

FILE

16-253-GA-BTX

2

**From:** L P Luigi Espenlaub [mailto:luigiwriter2@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 27, 2017 3:11 AM  
**To:** Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Please check info@nopecincy.org for a document

2017 JAN 27 PM 12:53  
PUCO

Matt Butler,

Public Information Officer,

Siting, Efficiency, and Renewable Energy Division, Rates and Analysis Department, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio | Ohio Power Siting Board

Please add the following to my previously docketed file in the public comments section of case number 16-253-GA-BTX.

A further Concern encountered at The Duke open house

The double-standard used by Duke to eliminate the route indicated by the Green line in my previous PDF document.

Something else I picked up at the meeting regarding the "Green Route" I laid out on Dukes base maps.

I was told by two different engineers that to use that route one or two laterals would have to be routed through Indian hill to serve areas near or within the Blue Ash, Deer Park area. [2]

The ill-logic of that hit me on the way home.

The duplicitous logic Duke has used to eliminate the "Green" route seems a convenient double standard applied to eliminate the "Green" route from public view. All the more convenient that these laterals should run through the Village of Indian Hill.[3]

\* Logically if all three lines have the same goal and the same start and end points then what is required on one route, must be required on all three routes.

\* Conversely, anything NOT required for one route with the same goal cannot be arbitrarily required on another route without being required on all routes.

Conclusion: If laterals are required on the "Green" route, then where are they on Duke's preferred and alternate routes. If Duke is not intending to install these laterals on their routes, then there is **no logical reason** for Duke to require laterals on the "Green" route or any other route.

All three routes:

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 AM Date Processed JAN 27 2017

\* Begin and end at the same points

\* **Should** have the same defined function.

Duke applied its double standard by defining the Green route's function differently.

Duke's stated purpose for the project is to install a high pressure gas line that **delivers all** the gas from the C314 gas line terminus to the Fair Fax Regulation station

Duke's double standard is the following:

\* Duke's defined function for the Green route is to **deliver only part of the gas** from the C314 pipe to the Fair Fax Regulation station by **delivering part of the gas** to Blue Ash and the Deer Park areas via laterals from it through the Village of Indian Hills. [2]

But:

\* Duke's defined function for its two proposed routes is instead to **deliver all the gas** from the C314 line to the Fair Fax Regulation station.

Which begs the question, "Why do the Blue Ash and Deer Park areas require service from the Green route, **but not** from the two Duke routes?"

Yours, with concern.

L. P. Luigi Espenlaub

CC: NOPE.org