ERRATA

To: Shonta Dunston, Chief Clerk

From: Kim Mitchell, Hearings and Court Reporting Manager

CC:

Date: October 5, 2022

Re: Docket No. E-100, Sub 179, Volume 21
Duke Energy Progress, LLC, and Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC,
2022 Biennial Integrated Resource Plans and Carbon Plan

The following correction has been made to the public and confidential transcripts in the above-mentioned docket. To ensure the accuracy of the docket, you will find attached to this Errata, corrected page 231.

Page/Line(s)	Text	Should Be
231 / 2-3	Sub 160 set	Sub 167

And essentially they use an economic dispatch model that looked at pricing periods from the Sub 167, similar to Sub 158, avoided cost proceeding. I think they were actually the Sub 167 rate design, and they optimized revenue over a period of time to come up with these solar output profiles.

Generally, they, you know, would discharge, say, during winter morning or charge during peak, but that was held constant throughout the entire modeling period through 2050, so it didn't reflect changes in those pricing periods that might be expected as you add and transition entirely over the next 28 years.

Q. Is it your understanding -- thank you.

Is it your understanding that partially in response to those concerns and concerns raised by CCEBA and some other intervenors that Duke Energy changed their assumptions about the dispatch of solar in storage in modeling SP5 and SP6?

A. Yes. In SP5 and SP6 they were modeled as two separate resources, and so the EnCompass algorithm was able to dispatch storage according to the system needs in real time. And I believe that is one of the contributing factors as to why the model shifted from standalone solar to solar plus storage.