

1 PLACE: Via Videoconference  
2 DATE: Monday, February 7, 2022  
3 TIME: 10:20 a.m. - 11:22 a.m.  
4 DOCKET NO: E-100, Sub 179  
5 BEFORE: Chair Charlotte A. Mitchell, Presiding  
6 Commissioner ToNola D. Brown-Bland  
7 Commissioner Lyons Gray  
8 Commissioner Daniel G. Clodfelter  
9 Commissioner Kimberly W. Duffley  
10 Commissioner Jeffrey A. Hughes  
11 Commissioner Floyd B. McKissick, Jr.  
12  
13

14 IN THE MATTER OF:

15 Duke Energy Progress, LLC, and  
16 Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC,  
17 Stakeholder Meeting Update  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

3 FOR DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC, AND DUKE ENERGY

4 CAROLINAS, LLC:

5 Jack Jirak, Esq.

6 General Counsel

7 Rebecca Dulin, Esq.

8 Director of Stakeholder Engagement

9

10 FOR CLEAN POWER SUPPLIERS ASSOCIATION:

11 Ben Snowden, Esq.

12

13 FOR APPALACHIAN VOICES:

14 Cathy Cralle Jones, Esq.

15

16 FOR NORTH CAROLINA SUSTAINABLE ENERGY ASSOCIATION:

17 Benjamin Smith, Esq.

18

19 FOR PUBLIC STAFF:

20 Nadia Luhr, Esq.

21 Jeff Thomas

22 Engineer, Energy Division

23

24

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

## P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR MITCHELL: Let's come to order and go on the record, please. I'm Charlotte Mitchell, Chair of the Utilities Commission. With me this morning are the following Commissioners. When I call your name please announce your presence. Commissioner Brown-Bland?

COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: I'm present.  
Good morning.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Good morning. Commissioner Gray?

COMMISSIONER GRAY: Here.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Clodfelter?

COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Yes, good morning.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Duffley?

COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Good morning.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Hughes?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Good morning.

CHAIR MITCHELL: And Commissioner McKissick?

COMMISSIONER MCKISSICK: Good morning.

CHAIR MITCHELL: In compliance with the State Government Ethics Act, I remind members of the Commission of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest, and inquire as to whether any member of the

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1 Commission has a known conflict with respect to  
2 matters coming before us this morning?

3 (No response)

4 The record will reflect that no conflicts  
5 have been identified, so we'll go ahead and get  
6 started.

7 House Bill 951 directs the Commission to  
8 take all reasonable steps to achieve reductions in the  
9 emissions of carbon dioxide in the State from electric  
10 generating facilities owned or operated by Duke Energy  
11 Progress and Duke Energy Carolinas. The Commission is  
12 directed to develop by December 31st, 2022, a plan,  
13 which we've referred to as the Carbon Plan, to achieve  
14 the targeted emissions reductions and to review the  
15 plan every two years thereafter.

16 The Commission has ordered Duke to file a  
17 proposed carbon plan by no later than May 16th of this  
18 year. House Bill 951 requires that the development of  
19 the carbon plan include stakeholder input.

20 The Commission has further ordered Duke to  
21 conduct at least three stakeholder meetings prior to  
22 May 13th, 2022. The first of these meetings occurred  
23 on January 21st -- I'm sorry, January 25th, 2022, and  
24 was facilitated by the Great Plains Institute.

1           To further the goal of keeping the  
2 Commission apprised of the sufficiency of the  
3 stakeholder process, we are here this morning to  
4 receive an update on that first stakeholder meeting.

5           We'll start with an update from Duke, which  
6 should not exceed 10 minutes. Following Duke's  
7 update, we'll take questions from Commissioners, if  
8 there are any. Next, we'll proceed with the Public  
9 Staff and hear from the Public Staff its views, which  
10 should not exceed five minutes, and we'll follow with  
11 Commission questions, if there are any.

12           The Commission is also allowing intervenors  
13 in this proceeding who have preregistered to do so to  
14 update the Commission on the sufficiency of the first  
15 stakeholder meeting. Each intervenor update should  
16 not exceed five minutes and will be followed by  
17 questions from the Commissioners, if there are any.

18           The intervenors that have preregistered to  
19 provide an update are the Clean Power Suppliers  
20 Association, the North Carolina Sustainable Energy  
21 Association, and Appalachian Voices, and the  
22 intervenors will be taken in that order.

23           I note that NCSEA filed a letter with the  
24 Commission in this docket on February 1st in which it

1 indicated it was providing the letter in lieu of  
2 presenting to the Commission this morning. The  
3 Commissioners have reviewed the letter and will  
4 proceed straight to Commissioner questions for NCSEA  
5 when I call upon NCSEA.

6 Finally, I want to stress that the sole  
7 purpose of the updates that we will receive this  
8 morning is to inform the Commissioners of the  
9 sufficiency of the stakeholder process. Parties are  
10 directed to limit their updates to the sufficiency of  
11 the stakeholder process and should not address any  
12 substantive issues this morning.

13 Just one last time to make sure we're all on  
14 the same page, please limit discussion to sufficiency  
15 of the stakeholder process. If you-all stray from  
16 sufficiency of the stakeholder process, do not be  
17 surprised when I direct you to get back in your lane.

18 With that, we're going to get started. I'm  
19 going to call upon Duke. And Duke, for the record,  
20 please announce -- you can make your appearance,  
21 announce, by stating your name and letting us know  
22 your title and your role in the carbon plan  
23 proceeding.

24 MR. JIRAK: Thank you, Chair Mitchell. Can

1 you hear me?

2 CHAIR MITCHELL: We can hear you, Mr. Jirak.  
3 There you are.

4 MR. JIRAK: All right. Well, thank you very  
5 much, Chair Mitchell and Commissioners for this chance  
6 to present to you this morning on the sufficiency of  
7 the regulatory -- of the stakeholder process. We do  
8 appreciate this chance to present with you. And with  
9 a 10-minute shot clock, I'm going to try to get out of  
10 the way very quickly, and we'll turn things over  
11 immediately to Rebecca Dulin.

12 Rebecca is a recovering regulatory attorney,  
13 but in her prior role with Duke as an attorney  
14 developed a wealth of experience in IRP planning  
15 processes in the Carolinas in front of both  
16 Commissions and has -- just brings an immense amount  
17 of expertise to bear all these issues, and also has  
18 strong relationships with many of the key stakeholders  
19 that are involved in regulatory processes in the  
20 Carolinas. So, we're thrilled to have her in her new  
21 role as Director of Stakeholder Engagement, and I will  
22 turn things over to her. Thank you.

