Roger & Janelle Nicolai

RECEIVED

NOV 1 6 2021

PUBLIC STRVICE CELIMISSION.

2663 Blue Bird Rd. Falls of Rough, Kentucky 40119

November 08, 2021

Kentucky Public Service Commission Executive Director 211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615 Frankfort, Kentucky 40602 Re: Docket #2021-00398

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Roger Nicolai. I am writing on behalf of my wife, Janelle Nicolai, and myself regarding the proposed construction of a wireless communications facility adjacent to our property; Docket #2021-00398.

We are asking the Kentucky Public Service Commission to intervene on our behalf and prevent the building of said communications facility at the proposed site. Please note that we are not requesting intervention regarding the facility itself. We are merely asking for the site location to be moved to a new area within the property adjoining ours.

Our purpose for requesting intervention derives from the following reason: property value.

Property value is the reason I argue that the proposed location and construction of this facility meets the requirements of KRS 411.5xx to be classified and handled as a "private nuisance". Upon completion, this facility will *permanently and negatively* impact the use and value of our property.

The proposed facility site is on the **immediate** western edge of our property. Particularly, it is right next to a working path/driveway that we use daily in the care of our livestock and to access our barn. There is no way for us to fully utilize our land and structures without being exposed to the proposed facility.

Likewise, in the construction of this facility at the intended site, we are receiving undue hardship in the potential future sale of our current property. The facility will be an "eyesore" and impact the property's aesthetics and appeal, to interested buyers.

According to their 2016 study of Central Kentucky¹, Locke and Blomquist determined that a property located within 1,000' of a "visible antennae" lost a minimum of 1. 86% of their property value. **The proposed building site for this communications** facility is well under 1000' from our house, let alone our barn/pathway/property line. Further, the site will be located closer to our house than the landowner's house where the site is proposed.

Another consideration is that the Locke and Blomquist study primarily considered suburban areas in Elizabethtown and Louisville. These are areas wherein like facilities are more easily "hidden" than our open fields of rural Grayson County. While I gladly admit that there are areas within rural properties that are likely to have a limited impact on the value of adjacent properties (e.g. in the middle of a field), abutting the property line of a small acreage holding is not one of those low impact areas. Our and our neighbors' limited acreage provide greater emphasis on the uncharacteristic nature of the proposed facility.

In summary:

 Our request for intervention relies solely on the proposed location of the wireless facility.

¹ Stephen L. Locke & Glenn C. Blomquist, 2016. "The Cost of Convenience: Estimating the Impact of Communication Antennas on Residential Property Values," Land Economics, University of Wisconsin Press, vol. 92(1), pages 131-147.

- The proposed location provides the least negative impact to our neighbors' property, while providing us with the most negative impact.
- We are not opposed to the building of the facility in a different location on our neighbors' property.
- We recognize the increase in wireless capacity and ease of communications this facility would provide.
- We recognize the negative impact that we would exclusively bear.

We should not have to suffer a drop in property value— and increased difficulty in the sale of our property— so others can benefit.

Should our request for intervention be denied, we are also requesting a public hearing regarding these matters. It is our intention and request, at said hearing, to make public comment on our behalf.

Thank you,

Roger and Janelle Nicolai