FILE

09-84-6A-CSS

Ronald Levi, Complainant

3220 Talmadge Road

Toledo, Ohio 43606

419-205-4215

January 14, 2009

Re: Ronald Levi

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

ANS JAN 30 AM DO 25

Complainant

Formal Complaint

PUCO Case No. New

VS.

Columbia Gas of Ohio

Respondent

APPEARANCES:

Ronald Levi, Pro se, 3220 Talmadge Road, Toledo, Ohio, 43606, Phone: 419-531-2965

Columbia Gas Of Ohio, 200 Civic Center Drive, Columbus, Ohio, 43215

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the enclosed Complaint was mailed by first class mail on January 14, 2009, to the offices of Columbia Gas of Ohio, 200 Civic Center Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Levi, Pro se

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 techniques.

Deta Processed 3 200

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTITILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Ronald Levi)	
)	
	}	,
Complainant,	}	
)	Case No. New
)	
v.)	Complaint
)	
Columbia Gas of Ohio)	Ronald Levi, Pro se
)	3220 Talmadge Road
Respondent.)	Toledo, Ohio 43606
)	419-205-4215

Complainant alleges that The Columbia Gas of Ohio (CGO) used inadequate practices and procedures in furnishing natural gas service and inadequate instrumentalities and facilities caused a gas leak, which is still not repaired, in October of 2008. The complainant further alleges that CGO practices and procedures violate the law. The complainant request that (a) CGO be found to have been in noncompliance with Commission orders or the gas pipeline safety code; (b) CGO provided inadequate or insufficient service; (c) CGO did not comply with the inspection and record keeping requirements pursuant to 49 C.F.R. para 192, et seq.; (d) CGO be required to take corrective action to avoid future leaks; and (e) the attorney general be required to enforce CGO's compliance with Commission orders.

Complainant further directs the Commission to 4901:1-16-05 (E) "To the extent necessary to carry out is responsibilities under the pipeline safety code, the commission or its staff may require testing of any intrastate gas pipeline facility

which is involved in an incident. After making a good faith effort to negotiate a mutually acceptable plan with the owner of the pipeline facility, the commission or its staff may require the operator or choose an independent laboratory to test such pipeline facility.

Complainant further directs the Commission to (F) "Each operator shall establish a program to identify, repair and replace (as necessary) its cast iron distribution pipeline system which is detrimental to the public safety. This program shall include, but not be limited to disturbing cast iron pipe, maintenance history, leak history, major street or highway reconstruction or repaving, construction activity, depth of cover, soil type, traffic loading, operating conditions, year of manufacture, type of pile, amount of graphitization, VIBRATIONS, (emphasis added), IMPACT FORCES, emphasis added), earth movement, backfilling after undermining and water leaks or sewer failures in the area.

Complainant further directs the Commission to the Ohio Board Of Tax Appeals Case No. 2008-R-1339 Interrogatories 10. 11. and 12. Appellant's Third Set of Interrogatories. 10."How can the appraiser make an adjustment for destructive vibration when most owners would conceal that fact? Answer: Objection. Calls for speculation." 11."Why would my decision to indicate the vibration problem with the property to prospective buyers be an appraisal problem when that is clearly the appellant's duty under the Ohio Revised Code? Answer: Property owner is the Appellant and has failed to provide credible evidence. " 12. "Why would anyone be surprised that buyers were not interested in being an owner of property with a destructive vibration? Answer: Objection. Calls for speculation. "

Complainant further directs the Commission to the removal of the gas pipe at the adjacent property at 3210 Talmadge Road approximately a week after the October 4th notification. This pipe was replaced because it also leaked. Testing should be made to determine if this was normal wear and tear or vibration. Complainant directs the Commission again to 4901:1-16-05 (E).

The complainant wishes to have an expedited hearing on this matter since the need for credible evidence as to the vibration be available prior to the Merit Hearing on March 23, 2009 at the Board of Tax Appeals.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ronald Levi, Pro se