23 CHAIR MITCHELL: So far so good, Mr. Jirak.  
24 Ms. Dulin, you may proceed. Glad to have you in your

1 new capacity.

2 MS. DULIN: Thank you, Chair Mitchell.  
3 Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you, Jack. It's a  
4 pleasure to be with you this morning. As Jack said,  
5 I'm Rebecca Dulin and I'm leading the Companies'  
6 stakeholder engagement efforts for the Carolinas  
7 carbon plan. My comments today are entirely limited  
8 to the sufficiency of the process. And so thank you  
9 for that reminder. I have not appeared before the  
10 Commission before, before this Commission, so it  
11 really is a pleasure to be with you this morning.

12 First and foremost, the Companies appreciate  
13 the leadership of this Commission in providing us  
14 guidance on the stakeholder process for the carbon  
15 plan. We believe that Duke has a strong recent track  
16 record of working cooperatively with stakeholders  
17 towards achieving consensus on complex issues. And  
18 we're committed to ensuring the carbon plan  
19 stakeholder process follows the path of those previous  
20 successes and fulfills the Commission's directives and  
21 those of House Bill 951 regarding the need for  
22 stakeholder input. Duke has worked to create a  
23 robust, open, transparent process through which  
24 stakeholders may provide input into the development of

1 the proposed carbon plan. We take this work very  
2 seriously and have dedicated significant Company  
3 resources and time to provide a thoughtful and  
4 meaningful approach to engaging with stakeholders on  
5 this very important work.

6 One of the first steps that we took when  
7 initiating this effort was to hire a third-party  
8 consultant, the Great Plains Institute, to help guide  
9 the development of the stakeholder process and to  
10 facilitate the discussions with stakeholders. This  
11 work is lead by Doug Scott who has a very interesting  
12 and robust background. He's the former Chair of the  
13 Illinois Commerce Commission. He's also the former  
14 head of the Illinois EPA, and he's also served as a  
15 mayor and a legislator. So, he brings a really, a  
16 broad perspective to this work. GPI has also worked  
17 on decarbonization efforts in other parts of the  
18 country, and so we believe they bring an informed and  
19 fresh perspective to working with stakeholders in  
20 North Carolina and South Carolina on the Companies'  
21 energy transition.

22 Onto our first stakeholder meeting, as Chair  
23 Mitchell mentioned, it was held on January 25th, and  
24 we brought over 350 stakeholders to the virtual table.

1 Those 350 stakeholders and the list of all of those is  
2 provided in the report that we filed last week. Those  
3 stakeholders represented over 150 different  
4 organizations and, seemingly, every facet of  
5 stakeholder interest. We think this great turnout is  
6 certainly a reflection of the immense interest in the  
7 energy transition, in general, and also in the carbon  
8 plan specifically, but we also think this great  
9 turnout is driven in part by our efforts to notify  
10 stakeholders of the meeting which we did through a  
11 variety of ways; through filings with this Commission,  
12 through our targeted website that we have developed  
13 for this initiative and, also, through specific  
14 outreach by both GPI and Duke. Interestingly, our  
15 current list of stakeholders includes over 650  
16 individuals.

17 The first meeting was designed to address  
18 both the needs of stakeholders who wanted to  
19 understand or discuss the bigger picture of the carbon  
20 plan and also the needs of those stakeholders who  
21 wanted to hear more about the technical modeling  
22 underlying the development of the plan. And so we --  
23 excuse me -- we dedicated the first half of the  
24 meeting to discuss these higher level process related

1 topics and then the second half of the meeting to  
2 discuss more of the technical topics.

3 Now, I would say I expected that we would  
4 lose maybe a fair amount of stakeholders once we took  
5 a lunch break and then dove into some of the more  
6 technical topics, but I was quite surprised and  
7 impressed with the number of attendees that were still  
8 with us through the depths of the technical topics.

9 Stakeholders had an opportunity to provide  
10 feedback to us at any time through the Webex chat  
11 feature, and specific portions of the meeting were  
12 dedicated to allowing stakeholders to provide verbal  
13 feedback. Now, this town-hall style format of these  
14 meetings is necessary to ensure all stakeholders can  
15 participate, but this approach doesn't necessarily  
16 lend itself to be a more in-depth conversation whereby  
17 we can drill down on some of the important technical  
18 pieces of the carbon plan development, and this  
19 dynamic was observed by certain stakeholders.

20 To address this, we are scheduling three  
21 additional working group meetings on topics that  
22 garnered significant interest. For example, the topic  
23 of the solar interconnection forecast is one that  
24 stakeholders gave us specific feedback on that they

1 would like to have a deeper dive on. So, we will be  
2 holding those meetings on February 18th, and  
3 communication about those meetings will be sent to  
4 stakeholders in the next few days. These upcoming  
5 meetings will be dedicated to specific topics with a  
6 more limited group of technical experts who are  
7 invited to actively participate. And this effort is  
8 in response to the feedback we received from  
9 stakeholders and we think will further the Companies'  
10 goal of obtaining meaningful input to inform the  
11 development of the Carolina's carbon plan.

12 And I would note that in this situation  
13 where we are creating a working group that's targeted  
14 towards specific stakeholders, we also will ensure  
15 that all stakeholders have the opportunity to listen  
16 in to these meetings.

17 Taking a step back as to the plans for the  
18 larger stakeholder meetings, the next large  
19 stakeholder meetings are scheduled for February 23rd  
20 and then subsequently for March 22nd.

21 I wanted to just briefly address some of the  
22 other feedback we've heard from stakeholders regarding  
23 the process and I also want to emphasize we really  
24 appreciate the feedback. We really hope stakeholders

1 will continue to bring the feedback to us with regard  
2 to the process, because it helps us make it better.

3 And so, for the requests regarding the need  
4 to receive agendas and presentations and other  
5 information in advance, we certainly appreciate this  
6 practical comment and understand the interest from  
7 stakeholders in obtaining these materials earlier.

8 While we were not able to provide this for our initial  
9 meeting, we are committed to providing these materials  
10 in advance for future meetings.

11 Stakeholders have also asked what will  
12 happen with the unanswered questions that were raised  
13 in the first meeting. And we actually received over  
14 550 comments and questions in the Webex chat during  
15 the first meeting and we tried to get to as many of  
16 them as we could. Of course, it was not possible to  
17 get to all of them. And so since that time we've been  
18 working to group the questions together by topic and  
19 subject matter and plan to address many of them at the  
20 beginning of the next stakeholder meeting on  
21 February 23rd.

