

RECEIVED

FEB 27 2023

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

Roger & Janelle Nicolai

2663 Blue Bird Rd.
Falls of Rough, Kentucky 40119

February 26, 2023

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,

I, Roger Nicolai, write this letter to ensure myself and my wife, Janelle Nicolai, are accurately characterized in all submissions to the Kentucky Public Service Commission.

I

Our *exclusive* concern regarding a cellular tower facility at the Falling Branch location is the negative impact the proposed facility will have on our **property value**. The degradation of our **property's value** is the *sole* reason we are seeking some form of assistance from the Public Service Commission. The protection of our **property value** is the *particular* impetus applying to *any and all* of our communication.

Presenting my wife and I as anything— other than laser focused on **property value**— is a fundamental misrepresentation.

It is a misrepresentation of our initial request for intervention. It is a misrepresentation of evidence we have submitted. It is a misrepresentation of all communication between ourselves and the Joint Applicants.

II

We have presented evidence that proves a loss in **property value** is expected.

Contra the Applicants, our evidence consists of *multivariable analyses*^{1 2} that provide granular information and the location of specific mechanisms affecting **property value**. Much of the evidence we presented was created using property cohorts that are *geographically closer* to our property than anything submitted by the Applicants. *All* of this evidence relies on a *greater sample size* than anything presented by the Applicants.

III

Having reviewed the location of the proposed cellular facility, and its relationship with our property/domicile, the authors of the aforementioned evidence state:

“It is my opinion that your property is close enough to the proposed location that economic damages are likely to occur.”³

¹Stephen 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.

Also located at: <https://gatonweb.uky.edu/Faculty/blomquist/LE%202016%20Locke%20Blomquist%20towers.pdf>

Submitted within the Nicolai's "Final Testimony" as "Exhibit A", 10/04/2022

²Affuso, E., Reid Cummings, J. & Le, H. Wireless Towers and Home Values: An Alternative Valuation Approach Using a Spatial Econometric Analysis. J Real Estate Finan Econ 56, 653–676 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11146-017-9600-9>

Also located at: <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2021/ETdata/Tmy/2021HB-06442-R000309-Lynch%20,%20Margaret--TMY.PDF>

Submitted within the Nicolai's "Final Testimony" as "Exhibit B", 10/04/2022

³Submitted within the Nicolai's "Final Testimony" as "Exhibit D", 10/04/2022

And:

“...[I]n our analysis utilizing our dataset, homes within the proximities as close as those depicted on your photo lost economic value.”⁴

IV

Weighed against the building of the Falling Branch facility, we have produced substantial evidence that:

- Provides absolute expectation of, “...an economically significant negative impact”⁵ on our **property value**.
- Proves, due to proximity, that our property will be the most negatively affected.

Weighed against the evidence of the Applicants, we have produced substantial evidence that is:

- More complete in scope.
- Larger in statistical sampling.
- Of greater specific application.

V

The loss in **property value** is already beginning to manifest prior to any tower having been built.

Multiple times in the last month we have had communications workers on our property. Based on GPS coordinates they expected to reach the proposed tower site on or through our property. This simple nuisance evidences the proposed site’s proximity to our property and its functional effects on us.

⁴ Submitted within the Nicolai’s “Final Testimony” as “Exhibit E”, 10/04/2022

⁵ Submitted within the Nicolai’s “Final Testimony” as “Exhibit D”, 10/04/2022

VI

Our **property** and its **value** are in a precarious position, though not due to a lack of substantial evidence. The evidence we have provided displays—in no uncertain terms—the negative impact that we will bear should this facility be erected. In both general and specific application this evidence is substantial and warrants the legal protection of our property.

VII

We request that the Commonwealth of Kentucky, as advised and pursued by the Kentucky Public Service Commission, please act on our behalf.

Counter to the Applicants, this is not just one more tower, one more job, or one more case for us. This is *our* home, *our* farm, and *our* property.

Please help us protect it.

Roger and Janelle Nicolai