Commonwealth of Kentucky Public Service Commission

APR - 6 2009 PUBLIC SERVICE

Re: Case # 2009-00020

Our answer to the responses to our complaint from Grayson Rural Electric, Kentucky Power Company, and American Electric Power is as follows:

First, as the parent of Kentucky Power, AEP is responsible for the actions of its corporate children.

Second, since rural electrification became a public policy beginning in the 1930's it is incumbent on public utilities to connect communities to the electrical grid. Public utilities are both monopolies and subsidized by the taxpayer either directly or indirectly. As such they are in a position to dictate all aspects of their business and are quite accomplished at getting sympathetic legislation passed through their political action committees. Therefore we cannot argue the specifics of arcane regulations.

Finally, we have purchased property in Eastern Kentucky for our retirement and our grandchildren's future at considerable personal sacrifice. We are neither wealthy nor Real Estate developers. Our only goal was to become a positive part of our adopted community, personally, spiritually, and economically. We have had some success as letters from Sheriff Roberts, Judge Compton, and PVA Chris Rose confirm. We have other letters and will present them at the hearing.

We were quite willing to work with AEP and expected nothing for free. We were, after a lengthy and frustrating process, presented with a proposal to restore power. The proposal was both arbitrary and excessive. We were expected to pay almost \$40,000 before any work was initiated. This is not a good business practice from a buyer's point of view.

The irony is that a restoration of power to the Rich Creek area is in the best long term interests of AEP. It would increase their customer base and considerably increase economic potential at a time when this country needs all of the economic team work it can get.

Therefore, we respectfully renew our request that AEP be required to restore power to its original point at no cost to the people of Rich Creek.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

James W. Riddick

Terrie Lynn Riddick

TERRIC LYMN RABECK

109 413/04 413104

Addendum for the record:

Mr. Overstreet's allegations in paragraphs 4, 5, 12, 15, 16 (G), 16 (F), 16 (D), and 21 are either categorically untrue or distorted to the point of being useless. With the exception of 16 (F), we will save our responses for the hearing in order that our position becomes a matter of public record. However, regarding 16 (F), Mr. Riddick freely admits to becoming "agitated" at Mr. Sode's procrastination as well as his haughty and dismissive attitude. Mr. Riddick further admits that his "agitation" continues to this day. Mrs. Riddick, however, is possessed of a much more serene nature and should not in the future be included in any allegations of "agitation." Mr. Riddick further resents Mr. Overstreet's attempt to personalize this situation and strongly suggests that in the future he refrain from ascribing to Mrs. Riddick the shortcomings of her husband. This kind of personal attack is of no use unless the purpose of this procedure is to increase billing hours rather than find reasonable solutions.