22 I'd also just generally mention with regard  
23 to the questions that I don't believe we'll be able to  
24 answer each and every question that has been raised in

1 the stakeholder process because, frankly, we don't  
2 have the answers to all of the questions yet. And,  
3 also, I don't feel like it's appropriate for Duke to  
4 come into the stakeholder process with all of the I's  
5 dotted and the T's crossed. The process is intended  
6 to garner stakeholder input that will then inform the  
7 analysis needed to develop the carbon plan.

8 And I'll just close by saying we are very  
9 pleased with the level of stakeholder engagement in  
10 the first meeting. And we believe we're off to a very  
11 positive start in creating a framework for  
12 stakeholders in North Carolina and South Carolina to  
13 provide input to inform the Companies' development of  
14 the initial Carolina's carbon plan. We understand and  
15 we believe that the stakeholder process must remain  
16 flexible and evolve as we gain more experience and  
17 respond to more suggestions from stakeholders.

18 So, in sum, we look forward to continuing to  
19 work with a broad endeavorous group of stakeholders as  
20 we develop a proposed plan to achieve a cleaner energy  
21 future that's reliable and affordable for our  
22 customers.

23 And that concludes my remarks, Chair  
24 Mitchell, Commissioners. I'm happy to answer any

1 questions.

2 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Dulin. Let  
3 me check in with the Commissioners to see if you-all  
4 have questions for Duke. I can't see each of you on  
5 my screen at this point so, if you do have a question,  
6 please just call out.

7 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Chair Mitchell, I  
8 have one or two quick questions.

9 CHAIR MITCHELL: Please proceed,  
10 Commissioner McKissick.

11 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Sure. And it's my  
12 understanding that essentially you're going to have  
13 smaller breakout groups; is that what I'm  
14 understanding --

15 (Technical difficulties)

16 CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner McKissick?  
17 We've lost your audio, Commissioner McKissick.  
18 Commissioner McKissick, can you hear me?

19 (Pause).

20 Commissioner McKissick, are you able to t  
21 hear me?

22 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Yes, I can hear  
23 you.

24 CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. We lost your

1 audio about half --

2 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Sorry --

3 CHAIR MITCHELL: -- way into your question.

4 So, why don't you please ask the question again.

5 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Sure. I'm just  
6 curious, when it comes to these specific issues where  
7 stakeholders have unique interest such as the solar  
8 interconnection process, are you planning to hold kind  
9 of subgroups to focus in on those unique areas of  
10 interest? And secondly, is it is envisioned that all  
11 of the meetings that are taking place are going to be  
12 virtual? Are you also planning to hold any live  
13 meetings to exchange information?

14 MS. DULIN: Jack, I was going to proceed  
15 unless you want to comment.

16 MR. JIRAK: Please do. Please do. Thank  
17 you, Rebecca.

18 MS. DULIN: Thanks, Commissioner McKissick.  
19 Yes, we -- you are correct. We are planning to have  
20 smaller working groups on subtopics that have garnered  
21 significant attention from stakeholders. I don't  
22 believe we'll be able to create a subgroup for every  
23 topic that stakeholders are particularly interested  
24 in, but we've started with three topics that, based on

1 feedback that we received from stakeholders, and so  
2 those will be the meetings we'll be proceeding with on  
3 February 18th in a smaller format as I described.

4 And as to the question about the virtual  
5 versus in person --

6 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Yes.

7 MS. DULIN: -- right now we're planning to  
8 do everything virtually. If the circumstances change,  
9 certainly we began this at the height of Omicron, and  
10 so the February 25th meeting needed to be all virtual.  
11 If circumstances evolve to allow for some in-person  
12 participation, my goodness, certainly that would be  
13 ideal, but there will always be a virtual option. And  
14 I think it just depends on how the current  
15 circumstances with the pandemic progress as to whether  
16 an in-person option will be viable or not.

17 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Thank you.

18 MS. DULIN: Sure.

19 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thanks, Commissioner  
20 McKissick. Any additional questions from  
21 Commissioners for Duke?

22 (No response)

23 I'm not hearing any. Ms. Dulin, I do have a  
24 few for you. You mentioned that Great Plains

1 Institute is facilitating the discussions. Can you  
2 talk for a minute, just why Great Plains, what their  
3 background is, what that organization brings to this  
4 process?

5 MS. DULIN: Sure. Absolutely. So the Great  
6 Plains Institute is based in the -- they do primarily  
7 work in the Midwest. We reached out to a number of  
8 potential facilitators and liked that the Great Plains  
9 Institute has not done work in the Carolinas before,  
10 so it may -- could create a challenge for them to  
11 become up-to-speed as quickly as possible on all the  
12 interest of our stakeholders. They also brought a  
13 really unique and new perspective to the issues that  
14 we're dealing with in the Carolinas. They also have  
15 been working on similar efforts with regard to various  
16 state's or region's decarbonization plans. I'm happy  
17 to provide you a few examples if that helps. And I  
18 think we really were interested in Doug Scott's  
19 perspective as well, having been the Chair of the  
20 Illinois Commerce Commission and also the head of the  
21 EPA and some other parts of his background that we  
22 thought would be helpful to bringing a new look at  
23 things in the Carolinas. So that was -- that was  
24 primarily what drove us to just really bringing in

1 someone brand new to help guide the discussions.

2 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thanks for that is  
3 additional explanation. That's helpful. You  
4 mentioned in your comments that you-all have reviewed  
5 the feedback that has been received so far on that  
6 first process and some of the suggestions that the  
7 participants have made, including circulating  
8 materials in advance, and you indicated that Duke is  
9 prepared to do that, to satisfy some of the requests  
10 that have been made of you-all.

11 One of the -- sort of reading through the  
12 materials that have been provided to us so far, what  
13 struck me is that stakeholders would like to know that  
14 information as far as in advance as possible so that  
15 they can be sure to have the correct personnel at the  
16 meetings. I'm glad to hear Duke say it's going to get  
17 those materials out as early as possible and hope that  
18 you-all continue to push to get those out there as  
19 soon as you can so that the right people are at the  
20 meetings and they can be as productive as possible.

21 I also heard you say, you can correct me if  
22 I didn't hear you correctly, but I heard you say that  
23 you-all received 550 questions. I think that's a  
24 combination of chat and discussion, is that right, or

1 was that 550 in chat alone?

2 MS. DULIN: That's 550 comments and  
3 questions --

4 CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay.

5 MS. DULIN: -- in the chat. So, some of  
6 that is dialogue form with someone weighing in and  
7 then another party weighing in. So, I wouldn't say  
8 550 unique issues, but 550 comments and questions from  
9 stakeholders, and that's in the chat box.

