

FILE

Butler, Matthew

14-1280-EL-BSB

2

From: Puco ContactOPSB
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 4:24 PM
To: 'Abbey Wilson'
Subject: RE: Case Number 14-1280-EL-BSB, Gable Substation Project, Jefferson County

Ms. Wilson,

Thank you for contacting the Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB). Your correspondence regarding the proposed Gable Substation Project will be docketed in the public comments for case number 14-1280-EL-BSB.

The adjudicatory hearing in this case will begin on Thursday, April 23 at the offices of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Columbus. During the adjudicatory hearing, AEP Ohio Transmission Company and OPSB staff will have an opportunity to offer expert testimony supporting their positions before an administrative law judge. Later, once the adjudicatory process is complete, the Board will schedule the project for a decision during a public Board meeting.

The OPSB website at www.OPSB.ohio.gov provides the latest information regarding this and other power siting cases. Should you have additional questions or comments, please feel free to contact me directly at (866) 270-6122.

Respectfully,

Matt Butler
Public Outreach Manager
Administration and Operations Division
Rates and Analysis Department
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio | Ohio Power Siting Board
614-644-7670
PUCO.ohio.gov | OPSB.ohio.gov

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
21 APR 21 PM 4:54
PUCO

This message and any response to it may constitute a public record and thus may be publicly available to anyone who requests it.

From: Abbey Wilson [mailto:abbeyjwilson@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 2:51 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB
Subject: Case Number 14-1280-EL-BSB, Gable Substation Project, Jefferson County

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing in regards to Case Number 14-1280-EL-BSB, Gable Substation Project, Jefferson County.

I grew up across the street from the Preferred Site location of the Gable Substation, which is where my parents, William and Margaret Otto, still live. I urge you to put yourself in the shoes of the people this will affect, not only my parent's farm, but many others surrounding this location. Would you like to put your very hard earned money and love into a land for thirty-five years to create a sanctuary where you can enjoy your retirement and someone build a large substation next to it? Would you like to hear the hum of power lines and see a substation while sitting on your deck that once looked at a beautiful, serene field? How would you feel to know that all you have worked to build for you and your family is going to be tarnished? I feel so badly for my parents and their neighbors because that may be their reality if the Preferred Site is built on.

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician Am Date Processed 4/21/15

The only reason the land for that site was able to be purchased is because a business, not another homeowner, sold it to make a large profit. The people behind the sale do NOT live anywhere near the substation let alone next to it, and their home and family are NOT affected by anything done to the land. A family who chose to live in the country and be surrounded by the beauty and nature of the land would not sell it to build a substation so close to their home.

In the Staff Report of Investigation, page 18 discussing site selection, states several shortcomings in the study. The most important to me states, "the Applicant fails to state precisely why the Preferred Site is more suitable than the Alternate, merely stating that the residents nearer to one site tend to prefer the other." According to the Overview Maps in the Staff Report of Investigation, 21 residences live within 1,000 feet of the Preferred Site and only 1 residence is within 1,000 feet of the Alternative site. Clearly, there are more people affected by the Preferred Site.

Another shortcoming states, "the Preferred Site is actually more severely sloped than the Alternate Site." This one is especially concerning to my family because it is sloped into my parents land. The runoff will flow into their field, next to their house. Also in the Staff Report of Investigation, page 12, paragraph 7, it states, "the access for the Preferred Site is located across the street from a storage shed and barn..." While the barn is there in the field where the runoff will flow, the "storage shed" is not a shed, it is a garage - a two story garage with living area on the top floor. The same paragraph also states, "There is a residence north of this shed and barn that would not likely benefit from the screening that the existing topography would otherwise offer." I feel, like my parents do, that it is not something that you want next to your house whether or not the "staff recommends the Applicant incorporate screening for this residence into an aesthetic impact mitigation plan for the entire site." I do not feel that trees will be able to fully block the negative aesthetic impact of the substation, and especially not in a timely fashion.

While the substation will destroy the aesthetical beauty of the field, it will create noise and light pollution that people who chose to live in rural areas are trying to escape, and an electromagnetic field overhead. I did read that the amount of electromagnetic energy is small, but any amount is more than what is there now.

I understand that both sites would greatly be affected, but many more families and their heirs will be impacted from the Preferred Site. Please continue to think about changing the location of the substation to the Alternate Site.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Abbey (Otto) Wilson