

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------|
| SUGAR GROVE FARM, INC., JOHN T. WARD JR., AND DONNA WARD |) | |
| |) | |
| COMPLAINANTS |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | CASE NO. 96-334 |
| |) | |
| EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. |) | |
| |) | |
| DEFENDANT |) | |

O R D E R

This matter arising upon the motion of the Leslie and Keenan Bishop for full intervention, and it appearing to the Commission that the Bishops have a special interest which is not otherwise adequately represented, and that such intervention is likely to present issues and develop facts that will assist the Commission in fully considering the matter without unduly complicating or disrupting the proceedings, and this Commission having considered the Bishops' motion and the response thereto by East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc., and being otherwise sufficiently advised,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The motion of Leslie and Keenan Bishop to intervene is granted.
2. The Bishops shall be entitled to the full rights of a party and shall be served with the Commission's Orders and with filed testimony, exhibits, pleadings, correspondence, and all other documents submitted by parties after the date of this Order.
3. Should the Bishops file documents of any kind with the Commission in the course of these proceedings, they shall also serve a copy of said documents on all other parties of record.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 30th day of August, 1996.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:


Executive Director

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------|
| SUGAR GROVE FARM, INC., JOHN T. WARD, JR., AND DONNA WARD |) | |
| |) | |
| COMPLAINANTS |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | CASE NO. 96-334 |
| |) | |
| EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. |) | |
| |) | |
| DEFENDANT |) | |

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that Complainants shall file the original and 12 copies of the following information with the Commission no later than September 13, 1996, with a copy to all parties of record. Each copy of the data requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), Sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure that it is legible.

1. Explain why the construction of the proposed facilities of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. ("EKPC") should not be considered as in "the usual course of business."
2. Explain why construction of the proposed EKPC facilities is not reasonable.

3. a. Have the Complainants commissioned or performed any study to show the impact of the proposed facilities' construction on the value of Sugar Grove Farm?

b. If yes, provide a copy of these studies.

c. If no, state the basis for Complainants' contention that the value of Sugar Grove Farm will decrease as a result of the proposed construction.

4. a. Have the Complainants commissioned or conducted any studies on the possible health or medical effects that the proposed facilities might have on animals within the immediate vicinity of the proposed facilities? If yes, provide a copy of each study.

b. Are Complainants aware of any studies that considered the health or medical impact on animals from exposure to high voltage electric transmission or distribution facilities? If yes, provide a copy of each study.

5. a. Has EKPC initiated judicial proceedings to condemn an easement for its transmission lines through Sugar Grove Farm?

b. If yes, provide a copy of the complaint that initiated the judicial proceedings.

6. Describe all communications that Complainants have had with EKPC regarding the proposed facilities. For each communication, state the date, the method of communication, and the persons involved.

7. Provide all correspondence between EKPC and the Complainants regarding the proposed substation and transmission line.

8. a. Has any governmental or private organization recognized the Sugar Grove Farm as a historical landmark or place of historical significance?

b. If yes, state the name of the organization and provide documentary evidence of this recognition.

9. From whom do the Complainants received their electric power?

10. Have any Complainants' customers advised the Complainants of their intention to cease using Complainants' services if the proposed facilities are built?

11. Refer to Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

a. What is meant by the statement that "representatives of EKPC have not been completely forthright in their descriptions of the project to certain landowners whose property EKPC has or proposes to acquire in connection with the project"?

b. Identify the EKPC representatives to whom Complainants refer.

c. Identify the landowners to whom Complainants refer.

d. Describe the misrepresentations or "less than forthright" descriptions that Complainants believe were made.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 30th day of August, 1996.

ATTEST:

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION



Executive Director



For the Commission

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------|
| SUGAR GROVE FARM, INC., JOHN T. WARD, JR. AND DONNA WARD |) | |
| |) | |
| COMPLAINANTS |) | |
| |) | |
| VS. |) | CASE NO. 96-334 |
| |) | |
| EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. |) | |
| |) | |
| DEFENDANT |) | |

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. ("EKPC") shall file the original and 12 copies of the following information with the Commission no later than September 13, 1996, with a copy to all parties of record. Each copy of the data requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), Sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure that it is legible.

