

May 5, 2008

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

**Re: PF07-12-000 and
Dominion Transmission, Inc. Storage Factory Project
Alternative Sites Update**

Dear Secretary Bose:

I would like to address several misrepresentations and inaccuracies by Dominion Transmission Inc. (DTI) in their statements about the new proposed site for their gas compressor facility as stated in their April 3, 2008 Alternate Sites Update letter. This site is bounded by Route 180 (Jefferson Pike), US Route 340, and Gene Hemp Road in Frederick County, MD.

First let me say that I am a resident of Jefferson living about 2 miles from the proposed site. My daughter attends Valley Elementary School which is about 1 mile from the proposed site.

In the above-mentioned letter, DTI says that this new site is approximately 1.9 miles west of Jefferson. This misrepresents the actual proximity of the new site to Jefferson. It is on the edge of Jefferson. Please see the attached Google Earth picture of the area which more accurately shows the relationship of the site to the Jefferson community. The proposed site is the small star I've added to the picture on the far left. The spot marked with "Jefferson, MD" on the right side of the picture is the traffic light in Jefferson. It is 1.9 miles from the proposed site, but as you can see there is a lot of Jefferson between the traffic light and the proposed DTI site. Soon there will be more. Midway between the proposed site and the traffic light (at approximately 1 mile) is Valley Elementary School (450 students and growing) and a large star that I have added. This large star has approval for development and soon will be covered in houses. This proposed facility is next to Jefferson – not 2 miles from it. While this site may satisfy the desire of various groups to not place the facility in a historically and agriculturally sensitive area, I do not believe that the placement of the facility on the edge of a community was what they had in mind. Certainly the light, noise, air, and ground water pollution issues as well as possible accident/explosion issues and the resources to respond to them are just as relevant if not moreso to the citizens of Jefferson as they are to the cows near the original Marker Rd. site.

Secondly, in the same letter DTI states that the site is next to a site of "existing industrial nature" It is true that the site is next to DTI's existing Jefferson Metering and Regulation gas transmission facility and power lines. However, this is the only thing of an industrial nature in or around Jefferson. There is no industrial zoning in or around Jefferson. As I would understand it, there is a vast difference between a gas processing facility and the metering facility. Jefferson is a residential community targeted for residential growth and surrounded by agriculture. And again, as stated above, some of the same concerns – noise pollution, air pollution, ground water contamination, appropriate resources to respond to an emergency situation such as an explosion, etc. are not only the same as for the Marker Rd. site, but moreso since there is a larger population base in close proximity to the current proposed site.

Thirdly, DTI notes that they eliminated one alternative site due to "existing surface infrastructure restrictions.". Does this accurately represent the situation? I am not a zoning expert, but the currently proposed site is zoned agricultural so there will need to be a change in zoning. If the site that was eliminated is zoned industrial with restrictions, isn't it possible that it would be more appropriate to see if those zoning ordinances could be changed rather than changing the zoning at the Jefferson site from agricultural to industrial? DTI would need to supply more information to thoroughly understand that situation.

Fourthly, as already pointed out by Citizens for the Preservation of Middletown Valley (CPMV) in their letter dated April 6, 2008, DTI misrepresented them in the above-mentioned letter in several ways. Please refer back to that letter for the specifics as I do not want to misrepresent them. I raise it here in support of my point that DTI has shown a strong inclination to misrepresent this situation.

I agree with the assessment of CPMV – prior to April, DTI had not appeared to have sufficiently considered alternatives to the Marker Rd. site, and the Marker Rd. site is not appropriate to the industrial nature of the proposed facility. Others, such as Representative Roscoe Bartlett and the Board of County Commissioners for Frederick County, also urged evaluation of alternative sites. The Jefferson site is different but is it really more appropriate? Shouldn't the number of people in close proximity to the site be one of the factors used to evaluate a site? I believe that DTI would be hard-pressed to find another site from Jefferson north that is as populated as their current proposed site.

Perhaps a reasonable study of alternative sites has been done, and Jefferson is clearly the most appropriate site for the facility. In that case, I look forward to seeing the data at Wednesday's meeting. However, if the sum total of DTI's analysis of alternative sites is in the previously mentioned letter, I do not find sufficient justification for putting this facility on the edge of a growing, non-industrial community.

Sincerely,

Susan Kaltenbaugh
4112 Old Bridge Lane
Jefferson, MD 21755
kaltenbaugh@acm.org



Document Content(s)

FERCResponse1.DOC.....1-3