FILE

3

AEP
AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER

Legal Department

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2008 MAR 20 PM 2:32

PUCO

American Electric Power
1 Riverside Plaza
Columbus, OH 43215
AEP.com

March 19, 2008

The Honorable Alan R. Schriber
Chairman
Ohio Power Siting Board
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793

Steven T. Nourse
Senior Counsel –
Regulatory Services
(614) 716-1608 (P)
(614) 716-2014 (F)
stnourse@aep.com

RE: Case No. 07-715-EL-BTX
Don Marquis 138kV Loop#1 Project

Dear Chairman Schriber:

The applicant, Columbus Southern Power Company (dba AEP Ohio), recently received some clarification questions from the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board concerning the application. Enclosed are AEP Ohio's responses to those questions. Please include these responses in the record as additional information in support of the application.

Thank you for you attention to this matter.

Cordially,

Steven T. Nourse
Senior Counsel
American Electric Power Service Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone: (614) 716-1608
Facsimile: (614) 717-2950
E-mail: stnourse@aep.com

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 _____ Date Processed 3.20.08

AEP Don Marquis Loop #1 Project
Case No. 07-715-EL-BTX

Clarifications/Questions from Staff regarding the Application for a Certificate on the proposed American Electric power Don Marquis Transmission line project

1. *Please clarify the sentence on page 04-7 of the application that states " no construction access across wetland or streams is proposed?*

Page 04-7 is incorrect. Initially AEP was anticipating not having to cross any streams, but after further investigation discovered some areas were there is no other viable choice and certain streams will need to be crossed. AEP will use its standard practice when crossing a stream. The statement is partially true in that AEP will not cross wetlands for construction.

2. *Please describe specific method(s) that will be used to control fugitive dust problems, should they arise during construction activities?*

AEP will follow all state and local regulations during construction practices. It is also AEP policy to address the concerns of the property owners if they feel fugitive dust is becoming an issue. Should the case arise AEP would use a water truck to control fugitive dust problems.

3. *The application only discussed "self supporting steel poles" with concrete foundations in its discussion of poles/towers to be used for the project (reference pages 04-7 and 04-9). Please clarify this, providing descriptions of all of the types of structures to be used, the general location of their use, and anticipated approximate heights of the structures?*

The statement in the application detailing the specifications of a typical self-supporting steel pole are accurate, these poles will be used all along the project were there is a turning angle in the route. All other structures along the route will involve the use of direct-embedded structures which will consist of approximately 14' in the ground with a base diameter of 2.5'. Both types of structures will vary in height throughout the project with the average height being approximately 80' out of ground.

4. *Please clarify the clearing methods to be used in the vicinity of streams, wetlands, and steep slopes (reference page 01-5).?*

Clearing of these areas would be based on case by case situations. Typically hand clearing would be used in all the above mentioned areas because on steep slopes and around streams using a mechanized clearing machine would not be possible. As mentioned earlier all clearing in wetlands will be done by nonmechanized methods.

5. *The application mentions a potential blackjack oak. Has this tree been positively identified? Is it in the ROW or adjacent to it? Can this tree remain (and be pruned) or would the Applicant propose to remove it (assuming it is in the ROW)?*

At this time, the potential blackjack oak has not been positively identified. After the leaves come out AEP will arrange to have this tree positively identified. The tree in question is located within the 80 foot Right of Way. Due to its mature height AEP feels this tree is a potential hazard to safe line electrical clearances and must be removed.

6. *The application mentions three state endangered fish species. Is it expected that crossing of streams or in-stream work will impact these species?*

Ohio Department of Natural Resources stated that this project is not likely to impact these species because of their mobility, but suggested it *may* be necessary to avoid in-stream work during spawning of the three species. The three species spawn between May and mid-August. AEP has not proposed any in-stream work during this time frame

7. *What are the applicant's plans for long-term protection of identified T&E plant species, riparian buffer areas, and high quality wetlands that were identified as being in the ROW but not impacted during construction?*

As discussed in section 4906-15-07 of the application, only 3 Threatened and Endangered plant species were identified within the 1000' study corridor of either the Alternate or Preferred Routes. A possible Blackjack Oak was discussed in question 5 above. Two other protected plants that were identified in the study corridor, Short's hedge hyssop and Yellow crown beard are low growing plant species that are compatible with the operation and maintenance of an electric transmission line. Short's hedge hyssop grows in ditches ponds and swamps. Following state and manufacturers' guidelines AEP does not spay herbicides within 50' of any water area. As also discussed in section 4906-15-07, several Threatened and Endangered animal species were identified within the project area. None of these animal species should be affected by the future operation or maintenance of this transmission line. AEP has no specific long-term protection plans for the above areas. AEP only obtains an easement to allow for the installation and future maintenance of the transmission facilities and has limited control over property owners on future development of their lands. All wetlands on the Preferred and Alternate routes were identified as either Class I or Class II. There are no Class III high quality wetlands located on either route.