16-253-GA-BTX

All Ph. 2.30

Butler, Matthew

From:

Ann C <annchisko@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, September 19, 2016 4:24 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB
Case #16-0253-GA-BTX

Members of the a OPSB:

I have read Duke's application for this project and it raises even more questions and concerns. I have previously written to oppose the project and wish to now state my continued opposition and in particular object to Duke's request for a waiver of any new public hearings.

Last week, Duke asked the Ohio Power Siting Board for a pass on any more public information meetings or mailers to residents. This is despite a major design change that will reduce the size and pressure of one line, but will likely result in "upgrades" to an existing line to transmit far more natural gas through our neighborhoods.

I feel that Duke should not be allowed the waiver of another public meeting. They have changed the route and should have to notify any new property owners. They have changed size and pressure but have not conducted feasibility and routing possibilities given that new scenario. For example, perhaps routing along a highway is now more feasible.

I feel their application is incomplete. They talk about future plans to "upgrade" but disclose little information about their "master plan" which they stated they would be sharing in the application.

Other concerns:

1. NEED

Pipeline need has not been justified. Why can't peaking plants be refurbished as Duke has done elsewhere? Why an additional high volume pipeline when demand is flat?

2. SAFETY

400 psi pressure is higher than other lines going through residential areas. Duke now talks about an upgrade to the A line (basically old pink route). Does this mean another high pressure line in the future? If need is truly there, why not a rural route?

3. ENVIRONMENTAL

Removing trees and vegetation leads to increased urban heating and the need for more usage of power for cooling in summer and heating in winter.

4. ECONOMIC

What is the effect on property values and economic development in the area?

5. TRANSPARENCY

Where is the Master Plan they promised in the application?

Considering all these concerns, Duke should not be allowed to waive the responsibility of conducting additional public meetings.

Sincerely, Ann Chisko 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 103 Date Processed EP 2 1 2016

From:

wordandimage@fuse.net

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:20 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Importance:

High

OPSB,

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX:

NOPE still opposes Duke Energy's Central Corridor Pipeline Extension Project. While Duke has reduced the diameter and apparent operating pressure of the pipeline, the result is still a high-pressure transmission line—with a large potential blast zone—running through densely-populated neighborhoods. The new plan raises numerous specific concerns. Here are some of them:

- A 20-inch, 400 PSI pipeline creates a blast zone of 912 feet on either side of the pipeline. Both proposed
 routes run directly in front of homes, schools, day care centers, businesses, and places of worship, putting
 them in harm's way.
- While Duke says it plans to operate the pipeline at 400 PSI, the company has not specified a maximum
 allowable pressure in its application. In the future, the amount of pressure—and corresponding danger—could
 be greater than what Duke is advertising now.
- In addition to the proposed line, Duke now intends to "upgrade" an existing 20-inch pipeline in the area that currently operates at 150 PSI. The company has not said when this upgrade will occur or at what pressure this line will eventually operate. We fear it may become just another way to send large quantities of natural gas through our communities.
- NOPE understands Duke's desire to retire propane-powered peak shaving plants, but Duke's plan would supply far more natural gas than is necessary for this purpose. Aside from a vaguely-described desire to balance natural gas supply, Duke has not explained why running significantly more natural gas through the area outweighs the safety, environmental, and economic concerns of the residents who live here.
- This is only one of five major natural gas projects that Duke is planning for the area, which includes
 surrounding counties and northern Kentucky. Despite earlier promises, the company has not publicly
 described the four remaining projects as part of its application. We're still not convinced that Duke doesn't
 have a larger, undisclosed plan in the works for all of this new natural gas.

Compounding these concerns is the fact that Duke no longer wishes to engage with the community on this matter. As part of its application to the Ohio Power Siting Board, the company has requested a pass on holding any more public informational meetings or delivering any more public notices. Regardless of Duke's legal obligations, the company's unwillingness to hear from the community **despite significant design changes** is inexcusable.

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project.

Thank you. Dick Croy, Blue Ash

From:

Carol McMahan <carolmcmahan@ymail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:16 AM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Carol McMahan 3503 West Fork Rd. 45211

513 969-5363

From: William Meyers <wrmeyers@fuse.net>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:21 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Reject Duke waiver of public meeting requirement and reject pipeline

From William R. Meyers, Ph.D.

Dear Ohio Power Siting Board:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable

NOPE still opposes Duke Energy's Central Corridor Pipeline Extension Project. While Duke has reduced the diameter and apparent operating pressure of the pipeline, the result is still a high-pressure transmission line—with a large potential blast zone—running through densely-populated neighborhoods.

