98

Hunter, Donielle

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

10-502-EL-FOR

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Janis Dugle

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 11:41 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler.

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

When you took office two years ago, you promised to make Ohio a more business friendly state.

2013 IAU 22 AM 9: 01

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Janis Dugle 404 Olde Mill Dr Westerville, OH 43082-1028

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Heather Landers

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 9:41 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Heather Landers 6904 Running Deer Pl Dublin, OH 43017-2838

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Chairman 614.466.3362 PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Alice Dugar

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 9:41 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Alice Dugar 6800 Chestnut Rd Independence, OH 44131-3310 (216) 447-4406

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Joan DeLauro

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 10:11 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Joan DeLauro 2434 Queenston Rd Cleveland Hts, OH 44118-4316

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Chairman 614.466.3362 PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Barbara Sue Scholl

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 12:11 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Barbara Sue Scholl 727 E 5th Ave Lancaster, OH 43130-3221 (740) 654-7491

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Janet Lawson

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 11:11 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Janet Lawson 1424 Old Lane Ave Kettering, OH 45409-1726 (937) 299-6662

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Stephen Farmer

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 4:42 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Stephen Farmer 369 Dutch Ridge Rd Portsmouth, OH 45662-8735 (740) 776-3441

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Sharon Stolzenberger

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 11:41 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Miss Sharon Stolzenberger 4608 Silverwood Dr Kettering, OH 45429-1849 (937) 305-3062

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Joan Sturtevant

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 8:42 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joan Sturtevant 8079 Ferguson Rd Streetsboro, OH 44241-5836

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of mb grey

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 12:41 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 18, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. mb grey 3119 Essex Rd Cleveland Heights, OH 44118-3537

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Mary Bartos

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 9:12 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Mary Bartos 5936 Stumph Rd Apt 314 Parma, OH 44130-1759

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of pete morabito

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 9:42 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. pete morabito 6463 S Timberidge Dr Youngstown, OH 44515-5551

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Anthony Mehle

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 9:42 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anthony Mehle 6634 Covington Cv Canfield, OH 44406-8161

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of meridith beck

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 9:12 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. meridith beck 2611 E Sand Rd Port Clinton, OH 43452-2740

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Philip Strickland

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 9:42 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Philip Strickland 112 N Portage Path Apt 10 Akron, OH 44303-1140 (330) 858-5670

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Victor Sudik

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 11:12 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Victor Sudik 14894 Grant Dr Middlefield, OH 44062-9627

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of William Rauckhorst

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 11:12 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Dr. William Rauckhorst 129 Country Club Dr Oxford, OH 45056-9002

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Linda Flannery

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 10:12 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler.

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Linda Flannery 1587 Northland Ave Lakewood, OH 44107-3721

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Marji Edguer

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 1:43 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Marji Edguer 1525 Kew Rd Cleveland Heights, OH 44118-1204

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Leone Batte

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 2:13 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Leone Batte 6456 London Groveport Rd Grove City, OH 43123-9625

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Martha Adams

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 12:13 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Martha Adams 5739 Dorr St Apt 302 Toledo, OH 43615-3479

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Francille & Donald Willis

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 4:43 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Francille & Donald Willis 5122 Spencer Rd Cleveland, OH 44124-1249

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

__

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Janet Hogue

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 3:43 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Janet Hogue 2070 Canterbury Rd Akron, OH 44333-1977 (330) 666-3234

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of glynis boyd

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 5:13 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. glynis boyd 1609 Stanhope Kelloggsville Rd Jefferson, OH 44047-8474

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Chairman 614.466.3362 PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of William Ondrey Gruber

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 8:43 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. William Ondrey Gruber 2714 Leighton Rd Shaker Heights, OH 44120-1325 (216) 371-3570

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Daniel Gray

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 4:43 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Daniel Gray 431 W 1st Ave Apt 301 Columbus, OH 43201-3599 (216) 789-3320

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Beverly Mick

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 12:43 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Miss Beverly Mick 4917 Lyle Rd Columbus, OH 43229-5307

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Victoria Hennessy

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 10:13 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Victoria Hennessy 250 Wright St Yellow Springs, OH 45387-1432

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Pat Johnson

Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2013 11:43 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Pat Johnson 864 Lakefield Dr Galloway, OH 43119-9477