10 CHAIR MITCHELL: Gotcha. Well, to me 550  
11 sort of, even if you're -- you know, that's a  
12 significant amount of material that was likely in your  
13 chat box at the end of the meeting. And I heard you  
14 say you-all have been working through that material  
15 and sort of organizing and sorting into topics so that  
16 you can address that going forward. Has the Company  
17 considered putting on its website responses to those  
18 questions or figuring out a way to address more  
19 quickly than perhaps the next stakeholder session the  
20 questions that have been asked, and is that in the  
21 works or is that a possibility?

22 MS. DULIN: Yes. So, we did in the meeting  
23 address as many questions as we could. And that is  
24 part of Great Plains' facilitation of the meeting, is

1 where there are questions that could go ahead and  
2 either quickly be answered, clarifying questions that  
3 could quickly be answered, or questions that would  
4 come up for discussion. Then as much of those that  
5 could be raised from the chat in the meeting itself  
6 were raised. That was one -- the beginning step. Of  
7 course, that doesn't come close to getting through  
8 550.

9 And so putting them -- we do have a  
10 dedicated website. We have currently some frequently  
11 asked questions that are there and we may be able to  
12 evolve that to group some of the topics together. And  
13 where stakeholders seem to have a real interest and  
14 there's a -- we have the ability to be able to provide  
15 answers to those on the website and I think it makes  
16 sense to build out that frequently asked questions  
17 portion of the website and provide feedback as quickly  
18 as we can, and understand the need to provide feedback  
19 more quickly than three or four weeks later. So,  
20 that's something that we certainly can look at and  
21 report back to you in future meetings on.

22 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you for that. I also  
23 heard you say that some of the questions asked,  
24 you-all, the Company didn't have -- the Companies

1 didn't have answers to at this time. That makes sense  
2 to me. And so, I hope that in the Companies'  
3 endeavors to address questions going down the road,  
4 you know, looking down the road in the future, you-all  
5 can point out questions that have been asked, that  
6 you-all are later able to address, if that makes  
7 sense. Just being responsive to the questions that  
8 you-all have been asked throughout the entirety of the  
9 process.

10 MR. JIRAK: Chair Mitchell, if I could, I'd  
11 just add there, there's attention here obviously in  
12 the stakeholder process, but first and foremost, our  
13 focus is on getting input. So, you know, what  
14 questions are raised on particular topics, we're  
15 trying to do the best we can to say if we don't have  
16 the answer or if we're not prepared to give the answer  
17 because we're still in the process of doing the  
18 analysis, we still want to hear from stakeholders what  
19 is your view on how this issue should be handled or  
20 what is your view on this particular input in the  
21 process. So, I agree with everything Rebecca has  
22 said. We'll continue to evolve the ways in which we  
23 can try to give answers, but it certainly won't be  
24 possible in every circumstance, in large part because

1 the point of this initiative is for us to get the  
2 thoughts from others and use that to inform how we  
3 develop the carbon plan. So --

4 CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay.

5 MR. JIRAK: -- it's a balance that we're  
6 trying to figure out as we go through this for sure.

7 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you for that  
8 additional explanation, Mr. Jirak.

9 With that, I don't -- I do not have anything  
10 further for Duke. I appreciate the update, Ms. Dulin  
11 and Mr. Jirak.

12 I'll check in one last time with  
13 Commissioners to see if there's anything further for  
14 Duke before we move onto the Public Staff.

15 (No response)

16 Well, thanks to both of you. And we will  
17 turn now to the Public Staff.

18 MS. LUHR: Thank you, Chair Mitchell. Nadia  
19 Luhr with the Public Staff and with me also is Jeff  
20 Thomas who will be available in case the Commission  
21 has any questions that he can help with.

22 So the Public Staff attended the stakeholder  
23 meeting on January 25th, along with approximately 150  
24 organizations as well as members of the public.

1 Technical experts with Duke Energy presented a large  
2 amount of information which was helpful in creating a  
3 baseline of knowledge as the stakeholder group begins  
4 the process of providing input on the carbon plan.

5 The Public Staff recommends several  
6 improvements to the stakeholder process and many of  
7 these recommendations are already being addressed as  
8 we heard from Ms. Dulin in her update just a few  
9 minutes ago, but I'll go ahead and go through what the  
10 Public Staff has put together.

11 So first, we believe that it would be  
12 helpful for Duke to provide a more detailed agenda  
13 further in advance of the next two meetings.

14 It would also be helpful for Duke to provide  
15 attendees with the presentation slides and any other  
16 materials that will be discussed in advance of each  
17 stakeholder meeting so that there's adequate time for  
18 participants to review those materials beforehand.

19 Duke should also share inputs and other data  
20 with stakeholders as soon as possible subject to any  
21 necessary nondisclosure agreements.

22 We also think that there is great value in  
23 conducting working groups that can go more in depth on  
24 certain technical issues, and it sounds like Duke has

1 started planning those, so that's great.

2 And lastly, stakeholders should be able to  
3 submit questions or suggestions to Duke prior to each  
4 stakeholder meeting, so that Duke can either respond  
5 during the meeting or provide a written response.

6 And, in addition, Duke should be required to respond  
7 in writing to all substantive questions and  
8 suggestions that are put forward either during the  
9 meetings or in advance of the meetings.

10 So, the Public Staff believes that with the  
11 adoption of these recommendations, the stakeholder  
12 process will be more productive and result in a  
13 stronger final carbon plan. And that concludes our  
14 update.

15 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Luhr. Let  
16 me check in with Commissioners to see if there are  
17 questions for the Public Staff. Commissioners,  
18 questions for Ms. Luhr or Mr. Thomas?

19 (No response)

20 Ms. Luhr, I do have a question for you. I  
21 very much appreciate the Public Staff's feedback here  
22 and participation in the stakeholder proceedings. I  
23 did hear Duke touch on many of the recommendations the  
24 Public Staff has made and expect that your

1 recommendations will be accepted by the Companies and  
2 carried out by the Companies.

3 The one recommendation I'm curious about is  
4 the data and model inputs, and I think you said  
5 subject to a nondisclosure agreement where it's  
6 appropriate to do that. Do you anticipate that being  
7 an issue in the working groups? I mean, where, at  
8 what point of the process do you see the discussion  
9 going into data and model inputs?

10 MS. LUHR: I -- and Jeff can help me out  
11 here as well. I expect that that will happen likely  
12 fairly soon in the working groups. However, I will  
13 say that several participants in the last stakeholder  
14 meeting did indicate that they were interested in or  
15 undertaking some modeling of their own, and that would  
16 be where they would need those inputs and data as soon  
17 as possible so they could start working on some  
18 modeling.

19 But, Jeff, do you have any input on timing?

20 MR. THOMAS: Sure. Yes. This is Jeff  
21 Thomas with the Public Staff and I can just provide a  
22 little bit more of another perspective.