The new plan raises numerous specific concerns. Here are some of them:

- A 20-inch, 400 PSI pipeline creates a blast zone of 912 feet on either side of the pipeline.
 Both proposed routes run directly in front of homes, schools, day care centers,
 businesses, and places of worship, putting them in harm's way.
- In addition to the proposed line, Duke now intends to "upgrade" an existing 20-inch pipeline in the area that currently operates at 150 PSI. The company has not said when this upgrade will occur or at what pressure this line will eventually operate. We fear it may become just another way to send large quantities of natural gas through our communities.
- While Duke's desire is to retire aging propane-powered peak shaving plants, it's unclear
 why upgraded facilities or a more limited pipeline project would not be sufficient to meet
 peak demand. Aside from a vaguely-described desire to balance natural gas supply,
 Duke has not explained why running significantly more natural gas through the area
 outweighs the safety, environmental, and economic concerns of the residents who live
 here.
- This is only one of five major natural gas projects that Duke is planning for the area,
 which includes surrounding counties and northern Kentucky. Despite earlier promises, the
 company has not publicly described the four remaining projects as part of its application.

We're still not convinced that Duke doesn't have a larger, undisclosed plan in the works for all of this new natural gas.

Compounding these concerns is the fact that Duke no longer wishes to engage with the community on this matter. As part of its application to the Ohio Power Siting Board, the company has requested a pass on holding any more public informational meetings or delivering any more public notices. Regardless of Duke's legal obligations, the company's unwillingness to hear from the community despite significant design changes is inexcusable.

NOPE has every intention of intervening in this case with the Ohio Power Siting Board, and will serve as a resource to any local governments that plan to do the same.

From:

youjia2006 <youjia2006@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:22 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

I personally lives on the routes Duke proposed, but never receive any notice. I feel like bring cheated.

Best,

Jia You

Tel: 513-288-4606

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

From: markacopes@gmail.com

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:23 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB **Subject:** CASE 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you,

Mark Copes 3146 N Farmcrest Drive Cincinnati, OH 45213

From:

Nathaniel Chaitkin < nchaitkin@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:24 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To the members of the OPSB:

Please deny Duke Energy's request for a waiver of the requirement to hold a public meeting on their revised pipeline proposal, submitted September 13. They have been evasive and secretive from the beginning of this process, and since public pressure has already forced them to abandon something they claimed was vital (a 30 inch pipeline), I see no reason to allow them to proceed without more questions from those of us who will be most affected by their plans.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter - we are relying on you to support the public's right to adequate information about what happens in our backyards!

Nat Chaitkin

4-WayQuartet.com

BachandBoombox.com

513.375.2136

From: Strathern, Maura <m.strathern@vega.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:26 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

To Whom It Concerns:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Maura Strathern

From: Erin Sheehan <erinmariesheehan@icloud.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:33 AM

Puco ContactOPSB To:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX Subject:

To whom it may concern:

I have written before but understand Duke Energy is now trying to request to not even have to meet the due process that has been set up for community learning and understanding of the proposed project. I am amazed in this day and age that more alternative sustainable energy sources are not being looked into-however I am writing to OPSB to DENY Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public deserves transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely-Erin Sheehan Kenwood, Cincinnati, OH

From:

vcrfromslauson@gmail.com on behalf of Will Holman <will@willholman.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:34 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To Whom It May Concern:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely,

Will Holman, concerned cittzen of Cincinnati

From: Karen Kearns < kkearns1990@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:35 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB **Subject:** Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you,

Karen Kearns 9522 Longren Court Blue Ash, OH 45242 513-638-6329

From: Neil Berg <neilberg@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:36 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Note Regarding Case 16-253-GA-BTX

I cannot think of a legitimate reason why Duke Energy would request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 or to not send letters of information to affected homeowners. It looks like abuse of the system. Know that the OPSB responsibilities cannot be waived.

The public is required to receive transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, violates the law and the intent of the law. I strongly suggest that you let them know this as you can as you reject their waiver.

