

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [PUCO-Docketing](#)
Subject: public comment 21-1231
Date: Monday, August 21, 2023 1:55:48 PM

Ohio Power Siting Board
Attn: Jenifer French
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
RE: Fountain Point Solar Project, OPSB Case #21-1231-EL-BGN

Dear Chair French,

While attending the Judicial hearing for Fountain Point Solar, I was confused by the testimony of Mr. Stottsberry so I tried, with my limited resources, to look at this issue.

He stated that they typically do not consider the opposition to be at the level to deny unless there is unanimous opposition by the local elected bodies. He further stated that from the support by Mr. Mosier along with the status as lease holders of the other two Trustees from Bokescreek Township, he assumed that Bokescreek Township was in support of the project, therefore not achieving the level for denial.

First, of the two townships that were included at the time of this testimony, only one is eligible to act in this case. That township, Rushcreek, passed a resolution to intervene against the project. Bokescreek due to the conflicted status of two trustees has, in fact, denied the people of Bokescreek Township the representation those elected officials swore to provide.

There is in fact, a petition filed with the OPSB with signatures of 119 residents and land owners in Bokescreek Township directly addressing that position. This was a hand carried petition that was compiled very quickly, after seeing the original staff report before the public hearing, as the dates associated with the signatures would indicate.

It is also note-worthy that those two trustees voted openly in 2022 to request restricted status for their township under SB52. Those restrictions were adopted for 16 of 17 townships, by the Logan County Commissioner in August of 2022, and became effective in September of 2022.

So, the question is whether Mr. Stottsberry's assumption regarding Bokescreek support is based upon the personal financial benefit of those trustees, or the actual representation for the people of Bokescreek Township. Likewise, you can question the statement of inconsistent opposition regarding the Logan County commissioners. The original letters were sent November 30, 2021, one month before Fountain Point even entered their application to the OPSB, and were a statement of general support that did not reference any case # or project. In Mr. Benedetti's follow up letter dated January 20, 2022, he identified this specific case, clarifying this point, and further qualifies his position by saying, "After seeing the location, size, and scope of the Fountain project, it is not right for our community." This position regarding Fountain Point Solar seems very clear.

My summary shows that not a single elected body acted legally in support of Fountain Point Solar.

The only two eligible elected bodies, Logan County Commissioners and Rushcreek Township Trustees, entered the case as interveners in opposition to the project. Even though Mr. Stottsberry felt the commissioner's position was inconsistent

Of the remaining 15 townships in Logan County, 13 legally passed resolutions to enter letters of opposition against Fountain Point Solar.

I'm not sure of the math, but with zero on the support side and 15 on the opposition side it seems very clear to me that the local elected bodies expressed overwhelming if not unanimous opposition.

Currently 16 of the 17 townships in Logan County are restricted under SB 52 and if not for this "grandfathered" loophole we would not even be engaged in this discussion.

I continue to oppose Fountain Point Solar, OPSB case #21-1231-EL-BGN. It certainly does not satisfy the public interest, convenience, and necessity as required by your criteria.

If you ignore the public interest and change your criteria to "political interest" you would have justification, as even self-proclaimed conservatives are quickly drawn by the golden calf of crony capitalism to worship at the altar of the green new deal.

Save our prime farmland and your integrity by denying this project.

Jim Wolever
Rushcreek Township
Logan County, Ohio

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

8/21/2023 4:54:20 PM

in

Case No(s). 21-1231-EL-BGN

Summary: Public Comment of Jim Wolever, electronically filed by Docketing Staff
on behalf of Docketing and Jim Wolever.