

From: Stephen Ploetz <sploetz6@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 29, 2019 8:53 AM
To: John H. Jones <john.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov>
Subject: Nestlewood permitting process

Re: Nestlewood Solar Facility

Mr. Jones, I am an Ohio resident concerned that the Ohio Power Siting Board, under the leadership of Chairman Randazzo, has acted in a capricious and biased manner regarding the permitting process of the Nestlewood Solar Facility to the detriment of Ohio citizens.

In particular, at the OPSB meeting of 10-17-19, the Board chairman, Mr. Randazzo, argued that the endangered Kirtland snake was not being protected. However, this argument was being raised after a Herpetological Consultant, Doug Wynn LLC had been hired and completed his report. The results of this report were quite explicit. In page 1 of the report it states, "The site was not identified as potential suitable habitat for the Kirtland Snake." This report can be found in the 8/30/2019 entry of the Case Record for 18-1546-EL-BGN, Exhibit 9.

This shows clear bias on the part of the chairman, as he is using an issue that had been already settled as a reason for deferring the Nestlewood project, perhaps indefinitely. How could any project go forward, when issues that have been raised and addressed can be raised again without additional evidence?

In the 10-17-19 meeting Mr. Randazzo raised 14 other specific complaints that he alleged were unaddressed. Most, if not all, of these issues have been part of extended negotiations between the Nestlewood staff and the staff of OPSB. Mr. Randazzo did not reference any of these negotiations and did not acknowledge any of the extensive efforts of the company to comply with OPSB requests.

I can provide a copy of the 10-17-19 OPSB meeting webcast if it is no longer available.

Is there any recourse to address this injustice? As a citizen of the State of Ohio I have a strong interest in having zero carbon emitting energy sources like Nestlewood being built. The 10-17-19 OPSB meeting shows a clear rejection of the use of evidence in the permitting process. Consequently, it violates the rules by which the OPSB is required by the state of Ohio to follow.

Thank you for considering this. Stephen Ploetz

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/5/2019 4:43:26 PM

in

Case No(s). 18-1546-EL-BGN

Summary: Public Comment of Stephen Ploetz electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing