

FILE

16-253-CA-BTX

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 107149
Received: 5/27/2016 2:31:16 PM
Message:
WEB ID: 107149 AT:05-27-2016 at 02:31 PM

Related Case Number: 16-0253

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Mr. D Herman

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

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: spamit@cinci.rr.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:

I just read Superintendent Forsthoefel of Sycamore Community Schools, and I am shocked, shocked that one of Duke Energy's routes for their 30 inch gas pipeline passes within 200 feet of an elementary school with 500+ children and staff. What type of flawed route selection criteria would output such a unacceptable result? What engineers would accept that output after review?

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 DM Date Processed MAY 31 2016

RECEIVED-PUCO
2016 MAY 31 PM 1:39
PUCO

It is telltale of a bad process. It is telltale of a process that doesn't place public safety, even children, first. And the Power Sitting Board should not accept the output of a bad process. Duke Energy has not been transparent on their route selection process, but the output clearly identifies it is flawed. As an Engineer, and a former member of the Safety Team of a local Fortune 500 company, I can say with confidence this result would never be accepted, but Safety of the public was job #1 and management never overruled that fact. If the route next to Blue Ash Elementary school is proposed by Duke it should be rejected without discussion. Besides that, the entire route selection criteria and results, both accepted and rejected should be reviewed by the Power Sitting Board in detail because if the output of Duke's process is to put a 30 inch pipeline so close to an elementary school, then routes that have MUCH less risk were probably rejected for other offensive criteria inconsistent with the public good. Duke is not an Ohio company, but they are risking Ohio lives... children's lives. I can only hope that the Professional Engineer on the Board recognizes that a route selection process that puts an elementary school in the path of a 30 inch gas pipeline is flawed. I would hope that the Engineers at Duke, belatedly, recognize that the safety of children should not be put at risk no matter how low they calculate the probability or how much management pressures them on cost. If a disaster can happen, it likely will. Even layman know that the probability of incinerating children can be zero if another more industrial or rural route is selected. I am afraid that Duke's corporate culture is blinding the engineers to their duty to protect the public against avoidable risks like it blinded GM on the ignition switch and Volkswagen on emissions. It is the responsibility of the Sitting Board to not make the oversight mistake that allowed an unmanned train loaded with flammable material to be parked up hill of Lac-Mégantic, Canada that was incinerated when the train ran away... only then did the authorities change the rules. 30 inch gas pipelines should have a criteria on how close they can be to densely populated areas (PARTICULARLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS), and I am sure that criteria is not less than 200 feet. Duke has not vetted their selection criteria in public and their proposed route should not be approved without detail scrutiny by experienced, educated people that care about the outcomes that Duke cares little about. Public comment alone is insufficient in providing the necessary checks and balances to this out of state, public, monopolistic company. The Sitting Board needs to do their duty to protect the public and reject foolhardy suggestions outright and scrutinize in detail the process that produces them before they are put into use.