



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265

IN REPLY PLEASE  
REFER TO OUR FILE

October 29, 2010

TO ALL PARTIES:

Re: A-2010-2159814, Application of Duquesne Light Company for the siting and construction of a 345 KV Transmission Line in the City of Pittsburgh, Municipality Of Penn Hills, Verona Borough and Plum Borough, Allegheny County, PA

On October 19, 2010, Paul Jenkins, a Party of Record in the above captioned and docketed case, filed Exceptions to the Initial Decision served by the Commission on September 30, 2010. Although Mr. Jenkins' Exceptions were timely filed, Mr. Jenkins failed in his responsibility to serve the other Parties of Record in this case in accordance with 52 Pa. Code Section 5.533. In the interest of administrative timeliness, we are enclosing a copy of Mr. Jenkins' Exceptions which will constitute proper service under the Commission's regulations.

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code Section 5.535, you shall now have ten (10) days from the date of this service to file Reply Exceptions. Therefore, Reply Exceptions are due to be filed with the Secretary of the Commission no later than the close of business at 4:30 p.m. EST on November 8, 2010.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rosemary Chiavetta".

Rosemary Chiavetta  
Secretary

RC:ddt  
Enclosure

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Secretary of the Commission  
Second Floor Keystone Building  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

P.O.Box 403  
Oakmont, PA 15139

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2010

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Re: Exceptions – A-2010-2159814

Gentlemen:

With all due respect, I strongly disagree with the decision concerning Duquesne Light Company's application for the Siting and Construction of a 345 kV Transmission Line:

1. It goes against common sense that increasing from 69kV to 345kV will not increase the dangers from EMF. Dr. Erdreich, compensated by the utility company, concluded that raising the line height by less than 100% and increasing the kV by 500% will actually be of a lower intensity. Would other, independent experts agree? One of the experts at a DLC public meeting admitted that "they were pushing the envelope".
2. The impact of metal towers twice the height of the existing wooden poles will have an adverse impact on the neighborhood. It is unreasonable to believe that changing from wooden poles that blend into the tree line to metal poles twice as high will only create "incremental suffering". The impact on home values with a new, expanded "fall zone" was not addressed.
3. Duquesne Light Company has other alternatives that would have less of an impact. Much discussion related to homes within 100 feet but there was no mention of homes located closer. In fact there was no mention of the portion of the ROW that is less than 50 feet wide. There are homes in my neighborhood located less than 20 feet from the ROW. There are locations where the line passes over school bus stops.
4. Public comment concerning DLC's aggressive tactics concerning vegetation removal beyond their ROW was not addressed. This lends to the conclusion that they are concerned that the ROW is not wide enough for 345kV.
5. The line is currently inactive. DLC has failed to prove the need to reactivate this particular line.

The DLC attorney made a point to question my background. Surely a concerned citizen, without an attorney, without an engineering degree, can question the adverse effects DLC is proposing for our neighborhood. DLC should explore other alternatives where less homes are impacted and the ROW is wider and safer. Thankyou.

Paul Jenkins



591052