

FILE

16-253-CA-BTX

(2)

James M. Naramore
9366 Bluewing Terrace
Blue Ash, Ohio 45236

April 28, 2016

The Ohio Power Siting Board
180 East Broad St.
Columbus, OH 43215

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the Duke Energy pipeline project proposed for Blue Ash. This is **case 16-253-GA-BTX**, on the Pink Route, which runs through residential neighborhoods and along the property line of the University of Cincinnati Blue Ash.

I live on the Pink Route, which runs at the back of my property and along the property line of the University of Cincinnati Blue Ash. However, my concerns generally apply to all residents who are affected by this project.

I understand the need for a reliable gas supply in our community and I support a plan to supplement it. However, I am unhappy with the communication we've received from Duke. As you might expect, residential property owners, including me, get very concerned by major construction that impacts the safety, environment and property value of our surroundings. I don't know if Duke can ever satisfy all of our concerns but they can do much better than they've done up to now.

I would like to have more detailed information about all of these issues. In my specific case, I would like some influence over the route the pipeline takes at the back of my property for the following reasons:

1. Consider moving the pipeline further away from our property line, and deeper into the University woods.

Our home was sited at the back of our property by the original owners. The distance from our deck to the University property line is short (I'm guessing it's 50' or less). A pipeline built at the property line will have a devastating effect on our view, but even more serious to me, a big impact on our property value and ability to sell.

2. Safety is a priority. Move the pipeline as far from homes as physically possible.

I'm glad to hear that Duke adheres to all regulatory construction and maintenance requirements. I'm sure they've reduced the risk of serious accident, but not eliminated it. Duke admits that a 30" line is large and unique to the area. Accidents will happen. They will be bigger along a 30" line than a 5" line. I am not reassured by the conversation I've heard up to now and encourage Duke to be more forthcoming about location of the line and emergency procedures in the event of an accident. I'd like Duke to select a path through University property that has the least NEW safety impact on residential property.

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 _____ Date Processed **APR 28 2016**

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2016 APR 28 AM 11:57
PUCO

3. The University woods is a unique natural area. Find an alternate route that avoids it.

The University woods is a 30 to 35 acre area (an estimate on my part) that supports old woods, drainage and wildlife. It is valuable to the community because there is so little space like this remaining. I encourage Duke to avoid the woods entirely and route the pipeline along developed pathways.

I have other more general questions about this project, including:

4. Why is Duke routing the pipeline through densely packed suburban communities?

Why not run the line "around" these neighborhoods, rather than directly through them? We've been told that this gas will be used by the City of Cincinnati, not the community we live in.

5. Why run such a large line through residential areas?

Wouldn't smaller lines operating at lower pressures pose less of a safety and construction impact to the neighborhoods involved?

6. Why are the concerns of residents receiving so little attention?

We've been given sketchy information and little time to evaluate. We are not generally familiar with these projects and need time to understand it. Is this approach a strategy to avoid opposition and delay? There is an atmosphere of suspicion surrounding this project within our community. It highlights the need for Duke to better communicate their intentions and to speak directly to individual residents like myself.

Note that I have called the Duke project line and received a helpful and courteous response from Kate Jeffries. However, in her own words, "I am not an engineer". My questions remain unanswered to the degree I have documented, above.

I'm in favor of an honest and thorough discussion of all these points. This has not happened to my satisfaction and so I remain in opposition to the project and therefore request that you reject Duke's proposal as it has been presented.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



James M. Naramore
Jim.naramore@gmail.com
513-793-2407