23 I think that outside of a few very high  
24 level technical data points, the larger groups are

1 probably too many people and too much to do to dig  
2 into the actual numbers. So, I would expect the  
3 smaller, more focused working groups hopefully to be  
4 able to actually review some pertinent data points and  
5 discuss where those are coming from, how they were  
6 developed or modified for North Carolina. And then,  
7 if there are other competing data sources that  
8 intervenors would like to be considered, that would  
9 kind of be at that time, but it would be more focused.  
10 So, you might have one working group on transmission  
11 costs and some of the assumptions there. You might  
12 have another that focuses on renewable costs and  
13 operating characteristics and inputs. So, kind of  
14 being able to narrow the field of inputs of which  
15 there are hundreds will be helpful in the smaller  
16 groups.

17 CHAIR MITCHELL: (Inaudible).

18 COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Chair Mitchell,  
19 you're on mute.

20 CHAIR MITCHELL: Sorry, y'all. I was just  
21 saying thank you, Mr. Thomas, for that clarification  
22 and that follow up. That's helpful. I'll continue to  
23 check in with the -- at the next update on how this is  
24 going and whether the parties and the extent to which

1 parties are able to utilize Duke's information to  
2 conduct their own analysis.

3 I want to ask, and this question is probably  
4 directed at Ms. Luhr. You know, one of the benefits  
5 of the stakeholder process is that it can -- they can  
6 involve groups not necessarily always represented at  
7 the Commission and, you know, sort of that -- a group  
8 beyond simply the regular participants in Commission  
9 proceedings. Clearly, just from the numbers of  
10 participants, there were many, many participants here,  
11 but is the Public Staff's impression that Duke was  
12 able to reach some of its customer groups that aren't  
13 necessarily always represented here at the Commission?

14 MS. LUHR: I believe so, Chair Mitchell.  
15 The list of organizations, you know, there were around  
16 150 organizations. There were many that we haven't  
17 seen here before in front of the Commission. So, I  
18 think that through their outreach, they were able to  
19 reach a lot of their stakeholders.

20 CHAIR MITCHELL: All right, Ms. Luhr. Thank  
21 you for that.

22 Let me check in with Commissioners one more  
23 time to see if any questions for the Public Staff  
24 before we let them go. Commissioner Duffley?

1           COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Just one question  
2 about, you mentioned that you would like to see Duke  
3 allow the submission of questions prior to the  
4 meetings and then have all of the responses in  
5 writing. In Duke's presentation, I heard them state  
6 that possibly there would not be questions or answers  
7 to some of those questions. Are you requesting -- I'm  
8 just trying to clarify what you're requesting. If  
9 they don't have an answer, you want it in writing that  
10 they don't have an answer at the time?

11           MS. LUHR: That's correct. That would be  
12 helpful. You know, either responding directly to a  
13 question or stating that they don't have an answer at  
14 that time would be what we're looking for; just an  
15 acknowledgment of the question and their response to  
16 it. And it's understandable at this point in the  
17 development of the plan that they don't have all of  
18 those answers. So, yes.

19           COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Thank you. I don't  
20 have anything further.

21           CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you.

22           COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Chair Mitchell?

23           CHAIR MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am. Please  
24 proceed, Commissioner Brown-Bland.

1           COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: I had a question  
2 related to the same recommendation that Commissioner  
3 Duffley questioned.

4           And that is -- and, Ms. Luhr, you may not  
5 have a precise answer at this time but it may be  
6 something to think about. And my question is, to the  
7 extent that you want answers of all questions that are  
8 submitted, we see a great deal of interest we've  
9 already seen in the chat, you know, over 500  
10 questions. I expect that will likely grow. And we  
11 all know, all things digital get extremely voluminous,  
12 and we pick up a lot of things. So, in making that  
13 recommendation, are there any thoughts to be had  
14 around organizing principles for how Duke might go  
15 about gathering all of that and responding? Is there  
16 an expected time frame? Did that involve -- did your  
17 recommendation indicate you would like a response  
18 prior to the meeting? And, you know, just how do  
19 we -- how would it be handled for efficiency and keep  
20 the process moving/going? You know, generally that.  
21 I think you pick up the gist, just how to corral all  
22 of that and make a response to everything. Is that  
23 what we need in this to make the stakeholder process  
24 all that it can be?

1 MS. LUHR: I think you're correct in that.  
2 It would be -- it's a complicated task because  
3 questions are coming in during the stakeholder  
4 meetings and, as I just recommended, it would be nice  
5 for questions to be able to come in ahead of the  
6 stakeholder meetings as well. So, there is the  
7 potential for, of course, many questions and  
8 suggestions. You know, one way to handle this could  
9 be an online portal for people to be able to submit  
10 these questions and suggestions and that could create  
11 an orderly method for responses.

12 And I believe Ms. Dulin mentioned that they  
13 are actually going through now and grouping some of  
14 the questions they received during the first  
15 stakeholder meeting. And I think that's a great way  
16 to organize responses as well is, if they're receiving  
17 a lot questions on the same topic, it would make sense  
18 to put those all together and respond to them in the  
19 same response. So, I think there is an organizational  
20 challenge, but I think through some of those, maybe a  
21 portal, maybe grouping responses, that can be  
22 streamlined.

23 MR. THOMAS: This is Jeff Thomas. May I  
24 just add very quickly, one model we were kind of

1 thinking of when we were considering this was that the  
2 CPRE, the Competitive Procurement of Renewable Energy,  
3 they have multiple stakeholder meetings where there is  
4 chat and there's questions asked during the meeting,  
5 but there's also an online portal where any member can  
6 go and kind of formerly ask a question that everyone  
7 else can see and then a response is publicly posted  
8 for everyone to see, which might also cut down on some  
9 repetitive questions that, you know, themes that are  
10 hit again and again. We just thought that could be a  
11 potential model here.

12 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Thank you.  
13 That's very helpful.

14 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Commissioner  
15 Brown-Bland. Any additional questions for the Public  
16 Staff?

17 MR. JIRAK: Chair Mitchell, this is Jack  
18 Jirak. I apologize. As we've explored these issues  
19 more, I would love to maybe have a little chance to  
20 give some additional thoughts on this, if that's  
21 appropriate, and will be glad to do that now or later  
22 or kind of put it to the next time we get together.  
23 But just, as we've explored -- I think if we just got  
24 a -- more specifics around what these processes are

1 and what they're not, more so than we were discussing  
2 when we were presenting, I think there's some ideas  
3 that we would like to kind of put in front of you on  
4 those topics as well. So, defer to you when the right  
5 time is for that.

