16.253.64-87×

4,

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us To: PUCO ContactThePUCO Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 106980 Received: 5/17/2016 3:38:03 PM Message: WEB ID: 106980 AT:05-17-2016 at 03:37 PM

Related Case Number: 16-0253

TYPE: Comment

NAME: (No first or last name submitted ?)

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- (NO CITY?), Ohio (NO ZIP??)
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: (no home phone provided?)
- Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)
- Fax: (no fax number provided?)

E-MAIL: (no e-mail address provided)

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:

Duke Energy did not explain to the public at their "informational meetings" the criteria they used in selecting the 3 routes from the universe they analyzed. Why is it that the public is only asked to provide input AFTER 3 routes that are acceptable to DUKE, but clearly unacceptable to the public (based on public comments) are selected. No doubt they had criteria, and I suspect that DUKE cost / benefit was the biggest weight. For a proposed project that impacts high density residential paths, public input should be solicited BEFORE routes are selected or deselected.

	at the images appearing are ap
	reproduction of a case file
document delivered in	the regular course of business.
Technician MK	Date Processed MAY 1 8 2016

2016 MAY 18 PH 12: 33

PUCO

Having said that it seems to me that passing within 1000 feet of a school (UC Blue Ash) or more specifically an elementary school (Blue Ash Elementary) should be a criteria that eliminates a route from consideration, yet one of the 3 proposed routes passes within 100 feet of Blue Ash Elementary school on Plainfield road. There are documented NTSB pipeline ruptures of 20 inch pipelines where the killing field was 820 feet wide... a 30 inch pipeline carries more than 2x the amount of energy as a 20 inch line. Why is it that a sexual predator can not live within 1000 feet of a school, but Duke proposes to install a 30 inch diameter natural gas pipeline within 100 feet of an elementary school? The risk of rupture, like the risk of a sexual predator attack, is an unnecessary risk when an elementary school is in the potential killing field. The greater good of the public is not served if our youth are put at risk for the benefit of a public company. If Duke down selects to install a 30 inch pipeline past a school, the route should be rejected. It is just not good engineering sense, and it fails to, on balance, serve the public good.