to Members

Dear Chairman Mayes and Commissioners,

I sent this letter to you last night - and forgot two important question.

1) Can SSVEC be restricted from sending out further letters with propaganda and misinformation to it's customers?

2) Also, prohibit them from engaging in the use of automated phone calls to unduly influence it's members against renewable energy and alternatives for energy reliability in the V-7 Feeder area of Sonoita, Elgin, Patagonia, Rain Valley, and Whetstone?

These kinds of activities are very unsettling - especially just before the ACC ordered Public Forums.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

gail getzwiller
sonoita, az
85637

On Mon, Jan 18, 2010 at 5:48 PM, Save the Scenic Sonoita Grasslands <sonoitagrasslands@gmail.com> wrote:
Docket : DOCKET NO. E-01575A-08-0328

Dear Chairman Mayes and Commissioners,

I wanted to thank you for the consideration you gave to the Net Metering Program for the SSVEC territory, it is great to have our program finally implemented.
I have learned a lot during the last 2 years about our electric utility company and the Arizona Corporation Commission and how they work.

In my remarks at the Net Metering Hearing on January 13th in Phoenix, my statements included;

"I would also like to again bring to the Commission's awareness that SSVEC has been using Cooperator Resources to mail propaganda (copies of 2 letter were submitted) and use automated phone calls to unduly influence its members before the Public Hearings scheduled to follow the ACC ordered Independent Feasibility Study."

In these letters they are telling the Cooperators that the ACC has no jurisdiction over what SSVEC does, however they are cooperating with the ACC anyway, because they are such good guys. Comments from some people in the area that have read these letters include, "SSVEC could put the line in tomorrow if they wanted to."

"Why? is SSVEC able to spend Co-operator dollars on propaganda mailings and mass phone calls?

An Audit of the SSVEC REST Program is at the very least in order, where is the money coming from to pay for producing and sending this propaganda?"

In the SSVEC letter dated January 10, 2010, SSVEC claims *" the Navigant Feasibility study concluded that the problems created by our existing line must be solved immediately and that the plan SSVEC has chosen is the best solution."*

However the Study says, on page 3: ***"Notably, full feeder outages that interrupt all customers served by the V-7 feeder has been very low- less than one per year over the last 5 years.....New supply alternatives which reduce line exposure by creating new feeder segments would improve reliability by 15 to 30% beyond current levels."***

Page 4: "*.....**alternatives were analyzed from a technical, economic, and environmental perspective. From an economic perspective, distributed generation (DG) and demand reduction in the form of electric heating conversion produces the lowest cost."***

Will there be an opportunity to educate the Cooperators in this same manner, of opposing or expanded findings? Will SSVEC be required to distribute unedited letters of alternative solutions to the membership? SSVEC is tainting the public opinion with false statements and accusatory statements about it's cooperators.

They repeatedly say there are only a few people opposing this 69kV line, when there were over 50 people at the August 17th ACC Hearing and I believe about 35 spoke and maybe more presented letters. Hundreds of signatures have been submitted over the past 2 years.

SSVEC is sending out propaganda at a cost to it's customers to unduly influence opinion against alternatives, against alternative energy, and against the ACC.

Can there be an investigation into where the funds are coming from for these activities?

Can SSVEC be made to be more responsive to the intervenors in the cases before the ACC?

SSVEC arguments put forth, that they are too busy to answer data requests - does not hold water - since they are able to spend time on these types of activities.

Thank you for your consideration,

gail getzwiller

sonoita, az 85637

520-455-5020

--
gail
http://groups.google.com/group/3SEG?pli=1