6 CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Jirak, just so I'm  
7 clear, are you saying you want to respond directly --  
8 you have response directly to questions that  
9 Commissioners Duffley and Brown-Bland asked of the  
10 Public Staff?

11 MR. JIRAK: Yeah. Well, more specifically,  
12 I would like to just share a few more general thoughts  
13 on the idea of how the question process we see fitting  
14 in the stakeholder process.

15 CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. Go ahead and  
16 proceed. And it seems like this will be helpful  
17 information for everybody here, so go ahead.

18 MR. JIRAK: Yeah. Well, thank you very  
19 much. And I appreciate this is a bit of a new  
20 territory for all of us.

21 I think I would just say first of all, you  
22 know, as you think about the range of activities we  
23 engage in the regulatory process, there's the fully  
24 litigated proceeding which we're not in yet, and then

1     there's the stakeholder process. I think, generally,  
2     our view is the stakeholder process is some- -- should  
3     be and feel and look different than once we get into  
4     the full litigated process. And for context, in the  
5     IRP process in the Carolinas, we received more than  
6     3000 data requests around our filings and we answered  
7     each and every one of those, but I will tell you it  
8     was a dedicated team of dozens if not more than a  
9     hundred Duke employees required to sort through 3000  
10    plus data requests in a litigated IRP proceeding.

11             And so our view is, if we want the  
12    stakeholder process to be something different than  
13    that, and I think we do, we want to accomplish  
14    something different in the stakeholder process. It  
15    can't be that it becomes just like the intensity level  
16    discovery like that happens in the context of a  
17    litigated proceeding. We know that is going to be  
18    part of this process but we're not there yet.

19             And so, again, as we said before, our focus  
20    is on receiving input. We want to hear from  
21    stakeholders what they think we should do, what  
22    assumptions we should make. And that's, again, what  
23    we're going to focus on, the working group is. Okay,  
24    here's something we're going to have -- here's a set

1 of things we're going to have to assume for modeling  
2 purposes. You tell us what assumptions you think we  
3 should make. To the extent we are leaning towards a  
4 particular input or an assumption about an input,  
5 we'll share that with you-all and we'll dialogue about  
6 it.

7 But again to the earlier point, we don't  
8 have all the answers so there's questions we can't  
9 answer because we haven't finished the analysis. We  
10 don't have a final answer on this assumption or that  
11 input but, more generally, we don't have the resources  
12 to both run the stakeholder process, do all the work  
13 that's going to required to get us to a May 16th  
14 filing and then respond to discovery-like  
15 data-request-type questions in this process.

16 So, what we're trying to do is thread the  
17 needle and give responses at high level where we have  
18 the information, but I think the reality is that from  
19 our view, the stakeholder process is not intended to  
20 turn into a discovery-like process, nor do we think  
21 that's the best use of our time. Because again,  
22 frankly, thinking about the level of questions we  
23 could get -- we received in one stakeholder process,  
24 if you multiply that times two meetings plus three

1 other stakeholder subgroup meetings, we could quickly  
2 be approaching the 3000 plus data-request-type  
3 discovery questions that we just don't have the  
4 resources and I think, frankly, will inhibit our  
5 ability to do the work and to engage in the  
6 stakeholder process.

7           So, I'm not suggesting we have like the one  
8 answer for how we do this and we recognize it again  
9 this is new territory for all of us, but I really want  
10 to be clear that from our vantage point to kind of  
11 full-on written responses to every question submitted  
12 in the process is going to really inhibit the  
13 efficiency of what we think is the purpose of the  
14 stakeholder process.

15           CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Jirak, for  
16 that additional explanation. What I'm hearing from  
17 the Company, from you, is that the Companies' focus  
18 has been on gathering and soliciting input from  
19 stakeholders as opposed -- and that remains the  
20 Companies' focus, so I have heard what you said.

21           Let me check in to see if there is any  
22 follow up particularly from Commissioners Brown-Bland,  
23 Duffley, any other Commissioners on Mr. Jirak's  
24 additional comment?

1                   COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Chair Mitchell, I  
2 do have one question.

3                   CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. Commissioner  
4 McKissick.

5                   COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: That's simply this.  
6 I understand what Mr. Jirak has stated so I guess I  
7 pose this question to you.

8                   Obviously, there are going to be many, many  
9 duplicative questions that come along that would have  
10 essentially the same response. What was discussed  
11 earlier was some type of portal that might be created  
12 where you could go over there and find the answers to  
13 questions that have been asked by others. Would it  
14 simplify that process if Duke tried to, what I would  
15 say, essentially take the essence of those questions  
16 and rather than providing individual responses provide  
17 a group and list of responses that generically cover  
18 specific topics and categories as opposed to  
19 responding to each one individually, so that what a  
20 person might do is go back and look at this generic  
21 list that summarizes in substance what the questions  
22 amounted to as opposed to always providing unique  
23 responses? I mean, in some instances it will be a  
24 unique response might be appropriate but, you know,

1 we're understanding that it's not a data request.  
2 That situation might come along later. But would that  
3 be a tool or a vehicle that might be workable? I'm  
4 just soliciting your thoughts about that. And it just  
5 occurred to me as all of this was unfolding and being  
6 discussed.

7 MR. JIRAK: I think that's -- Commissioner  
8 McKissick, thank you. I think that's a great question  
9 and a great framework for us to think about it. I  
10 definitely think that we could look to identify common  
11 themes in the questions and have a kind of FAQ-type  
12 section on the website where some of those questions  
13 that we can answer we can educate, can answer those  
14 types of questions and we can post those. I think  
15 that's something we will definitely explore and I  
16 don't see any reason why we couldn't try to do that  
17 where we have an answer to provide, obviously.

18 COMMISSIONER MCKISSICK: Yeah, okay. Thank  
19 you.

20 MR. JIRAK: Thank you.

21 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Commissioner  
22 McKissick. Any additional questions for Mr. Jirak?

23 (No response)

24 Before we let Ms. Luhr go, any additional

1 questions for Ms. Luhr? Ms. Luhr, we may have already  
2 let you go and if so I apologize, but I just want to  
3 make sure. Nothing further for the Public Staff?

4 (No response)

5 Okay. Next up we will hear from the Clean  
6 Power Suppliers Association.

7 MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you, Chair Mitchell.  
8 Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Ben Snowden with the  
9 Law Firm of Fox Rothschild and I'm here on behalf of  
10 the Clean Power Suppliers Association.

11 CPA -- sorry, CPSA is a nonprofit trade  
12 association whose members include developers of  
13 utility-scale solar facilities in the Carolinas. We  
14 want to thank the Commission for its active engagement  
15 in the stakeholder process and also for providing us  
16 an opportunity to present our views on the sufficiency  
17 of the process.

