

**Sulphur Springs Valley
Electric Cooperative, Inc.
E-01575a-09-0453
E-01575a-08-0328**



0000108517

Antonio Gill

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

(Support)

Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:28 PM
Pierce-Web
Member Comment for Docket E-01575A-08-0328 & E-01575A-09-0423

RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAR 22 11:42

MAR 22 2010

ORIGINAL
Commissioners,

AL CORP COMM
DOCKET CONTROL

DOCKETED BY
MM

I would like to open this letter by stating that I am an SSVEC employee; however, I am submitting this document, not as a representative of Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, but rather as a long time, rate paying member of the Cooperative.

I am greatly troubled by comments docketed by Ms. Gail Getzwiler (Opinion No. 2010 84764, in reference to Case E-01575A-09-0453) regarding SSVEC Employee comment concerning the construction of the proposed 69kV Transmission line in the Sonoita area.

"...This may explain the flood of emails to the Docket after that edict, and I recognize a lot of them as SSVEC Employees...I feel it is unfair for SSVEC to put it's employees in a position to write letters like this. If they don't write a letter are they going to have problems with management?"

In addition to Ms. Getzwiler's comments previously docketed with the ACC; during the Public Forum held in Sonoita on 3/11/10, Ms. Getzwiler directed comments at the employees in attendance.

"...I really miss the 60 SSVEC employees that were in Patagonia, I wonder where they are tonight, they added a lot to the meeting in Patagonia..."

Ms. Getzwiler's comments infer that employees' presence at the public forum was in some way inappropriate; possibly even mandated by SSVEC management in order to feign support for the project. Neither I, nor any employee of SSVEC, have been forced or otherwise pressured to make any form of public comment or attend any public meeting regarding the Sonoita Reliability Project.

Most of the employees of the Cooperative, are also members. Being an employee should not preclude, nor negate, their rights as a member to either support, or oppose any proposed projects or policies of SSVEC; including the proposed 69kV line in the Sonoita area. This should include the right to send comments to the commission, and/or to attend any public forum or public meeting regarding the Sonoita Reliability project; and to have those comments and opinions carry the exact same weight and importance as any other member of the cooperative.

I find it grossly unsuitable for anyone to chastise involvement from any member of the Cooperative in these proceedings. Every single member of the Cooperative, employees as well as members outside of the "affected area," will bear the inevitable cost of this project; including the additional costs incurred by the legal proceedings and feasibility study deemed necessary by the Arizona Corporation Commission.

For the record, I am in support of the building of the 69kV line, along the Babocomari route; as it is, per the Feasibility Study mandated by the ACC and performed by Navigant, the most COST EFFECTIVE long term solution to the electric service problems in the Sonoita, Elgin and Patagonia areas. Again, as I – as well as all of the other members of the cooperative – will be responsible for bearing the cost of any and all SSVEC system improvement projects, I believe choosing the most fiscally responsible option is not only the responsibility, but the obligation, of the Arizona Corporation Commission.

As elected officials, you must take into consideration not just a small faction of the Sonoita community, but all SSVEC's members, employees or otherwise, and vote accordingly.

Thank you for your time and attention,

Andrea Shannon