

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF THE CINCINNATI SMSA )  
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP FOR THE ISSUANCE OF )  
A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND )  
NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT A NEW CELL )  
FACILITY FOR ITS DOMESTIC PUBLIC ) CASE NO. 93-402  
CELLULAR RADIO TELECOMMUNICATIONS )  
SERVICE IN FLORENCE, IN THE KENTUCKY )  
PORTION OF THE CINCINNATI MSA )

O R D E R

On November 29, 1993, the Commission received the attached letter from Emro Marketing. Emro Marketing either owns or occupies property within 500 feet of the proposed cellular telecommunications facility to be located at 7673 Burlington Pike, Florence, Boone County, Kentucky.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Cincinnati SMSA Limited Partnership ("Cincinnati SMSA") shall respond to Emro Marketing's questions by certified letter, within 10 days of the date of this Order.
2. Cincinnati SMSA shall file a copy of the certified letter and dated receipt, within 7 days of the date on the receipt.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 3rd day of December, 1993.

ATTEST:

  
Executive Director

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

  
For the Commission



November 23, 1993

P.O. Box 28070  
Columbus, Ohio 43228  
Telephone 614/274-0981

**RECEIVED**

**NOV 29 1993**

**PUBLIC SERVICE  
COMMISSION**

Executive Director's Office  
Public Service Commission of Kentucky  
P. O. Box 615  
Frankfort, KY 40602

**Re: Case No. 93-402**

To Whom It May Concern:

Our subsidiary company, Emro Marketing, owns property at 7690 Burlington Pike in Florence, Kentucky. We recently received notice that SMSA Limited Partnership applied to the Public Service Commission of Kentucky for a 184' tower, which would be located at 7673 Burlington Pike in Florence, Kentucky. It is my understanding the referenced company would use the tower for a cellular radio telecommunications receiver.

While we understand the need for a tower of this nature, we do not believe the location chosen by the applicant is appropriate. Since we made a major capital investment on our property in 1989, we are concerned with the appearance of the area. In our opinion, a tower of this nature should be located in an area with substantially public exposure than this site has. Frankly, the applicant also approached us about installing this tower on a piece of surplus real estate behind our own facility, and we rejected the idea for the same reason. I would urge the Commission to strongly consider the potential adverse impact that the tower could have on this area.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Paul'.

P. E. Caudill  
Real Estate Representative

PEC:srm  
1122flor.pec