

FILE

16-253-GA-BTX ~

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 106570
Received: 4/23/2016 1:26:28 PM
Message:
WEB ID: 106570 AT:04-23-2016 at 01:26 PM

Related Case Number: 16-0253

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Mr. Howard Richshafer

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 9252 Bluewing Terrace
- Cincinnati , Ohio 45236
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 513-791-0782
- Alternative: 513-309-2719
- Fax: 513-419-6427

E-MAIL: hrichshafer@woodlamping.com

INDUSTRY:Gas

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- (no utility company name provided?)
- (no account name provided?)
- (no service address provided?)
- (no service phone number provided?)
- (no account number provided?)

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2016 APR 27 AM 9:04
PUCO

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 MA Date Processed APR 27 2016

My spouse and I vehemently object to Duke Energy's "pink route" proposal to construct a 30-inch natural gas pipeline known as the "Central Corridor Pipeline Extension Project," Case Number 16-253-GA-BTX. The pink route is located behind our residential property at 9252 Bluewing Terrace. We oppose the pink route either as a "preferred" or "alternate" route for the following reasons: 1) Probable Adverse Environmental Impact. The pink route abuts the rear of multiple residential property lines, including ours. Bluewing Terrace is a quiet residential neighborhood. The proposed pink route would have a material adverse environmental impact on the natural wooded areas along that route. The affected wooded areas are characterized by steep hilly terrain and valleys, large and mature trees, which would be negatively impacted; moreover, the construction would affect various animals and wildlife living in the wooded areas. 2) Potential Risk of Death, Serious Injury, and Property Destruction. The proposed pink

route abuts multiple residential properties. Duke Energy claims this is the first time it constructed a 30-inch gas pipeline in residential neighborhoods. History has taught us that the potential risk of death, serious injury, and property destruction can result from constructing gas pipelines abutting residential properties; one such example is the recent 2010 San Bruno, California PG&E 30-inch gas pipeline explosion, which killed eight, leveled 35 homes, and reportedly damaged many more homes. That explosion reportedly created an asymmetric crater 167 feet in length, 26 feet wide, and 40 feet deep. The explosion resulted in complex mass tort lawsuits filed by more than 100 plaintiffs and 20 law firms against PG&E. PG&E was also indicted twice by federal grand juries in 2014 alleging violations of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and for obstructing justice for lying to the NTSB. Ultimately, PG&E was fined billions of dollars for constructing the gas pipeline in residential neighborhoods. Thus the proposed pink route proposed by Duke Energy that abuts multiple residential properties poses the potential risk of death, serious injury, and substantial property damage for Bluewing residents. 3) Invasion of Property and Enjoyment of Property. The pink route invades the property owners' right to privacy and enjoyment of property. The proposed route would cut a swath of extreme blight across backyards potentially destroying the character of our collective neighborhood and negatively impacting the enjoyment of property. 4) Direct and Negative Impact on Property Values. The proposed route will have a direct and negative impact on property values. There is a stigma relating to properties adjacent to gas pipelines because prospective property owners fear such pipelines due to the risk of death, injury, and property destruction. This will have a direct negative impact on our property values making them more difficult to sell when neighbors retire and move to smaller homes. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Siting Board reject the pink route as either a "preferred" or "alternate" route. Speaking for ourselves, I can unequivocally tell the Board that we will oppose any attempt by Duke to access our property for surveys, etc. Moreover, we will not voluntarily agree to any easement regardless of the consideration offered for any easement. Respectfully yours, Howard and Donna Richshafer.