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Linda Vietz

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 12:43 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 19, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Miss Linda Vietz 4917 Lyle Rd Columbus, OH 43229-5307

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Adam Proehl

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 10:44 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Adam Proehl 1392 Summit St Columbus, OH 43201-2559

From: Snitchler, Todd

Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To: Docketing

Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of John Bienz

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 12:15 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Dr. John Bienz 415 Vincent St Alliance, OH 44601-3951 (330) 821-0065

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Kay Brown

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 1:45 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Kay Brown 2430 Parwich Cir Alliance, OH 44601-5139 (330) 823-6977

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Thomas Rampe, PE

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 3:45 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Thomas Rampe, PE 5401 Club Island Rd Celina, OH 45822-8871 (419) 268-2319

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Lisa Herold

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 1:15 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Lisa Herold 27051 Oak St Beloit, OH 44609-9472 (330) 525-7542

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Chairman 614.466.3362 PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Sujit Chatterji

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 9:45 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Sujit Chatterji 848 Thornview Dr Galloway, OH 43119-8616

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Mark Parsley

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 2:45 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mark Parsley 174 Rugg Ave Newark, OH 43055-4612 (740) 366-9737

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Jaclyn Serpico

Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2013 10:15 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 20, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jaclyn Serpico 2428 Bryden Rd Bexley, OH 43209-2130

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of James O'Reilly

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 7:46 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. James O'Reilly 24 Jewett Dr Wyoming, OH 45215-2648 (513) 556-0062

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of rob wilson

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 9:46 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. rob wilson 1439 Bryden Dr Akron, OH 44313-6554 (330) 212-4101

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Linda Park

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 12:17 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Linda Park 1848 Beersford Rd Cleveland, OH 44112-3916

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Marilyn Welker

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 5:47 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Marilyn Welker 3538 W US Highway 36 Urbana, OH 43078-9608

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Anne Caruso

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 10:17 AM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Anne Caruso 2273 Bellfield Ave Cleveland, OH 44106-3136

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Chairman 614.466.3362 PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Julie Lapp

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 12:17 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Julie Lapp 307 N Union St Delaware, OH 43015-1633

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Jeff Dean

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 3:47 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jeff Dean 7491 View Place Dr Cincinnati, OH 45224-1458

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

__

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Daniel Nelson

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 4:17 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel Nelson 970 N Hametown Rd Akron, OH 44333-1426

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

----Original Message-----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Paul Hang

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 6:47 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Mr. Paul Hang 581 Northridge Rd Circleville, OH 43113-1151

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Barbara Martin

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 10:17 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Barbara Martin 1901 Stratford Rd Delaware, OH 43015-2931

From:

Snitchler, Todd

Sent:

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 8:26 AM

To:

Docketing

Subject:

FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Chairman
614.466.3362
PUCO.ohio.gov

_

----Original Message----

From: Ohio Environmental Council [mailto:OEC@theOEC.org] On Behalf Of Gretchen Thomas

Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 7:17 PM

To: Snitchler, Todd

Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 21, 2013

PUCO Chair Todd Snitchler

Dear PUCO Chair Snitchler,

I was shocked to see that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio recently rejected AEP Ohio's proposal to develop the Turning Point solar project. This decision is a step in the wrong direction for Ohio's economy and environment.

The Turning Point project was set to be built on 700 acres of reclaimed strip mine land in Noble County.

As you know, Southeast Ohio's economy has struggled to climb out of the recession. The unemployment rate in Noble county stands at 9.3%, among the highest in the state. Many of the surrounding counties are even worse off. Turning Point would be a step towards reversing that by creating over 100 local jobs during each of the three phases of the project.

Additionally, the project attracted more than \$100 million of additional investment when the Spanish solar manufacturer Isofoton announced it was locating its North American manufacturing facility in Napoleon, largely because of the Turning Point project. All told, more than 600 jobs are in jeopardy because of this controversial decision.

The economic impact of this ruling is just the tip of the iceberg.

Unlike the scarred remnants of Ohio's coal dependency that litter Southeast Ohio, Turning Point would have no negative environmental impact. In fact, the project would reduce climate change-related pollution by 70,000 tons a year.

Ultimately, the success or failure of Turning Point will be a symbol of your vision of Ohio.

Sincerely,

Ms. Gretchen Thomas 1610 Bradner Rd Northwood, OH 43619-2418