

FILE

Hunter, Donielle

**From:** ContactThePUCO  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 16, 2013 11:08 AM  
**To:** Docketing  
**Subject:** Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 1/16/2013

Re: Justin Depinet  
199 Siesta Dr  
Apt J  
Tiffin, OH 44883

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV  
2013 JAN 16 PM 1:33  
PUCO

Docketing Case No.: 10-501-EL-FOR

Notes:

I recently read in our local newspaper that "The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio voted Wednesday against funding the project because they weren't sure it would benefit ratepayers." The project that was of interest was the Southeast Ohio solar farm. My question to you is why your commission decided to not appropriate funding for this with your reasoning of not benefiting ratepayers. I have been with AEP for quite some time and would heavily favor any decision in the direction of #1 creating jobs in Ohio, and #2 creating jobs moving in the trend of Renewable Energy. Why do you not feel it would benefit ratepayers? Did you ask them? What kind of benefits are you referring to? Are your assumptions accurate with that of the ratepayers? Are you talking short-term or long-term benefits? What benefits? financial, economical, environmental? Do what is right, not what is easiest ...

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business  
Technician SM<sup>1</sup> Date Processed JAN 16 2013