Thank you, Dr. Neil Berg 4434 Chesswick Dr Blue Ash OH, 45242

From: Steven Chromik <schromik@fuse.net>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:49 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: FW: RE: Case 16-253-GA-BTX Duke Energy Central Corridor Extension Project

Subject: RE: Case 16-253-GA-BTX Duke Energy Central Corridor Extension Project

Dear OPSB,

Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable

Best Regards Steve Chromik

Stephen M Chromik

8280 Springvalley drive Amberley Village, Ohio 45236 513-910-1907

From:

Keri-Anne Wilson < kerianne.wilson620@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:49 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

From: ezragoldschmiedt@gmail.com on behalf of Ezra Goldschmiedt

<rabbi@shaareitorahcincy.org>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:50 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To whom it mat concern,

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Rabbi Ezra Goldschmiedt Congregation Sha'arei Torah 2400 Section Road, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45237

Cell: (347) 443-8613 Office: (513) 620-8080 <u>shaareitorahcincy.org</u>

From:

Kylee Dunigan <kylee.dunigan@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:55 AM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To Whom it May Concern:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you, Kylee

Kylee Dunigan Kylee.Dunigan@gmail.com

From:

Kal Heyn <kalheyn@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:57 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To whom it may concern:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you,

Kal Heyn

From:

Lew Ebstein < lew.ebstein@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:04 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Natural Gas Pipeline Proposal

Ohio Power Siting Board:

Duke Energy has proposed a natural gas pipeline that will run through highly populated areas of Hamilton County, specifically near where I live, shop and worship.

After a first attempt to avoid public input, Duke Energy was met with extensive community opposition to their original plan(s). My understanding is that they have submitted alternative plan(s) along with a request to avoid/bypass/circumvent any further public input.

The fact that this request has been made is reprehensible, at best. There can be and *must never be* any shortcuts to the democratic process, especially when and where public safety is at risk.

My community requests that you, as gate keepers, ensure that no process is shortcutted and that the public voice is not squelched.

If the pipeline is necessary then it must be accomplished with full disclosure of the risks, cooperation of the community and public safety at the forefront.

I am certain, you would be equally concerned if the proposed pipeline were to run through your neighborhood and by your place of worship.

Your careful consideration and public service is greatly appreciated.

Regards,

Lew Ebstein Concerned Citizen

From:

Janis Kartal <janis.kartal@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:08 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Proposed Pipeline

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you, Kartal family

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

From:

Laura Ghory laura.ghory@gmail.com

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:08 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Hello,

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you,

Laura Ghory Evendale, OH

From: John Schmidt < johnjschmidt@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:12 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Case 16-253-GA-BTX notice waiver

It is my understanding that Duke has filed a request to waive any further public notice or notice to residents directly affected by the Central Corridor Pipeline, as it has been modified and filed for approval by the OPSB. My property is potentially affected by the modifications, and as of now I have no clear idea of what those changes may be, and little confidence in my ability to sift through the sizable application to find them. Given the public interest in this matter, it is shocking that Duke believes that a lack of further notice is warranted. If anything, even greater transparency is warranted.

Please deny Duke's request for waiver.

John Schmidt 8695 Arbrorcrest Drive Amberley Village, Ohio

From:

Paul Nidich <nidich3860@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:27 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Duke Energy has requested a waiver to avoid having to hold a public meeting and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the amended routes.

Duke Energy filed its application on September 13, 2016, and requested a waiver as set out above. The fact that Duke Energy modified the routing and other changes in response to public comments demonstrates that the waiver should be denied. Those living or working within the blast zone because of the amended routing should be given the opportunity to participate and allowed to learn about the modified routing and comment, if they wish to do so. "Transparency" does not occur after, rather than before, action is taken.

Duke Energy should not be allowed to skirt its duty to provide information relating to its application amendments. Permitting Duke Energy to do so would be doubly wrong.

Please deny Duke Energy's request for a waiver.

Sincerely,

Paul Nidich 3860 Chimney Hill Drive Blue Ash, OH 45241

From:

Saul Rand <saulrand@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:31 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

To the Ohio Power Siting Board:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely,

Saul Rand, Citizen of Ohio.

From: Bill Wright <billw24@cinci.rr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:38 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Cincinnati Duke Pipeline - Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

From:

susan@smccullough.net

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:41 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Duke Energy

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter, Susan McCullough 8498 Darnell CIncinnati, Ohio 45236

From: Anne Cooper <annereid@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:41 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Duke Energy Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in regard to Duke Energy Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes.

As a concerned resident of Montgomery, Ohio, I feel strongly that the public deserves honest communication, transparency, and an opportunity to be heard. This project may affect the lives, safety, and property values of everyone in our area. Duke's request to avoid further public hearings, and thus transparency and information sharing, is absolutely inexcusable.

Thank you, Anne Cooper

From:

Elizabeth Rueve-Miller <info@nopecincy.org>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:54 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB

Deny Duke's Waiver

Dear Ohio Power Siting Board,

As a resident of Blue Ash and concerned citizen, I am writing you to register my opposition to Central Corridor Pipeline Extension Project (Reference No. 16-253- GA-BTX).

