

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Timothy N. McGibbon  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 9:32 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Timothy N. McGibbon

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Timothy N. McGibbon

### Email

mcgibbon.tim@interstatehydrogen.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 190

### Message

Sirs, Your should has both a solar and hydrogen advisors on your committee who is not fossil fuel industry's voice. If we are to have a shoot at Net-Zero greenhouse emissions by the Paris Agreement the power generation needs to be 100% renewable energy sources. Without carbon free hydrogen it would require more capital cost and our carbon footprint will fall short of the Paris goals. Until the power grid has a zero carbon footprint, why buy BEV to only keep producing high carbon electrical power for the grid. One solar rooftop option would be solar and battery systems that the grid could pull power as needed to feed the grid. This option is current feasible and all parts can be gotten today to build a configuration if the power company would not be apposed to the option. I have a number of other ideas if you like to contact me use my to setup a meeting I am willing to help as it will take us all to save our climate.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Teresa J Ladd  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 2:58 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Teresa J Ladd

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Teresa J Ladd

### Email

teresa.j.west@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 190

### Message

Please, the NCUC must partner with the citizens of NC who overwhelmingly support moving to solar energy as part of meeting our electricity needs. If solar installations were less expensive (ours cost \$24,000 3 years ago), many more homeowners and businesses would install solar panels plus battery storage. NC WARN's "Sharing Solar" proposal is supported by over 60 organizations and businesses. Duke's long-term plan for "small" nuclear reactors, switching their gas powered plants to hydrogen, and cutting trees for new transmission corridors to carry energy from massive solar farms would take DECADES to implement, possibly more give the unproven technology of small nuclear reactors and converting natural gas plants to hydrogen. Any person living through our increasingly brutal NC summers understands we don't have decades to move off of fossil fuels! Duke can make plenty of profit from solar and wind energy. Duke has proven over and over again that they intend to drag their feet and keep burning fossil fuels for as long as regulators let them. Their supposed embracing of solar/wind energy and their movement toward "green" power is gaslighting, pure and simple. We need the NCUC to represent the interests of NC citizens, not Duke Energy. You must stop rubber stamping Duke's costly and dangerous plans for future fossil fuel based electricity production. And their unproven nuclear and hydrogen proposals. Thank you for your service. Teresa Ladd Pittsboro NC

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Graham Crispin  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 3:03 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Graham Crispin

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Graham Crispin

### Email

gcrispin59@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 190

### Message

Casinos know that if they don't provide enough value for people's time and gambling losses, they will go out of business. Duke Energy does not see that, just as Marie-Antoinette did not. Chaos theory shows that when some try to bulwark the status quo, little happens until it does. God Bless America and the Independance taken on July 4th. Follow Australia's lead, change is happening there without a revolution.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Rosemary Robinson  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 3:06 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Rosemary Robinson

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Rosemary Robinson

### **Email**

roseroo14@gmail.com

### **Docket**

E-100 Sub 190

### **Message**

Commissioners! Please stop Duke Energy from blocking alternatives to its proposed carbon plan. NC Warn for one has introduced several innovative plans and they are being ignored. Gas plants will be obsolete in 5 years. We need to move to solar and other clean renewables now! No time to waste!

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Terry Wilson  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 3:13 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Terry Wilson

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Terry Wilson

### **Email**

terry.94@gmail.com

### **Docket**

E-100 Sub 190

### **Message**

Please, please say NO to Duke for their proposed "genuine solutions". Say yes to residential solutions, say yes to local solutions, say yes to the future, say yes to the people who make North Carolina great, say yes to the future. Duke plans to make money not save the earth.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Kelly Gloger  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 6:43 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Kelly Gloger

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Kelly Gloger

### Email

solardelivered1@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 190

### Message

The Duke Energy plan for carbon/GHG reduction is flawed and ignores faster and already proven technologies, solar, wind, and battery storage. The unproven technology of modular nuclear reactors (MNR) is years out, has no regulatory approval, creates a millennia-duration waste problem for which no safe, effective, and economical solution currently exist, requires new transmission capacity (10-yr to approve and build), and maintains the outdated 100-yr old central power plant model of energy supply. While the concept of substituting hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) for natural gas is appealing, most H<sub>2</sub> today is generated by reformed natural gas. Renewable production of H<sub>2</sub> is in its infancy with questionable economics and is not a technology currently deployable at scale. Renewables with storage offer distinct advantages over both MNR and H<sub>2</sub>. 1. Economical and deployable at scale 2. Can be sited where energy is used, no new transmission lines required. 3. The technologies can create islandable community microgrids which increase natural disaster resiliency and national security. 4. Minimal waste generation and all materials are recyclable and reusable. 5. They have the fastest design, permit, installation, & commissioning times. 6. Greater siting opportunities, roof-top, floatovoltaics (lakes/canals), agrivoltaics for dual use of farmland, parking lots, and roadways. With the advancements of newly developed copper/graphene wire, distribution cabling to support additional carrying capacity for short distance distribution between locally-sited renewable resources is easily facilitated using existing poles and towers, no new corridor permits or NMBY fights required. NUCU needs to understand that it is time to shift its thinking and reimagine the future using the resource that are currently available.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Jean Alsup  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 7:02 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jean Alsup

