

Dear Mr. Kirby:

Your comments have been received and will be placed into the case file for the commission's consideration as it deliberates in this matter. Thank you for your interest.


Andrew Melnykovich
Director of Communications
Kentucky Public Service Commission
(502) 564-3940 x 208

RECEIVED

AUG 20 2007

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

From: PSC - Public Information Officer
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2007 3:56 PM
To: Melnykovich, Andrew (PSC)
Subject: FW: Smith to West Garrard 345-kV Transmission Project

From: Bryan Kirby[SMTP: 
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2007 3:55:45 PM
To: PSC - Public Information Officer
Cc: Sytira Kirby; cbsmith2323@insightbb.com; rjmiller@ipro.net
Subject: Smith to West Garrard 345-kV Transmission Project
Auto forwarded by a Rule

RE: Case No. 2006-00463

To Whom it May Concern:

Our family farm lies in the path of the proposed Smith to West Garrard 345-kV Transmission Project, being proposed by East Kentucky Power. Notably, the EFP mapping lists this farm as being Parcel #353. We attended the Public Hearing of August 2nd, 2007 on the ECU campus and expressed our concerns for the route. As stated there, our farm lies less than one mile from the Lancaster corporate limits on US 27. In the 1020's, Kentucky Utilities constructed a transmission line running parallel to US 27, lying in a north-south direction. This KU line divides our farm and stifles future development. The proposed EKP transmission line would cleave our farm as well, but this time from an east-west direction, effectively dividing our farm into four small areas. The route of this 15-foot right-of-way would rip up a large swath of 100 to 150-year old trees and denude a large part of our farm. We understand that one of the issues at hand is the concern for public health and safety due to insufficient electrical power availability for growing areas. However, our appeal merely challenges the proposed route in a very small section, since no other property will be affected in such a detrimental manner.

We have questioned the methodology used to determine the route that would have the least impact upon property owners and still have questions. We have a copy of the "Selection of Preferred Route, Smith to West Garrard 345-kV Transmission Project, East

Kentucky Power Cooperative, December 2006” and would like to pinpoint out specific queries, as follows:

- Part V, Table 2, Page 17 – Sixteen routes were evaluated and the route that will cut through our farm is listed as “Hr”. One of the Comparisons that was utilized had a feature called Proposed Residential Developments, with a scoring system that awarded points to routes with the least number of residential developments. It is our impression that a Proposed Residential Development was only valid for the purpose of this scoring if a plat was filed with the Garrard County PVA’s office. We have tracked the various routes and cannot determine the methodology used to make EKP’s determination. Other routes north of the City of Lancaster have potential for development but if no plat has been filed, was it counted nevertheless on some assumption or speculation? We want to know the exact location of these Proposed Residential Developments to make sure developers and/or property owners along a particular route did not have their intent to develop interpreted as a firm resolution to develop (via a filed plat).
- Part VI: Expert Judgment, page 28, Visual Issues – this justification was very vague, addressing only the visual impact of the section of Route Hr that is to be rebuilt, with no comment as to the impact upon the new section where our farm lies. It is difficult to ascertain why this as a negative factor.
- Part VI: Expert Judgment, page 29, Regulatory Issues – EKP cited recent PSC Orders that have “highly encouraged utilities to co-locate and/or rebuild electric transmission lines whenever feasible”. It then went on to state that alternate routes Er and Gr would require more greenfield rights-of-ways than Hr. Puzzling, since the next sentence does not even discuss the greenfield issue on Route Hr, it just states that this route seems to better reflect the recent orders issued by PSC. No mention of the impact, but justification that simply suits the regulatory agency and its supposed desires.
- Part VI: Expert Judgment, page 29, Regulatory Issues, Figure 15 – This section discusses the location of a potentially eligible structure for the National Register of Historic Places. Review of this Figure 15 illustrates best what we have been trying to convince EKP, that there is yet another route, one that is south of this potential site yet north of Route Hr, their preferred route. Might I remind you that this is simply an opinion that a site has potential and that documentation must be submitted to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior who truly makes that decision. This is, then, mere speculation, not a valid reason to eliminate potential routes Er and Gr.

You will note that we have not challenged the need for the power line since understanding this need is for experts. I will say that if this line is being constructed to merely position EKP so they may better market their excess power, then it is wrong. Nationwide, regulatory entities are examining the true need as well as the environmental impact of merchant plants. If EKP is developing this line to eliminate inconsistencies in their systems such as overloads, then it seems justifiable.

I appreciate your attention to this matter and hope I have explained the reason we protest the route of this EKP line at its proposed location. We do not feel that this is the best route for our neighbors or us and that it is too close to the Lancaster corporate limits.

Bryan & Connie Kirby
Sheila Kirby-Miller
Michael & Joanna Kirby

1234 Lexington Road
Lancaster, KY