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy?s request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke?s request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable

This pipeline will travel through densely populated areas, including my neighborhood and will pose a danger to residences, schools, businesses and houses of worship.

Unlike delivery pipelines, this pipeline will be under up to 720psi pressure and an accident or rupture could cause injuries, death and destruction of property within a radius of 1/3 mile.

I ask you to oppose this pipeline and encourage both Duke Energy and the Ohio Power Siting Board to reject this pipeline

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards, Elizabeth Rueve-Miller

From:

Gary <ggrothaus70@rocketmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 12:58 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you,

Gary Grothaus

From:

Todd Musgrove <todd@madtm.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:01 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX Opposition to Duke Energy - need another public hearing

Dear OPSB,

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thanks, Todd Musgrove

From: Rose Reidmiller Gowda <rosereid@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:03 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB **Subject:** Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely, Rose Gowda

From:

Anne Robinson <annedrobinson@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:25 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

RE: Case16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you,

Anne Robinson 6625 Hudson Pkwy Cincinnati, OH 45213

From:

Blackmer, Beth

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:39 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Email Regarding Case #16-0253

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 109079

Received: 9/20/2016 12:07:47 PM

Message:

WEB ID: 109079 AT:09-20-2016 at 12:07 PM

Related Case Number: 16-0253

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Ms. Barbara Didrichsen

CONTACT SENDER? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 6231 Cortelyou Avenue
- Cincinnati
- Cincinnati, OH 45213
- United States

PHONE INFORMATION:

Home: 5135312207

• Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)

• Fax: (no fax number provided?)

E-MAIL: barbdid@gmail.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:

Last week, Duke asked the Ohio Power Siting Board for a pass on any more public information meetings or mailers to residents along proposed pipeline routes. This is despite a major design change that will reduce the size and pressure of one line, but will likely result in "upgrades" to an existing line to transmit far more natural gas through our neighborhoods. This is unacceptable. Given the unprecedented number of comments to date, and the major change in plans in the application, another public forum hardly seems like too much to ask. Please decline Duke's request for a waiver to further public meetings. Residents along these pipeline routes deserve to have their voices heard.

From:

Blackmer, Beth

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:41 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Email Regarding Case #16-0253

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 109080

Received: 9/20/2016 12:17:18 PM

Message:

WEB ID: 109080 AT:09-20-2016 at 12:17 PM

Related Case Number: 16-0253

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Mr. Steve Armsey

CONTACT SENDER? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 9791 Troon Court
- BLUE ASH, Ohio 45241-3349
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

• Home: (513) 677-6213

• Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)

• Fax: (no fax number provided?)

E-MAIL: sda@resurgencegroupllc.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:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

From:

Mike guy <mguy@amsupplyco.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:50 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thanks!

Mike Guy

From:

Standish Fortin <Standish@fortinadv.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:59 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Hello,

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes.

The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable. Why is this project even necessary? And are there not rules about locating projects like this near schools?

Thank you,

J. Standish Fortin

President





Towers of Kenwood 8044 Montgomery Road Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45236

513-792-2230 Office 513-226-2020 Mobile 513-672-2406 Fax

From:

Bobrd55lane@aol.com

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:01 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

To: The OPSB

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

I AM A RESIDENT OF GOLF MANOR

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely, Robert Lane

From:

James Smith <sjsmith95@msn.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:07 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Hello:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely

James Smith

From: Lee Demis <leedemis@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:12 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Cc: Karen Palatchi; tmoeller@madeiracity.com; Pillich, Connie; M Adrien; T Theis; T Ashmore;

CHilberg@madeiracity.com; N Spencer; S Gehring; M Steur

Subject: RE: Central Corridor Pipeline - Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Dear OPSB,

I am writing again, on behalf of the Fox Hill Meadow Neighborhood Association (Madeira, OH), in strong opposition to Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the proposed natural gas pipeline routes referenced in the September 13, 2016 filing.

The public - specifically those directly affected by this proposed pipeline project are due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus, transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

We continue to urge you to deny approval for this project. The residents of Madeira and the Fox Hill Meadow neighborhood should in no way incur the potential risks to health, safety, property value and others that a pipeline of this magnitude in close proximity to our neighborhood would introduce.

Duke Energy's natural gas pipeline highway should not in any way run through our community.

Regards,

Lee Demis Fox Hill Meadow Neighborhood Association (513) 477-8541

From: Connie Ferguson <cfergdance@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:22 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Duke energy case 16-253-GA-BTX

Hello OPSB,

Between the last public meeting and Duke's filing with you they have changed the parameters of their project. The public deserves the right to understand the impact the new proposal will have on our communities. We also deserve to be told the details of the "upgrade" to current pipelines under our homes and property.