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Jean Alsup

### **Email**

jalsup1@triad.rr.com

### **Docket**

100-190

### **Message**

Please consider that we are in the climate change is that the idea of increasing fossil fuel use is ridiculous. Duke power has the technology to increase solar wind power. Please consider this in your deliberations

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Nancy Kay LaPorta,  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 7:14 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Nancy Kay LaPorta

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Nancy Kay LaPorta

### **Email**

wolfmommy@msn.com

### **Docket**

E-100 Sub 190

### **Message**

Duke is a monopoly and does not help WE THE PEOPLE. Stop allowing them to rule without recourse.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 02 2024



**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Bonnie and Donald Oulman  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 9:20 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Bonnie and Donald Oulman

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Bonnie and Donald Oulman

### **Email**

boulman7773@gmail.com

### **Docket**

E 100 Sub 190

### **Message**

People stop Duke from blocking solar and other sustainable energy sources.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Marvin Woll  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 4:35 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Marvin Woll

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Marvin Woll

### **Email**

mjwoll@nc.rr.com

### **Docket**

E-100 Sub190

### **Message**

We must not allow Duke to continue to use fossil fuels! It is time we used more solar and wind power! The future of our country and planet depend on us using more renewable energy now and not five years from now. Our children and future generations are counting on you doing the right thing and we must not let them down!

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Dave Walsh  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 9:40 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Dave Walsh

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Dave Walsh

### **Email**

iamdavewalsh@gmail.com

### **Docket**

E-100 Sub 190

### **Message**

I urge the commission to stop enabling Duke Energy to act against the public interest: i support the Share solar proposal to quickly, cheaply, and equitably achieve a lower carbon energy plan. Duke's plan are risky, and rely on either unproven technology or continued reliance on methane- neither of which are necessary.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

G

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Michael Savino  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 9:49 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Michael Savino

## **Statement of Position Submitted**

### **Name**

Michael Savino

### **Email**

mjsavino512@gmail.com

### **Docket**

E-100 Sub 190

### **Message**

Please adopt NC WARN's "Sharing Solar" plan for meeting our electricity needs with renewable energy plus storage. It is: 1. Cheaper 2. More reliable 3. Faster to install, and 4. Cleaner than Duke Energy's disastrous plan to build methane and nuclear powered electricity. The "Sharing Solar" plan is a win-win-win for customers, jobs, good health, the environment, AND for Duke Energy (they'll still make a profit). Do you agree? If not, please explain the flaws in my logic. Wishing you a blessed day,

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Grant, Lakisha**

---

**From:** Christopher A Berg  
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 10:20 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Christopher A Berg

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Christopher A Berg

### Email

cshapenote@hotmail.com

### Docket

Docket: E-100 Sub 190

### Message

North Carolina utility customers will be far better served by development of localized solar energy, with various types of energy storage as these are made available and economically viable, than to be subject to Duke Energy's proposed investments - in the ratepayers' behalf but directed largely to natural gas burning for energy production. Ratepayers count on the Utilities Commission to engage the various financial, reliability and capacity factors and to support strategies the represent economic sense over (at this point) the approximately 25 year planning period. I recommend a dispersed energy production system be a major part of the State's strategy for increasing energy availability while containing the greenhouse-gas footprint of energy providers serving the state's electric customers. Solar inputs are likely to be the principal source for new production, even as refinements may still need to be considered, such as how to reduce vulnerability of production equipment to hail damage. The best configuration of storage units may also be subject to trials. These uncertainties seem well worthwhile to be taken on when compared against the Duke Energy proposals for massive early investment in gas fired equipment.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 02 2024

**Statement of objection to the Marshall Plant proposed by Duke Energy**

The climate emergency is an existential threat for every person alive today and for generations to come. Minimizing that threat is the challenge of our lifetime. It's in that context that I strongly object to Duke Energy's plan to build a new gas plant, the Marshall Plant, in my community. As a resident of Charlotte and a Duke customer since 1997, I completely reject Duke's position that new investment in "natural gas" benefits me or anyone else, except for generating profits for the shareholders. My strong opposition to the plan is based on two main points:

**1. Methane is a greenhouse gas many times more potent than carbon dioxide.**

The climate emergency is being created by human-caused emissions of greenhouse gases, gases which warm the earth, producing extreme conditions such as the hottest temperatures seen for at least 125,000 years. Methane is a greenhouse gas many times more potent than carbon dioxide.

