

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007 (attn: Docket Control)

Chairman Mayes and Commissioners via Docket Control:

Re: Docket No. E-0157A-08-0328

I attended the March 2nd SSVEC "Public Forum" at the Willcox Chamber of Commerce meeting yesterday and have the following comments and recommendations. SSVEC conducted their first Public Forum at the Best Western Hotel in Willcox. The first slide stated this was a Public Forum. The SSVEC presenter said that this meeting was held because the Commission required it. There was no moderator present.

I am appalled that SSVEC conducted this Public Forum without complying with ACC Order No. 71274 for holding a Public Forum:

"..... conduct public forums in the communities served by the planned 69kV line and associated upgrades....."
"....."IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. as a matter of compliance, shall docket by October 30, 2009, a report setting forth the manner and dates it shall conduct public forums in the communities served by the planned 69kV line and associated upgrades. This report shall also discuss the topics to be addressed at the public forums and the topics shall include, but not be limited to, addressing how renewable energy generation (in particular distributed generation) could be incorporated into the generation plans to serve the area covered by the planned 69kV line and associated upgrades."

- 1) SSVEC stated this was a Public Forum mandated by a Corporation Commission's Order and that the Feasibility Study confirmed both SSVEC and Commission recommendations for a 69 kV line.
- 2) Willcox is the home of SSVEC's headquarters. Future meetings in Benson and Sierra Vista are also not being served by the planned 69kV line.
- 3) This presentation contained only the SSVEC's points of view. This was NOT a "town hall" with a free exchange of views.
- 4) There was no participation from any present, or from anyone with different views.
- 5) There was no in depth presentation of the renewable energy and distributed energy alternatives from the Feasibility Study. Renewable energy was a passing comment and dismissed due to no sun at night or when clouds are overhead.
- 6) SSVEC gave an in depth report on their "Customer Survey Poll". This poll has nothing to do with the issues in this case. The misleading script in this docket ensures that SSVEC's views would prevail. For example, after saying that this area annually has 270 hours of outages, should SSVEC try to improve its reliability? Obvious answer is yes. Actual annual outages are 3 hours per customer. That 3 hours is confirmed in the Feasibility Study, was never mentioned, but the misleading 270 hours mentioned several times.
- 7) The Public Forum ended - after a retired SSVEC General Manager made several caustic remarks about the Corporation Commission and demanded that the line should be installed right now - by the Chamber President with "sorry we don't have any time for questions as Mr. Bethall took up all the time".

Having witnessed this one-sided SSVEC view of the issues under consideration by the Commission, if this presentation is a preview of the forthcoming Public Forums, I feel this "presentation" should NOT be considered as complying with the Commission's Public Forum requirements repeated above.

Most of this presentation's content was self-serving and not oriented to the Feasibility Study. The one slide that discussed the 20 options reviewed in the Study was impossible to read. The next slide showed the five options that were analyzed in greater depth. It also was impossible to read. These slides were passed-off as "this is what utilities do" and then on to one slide for "conclusions". There was almost no discussion of most options, why it was or was not viable, its costs or factors as discussed in the Study. Copies of the Study were not available to the audience. In particular, the renewable energy, demand side management, transmission line, distributed generation and other options were ignored. There was no mention of the environmental and cultural analysis in the study.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

This was NOT a town-hall style meeting. It would be most interesting if the Commission could review these slides as presented on March 2nd in Willcox. Most were not relevant. For example, there is no controversy concerning the proposed Sonoita substation. Because it was moved from a prior location (within the floodplain) to a more central and better location, based on public comment, is about all that has to be said. Not ten minutes on how responsive SSVEC acted in making such an easy decision.

The forthcoming hearings concern a SSVEC petition for the immediate construction of the 69 kV line based on the results of the Feasibility Study. About 45 minutes were wasted on non-related issues. I had some comments to make but was unable due to overrunning the time allotted.

It is requested that the slides planned for an actual Public Forum be sent to all Parties and the Moderator at least 3 days prior to the event. This should prevent another round of continuous self-serving propaganda. It also is requested that the Commission or a third party, such as RUCO, witness each of the following Public Comment sessions.

Furthermore, it is urgently request that Navigant Consulting be the key technical participant as that organization wrote the Feasibility Study. TRC was just an intermediary "conduit" organization between SSVEC and Navigant, and was not responsible for the Study. Providing details about resumes of TRC personnel was not relevant; however, details about the Navigant participants would definitely be of interest. In particular, only Navigant should represent this Study, not TRC, since they were the actual "writers" of the Feasibility Study. The names on these slides should only be for Navigant Consulting personnel, not those who interacted with SSVEC, but the "independent" team. This selection of emphasis appears to show that whom SSVEC interacted with during this study was more important than the independent study team.

Therefore, in summary, it is recommended:

1. That SSVEC provide a copy of all slides to all Parties and the Moderator at least 3 weekdays prior to presentation at Public Forums and the Willcox slides be mailed in several days to the ACC.
2. That SSVEC use Navigant Consulting personnel as representative of the Feasibility Study and not those from TRC who directly interacted with SSVEC in order to continue transparency and reduce any appearance of a conflict of interest.
3. That each of the 20 options in the study be discussed, one per slide, during the Public Forums.
4. That a "Town Hall" approach be followed, not a standup presentation by just SSVEC employees.
5. That a Commission or RUCO employee attends each Public Forum to observe transparency.
6. That non-issue related material, such as the long history lesson and the biased poll, be deleted.
7. That the Moderator be present and control all Public Forums to ensure all sides are fairly represented.

Sincerely,

Steve Getzwiller
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Opinion docketed with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission to be made part of the record. CLOSED
End of Comments

Date Completed: 3/8/2010

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Opinion No. 2010 - 85559