Running these high pressure pipelines through densely populated communities is unnecessary and unconscionable. The only necessary issues are to repair any existing problematic pipes and to rebuild the propane peaking plants. Duke has publicly stated that gas usage in our area has remained at a steady usage in recent years, due to more energy efficient building practices and folks using alternative energy sources. Why then the sudden need for so much more capacity in our neighborhoods??

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Connie Ferguson 3112 Troy Ave. Cincinnati, Ohio 45213 (513) 731-8082

From:

Dick Ravenhall <woodbine@cinci.rr.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:23 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Cc: Subject: woodbine@cinci.rr.com pipeline

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Richard Ravenhall 10624 Kenridge Dr Blue Ash, Ohio 45242

From:

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:31 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Pubic inquiry should be required for such a project to protect the residents and businesses that will be affect by Duke's request pipeline changes. The fact that it is even possible to waive a public meeting in such circumstances is absurd.

Clint Bourgeois 6265 Cortelyou Ave. Cincinnati Oh 45213

From:

Sarah Fortin <Sarah@fortininsurance.us>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:33 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Case 16-253-GA-BTX Duke Pipeline Hamilton County

To: contactOPSB@puc.state.oh.us

RE: Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Hello,

Please deny Duke Energy's request that OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept.13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes.

The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable. Why is this project even necessary? And are there not rules about locating projects like this thru public parks and schools?

Thank you,

Sarah Fortin

Fortin Insurance LLC
A Division of Pavlisko Insurance
12137 McCauly Rd
Cincinnati, OH 45241
513-604-8618
sarah@fortininsurance.us

From:

Shena Jaffee <shenapotterjaffee@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:04 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Cc: Subject:

Duke Pipeline request Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

To Whom it May Concern:

I am a resident of Colombia Township - Ridgewood Neighborhood.

Shena Jaffee

I am deeply concerned about Duke Energy's continued efforts to build a pipeline through densely populated neighborhoods. My family lives along the proposed pipeline route, attends school and synagogue near the proposed pipeline route and participates in community activities all near the proposed pipeline route.

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes.

Given the potential impact of this pipeline project, the public is due as transparent a process and as much information as possible. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable and deeply suspect. If anything, such behavior should incur even greater than usual scrutiny, not less.

Thank you for your consideration and time. Rabbi Shena Potter Jaffee 6517 Ridge Cir. Cincinnati, OH 45213

Rabbi Shena Potter Jaffee ShenaPotterJaffee@gmail.com 513.502.6919

From:

Steph <steph@madtm.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:04 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Pipeline

Dear OPSB,

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you, Stephanie Musgrove

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments:	Alan Ullman <ahullman@gmail.com> Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:13 PM Puco ContactOPSB Duke Energy's Waiver Request; OPSB Case #16-0253-GA-BTX Ohio Siting Board Duke Waiver.pdf</ahullman@gmail.com>
Mr. Matt Butler, Outreach Manager	
Siting, Efficiency, and Renewable Energy Division	
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Ohio Power Siting Board	
Dear. Mr Butler:	
In the formal letter below (also attached in PDF form), I have written to oppose Duke Energy's waiver request with regard to additional public meetings and notification of their gas pipeline plan for Hamilton County. Please be sure it reaches all necessary parties.	
Very truly,	
Alan H. Ullman Blue Ash, OH ahullman@fuse.net	············
	Blue Ash, OH 45242
	September 20, 2016
The Ohio Siting Board	
180 East Broad Street	
Columbus, Ohio 43215	
	Re: OPSB Case #16-0253-GA-BTX
Ohio Siting Board:	

I am writing to urge you to deny Duke Energy's request for a waiver on the requirement to hold additional public meetings and notify affected consumers. Recall that Duke requested the waiver in their 13 September 2016 filing for a new high volume natural gas pipeline through northeastern Hamilton County.

I believe Duke made sufficient changes to their preliminary plan to warrant additional discussion at public meetings. Neither of the two routes in the official submission is exactly the same as in the preliminary plan; indeed, there are also some discrepancies between the submitted maps and verbal descriptions of the routes. Furthermore, Duke makes multiple references to additional work they will or are planning to do, without providing any details. In particular, Duke apparently plans to increase the gas pressure in Line A. This seems quite significant to me, mandating public sharing of information.

In summary, there are enough differences between the preliminary plans previously shared at public meetings and the one officially submitted last week, to warrant open discussions among Duke Energy, affected homeowners, their other customers, concerned citizens, public officials, and the Siting Board.