18 CPSA very much appreciates Duke's efforts to  
19 reach out to stakeholders early in the process and in  
20 our view it is clear that the Company is taking this  
21 process seriously. As Ms. Dulin said, the first  
22 stakeholder meeting on the carbon plan focused on  
23 providing background information on H.B. 951 and the  
24 process for developing the carbon plan. It also

1 included wide-ranging but generally high-level  
2 discussion of the data sources and modeling  
3 methodologies that Duke plans to use in devising the  
4 plan. Interested parties as everyone has observed had  
5 the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback  
6 on all the materials presented. We believe that this  
7 approach was completely appropriate for an initial  
8 stakeholder meeting and we also believe that Great  
9 Plains was an effective facilitator. We do have a few  
10 observations and recommendations about the process  
11 going forward, most of which have already been  
12 discussed in some way here.

13 First, given the wide array of complex  
14 issues that are involved in formulating the initial  
15 carbon plan and the short time the Commission will  
16 have to consider those issues, we think it is critical  
17 that Duke strive to achieve consensus on as many  
18 issues as possible prior to filing a plan with the  
19 Commission. One thing that is essential in achieving  
20 any sort of consensus on major issues is that the  
21 Companies be absolutely transparent early in the  
22 process about the inputs and the assumptions that  
23 they're using to formulate the carbon plan.

24 CPSA echoes the recommendations from other

1 parties that Duke provide written materials and  
2 agendas for stakeholder meetings well in advance of  
3 those meetings and we're very happy to hear that Duke  
4 is committing to do that.

5 In addition, we think it is essential that  
6 Duke share a draft of the carbon plan and allow time  
7 to incorporate feedback from stakeholders prior to  
8 filing its plan with the Commission. Stakeholders who  
9 are actively engaged in the process should not be  
10 surprised by anything they see in the carbon plan that  
11 gets filed.

12 And finally, and I know this has been  
13 discussed, although it's appropriate for the initial  
14 stakeholder meeting to be high level, it is imperative  
15 that Duke begin the detailed technical engagement with  
16 stakeholders as soon as possible. We are glad to hear  
17 that Duke is setting up these working groups on  
18 technical subtopics. And our understanding, based on  
19 the conversation and the response to Commissioner  
20 McKissick's question, is that these are intended not  
21 just to be one-off meetings but to kick off a deeper  
22 engagement on those issues and we hope we understand  
23 that correctly.

24 Now, just to be clear, nothing about Duke's

1 efforts so far has been inconsistent with our  
2 recommendations. Duke has a huge task ahead of it and  
3 the Company has been working very hard on stakeholder  
4 engagement. We heard from Ms. Dulin this morning that  
5 Duke is already taking up some of the recommendations  
6 its gotten from CPSA and other stakeholders. We think  
7 that is a great sign. And it's our hope that we stay  
8 on this trajectory as the process continues. Thank  
9 you.

10 CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Snowden, thank you for  
11 your remarks this morning. Let me check in with  
12 Commissioners to see if there are questions for  
13 Mr. Snowden.

14 (No response)

15 Mr. Snowden, you are off the hook this  
16 morning. Thank you again for your time and for your  
17 recommendations.

18 And we will now call on NCSEA. I know that  
19 Mr. Smith, I believe, is here to respond to questions  
20 should the Commissioners have any for NCSEA.  
21 Commissioners, any questions for Mr. Smith on comments  
22 filed by NCSEA?

23 (No response)

24 I'm not hearing any questions from

1 Commissioners. Mr. Smith, there you are. I see you.

2 Good morning, sir. You're off the hook, Mr. Smith.

3 Next up, we will call -- I will call on

4 Appalachian Voices. Ms. Cralle-Jones, I see you.

5 MS. CRALLE JONES: Yes.

6 CHAIR MITCHELL: Go ahead and introduce

7 yourself, please, ma'am.

8 MS. CRALLE JONES: Good morning, Chair

9 Mitchell, Commissioners and Parties. My name is Cathy

10 Cralle Jones. I'm with the Law Office of Bryan Brice,

11 and I'm here as counsel for Intervenor Appalachian

12 Voices. I had intended this morning just to be able

13 to introduce Rory McIlmoil, the senior analyst with

14 Appalachian Voices, to make a few comments, but

15 unfortunately, he's had an unexpected illness in his

16 family this morning and is not able to attend. And so

17 in lieu of that appearance, we submitted just this

18 morning to the Commission written comments.

19 Since those comments were just now filed, I

20 would like to take just a couple of minutes to

21 highlight a few points that are made there and many of

22 them have already been echoed today by other parties.

23 Appalachian Voices has as a primary concern

24 the inclusion of low-income minority voices as

1 stakeholders in this process and so would encourage a  
2 continued outreach to try and reach low and moderate  
3 income customers, Spanish speaking communities and  
4 other impacted stakeholders to ensure that those  
5 voices that may not have ready access to this process  
6 are engaged and heard.

7           Appalachian Voices would also suggest that  
8 as these discussions are -- these meetings are  
9 planned, that time be managed to allow for expanded  
10 question and answer time and discussion of the  
11 questions that are presented in the chat boxes. And  
12 it may be that these -- this initial meeting was so  
13 information heavy, just trying to get the information  
14 out, that there was not time for feedback and  
15 discussion, but would hope that going forward, that  
16 that time be managed so that there is an opportunity  
17 to be prepared for and engage in stakeholder feedback  
18 during that process.

19           We would also reiterate what other folks  
20 have said that key to making this a conversation and  
21 an opportunity for stakeholder feedback is critical  
22 that materials are provided. And we would suggest at  
23 least five days prior the meeting so that those  
24 materials can be digested and the right people can be

1 part of that conversation. So, we would highlight  
2 that suggestion that has been raised by Public Staff  
3 and others as well.

4 And then finally, and this is along the  
5 issue of the information that has come in through the  
6 chat box, is we know that the facilitators are trying  
7 to do the best they can to organize, to summarize, and  
8 to present that information in a more manageable  
9 format. However, it's impossible to do that without  
10 losing some of the context. And so question is  
11 raised, can the information that's submitted in the  
12 chat box, and maybe this is through this other portal  
13 that's being suggested, be included and be made  
14 available as a sort of public record so everyone has  
15 access to that information rather than just receiving,  
16 and the Commission receiving a distilled version, that  
17 it's impossible to distill and summarize information  
18 without inserting some bias in there. And so, to have  
19 access to those comments kind of in their form would  
20 allow people to refer to those comments and reiterate  
21 that without that kind of filter that comes through  
22 the summary process.