1. Refer to EKPC's Answer, paragraph 7. What non-agricultural operations are located in the area of the proposed substation and transmission line?
2. a. Has EKPC initiated judicial proceedings to condemn any of Complainants' properties for the proposed substation and transmission line?

b. If yes,

(1) For each action which EKPC has initiated, state the date on which the action was filed, its case number and its case style.

(2) For each action initiated, provide a copy of the complaint and any answer.

c. If no, state when EKPC expects to initiate such action.

3. Provide all correspondence between EKPC and the Complainants regarding the proposed substation and transmission line.

4. Provide all correspondence between EKPC and Harrison Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation ("Harrison RECC") regarding the proposed substation and transmission line.

5. Provide Harrison RECC's most recent Distribution Circuit Analysis for feeders in the Lee's Lick and Cynthiana Substation areas which the proposed new substation will serve. This analysis shall include:

a. Existing distribution feeder configurations using the projected winter 1996-1997 peak loads.

b. Existing distribution feeder configurations using the actual loads from which the projected loads were calculated.

c. Distribution feeder configurations after the proposed substation is in service, using projected winter 1996-1997 loads.

d. Historical and projected peak substation loading for each transformer or feeder out of the Lee's Lick and Cynthiana Substations.

6. a. Provide a map which shows Harrison RECC's distribution facilities in the Lee's Lick and Cynthiana Substation areas. This map should also show geographical landmarks such as roads.

b. If EKPC cannot provide the map requested in Question 6(a), provide a copy of Harrison RECC's boundary map of the Paris West quadrangle on which the approximate locations of the following facilities are sketched:

(1) Lee's Lick Substation area - the substation, line sections 524, 530, 531, and 532. Indicate projected, unregulated cumulative voltage drops for those line sections near the end of the feeder.

(2) Cynthiana Substation area - the substation, line sections 295, 299, 300, and 301. Indicate projected, unregulated cumulative voltage drops for those line sections near the end of the feeder.

7. a. What consideration did Harrison RECC give to upgrading portions of Feeder 2 of the Lee's Lick Substation with a double circuit?

b. What concerns, if any, does EKPC or Harrison RECC have about the reliability of Feeder 2 of the Lee's Lick Substation?

c. (1) Provide the outage information for this feeder for the period since 1986.

(2) Compare outages for Feeder 2 of the Lee's Lick Substation with Harrison RECC's total outages for the period since 1986.

8. a. Provide the analyses, together with all workpapers, which EKPC performed for the proposed project and all alternatives.

b. For each alternative considered, provide its cost in current dollars and in present value dollars. Provide all workpapers and state all assumptions used to calculate these costs.

c. Provide a breakdown of costs of each alternative considered.

9. Refer to EKPC's Answer, paragraph 15. As the Toyota Motor Company plant is not located within Harrison RECC's service territory or the service territory of any other EKPC member, how will that plant have an impact on "existing service and reliability problems?"

10. a. Has EKPC commissioned or conducted any studies on the possible health or medical effects which the proposed facilities might have on animals within the immediate vicinity of the proposed facilities? If yes, provide a copy of each study.

b. Is EKPC aware of any studies which considered the health or medical impact on animals from exposure to high voltage electric transmission or distribution facilities? If yes, provide a copy of each study.

11. a. The proposed transmission lines will traverse the land of how many property owners?

b. On the land of how many property owners will the proposed facilities be constructed?

12. Who surveyed the areas selected for the proposed transmission facilities and substation?

13. a. Provide a copy of EKPC's written procedures for the notification of landowners whose land has been selected for proposed EKPC transmission and facilities.

b. If no written procedures exist, describe EKPC's procedures for such notification.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 30th day of August, 1996.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:


Executive Director