Methane emissions are a predictable and, in fact, inevitable by-product of burning "natural gas" to produce electricity. I'm not speaking of accidental emissions. We in Charlotte are all too familiar with accidents like that in which the Colonial pipeline spilled some 2 million gallons of gasoline, contaminating soil and water in our county. But, no, I'm referring to ordinary emissions that *will* occur in the course of methane extraction (fracking), methane transport (pipelines, like the MVP Southgate extension, which is necessary to supply the planned Marshall plant), and the burning of methane (as at the Marshall plant itself).

In a law passed with bipartisan support (HB951), the state of North Carolina enshrined its goal of reducing greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050. This law brings us into line with the international community as it seeks to protect us all from the worst effects of the climate emergency. The fact that only carbon dioxide, not methane, is explicitly named in this law does not change the fact that methane is even more harmful than carbon dioxide. Cutting edge science tells us that the best way to impact global warming in the short term is to minimize methane emissions. But projects like the Marshall plant take us in *exactly the opposite direction*.

Shame on Duke Energy for promoting methane as "natural gas", in a transparent effort to obscure the fact that it is such a potent greenhouse gas. This is nothing more than a cynical piece of greenwashing. And shame on Duke Energy for claiming that it can't develop renewable energy at the needed pace, their rationale for why we have to build methane-burning plants in the meantime. Is such a "bridge" really necessary? Others with expertise and experience in the field disagree.

**2. North Carolina is a perfect place to develop renewable energy, whether wind or solar, but Duke is passing up great opportunities to do so.**

Duke has sold methane as the right fuel to replace coal in 2024 because it's cleaner (it's "natural"). They claim to be genuinely committed to developing renewal energy sources like wind and solar. After all, didn't they double their generation of electricity by renewables between 2005 and 2018? Yes their use of renewable fuels did increase from 2% to 4% in that time frame. But to hype 4% as a "doubling" is another shameless piece of greenwashing. Meanwhile, Duke's net-metering policies are unfair to ratepayers willing to invest in their own solar panels in order to facilitate solar energy development and, by doing so, disadvantage companies that work to make solar panels cheaper and more effective.

Duke clearly wants Investment at a level that matters to go to gas plants like the Marshall, not to renewables. But comparison between Duke and other utilities around the world which have done much better by renewables tells the whole story: 4% is nothing—compared to what is not only technologically possible but also financially feasible.

When all aspects of methane extraction, transport, and burning are considered, it's highly questionable how much cleaner methane is than coal. But, leaving that argument aside, the fact is that prioritizing investment in gas plants so heavily neglects our state's great potential for developing renewable energy. After all, wind and solar energy are free, clean, and sustainable, and we already know a great deal about how to make use of them. I know this from my own experience as a homeowner with rooftop solar panels. The bottom line is that my solar panels regularly produce more electricity than my family uses, powering all the usual appliances and electronics, as well as a hybrid vehicle that we charge at home.

Of course, there are challenges to be addressed to give us enough access to wind and sunlight as free fuel. Duke cites the time and money needed to develop infrastructure such as transmission lines and battery storage. But gas plants like the Marshall are expensive too. And their future is problematical, given the state's goal of reaching net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Duke claims that, at that point, it can transition plants like Marshall to hydrogen as a clean fuel. But right now, "green" hydrogen is pie in the sky. With wind and solar energy, there is no comparable uncertainty. Innovative technologies are already queuing up. For example, the *New York Times* reports that "replacing existing power lines with cables made from state-of-the-art materials could roughly double the capacity of the electric grid in many parts of the country, making room for much more wind and solar power. This technique, known as 'advanced reconductoring,' is widely used in other countries." (4/9/24, updated 4/14)

So why do we need new gas plants in North Carolina as a "bridge" to renewable energy? The real reason behind Duke's plan is to maximize its own profits. That's simply not good enough.

### **Conclusion.**

Other utility companies around the world have developed wind and solar energy to a much greater extent than Duke Energy has done or seems to intend in the future. And they've done it without using methane as the "bridge" Duke claims to be both necessary and relatively harmless. That flies in the face of what science now knows about methane. How does Duke get away with ignoring that fact? The answer is that it operates as a

monopoly. But wait! There's the North Carolina Utilities Commission. Isn't that supposed to advocate for us here in Mecklenburg country, in Roxboro, and everywhere else in the state where Duke rate-payers are held hostage by this giant corporation that's positioned to be a leader in its field?

We in Charlotte don't need and don't want the Marshall Plant, or the Southgate Extension pipeline that will have to be built to supply it. I respectfully implore the NCUC to reject plans for this unjustifiable investment in the burning of methane.

Thank you for considering my input,

Dr. Karen Hodges

2641 Palm Avenue, Charlotte NC 28205

*Karen Hodges, Ph.D.*