23 But Appalachian Voices wants to reaffirm its  
24 commitment to this process and really appreciate the

1 work that the parties and the Commission to create a  
2 space where all stakeholders can work together towards  
3 a common goal with a carbon plan that serves all  
4 stakeholders, so we do appreciate that. Written  
5 comments in more detail were provided to the  
6 Commission today.

7 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Cralle  
8 Jones, and thank you for your reacting sort of in  
9 real-time to the situation with Mr. McIlmoil. Let me  
10 see if there are questions for you from the  
11 Commissioners.

12 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Chair Mitchell,  
13 just one question, I believe, maybe a second one.

14 Ms. Jones, you raised the question about the  
15 inclusion of persons that are low and moderate income  
16 into this process. Do you have any recommendations  
17 for making that a more effective vehicle than what was  
18 done in the first meeting? I mean, are there any  
19 thoughts that you have about reaching out to  
20 those constituencies?

21 MS. CRALLE JONES: I need to discuss in more  
22 detail with Mr. McIlmoil kind of what has been thought  
23 of there. But I think one of the things that is  
24 inherently a boundary that's put up is if someone does

1 not have high speed internet access they already lose  
2 access to these proceedings. And so -- and I know  
3 some of this has been required because of Covid, but  
4 to have some opportunities for community meetings,  
5 in-person meetings where folks are meeting to discuss  
6 what these issues are and how they impact communities.  
7 I think part of it is we just can't rely solely on  
8 everyone having Webex and high tech expertise, because  
9 if we do then there are going to be voices left out.

10 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: So, your thoughts  
11 are essentially that if there were in-person meetings  
12 with certain perhaps specific community groups or  
13 organizations, or even ones that were just broadly  
14 open to the community, it would be a mechanism that  
15 would allow for a higher degree of its inclusivity as  
16 part of this process just in relying upon virtual  
17 meetings?

18 MS. CRALLE JONES: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. And  
19 we'd be happy also, if there are additional  
20 suggestions that Appalachian Voices can provide to the  
21 Commission, we can supplement our comments for those  
22 particular suggestions.

23 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Chair Mitchell.

1                   CHAIR MITCHELL: Please proceed,  
2 Commissioner Brown-Bland.

3                   COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Thank you,  
4 Ms. Cralle Jones, for your input and your comments and  
5 your thoughtfulness on the subject. The Commission  
6 really wants some insight into knowing what our role  
7 can be and how best to -- how to create for North  
8 Carolina a great stakeholder process that we can use  
9 in this matter and many others. So, to some extent  
10 all this is experimental and a great learning  
11 opportunity.

12                   But you and several others are suggesting  
13 that Duke provide as far in advance what information  
14 they can about what's going to come up at a particular  
15 meeting, and I wonder how -- for example, you  
16 suggested a five-day, at least a five-day notice of  
17 what's coming up and what will be presented, but I  
18 wonder whether if some sort of limit like that were  
19 imposed how do you envision -- do you envision that  
20 being a limitation to discussion so that if three days  
21 out, two days out they think of something that's  
22 appropriate or, you know, something else comes up.  
23 Would you rather them not discuss it and not have that  
24 flexibility to bring it up? Would we be that strict

1 about it or would we maintain some flexibility in this  
2 process?

3 MS. CRALLE JONES: I think the flexibility  
4 is key. I would suggest that the intention is what's  
5 important. I'm sure there is an agenda that's put  
6 together. There's materials that are put together.  
7 And, you know, if you have a hard deadline ahead of  
8 that to get as much information out as possible,  
9 that's going to be a better informed conversation.

10 However, we all know that things come up  
11 between the last time you send it out and I wouldn't  
12 want to limit the conversation, but to say as a goal  
13 let's try and provide as much information ahead of  
14 time so that we can really make best use of our time  
15 together. Not trying to exclude what can be discussed  
16 but just trying to empower people to have the  
17 information for the best use of time.

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Thank you.

19 CHAIR MITCHELL: Any additional questions  
20 for Ms. Cralle Jones?

21 (No response)

22 Not hearing any, so at this point Ms. Cralle  
23 Jones, thank you very much for your time and your  
24 remarks this morning.

1           With that, we have come to the end of at  
2     least the agenda for the morning. I want to thank  
3     you-all again for your time and your thoughts and  
4     helping us, the Commission, to remain informed about  
5     the process that is ongoing.

6           I will pause here to see if there is any  
7     other point of business I need to consider before we  
8     adjourn.

9           MR. JIRAK: Chair Mitchell, if I may.

10          CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Jirak.

11          MR. JIRAK: We, again, appreciate all of the  
12     input we're receiving both in writing and in this  
13     meeting, and especially around how we can do -- even  
14     improve the ways in which we're disseminating the  
15     opportunities to participate in these events. And so  
16     we continue to remain open to ideas on how to do that  
17     better and appreciate that input.

18          The one item I think I would want to just be  
19     really clear before we sign off on is that the new  
20     idea that was raised by CPSA for the first time that  
21     suggests that we might file -- that we might provide a  
22     draft version of the carbon plan. And I would just  
23     say that, for the reasons we outlined in our motion  
24     requesting additional time to get the carbon plan

1 done, we think that's a fairly unreasonable request  
2 and not one -- one that will inhibit rather than  
3 facilitate more stakeholder engagement. So, just --  
4 we're glad to talk about that more.

5 We absolutely believe there's value in  
6 dialogue around inputs and even draft inputs that  
7 assumptions that Duke is considering using. And  
8 that's what the stakeholder process is for, but the  
9 notion that we will be able to have sufficient time to  
10 both do this stakeholder process thoughtfully and well  
11 and produce a draft carbon plan and parallel with  
12 those efforts is in our view, kind of untenable and  
13 not really consistent with the expectations the  
14 Commission set out so far.

15 So, we're going to keep dialoguing with  
16 parties on that. We want to hear perspectives but  
17 just wanted that to be heard before we signed off for  
18 today.

19 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Jirak. We  
20 will take all of that under advisement. And again,  
21 appreciate the Companies and all of the parties' time  
22 this morning.

23 With that, if there is nothing else for our  
24 attention, we will be adjourned. Thank you very much

1 everybody.

2 (The proceedings were adjourned)

3 -----  
4  
5 C E R T I F I C A T E

6 I, KIM T. MITCHELL, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that  
7 the Proceedings in the above-captioned matter were  
8 taken before me, that I did report in stenographic  
9 shorthand the Proceedings set forth herein, and the  
10 foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription  
11 to the best of my ability.

12  
13 Kim T. Mitchell

14 Kim T. Mitchell  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24