Alan Ullman

ahullman@fuse.net

From:

Diane Burns < diane.burns1@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:17 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Ohio Power Siting Board Representatives,

Please deny Duke Energy's request that you waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016, and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

George David and Diane Burns 8735 Arborcrest Drive Cincinnati, OH 45236

From:

Jim Lex <jlexster@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:30 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

RE: Case 16-253-GA-BTX

As a resident of Deer Park, I strongly request that you please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable. This alone should show that Duke Energy knows the residents of Deer Park and Blue Ash do not want this pipeline and want to secretively get it passed through. Please do not allow them to do this.

Sincerely,

Jim Lex Deer Park, OH

From:

Barbara Heyn < heynbarbara@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:44 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To whom it may concern:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you,

Barbara McMahan

From:

Jeanne <idream0f@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:44 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Duke's Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

If they have nothing to hide and are proud of the work they are doing they should be willing to explain it to the public that they say will "benefit" from their actions

Jeanne Fisher 2156 Julie Terrace Cincinnati, OH 45215

From:

Charlene <ckschneider@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:50 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Duke's request for a waiver

OPSB:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely,

Charlene Schneider grandmother of children who live in the "blast zone"

From:

Joe Godschalk <jgodschalk@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 3:56 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

WJ Godschalk 6960 Ken Arbre Dr. Cincinnati, OH 45236

From:

Blackmer, Beth

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 4:01 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Received Email Regarding Case #16-0253

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 109075

Received: 9/20/2016 9:50:46 AM

Message:

WEB ID: 109075 AT:09-20-2016 at 09:50 AM

Related Case Number: 16-0253

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Dr. Eric Mullins

CONTACT SENDER? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 8810 Brittany Dr
- Cincinnati, OH 45242
- United States

PHONE INFORMATION:

Home: 5138910812

• Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)

• Fax: (no fax number provided?)

E-MAIL: mzzu.tigers@gmail.com

INDUSTRY:Gas

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: Duke Energy
- (no account name provided?)
- (no service address provided?)
- (no service phone number provided?)
- (no account number provided?)

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

Dear members of PUCO and the Siting Board: Duke Energy has requested a waiver of the public information session prior to formal consideration of the high pressure pipeline proposed to be built through Blue Ash, Deer Park, and Sycamore Township. While it is true that that have had informational sessions, the information disseminated at these sessions was clearly based on company talking points and did not truly answer questions of the residents and customers that would be impacted by this pipeline. In most instances, Duke Energy did not answer direct questions. Instead they repeated statements that did not explain the need for the pipeline, the need for this central location through a highly populated corridor, and an inability to re-route through less densely populated areas. Further, Duke Energy has not given information to homeowners both directly affected (by the pipeline on their property) and indirectly affected (an adjacent property or property within an area that would be affected by a leak or explosion) on a) the allowed use of property over the pipeline, b) effect on property prices and ability to resell land that has a pipeline easement, c) the area around the pipeline easement that Duke Energy requires for a "temporary construction easement", d) the typical change in insurance premiums on property which has a pipeline in such proximity, and e) negative economic impact on the community due to property value loss from the location of such a pipeline. As Duke Energy has avoided answering or providing information on any and all of these very real concerns to residents and consumers, the previous informational sessions should be deemed inadequate. Additionally, these informational sessions have been somewhat limited. The drop-in format that Duke Energy adopted ensured that answers/information given to one individual was not disseminated to all participants. Given the interest in these sessions, the ability to ask questions and participate was severely limited. The last such session only allowed participation by elected officials. While important, this should not be a substitute for informational sessions for landowners and residents in the adjacent property. Therefore, I respectfully ask that PUCO and the Siting Board require additional informational sessions and deny the waiver requested by Duke Energy. Sincerely, Eric Mullins, M.D.

From: Ralph Lowenstein <ralphjl@live.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 4:38 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB **Subject:** Case #16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny the Duke Energy request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold a public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on 9/13/16 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid transparency and information sharing is inexcusable.

We still oppose the pipeline extension project. Although Duke has reduced the diameter and the pressure it is still a very dangerous hazard running through densely populated areas.

Fran & Ralph Lowenstein

23 Fallen Branch Ln.

Blue Ash, Oh 45241

From:

Bridget Hoffman <xu2uc02@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 4:40 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

My husband and I own a home in Evendale and our children attend school in Reading

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Brian and Bridget Hoffman

From:

Connor Smith <smith.connor.m@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 4:43 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

RE: Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Good afternoon.

