

March 29, 2011

To: Clerk's Office

From: Kim Campbell

Re: E-7, Sub 819

FILED
MAR 29 2011
Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission
OFFICIAL COPY

Attached are three (3) Consumer Statements of Position and Chairman Finley's response for filing in Docket Number E-7, Sub 819.

Campbell, Kim

E-7, Sub 819

From: Campbell, Kim on behalf of Finley, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 2:04 PM
To: 'Reed, Daniel'
Subject: RE: Opposing the registration of a new nuclear power plant for Duke energy

FILED
APR 9 2011

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Comm.

Thank you for your thoughtful email and expression of concern. State statutes enacted in 2007 promote energy efficiency, demand response and renewable generation. Older uncontrolled coal fired plants are being retired. Gas fired plants are replacing many of them. Progress has delayed its plans to add new units at the Harris site. Duke's proposed nuclear plant in South Carolina is still under consideration but is not projected to operate before 2021. Many important decisions will be required before then.

From: Reed, Daniel [mailto:dreed@INCResearch.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 11:22 AM
To: Finley, Ed
Subject: Opposing the registration of a new nuclear power plant for Duke energy

Dear Chairman Finley:

I am a resident of Apex, NC and I am writing to you to urge you not to support the registration of more nuclear power plants in the Carolinas at this time. I understand that we are desperately seeking more energy options which do not contribute to GHG emissions; however, I am not certain our local utilities have exhausted all other options first. Perhaps the Commission could make a recommendation that a group be brought in to assist the various utility companies in the region with their long term sustainability strategy. A group such as the Rocky Mountain Institute may be able to coordinate and suggest an integrated approach for the regions utilities which could increase the companies' efficiencies as well as transition to a more diversified energy future. Ideally, until we as a society address the waste problem with spent nuclear fuel, we should avoid construction of more plants. Water moderated reactors may indeed be fairly safe, but the cooling pool landfills that they create are not. As someone who lives in the 10 mile zone from Shearon Harris' cooling pools, I am deeply aware of the risk that they pose in the now and the risk they will pose in the future. No one can say with any certainty that in the long life of that waste it will never cause a problem. Simply because of the long life of that waste, it is guaranteed to cause a problem at some point in the future. I urge you to do what you can to promote new technologies in solar, wind and wave along with finding more efficiencies in coal and retrofitting of old coal plants. Thank you for your attention.

Regards,
Dan J. Reed
106 Country Valley Ct
Apex NC 27502

Dan J. Reed | Systems Validation Specialist | IT
INC Research® | 3201 Beechleaf Ct. Suite 600 | Raleigh, NC 27604
☎ 919.745.2653 |

Notice:

INC Research, LLC. This transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication or any associated attachments in error, please notify the sender immediately. Thank you in advance.

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

Campbell, Kim

E-7, Sub 819

From: Campbell, Kim on behalf of Finley, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 2:23 PM
To: 'Richard Leber'
Subject: RE: Why burden Duke Customers with unnecessary and unknown Capital and safety Risks?

FILED

Clerk's Office
Public Commission

Thank you for your email and concern. This Commission presently has no request from Duke to prefund costs of future nuclear power plants. We have a request that the Commission issue an order stating that Duke is not acting imprudently in expending initial development costs to proceed with the proposed Lee nuclear plant, but such an order would not effect rates at this time. Duke has indicated its intent to seek legislation in the North Carolina General Assembly that some classify as seeking the result you describe. You may wish to express your concern to your state legislative representative.

From: Richard Leber [mailto:rich_leber@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2011 7:17 AM
To: Finley, Ed
Subject: Why burden Duke Customers with unnecessary and unknown Capital and safety Risks?

Dear Chairman Finley,

I hope you and your fellow Utility Commissioners deny Duke Energy's request to prefund the unknown costs of a future nuclear power plant. I find it hard to comprehend that Jim Rogers and his management teams are asking the North Carolina PUC to transfer what should be the responsibility of Duke Energy stockholders to the customers of Duke Energy. I've read that Mr. Rogers prides himself in being one of, if not the largest, individual stockholder of Duke Energy. To me it is clear that Mr. Rogers is saying "I don't want to burden myself, my family and other stockholders with the unknown cost of future nuclear plants I want to transfer this risk to our customers. Why should Duke Energy customers be burdened with more unneeded financial pressures when they are already under significant financial pressure?"

