

**BEFORE
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke :
Energy for a Certificate of Environmental :
Compatibility and Public Need to : Case No. 16-0253-GA-BTX
Construct the C314V Central Corridor :
Pipeline Extension Project. :

**PREFILED TESTIMONY
OF
Tim Burgener
GIS & OPERATIONS DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF RATES AND ANALYSIS
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF**

STAFF EX. ____

April 2, 2019

1 1. Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. My name is Tim Burgener, and my business address is 180 East Broad
3 Street, Columbus OH 43215.
4

5 2. Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position?

6 A. I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) as a
7 Public Utilities Administrator in the GIS & Operations Division of the
8 Department of Rates and Analysis. My position includes assigned duties
9 by the Chairman of the Ohio Power Siting Board (Board) to investigate
10 applications filed with the Board and assist in preparing reports.
11

12 3. Q. Please summarize your educational background and work experience.

13 A. I received a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Spanish from the University of
14 Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and Master's Degrees in Social Work and City
15 and Regional Planning from The Ohio State University. In addition, I have
16 completed several technical courses in Geographic Information Systems
17 (GIS).
18

19 I have been employed by the PUCO since January 2016, and was
20 previously employed by the PUCO from 2004 to 2013, in what was then
21 called the Facilities, Siting, and Environmental Analysis Division. My

responsibilities include review of Board cases and administration of the PUCO's GIS.

4. Q. Have you testified in prior proceedings before the Ohio Power Siting Board?

A. Yes, I testified to sponsor the Staff Report of Investigation in case number 08-0281-EL-BGN, Middletown Coke Cogeneration Station.

5. Q. What was your role in this case?

A. I reviewed sections of the application for compliance with Board rules and contributed sections to the Staff Report.

6. Q. What sections of the Staff Report of investigation did you work on?

A. I contributed to the sections titled Demographics, Land Use, Residential Structures, Land Use Plans and Regional Development, Aesthetics, and Route Selection. I also proposed conditions 14, 15, 16, and 17 in the Staff Report.

7. Q. What did you conclude in regard to demographics?

A. I reviewed the most recent census data for Hamilton County, and available population projections. I confirmed that the population of the county is expected to grow over the next 20 years. I also reviewed census-tract level income data and concluded that the median income in the area around the

1 Preferred and Alternate routes is similar to the median income across the
2 entire study area for the project.
3

4 8. Q. What did you conclude in regard to land use?

5 A. I reviewed the data submitted by the Applicant in its application and
6 various supplements. I concluded that land use impacts are similar for the
7 Preferred and Alternate routes, and are largely temporary. The Applicant
8 has proposed construction measures that would limit temporary impacts to
9 the extent practicable. Permanent land use impacts would be mitigated
10 through the easement acquisition process.
11

12 9. Q. What did you conclude in regard to residential structures?

13 A. I reviewed the data submitted by the Applicant in its application and
14 supplements, and concluded that the Alternate route has more structures
15 within 100 feet, while the Preferred Route has more structures within 1,000
16 feet. No residential structures would be removed for the project.
17

18 10. Q. What did you conclude in regard to land use plans and regional
19 development?

20 A. I reviewed information submitted by the Applicant regarding their
21 investigation of local land use and development plans. No potential land
22 use conflicts were identified. The project is expected to support future

development in the region by increasing the supply of natural gas. In order to prevent conflicts between the project and future development, I recommended Condition 14, which requires the Applicant to initiate a consultation process with local planning authorities.

11. Q. What did you conclude in regard to aesthetics?

A. I concluded that permanent visual impacts would be introduced at the locations of the project's valve stations, regulating stations, and pipeline markers. I also recommended three conditions, 15, 16, and 17, that would mitigate the visual impact of the above-ground facilities by requiring green screening and vegetation around regulator and valve stations, requiring that security lighting to be directed downward, and requiring the Applicant to work with property owners on the design and placement of pipeline markers.

12. Q. What did you conclude in regard to route selection?

A. I reviewed the Applicant's route selection study and concluded that the Applicant investigated all practicable routes, and used a reasonable process for selecting the Preferred and Alternate routes.

13. Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

1 A. Yes it does. However, I reserve the right to submit supplemental testi-
2 mony, as new information subsequently becomes available or in response
3 to positions taken by other parties.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Prefiled Testimony of Tim Burgener, submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board, was served via electronic mail, upon the following parties of record, this 2nd day of April, 2019.

/s/ Steven L. Beeler

Steven L. Beeler

Parties of Record:

Jeanne.Kingery@duke-energy.com
Rocco.DAscenzo@duke-energy.com
Andrew.Garth@cincinnati-oh.gov
Howard.Miller@cincinnati-oh.gov
robert.holderbaum@puco.ohio.gov
john.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
Robert.eubanks@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
jyskamp@fairshake-els.org
ecollins@fairshake-els.org
bfox@graydon.law
jlang@calfee.com
slesser@calfee.com
mkeaney@calfee.com
cjones@calfee.com
tburke@manleyburke.com
mkamrass@manleyburke.com
Bryan.pacheco@dinsmore.com
Mark.arnzen@dinsmore.com
miller@donnellonlaw.com
KCMcDonough@woodlamping.com
Roger.friedmann@hcpros.org
Michael.friedmann@hcpros.org
Jay.wampler@hcpros.org
tmd@donnellonlaw.com
butler@donnellonlaw.com
dstevenson@cinci.rr.com

ahelmes@deerpark-oh.gov
dborchers@bricker.com
dparram@bricker.com
joliker@igsenergy.com
Richard.tranter@dinsmore.com
Kevin.detroy@dinsmore.com
Kent.bucciery@gmail.com
lauxlawesq@gmail.com
Paula.boggsmuething@cincinnati-oh.gov

Administrative Law Judges

sarah.parrot@puco.ohio.gov
greta.see@puco.ohio.gov

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/2/2019 2:50:24 PM

in

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

Summary: Testimony of Tim Burgener electronically filed by Ms. Tonnetta Scott on behalf of PUC