This email pertains to case #16-253-GA-BTX.

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely,

Connor Smith

From:

Diana B Stewart <dbstewart@mac.com> Tuesday, September 20, 2016 5:16 PM

Sent: To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I urge you to DENY Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting and to send letters to homeowners and business owners along the proposed routes, contained in their filing on September 13, 2016. As affected citizens, we are due a transparent process along with information on this amended project, which has changed significantly. The government should not allow Duke to avoid these requirements, which were established with good reason. It is important that the process be followed with transparency and information sharing.

Particularly given the large public desire for information about this project, but also because the process requires it, Duke should be required to follow the established procedures throughout this process.

I urge you to insist that Duke follow the proposed procedures to the letter.

Feel free to contact me if you have any information or questions for me.

Thank you.

Diana Stewart 513-546-4347

From:

Alice Berry <alicemberry@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 5:24 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

To Whom It May Concern:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely,

Alice Berry, concerned citizen of Cincinnati

From:

kenneth mergard <thepines2@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 4:51 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

RE.Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in there filing on Sept. 13,2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing is inexcusable.

Thanks Kenneth C Mergard

Sent from Windows Mail

From:

Barbara Hayden <bcm0827@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 6:31 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Duke pipeline. Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Barb Hayden

Sent from my iPhone, please excuse any spelling mistakes or abbreviations.

From: Kimberly Douthit <kimberlydouthit@icloud.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 6:34 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Madisonville Pipeline Route

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Kimberly Douthit 6913 Palmetto St. Cincinnati (Madisonville), Ohio 445227 5135206091

From:

William O'Neil Jr, <mobilone@fuse.net> Tuesday, September 20, 2016 7:14 PM

Sent: To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Natural gas pipeline proposal in Hamilton County, Ohio

To: Ohio Power Siting Board: Re: Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Please <u>deny</u> Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to ALL affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

The proposed pipeline (20-inch, 400psi) could have a blast zone six football fields wide! That's 1,800 feet! That's not safe! What were they thinking?

Thank you for your close attention to this issue. William O'Neil, Jr. Cincinnati, Ohio

From:

Anna Adams <aadamscst@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 7:26 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you, Anna Adams-Buettner

From: Peter Teitelman <pteitelman@cinci.rr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 7:32 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB **Subject:** Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re, Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely,

Kathleen and Peter Teitelman 7884 Jolain Drive Montgomery, OH 45242

From:

Alex Hale <alex.halesj@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 8:45 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Regards,

Alex Hale (248) 912-5304

From:

Peg Wight <pegwight@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 9:18 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you.

Margaret R. Wight

From: Jim Lee <leejskijrl@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 9:40 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB
Subject: Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Look for more emails over the next few days with other things you can do to help. Your continued support is, as always, much appreciated.

Fortunately the route past our home, the UC College campus, grade school, daycare and historic cemetery has been eliminated. However, what Duke is doing lacks integrity and transparency and I believe is wrong. Please hold them accountable

Kind Regards,

Jim & Fran Lee 9752 Troon Ct. Blue Ash, Oh 513-702-0187

From:

jrfalee@aol.com

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 9:44 PM

То:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Look for more emails over the next few days with other things you can do to help. Your continued support is, as always, much appreciated.

jrfalee@aol.com

From:

kathy kugler <kuglertennis@aol.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 9:54 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you, Kathy H. Kugler 7106 Tenderfoot Lane Cincinnati, OH 45249

From:

Emily Levatte < miamigrad 96@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 10:00 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB

Duke Energy pipeline

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

This is the suggested text that Cincy Nope is asking us to send, and it is spot on. There's no reason to skip the public hearing, other than Duke's wish to gloss over the considerable opposition to their plan. The rule exists for a reason, and it should be followed. It is particularly appalling that Duke is trying to weasel out of notifying affected homeowners of their plans. Homeowners have a right to know what is happening and to comment on it to their public officials who represent their interests.

Emily Levatte 9315 Bluewing Ter. Blue Ash, OH 45236 (503) 698-4914

Sent from my iPhone

From:

Elaine Kerr <elainekerr321@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 10:06 PM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to request your help. I own a residence in Blue Ash, Ohio and continue to be concerned and opposed to Duke Energy's plans with respect to a Central Corrider Pipeline Extension in and around highly populated areas in our state.

Specifically, I am writing today to request that you <u>PLEASE DENY</u> Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. As I am sure you are aware there is a major opposition to this project and the public should be heard and the entire proposed areas impacted should be made aware of Duke's plans. Transparency and information on the amended project are critical! I personally find it incredible that Duke Energy has made a request to avoid these requirements! The public deserves a voice in this process!