Doesn't the request of Mr. Rogers mirror the melt down of so many financial institutions in our country? We've seen time and again management teams in poorly run financial institutions indicate by their actions:

"I don't want our stockholders to own these toxic investments, I want to transfer the risk to others."

It is well known that Duke Energy's management team has many other options to meet unknown future electrical energy needs of Duke Energy customers. On top of most customer lists is energy conservation. If energy conservation doesn't meet future energy needs, Duke Energy has a plethora of other lower capital cost, incremental generation options such as solar, wind or even natural gas sourced generation. We're seeing the consequences in Japan of what can happen when executives decide to concentrate significant financial resources in very expensive and very complex nuclear plants.

Please deny Duke Energy's request to have their hard working, over stressed customers' prefund unknown costs of unneeded new nuclear plants.

Thank you for your kind consideration to my request and the request of so many other concerned residents of North Carolina!

Richard Leber (16 year Duke Energy customer)

Chapel Hill NC

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

Campbell, Kim

E-7, Sub 819

From: Campbell, Kim on behalf of Finley, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 3:30 PM
To: 'TURNER, ANGEL [AG/2074]'
Subject: RE: Web Site Contact Energy Concerns

FILED

MAR 29 2011

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Thank you for your thoughtful email. We are confronted with the issues you raise on a frequent basis. Senate Bill 3 requires emphasis on renewables, energy efficiency and demand response. We conduct Integrated Resource Planning proceedings where experts provide testimony on alternatives to nuclear and fossil fuel generation. Recently Progress has indicated a substantial delay in the possibility of adding a new unit at the Harris site.

From: TURNER, ANGEL [AG/2074] [<mailto:angel.turner@monsanto.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 10:54 AM
To: Finley, Ed
Subject: Web Site Contact Energy Concerns

Dear Chairman Finley:

I am a resident of Apex, NC and I am writing to you to urge you not to support the registration of more nuclear power plants in the Carolinas at this time. I understand that we are desperately seeking more energy options which do not contribute to GHG emissions; however, I am not certain that our local utilities have exhausted all other options first. Perhaps the Commission could make a recommendation that a group be brought in to assist the various utility companies in the region with their long term sustainability strategy. A group such as the Rocky Mountain Institute may be able to coordinate and suggest an integrated approach for the regions utilities which could increase the companies' efficiencies as well as transition to a more diversified energy future. Ideally, until we as a society address the waste problem with spent nuclear fuel, we should avoid construction of more plants. Water moderated reactors may indeed be fairly safe, but the cooling pool landfills that they create are not. As someone who lives in the 10 mile zone from Shearon Harris' cooling pools, I am deeply aware of the risk that they pose in the now and the risk they will pose in the future. No one can say with any certainty that in the long life of that waste it will never cause a problem. Simply because of the long life of that waste, it is guaranteed to cause a problem at some point in the future. I urge you to do what you can to promote new technologies in solar, wind and wave along with finding more efficiencies in coal and retrofitting of old coal plants. Thank you for your attention.

Regards,
Angel Turner

Angela D Turner
angel.turner@monsanto.com
106 Country Valley Ct
Apex NC 27502

This e-mail message may contain privileged and/or confidential information, and is intended to be received only by persons entitled to receive such information. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately. Please delete it and all attachments from any servers, hard drives or any other media. Other use of this e-mail by you is strictly prohibited.

All e-mails and attachments sent and received are subject to monitoring, reading and archival by Monsanto, including its

subsidiaries. The recipient of this e-mail is solely responsible for checking for the presence of "Viruses" or other "Malware". Monsanto, along with its subsidiaries, accepts no liability for any damage caused by any such code transmitted by or accompanying this e-mail or any attachment.

The information contained in this email may be subject to the export control laws and regulations of the United States, potentially including but not limited to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) and sanctions regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Treasury, Office of Foreign Asset Controls (OFAC). As a recipient of this information you are obligated to comply with all applicable U.S. export laws and regulations.

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.