

From: Melnykovych, Andrew (PSC)
To: ["Corey Biddle"](#)
Subject: your comments in case number 2017-00143 - APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY RSA #3 CELLULAR GENERAL PARTNERSHIP FOR APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A NEW CELL FACILITY TO PROVIDE CELLULAR RADIO SERVICE (STEPHENSPORT) IN RURAL SERVICE AREA #3 (BRECKINRIDGE COUNTY)
Date: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 3:20:00 PM

Dear Mr. Biddle:

Thank you for your comments in the above-referenced case.

Your comments have been received and will be placed into the case file for the Commission's consideration.

The application and other documents in this case are available at http://psc.ky.gov/PSC_WebNet/ViewCaseFilings.aspx?case=2017-00143.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Andrew Melnykovych

Director of Communications
Kentucky Public Service Commission
502-782-2564 (direct) or 502-564-3940 (switchboard)
502-330-5981 (cell)
Andrew.Melnykovych@ky.gov

RECEIVED

By Kentucky PSC at 3:52 pm, Dec 06, 2017

From: Corey Biddle [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 4:58 PM
To: PSC - Public Information Officer <PSC.Info@ky.gov>
Subject: Case # 2017-00143; Request for Response

I would like to receive a response as well as have the public service commission review these issues.

a) Item 19 in the application states that "this existing land use is agricultural (completely forested)". None of the immediately affected property is forested, but is part of a subdivided tract of land intended for development. This proposed tower would be located in the front entrance of these parcels which would significantly impact their potential value. It is a subdivision, so why is it being presented in this way? I can again provide a survey if necessary.

b) Item 20 states that there are no other places or opportunities to co-locate this equipment. From this location, one can see five towers (one at Milliner's school along 144, two along US 60, one off of Flood Road, and another off of Lawrence Eskridge Road). I would like to see the correspondence requesting co-location or other reasoning that these would not be suitable spots for co-locating. The tower along Lawrence Eskridge Road is on the hill directly south and probably within a half mile of this proposed sight and the elevation is close to 150 feet higher.

c) The tower off of Lawrence Eskridge Road affects ONE property owner on a large tract of land, not four like this proposed site. I find it reasonable that Bluegrass Cellular should be expected to be as low impact also. There are plenty of options for locating this tower in this area but on a piece of property that only affects the landowner that has the tower on their property. My immediate neighbor has been interested in a tower for years, owns hundreds of acres, and has land that is both accessible and higher in elevation. Again, this proposed site unnecessarily affects 4 different land owners. Isn't it reasonable for these companies to be as low impact as possible? Is it sensible or reasonable to place a tower of this size on a one acre piece of land when it could be placed on one of the many large tracts in this area?

d) When you research Stephensport, one of the first things that are mentioned include the beautiful ridge lines surrounding the town and the view of the Ohio River Valley. This proposed site is along the ridge line immediately above town and a tower of this size would be very inconsistent with the community image. There are motorcades of classic cars, motorcycles, etc. that travel this corridor on a continuous basis due to this setting/scenery. With so much of the area being high hills and ridges, how is it reasonable or neighborly to place such an eye sore right over town and in a subdivision that is probably the most valuable piece of property in the area?

e) We have no significant coverage gaps in this area. I am currently farming through the area and between myself and the two others whom use different providers (one of us has Bluegrass Cellular and it is by far the better), I'd like to understand the reason for putting ANOTHER tower in this area. Where are there coverage gaps that the existing towers do not cover (or co-locating on one of them won't fix)?

Several of my neighbors and I are very hopeful that the Public Service Commission will recognize the significance of this proposal and ensure that it has a minimal impact on those of us that do not want to be immediately impacted. It is unnecessary and should not be permitted with so many viable options.

Thank you,

Corey M. Biddle

Adjoining Land Owner

6070 Haysville Road

Guston, Ky 40142



*Kentucky RSA #3 Cellular General Partnership,
2902 Ring Road
P. O. Box 5012
Elizabethtown, KY 42701

*Felix Sharpe
Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP
101 South Fifth Street
Suite 2500
Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202

*Honorable John E Selent
Attorney at Law
Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP
101 South Fifth Street
Suite 2500
Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202