

OFFICIAL COPY

Mount, Gail

From: James Schall <tchapi@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2016 9:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub

FILED

FEB 19 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Hello,

Please spend our taxpayer money on expanding renewable energy production rather than old fossil fuel technology.

Sincerely,

James Schall
Asheville

Mount, Gail

From: Betsey Granda <bbgranda@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 10:07 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

FILED

FEB 19 2016

Clerk's Office
Utilities Commission

I am writing to strongly request an open review of Duke energy's gas expansion plans.

Thank you,

Betsey Granda
112 Circadian Way
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Mount, Gail

FILED

From: Mikal McKee <mikalmckee@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 1:38 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-2 Sub 1089-I support clean energy, not over-reliance on gas

FEB 19 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Dear NC Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Duke Energy's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to build three new natural gas units in Asheville, NC.

While I believe it is good news that there's an end in sight to coal ash, sulfur dioxide, and carbon pollution from this coal-fired plant, replacing it with an over-sized gas plant is not the vision we hold for a clean energy economy here in North Carolina.

I strongly support replacing as much of the retiring plant's capacity as possible with clean, renewable energy. Duke's proposed 15 MW of solar are a great first step, but needs to be larger. The proposed 5 MW of storage is a potential game-changer, and I strongly support this forward-thinking investment.

Duke Energy needs to publicly demonstrate how it projects the future energy needs for western North Carolina. Historically, Duke has overestimated electricity demands, as compared to actual experience, and has favored building new power plants which drive profits for its shareholders.

I do not want my money wasted on an overly large, unnecessarily expensive power plant when low cost, job creating energy efficiency programs are a viable option to reduce our energy demand. Thirty percent of the energy use that goes into our buildings is wasted from air leaks, poor insulation, outdated appliances and inefficient or malfunctioning equipment. We should fix those problems before committing to such a large natural-gas-infrastructure project..

Including a third natural gas unit in the application is premature. Duke told the public that this third unit, an inefficient unit designed to run when power usage is at its highest, won't be needed until 2023 and only if the energy efficiency programs Duke has promised are unsuccessful. Duke's application should match its public statements; Duke should include concrete energy efficiency programs in its filing and revisit any future need for additional capacity at a later date. Otherwise, it is betting against the success of the new clean energy partnership it is forming with the City of Asheville and Buncombe County.

I urge the Commission to share in our vision for a clean energy future for North Carolina, and call for Duke Energy to scale back any new natural gas generation and require investments in clean energy and energy efficiency for our region.

Sincerely,

Mikal McKee

Mount, Gail

From: Sharron St John <reros3@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 3:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket number E-2 Sub 1089

FILED
FEB 19 2016
Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Please, I beg you, do not approve more than the minimum capacity needed for the electricity needed for our area. Doing anything more than is needed, with fossil fuel, does not allow for the rapid expansion and development of renewable energy that is coming down the pike and would come down a lot faster with better affordability for people if Duke were not doing everything it can to profit from it and cost homeowners more than they need to.

Additionally, you could require Duke to hold a minimum of 2 public meetings where evidence can be presented by multiple parties and general public can input or deny the application.

And the limited 45 day period allowed for review and evaluation by both the public utilities and by the public is an arbitrary way of hoping to get this passed before enough of us know about it to give our responses.

Duke needs to adequately explore alternatives such as renewable energy sources, demand management, energy efficiency, as well as purchasing power from other companies.

Thank you so very much for doing anything you can to slow the process down and order to change it

Hopefully and very sincerely yours
Sharron K St John
22 Shelby Dr
Asheville, NC 28803

Sharron

Mount, Gail

From: Diane Wallace <dianew65@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 3:22 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E2 Sub-1089

FILED
FEB 19 2016
Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Chairman Finley:

Please provide a full and transparent examination of Duke Energy's proposed Asheville gas plant — not a rubber-stamp approval. Please make Duke Energy address the concerns of technical experts.

--

Diane Wallace
cell: 554-3869
dianew65@gmail.com