

From: [Johnson, Thomas](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: FW: Case #16-0253-GA-BTX
Date: Tuesday, February 07, 2017 11:53:38 AM

From: Patty Kreitinger [mailto:pkreitinger@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2017 11:09 AM
To: Johnson, Thomas <Thomas.Johnson@puco.ohio.gov>; Puco ContactOPSB
<contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: Case #16-0253-GA-BTX

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

RE: Case #16-0253-GA-BTX, Duke Central Corridor Extension Gas Pipeline

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Duke Energy has changed the term used to describe the pipeline they wish to have approved. According to the letter I received at my house dated February 19, 2016 Duke Energy referred to the pipeline as a transmission pipeline. At Duke Energy's public open house on January 26, 2017 Duke started calling the pipeline a distribution pipeline instead of a transmission pipeline. Duke does not appear to use a term to describe the type of pipeline in their amended application to the OPSB dated January 20, 2017. They don't call their pipeline a transmission line or a distribution line; they just call it a pipeline.

Duke Energy's Vice President of Gas Operations gave a power point presentation twice during the open house on January 26, 2017. The presentations were recorded and are available on YouTube for anyone to watch. I think you might want to watch the videos to see exactly what Duke Energy told the public.

Different behavior-distribution lines vs transmission lines

At 24 minutes 48 seconds into the first presentation a citizen asked a question about the distance affected if the gas pipeline were to explode. The Duke's Vice President never actually answers the lady's question. He did say, "... **with us designing this pipe to a distribution pipeline it doesn't have the behaviors of a transmission line.** If there is going to be an issue on this pipeline it's going to show up in the form of a leak. It is about the stress of the pipe. That's why we reduced below the 20%. It does not have behavior of a transmission line. Transmission line has different mechanism or mode of failure than a distribution line. This is a distribution line."

If there is different behavior between a distribution and a transmission pipeline I believe Duke Energy needs to withdrawal their application for the transmission pipeline, then re-apply for a distribution pipeline.

Here's a link to the first of Duke Energy's power point presentation if you wish to view it:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B89Wp_AIXTc&feature=share

Different skill to assemble a distribution line vs a transmission line

At 20 minutes 19 seconds into the second presentation a citizen asks a question about local workers

being hired to construct the pipeline. Then at 20 minutes 45 seconds while still answering her question the Duke's Vice President says **"distribution contractors don't have the same skill as transmission contractors so you have to get the right skill set"**.

It sounds like Duke plans to use lower skilled workers now that they are calling the pipeline a distribution pipeline. If there is different skill set between a distribution and a transmission pipeline contractor I believe Duke Energy needs to withdrawal their application for the transmission pipeline, then re-apply for a distribution pipeline.

Here's a link to the second of Duke's power point presentation if you wish to view it:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rph696lzkRA>

Case number extension

My understanding the OPSB assigns case number extensions based on the type of pipeline. Duke Energy initially applied for a transmission pipeline and received a case number with a BTX extension. It would seem they will need to withdrawal their application for the transmission pipeline, then re-apply for a distribution pipeline.

Duke Energy initial applied for 700 psi pipeline on September 13, 2016. How does the OPSB prevents Duke Energy from increasing the pressure in the pipeline to that of a transmission line if they receive approval from your board for a distribution line?

Sincerely,

Patricia Kreitinger

Sycamore Township (Kenwood), OH

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

2/15/2017 10:15:16 AM

in

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

Summary: Public Comment in opposition filed on behalf of concerned consumer, Patty Kreitinger electronically filed by Ms. Donielle M Hunter on behalf of PUCO Staff