Again, PLEASE DENY Duke's request!!!

Sincerely, Elaine Kerr Blue Ash, OH homeowner

From:

Marilyn Clayton <mbcfl@bellsouth.net>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 10:06 PM

To: Cc: Puco ContactOPSB Marilyn Clayton

Subject:

OPSB case number 16-0253-GA-BTX

I have just been informed that Duke Energy is asking the OPSB for a waiver so they are not required to hold another public meeting on the proposed routes as stated in their filing on September 13, 2016, and instead just to send informational letters to affected homeowners along the routes.

The public deserves information and transparency on this amended project, and Duke's request to avoid these requirements is worrisome, irresponsible and unacceptable.

Please deny this waiver.

Respectfully, Marilyn Clayton 9870 Timbers Dr Blue Ash, Oh 45242

Sent from my iPad

From:

Abbie Youkilis <ayoukilis@cinci.rr.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 10:32 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Opposed to Duke's request for waiver

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you.

Abbie Youkilis

From:

AnyiMary <anyifamily@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 10:52 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

I oppose Duke Energy's plan (Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX)

Dear officer,

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thanks Anyi Li

From:

Mary Liang <maryliang88@yahoo.com> Tuesday, September 20, 2016 10:57 PM

Sent: To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Dear officer,

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thanks Mary L.

From:

liay88 <liay88@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, September 20, 2016 11:00 PM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Dear officer, regarding Duke Energy case (16-253-GA-BTX)

Dear officer,

I strongly oppose Duke Energy's plan to build this unsafe pipe in my neighbourhood.

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thanks Larry

From:

tlecompte@fuse.net

Sent:

Wednesday, September 21, 2016 1:01 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Our house is 1/2 block from one of the proposed HP gas pipeline routes. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filling on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

From:

turkyroost <turkyroost@aol.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, September 21, 2016 8:04 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX.

Members of the OPSB PUC State of Ohio

21 September 2016

Dear Members of the OPSB:

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Leonid Turkevich 3650 Carpenters Creek Drive Cincinnati, OH 45241-3822

From:

K Kettler <ke_tts@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, September 21, 2016 8:36 AM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes.

The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

These homeowners HAVE THE RIGHT TO KNOW!

Karen Kettler Madeira, Ohio

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:

Cowans Info <info@cowans.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, September 21, 2016 9:08 AM

To: Subject: Puco ContactOPSB

Duke gas line problem

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

From:

amy francis <aifrancis4@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 9:08 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB
Subject: Puco ContactOPSB
Duke gas line

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

From: Janie Rice <jaguar10books@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 9:42 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB

Subject: Duke Central Corridor Pipeline

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable

The route they have chosen still goes through a heavily populated, industrial and business area. It is unacceptable. They need to put this pipeline in a RURAL area!!!

J. Rice Cincinnati, OH

From:

Yvonne Cooper <ymccooper@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, September 21, 2016 10:26 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

NOPE

To Whom It May Concern, Re: Case 16-253-GA-BTX

I am opposed to giving Duke energy the go ahead to put in a pipeline through my city. Please deny Duke's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Thank you, Yvonne Cooper 2617 Grandin Road Cincinnati, Ohio 45208

From:

Peat, Ian <peati@miamioh.edu>

Sent:

Wednesday, September 21, 2016 10:51 AM

To:

Puco ContactOPSB

Subject:

Re: Case 16-253-GA-BTX

Dear OPSB,

It is absolutely necessary to deny Duke Energy's request to avoid informing the public by holding meetings and mailing letters about their plans for the high pressure gas pipeline.

Duke Energy's proposed reduction in pipe diameter and pressure still presents an unacceptable and very serious hazard to anyone near the blast zone.

Although touted to be very safe, every year there is a disaster when such a pipeline ruptures. These failures may be accidental, but unfortunately in the current state of affairs, one cannot rule out the deliberate action of terrorists.

Sincerely,

Ian Peat, Ph.D. Blue Ash

From: Barbara Hendricks <bphendricks@icloud.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 12:26 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB
Subject: Cincinnati pipeline

Re. Case 16-253-GA-BTX. Please deny Duke Energy's request that the OPSB waive the requirements to hold another public meeting on the routes proposed in their filing on Sept. 13, 2016 and to send letters of information to all affected homeowners along the routes. The public is due transparency and information on this amended project. Duke's request to avoid these requirements, and thus transparency and information sharing, is inexcusable.

Sincerely

Barbara Price Hendricks

Sent from my iPhone