

FILE

16-253-GA-BTX

From: Ethan Boger 9779 Troon Ct., Blue Ash, OH 45241

To: Ohio Pipeline Siting Board

In re 16-0253-GA-BTX, Duke Energy Central Corridor Pipeline Extension

Sirs,

Regarding the three proposed routes submitted by Duke Energy (Duke), we must question the reasoning behind the three routes proposed by Duke Energy. All three routes pass through highly populated areas in the Reading, Blue Ash, Deer Park and Dillonvale communities (see table below), not to mention other communities within and without the City of Cincinnati, such as Pleasant Ridge. We must ask why a route **OF SIMILAR LENGTH** has not been proposed, for example, through Village of Indian Hill (Indian Hill), which has a much lower population density.

In light of the known critical safety concerns regarding passage of high capacity transmission lines through High Consequence Areas, it is the responsibility of the OPSB to ask why the Indian Hill route was not chosen considering the average combined daytime population density of Reading, Blue Ash, Deer Park and Dillonvale is **5681 p/sqmi** while the population density of Indian Hill is **310 p/sqmi**. I.e., **18 times denser** and the route through Indian Hill is just as short as any of the others.

It is obvious to any resident of Hamilton County that Indian Hill has been a sacred cow, shielded in the past from development projects such as the Cross County Highway Extension. The median household income in Indian Hill is four times that of the other four communities and median home price is six times higher. If these are the kind of reasons why the proposed routing does not consider Indian Hill, a decision of the OPSB that puts other, more densely populated communities at risk would cast a dark cloud over the decision-making process.

The OPSB must ask itself if economic/political considerations have outweighed safety concerns. In this regard the following economic data may be of interest:

	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Blue Ash</u>	<u>Deer Park</u>	<u>Dillonvale</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Indian Hill</u>
Population (evening)	10,385	12,114	5736	3,474	31,709	5,785
Population (approx., day)	10,385	50,000	5736	3,474	69,595	5,785
Area (sq.mi.)	2.89	7.59	0.87	0.9	12.25	18.65
Pop. Density Evening (p/sqr)	3593	1596	6,593	3,900	2,588	310
Pop. Density Day (p/sqmi)	3593	6588	6,593	3,900	5,681	310
Median household income	\$38,335	\$73,464	\$44,092	\$52,041	\$54,299	\$200,140
Median home price	\$124,000	\$209,301	\$121,677	\$132,118	\$146,774	\$912,000

Respectfully,

*Ethan Boger*

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 SM Date Processed JUL 25 2016

PUCO

JUL 25 AM 11:25