

FILE

From: [webmaster@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:webmaster@puc.state.oh.us)  
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO  
Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 107552  
Received: 6/19/2016 5:09:57 PM  
Message:  
WEB ID: 107552 AT:06-19-2016 at 05:09 PM

Related Case Number: 16-0253

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Mr. David Mize

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 3325 Longmeadow Lane
- Cincinnati , Ohio 45236
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 513.290.1591
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: [baddogz@fuse.net](mailto:baddogz@fuse.net)

INDUSTRY:Gas

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: Duke Energy
- Name on account: David Mize
- Service address: 3325 Longmeadow Lane
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

I am writing today to express my serious concerns about the Duke Energy routing proposals for the Central Corridor Pipeline. All three route proposals would direct the construction of a high-capacity, high-pressure gas distribution line through heavily populated residential areas of the city. These routes are circuitous, convoluted, and seemingly unnecessary departures from what

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 AN Date Processed 6/16/16

2016 JUN 20 PM 1:34  
PUCO

would be a more rational proposal along the I-71 corridor, given that both ends of the proposed routes (Fairfax and Fields Ertel) are more aligned with it. Another logical alternative not proposed would have been to move the corridor east along State Route 22 and I-275, but this was not proposed, probably because it too would have been routed through residential areas, even though they may be less populated. The question, then, is why would one residential route seem less appropriate than another residential route? Why would any route through residential areas be a "better" route than one with the least potential risks to area residents? If the answers to those questions were simply cost and expedience, they would be insufficient. Safety, security, and maintainability should be the primary concerns. If, however, the answers are legal and that the proposed routes do not require consent or entitlement that would seem a serious misapplication of the public trust for the benefit of private enterprise. The correct response would be to obtain all of the prerequisites for the best solution before going forward rather than going forward with a less optimal solution because it might seem easier and quicker. That would certainly be in the best interest of those the project is intended to serve. According to the proposals, the infrastructure built under this project is intended to last for some seventy-five (75) to one hundred (100) years and would be built with the best materials currently available. The sheer longevity of the project would suggest extreme caution should be applied before reaching a final proposal. We cannot know how the results of this project will weather time and usage. Intentions are always good, but reality is rarely taken into account, and what may seem practicable today is rarely practical over a 100-year time span. As with all engineering, the best solution is the one that can be modified and adjusted over time. The current proposals do not seem to present such solutions. Neither the routes nor construction can be easily altered, repaired, or revised in 10, 20, or even 50 years to address future needs or material requirements. So, why are the proposed routes not a solution to the stated requirements? The obvious answer is that they route hazardous materials, and there is sufficient documentation to warrant that designation, through residential areas. We do not build nuclear power plants near or allow the transportation of hazardous materials through such areas for a reason, and that reason is the catastrophic potential of an unexpected event. That is the primary concern that should lead any concerned person to reject the current proposals and work towards a more considered alternative.