

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 8:32 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

1D-501-EL-FOR
1D-501-EL-FOR

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Robyn Herr
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 8:32:03 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 23, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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 Isoton 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician DP Date Processed JAN 24 2013

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2013 JAN 24 AM 7:52
PUCO

Ms. Robyn Herr
2572 Kemper Rd Apt 111
Shaker Heights, OH 44120-1235
(510) 325-7849

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 7:32 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Pamela Hollenbeck
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 7:32:01 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 23, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. Pamela Hollenbeck
2439 Drummond Rd
Toledo, OH 43606-3128

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 7:32 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Jeff Peters
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 7:32:01 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 23, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Jeff Peters
1943 Cherrylawn Dr
Toledo, OH 43614-3506
(419) 381-6614

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 7:03 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Peter R Griesinger
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 7:01:56 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 23, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Peter R Griesinger
7300 Old Mill Rd
Gates Mills, OH 44040-9637

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 6:35 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: I oppose Duke Energy's rate hike

From: GreenpeaceOn Behalf OfVinícious De Luca
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 6:34:46 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: I oppose Duke Energy's rate hike

Jan 23, 2013

Todd Snitchler

Dear Snitchler,

Now that the city of Cincinnati has taken a stand against Duke Energy's dirty business and chosen an energy provider using less coal, Duke is asking for a rate hike on working Ohioans and small business owners to compensate for their failure to modernize. Duke Energy shouldn't be allowed to use rate hikes to punish customers who choose cleaner, cheaper options for their electricity supply.

Duke Energy should quit investing in coal and instead invest in the renewable technologies that they claim to support--and that are required under Ohio's Renewable Portfolio Standard. In Ohio, we already pay the hidden cost of coal with our health and our environment. But if companies like Duke want to ask more from our pocketbooks too, it should be for an Ohio that's powered by local wind & solar that will protect our health and employ thousands of Ohioans.

I oppose this rate hike.

Case number: 12-1682-EL-AIR

Sincerely,

Vinícius De Luca
Rua Sao Benedito
São Paulo, ME 0473500133

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 5:01 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Rosemary Joyce
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 5:01:05 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 23, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Dr. Rosemary Joyce
625 Founders Ln
Granville, OH 43023-8017
(740) 587-3831

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 11:33 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Carolyn Crites
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 11:32:18 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 23, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Carolyn Crites
964 Overlook Dr
Alliance, OH 44601-3726

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 6:33 AM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Brittney Sunderland
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 6:33:01 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 24, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Brittney Sunderland
320 Maplewood Dr
Apt 5
Cortland, OH 44410-1360
(330) 978-7678

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 3:33 AM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of jill.cowan
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 3:32:42 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 24, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. jill cowan
302 Balaclava st
bedford, NS 90210

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 2:33 AM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Pearl Southwell
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 2:32:37 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 24, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Pearl Southwell
7201 Minerva Rd SE
Waynesburg, OH 44688-9305

Hunter, Donielle

From: Snitchler, Todd
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 12:02 AM
To: Docketing
Subject: FW: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

From: Ohio Environmental Council On Behalf Of Sonmez Sahutoglu
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 12:02:22 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Snitchler, Todd
Subject: Don't Turn Your Back on Ohio's Clean Energy Future

Jan 23, 2013

PUCO Chair Snitchler

Dear 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.

You've gone out of your way to ensure businesses and the jobs they represent, stay in Ohio. I urge you to show the same passion and commitment to job creation when it comes to this project.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Sonmez Sahutoglu
7132 Crabtree Ln
Sylvania, OH 43560-1107