

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: Public comment 16-253-GA-BTX
Date: Friday, May 26, 2017 3:01:45 PM

From: ContactThePUCO@puc.state.oh.us [mailto:ContactThePUCO@puc.state.oh.us]
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 3:25 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: Duke Pipeline

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 112882
Received: 5/25/2017 11:58:27 AM
Message:
WEB ID: 112882 AT:05-25-2017 at 11:58 AM
Related Case Number: 16-0253
TYPE: Comment
NAME: (No first or last name submitted ?)
CONTACT SENDER ? No
MAILING ADDRESS:
(NO CITY?) , Ohio (NO ZIP??)
USA
PHONE INFORMATION:
Home: (no home phone provided?)
Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)
Fax: (no fax number provided?)
E-MAIL: (no e-mail address provided)
INDUSTRY:Other
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:

Dear Senator Wilson, Mayor Policastro and Manager Geans: Having taken the time to read your letters in support of Duke Energy's high pressure natural gas transmission line 16-253-GA-BTX, what is immediately striking as ironic is the eerily similar – if not seemingly the exact same – crafted language in support of this project. A project that has been overwhelmingly opposed by the general population (including your voting constituents) and other government entities. Perhaps the use of the same language is nothing more than an extremely odd coincidence – as one would never want to assume that your letters were submitted in an attempt to pander to Duke Energy's strong political and monetary influence. However, since you have taken the opportunity to use your elected position to assist in swaying the power siting board's opinion regarding the proposed pipeline, one must now assume that you have done your thorough and complete research on the issue and are well

versed on the following: 1) That it appears as if Duke Energy attempted to mislead the public at its last open house by suddenly renaming this project as a "distribution line" that is meant to serve the immediate public, when in fact from the start this project was labeled by Duke Energy as a transmission line in its initial filings with the Ohio Power Siting Board, until January of 2017 was being called a transmission line in Duke's own publications and PR information. While Duke is now playing a name game, the Power Siting Board still considers this to be a transmission line due to the fact that there is no change in the line's start to finish and has no lines running off of it. What is the difference between a distribution line versus a transmission line you may ask? A distribution line is, by design, what is found in communities to distribute natural gas to homes and businesses through mains and services lines. While according to the Ohio Adm. Code 4906-3-06 a transmission pipeline transports natural gas thousands of miles from processing facilities across many parts of the continental United States. These lines are compared to the nation's interstate highway system for cars. They move large amounts of natural gas from the producing regions to local distribution companies (LDCs). 2) That while you are repeating Duke's propaganda that this line is will be "replacing old infrastructure," Duke's representatives themselves have stated that NO line will be retired with the installation of this line. Thus, the "old infrastructure" that you are concerned with will still be in place, still be utilized and still supply the same amount of natural gas that has adequately served our communities. This additional (not replacement) infrastructure adds significant additional natural gas. And perhaps with your detailed research you will be able to share just where this additional gas will be going and be used for – especially since Duke has admitted that its own studies show that the natural gas use in our immediate area will remain flat for the next 20 years. 3) You all have applauded the concept of retiring the peaking stations but have offered no explanation why. Are you aware that these stations are used only 4-10 days of the year when the weather is extremely adverse? And with this past winter having been so mild it is highly doubtful that the stations were used at all. So, why build such a large infrastructure to address an issue that may come into play 4-10 days of the year? Why do you applaud retiring the stations when they can be, and HAVE recently been, refurbished by Duke Energy? 4) You all say that safety is of importance in your support of the line but are you aware that the natural gas industries journal of safety states that high pressure transmission lines are NOT recommended for densely populated areas due to the fact that they are known to leak and are known to have weld failures? Are you aware that this pipeline is designed to run right by a gamma radon storage facility making the line a potential risk for intentional acts against the public? Are you aware that the pipeline is designed to run through a park that hosts hundreds of thousands of individuals during festivities – again making it an excellent mark for intentional acts? That the line runs by nursing homes, daycares, schools, hospitals, rec centers, and other sensitive facilities? Is this the type of safety protection that is vital to you? Again, since you have placed yourself directly in support of this project perhaps you would be willing to share with the public the extensive research you have performed that helps suggest that this is the safest, most cost effective manner in supplying energy to the public? 5) Lastly, since you support the building of additional infrastructure – despite the fact that studies have shown that pipelines are being built 3x faster than the actual need for the lines – can you please explain what you have done to promote sustainable energy in your communities and voting districts? Thank you for your thoughtful consideration on these issues and the general public anxiously awaits your responses.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/26/2017 3:36:07 PM

in

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

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