16-253-GA-BTX

ROBERT "BO" BEMMES
Mayor
PATRICK G. ROSS
Safety-Service Director
DAVID T. STEVENSON
Law Director
DOUGLAS G. SAND
Auditor
MELVIN T. GERTZ
Treasurer

FILE

READING
The Crossroads of **Opportunity**

1000 MARKET STREET
READING, OH 45215-3283

PHONE: 513.733.3725
FAX: 513.733.2077
WWW.READINGOHIO.ORG

CRIS NESBITT
President of Council
ROBERT J. ASHBROCK
DONALD H. LINDEMAN
RANDOLPH FISCHESSER
Council-At-Large
SCOTT J. HECKLE
Council Ward 1
ANTHONY J. GERTZ
Council Ward 2
THOMAS A. LYND
Council Ward 3
DENNIS E. ALBRINCK
Council Ward 4
CARLA D. KACHER
Clerk of Council

Ohio Power Siting Board
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

June 23, 2016

2016 JUN 30 PM 12:30
PUCO

RE: Case No. 16-253-GA-BTX

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my grave concern regarding Duke Energy's Central Corridor Pipeline Extension Project.

As you know, Duke has publicly shown three proposed routes for this pipeline to follow- all of which pass through densely populated, built-up suburban communities. One of those communities is the City of Reading. I serve as a member of City Council in Reading and have heard from constituents and colleagues their opposition to the project as proposed for a wide array of reasons: loss of mature trees and other environmental impacts, reduced property values, diminished salability of homes and businesses, inconvenience and traffic disruption during construction. Most notable, however, has been their concern for public health and safety in the event of leaks or explosions owing to acts of God, accidents or sabotage. I add my voice to theirs in urging the Board to reject all the proposed routes for these reasons.

While these well-placed concerns are shared in all the potentially affected neighborhoods, others are more peculiar to the City of Reading. In a separate correspondence, our Safety Service Director, Patrick Ross, has detailed to you how this project could thwart economic development efforts in our financially struggling, blue-collar community. This is particularly true at a site made "job-ready" with over $2.3 million in state and other grants. I urge you to review his letter.

It should be further noted that sections through Reading include areas with ,arguably, the highest housing densities (11 homes/acre) of any of the paths under consideration Many of these homes are in economically disadvantaged (low and moderate income census tracts) areas. And, since it appears the proposed path past their homes uses the public right of way, they would experience all the negatives without ANY benefit.

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 MN Date Processed JUN 30 2016

Since Reading maintains its own water distribution system, the presence of such a facility under our streets woven between the many water and gas service lines, sewer laterals, etc would complicate the management of the public-right of way and burden our public works dept without any offsetting compensation.

Surely, there must be among the routes considered and rejected (I've heard that number to be between 300-1000) at least one that is more acceptable than any of the three we've seen. I urge the Board to reject all and ask the applicant to try again.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Ashbrock

Council-at-large