

Public comment 16-0253-GA-BTX

-----Original Message-----

From: Elizabeth Rueve-Miller [<mailto:info@nopecincy.org>]

Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 9:49 AM

To: Puco ContactOPSB <[contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov](mailto:contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov)>

Subject: Duke's Central Corridor Pipeline - 16-253-GA-BTX

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).

Residents, organizational and religious leaders, elected officials and businesses have vehemently opposed Duke's plans to build a high-pressure pipeline through our densely populated communities for almost 2 years (16-253-GA-BTX). This intrastate pipeline, under the jurisdiction of the OPSB, has received far more opposition than any other project to come under review by OPSB in the past decade.

1. The fact that Duke did not identify the potential Environmental and Public Safety risk until 1 ? years after filing their initial application is shocking.
2. The fact that the OPSB recommended the route with the Environmental Superfund Site seems to indicate that Staff did not conduct a critical and in-depth evaluation of the application and is either negligence or a dereliction of duty.
3. And the fact that no decision makers from the OPSB could not be bothered to attend their own public hearing, despite the unprecedented concern suggests that regardless of what the public has to say, the decision of the OPSB has already been made.

In this context, it is not surprising that confidence in both Duke's application and OPSB's review and the decision making process has been deeply shaken.

Duke has gone back and gotten more information about the Superfund site. How do we know the analysis is sufficient? How do we know that there are not other significant issues of concern that Duke has not identified in their application? Are there brownfields? What if there are multiple issues, that when combined, create a significant concern (for example HDD and Superfund?)

It does not appear that Duke actively identifies areas of concern as part of the design and routing process (unless it involves an endangered species). Rather it is upon the municipalities, residents and businesses to identify them. We do not have access to the same resources and information that Duke has.

How do we feel assured that OPSB Staff has done due diligence in their review of the application? Many people think OPSB has accepted everything in Duke's application at face value. As a result, OPSB already missed one major issue in Duke's application. What else are they missing? How do we feel confident that the OPSB has completed a critical evaluation of Duke's application, unless they review the application again, in more depth?

How do we feel confident that decision makers at OPSB actually consider what the public has to say, if we never see them listening to us? Do they really understand the costs and benefits of this pipeline?

In light of what has happened:

1. Duke has an obligation to ensure that the public understands what has been done to understand/mitigate the environmental superfund issue and what has been done to insure there are no other significant issues they 'missed' during their application process.
2. OPSB Staff has an obligation to review Duke's application critically and in its entirety. OPSB decision makers have an obligation to listen to what the public has to say.
3. PUCO and OPSB Board must insure that the public's confidence in this entire process is restored.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Rueve-Miller  
Blue Ash, OH 45236

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 500psi pressure and an accident or rupture could cause injuries, death and destruction of property within a radius of 1000 feet.

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

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**4/23/2018 11:49:04 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 16-0253-GA-BTX**

Summary: Public Comment electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing.