

Statement of Position Re: Docket No. E-2 Sub 1089

Duke Energy's Proposed Replacement Plan for the Asheville Coal Plant

FEB 16 2016

Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

I/We are opposed to Duke's Request (Re: **Docket No. E-2 Sub 1089**) for the Following Reasons:

1. It is premature to include a third natural gas turbine unit (192MW) in the application since this unit is not needed until 2023 and may not be needed at all if the if the new clean energy partnership with the City of Asheville and Buncombe County (and other energy efficiency programs) are successful.
2. Duke Energy should be required to publicly disclose its future energy needs models. Otherwise, how can an informed decision be made? Historically Duke has overestimated future energy needs.
3. Duke's plans for 15 MW of solar and 5 MW of utility-scale battery storage are welcome, however, the solar capacity should be much larger. Solar must be part of the current application and its installation must be a requirement for Commission approval of the two new gas turbine units.
4. The commission must require Duke to formulate an ongoing energy efficiency program and periodically report on its success. Energy efficiency is the proven least cost option for meeting electricity demand.

Therefore, I urge the Commission to reject the current proposal that relies solely on fossil fuels and ask Duke to resubmit a plan to scale back the gas generation capacity, implement more solar capacity and commit to implement an energy efficiency program.

Name: Mary H. Campbell Date: 2.9.16  
 Address: 58 Pleasant Ridge Dr Asheville NC 28805

Mail to: Chief Clerk, North Carolina Utilities Commission, 4325 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-4325  
 (or) eMail to: [statements@ncuc.net](mailto:statements@ncuc.net)

NOTE: The Public Staff shall present its findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Commission on February 22, 2016

Statement of Position Re: Docket No. E-2 Sub 1089  
Duke Energy's Proposed Replacement Plan for the Asheville Coal Plant

FILED  
FEB 16 2016  
Clerk's Office  
North Carolina Utilities Commission

I/We are opposed to Duke's Request (Re: **Docket No. E-2 Sub 1089**) for the Following Reasons:

1. It is premature to include a third natural gas turbine unit (192MW) in the application since this unit is not needed until 2023 and may not be needed at all if the new clean energy partnership with the City of Asheville and Buncombe County (and other energy efficiency programs) are successful.
2. Duke Energy should be required to publicly disclose its future energy needs models. Otherwise, how can an informed decision be made? Historically Duke has overestimated future energy needs.
3. Duke's plans for 15 MW of solar and 5 MW of utility-scale battery storage are welcome, however, the solar capacity should be much larger. Solar must be part of the current application and its installation must be a requirement for Commission approval of the two new gas turbine units.
4. The commission must require Duke to formulate an ongoing energy efficiency program and periodically report on its success. Energy efficiency is the proven least cost option for meeting electricity demand.

Therefore, I urge the Commission to reject the current proposal that relies solely on fossil fuels and ask Duke to resubmit a plan to scale back the gas generation capacity, implement more solar capacity and commit to implement an energy efficiency program.

Name:

KATHERINE MONAHAN

Date:

2/11/2016

Address:

103 GREEN RIDGE RD  
WEAVERVILLE, NC 28787

Mail to: Chief Clerk, North Carolina Utilities Commission, 4325 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-4325  
(or) eMail to: [statements@ncuc.net](mailto:statements@ncuc.net)

NOTE: The Public Staff shall present its findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Commission on February 22, 2016

**Mount, Gail**

---

**From:** George Malone <malone.george@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 16, 2016 12:10 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** end carbon-bases fuels

**FILED**

FEB 16 2016

Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

We are totally opposed to the natural-gas plant proposed by Duke Energy and insist that they transition as quickly as possible to renewables. And we favor the carbon fee & dividend plan to achieve this.

George & Kathleen Malone

**Mount, Gail**

---

**From:** Gloria Shen <gloshen@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 16, 2016 12:11 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket #E-2 Sub 1089

**FILED**  
**FEB 16 2016**  
Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

Dear Honorable Commissioners and Honorable Chairman of Commissioners:

As a resident of Asheville, North Carolina, I wish to submit my comments about Duke Energy's application for new construction at the Asheville Steam Electric Generating Plant.

I am extremely concerned about the fact that there has not been enough time to truly evaluate what the construction of these gas-powered generators could do to this area and the health of those living here. Additionally, how will such construction impact ratepayers and customers? How much consideration of the energy efficiency, conservation and demand-side management aspects of the area's energy needs will there be? Surely these are important questions to ask and areas to explore before a decision on such a project is evaluated.

It has come to my attention that the plant's capacity of 749 MW will be increased to 1,116 MW. Given the poor air quality that already exists in this region, that significantly increased capacity will worsen our air quality even more.

The Mountain Energy Act, passed in June of 2015, was conveniently enacted to ensure that Duke's application could be approved without the consideration of the issues I have highlighted here. However, it is still within the right and the power of the Public Utility Commissioners to ask for reasonableness and fairness for all who live in this area as this decision is to be made.

I implore you to turn down Duke Energy's application and to request an extension of time for your consideration of all of the important questions that would need to be answered to make an informed and responsible decision that will impact this area and its residents for decades.

I thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Sincerely,  
Gloria Shen  
40 Rocking Porch Lane  
Asheville, NC 28805

FILED

FEB 16 2016

Mount, Gail

**From:** Sam Hunt <fiadhruadh@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 16, 2016 3:25 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Need real answers and a public hearing on Duke's Foothills Transmission project: NC Docket E-2 sub 1

Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

E-2 SUB 1089

Dear NC Utilities Commission,

I am writing in opposition of Duke Energy's Foothills Transmission line & Substation. This project seems to be designed with one thing in mind: Duke's bottom line, ignoring the impact and costs to our local communities. Thousands of people in the Upstate of S.C. and Western North Carolina will carry the costs of this project for years to come: diminished views and property values, loss of homes and property rights and a degraded environment.

The timeline for this project needs to be immediately slowed down and Duke must give a full account of the cost and benefits of this project and evaluate alternatives that will have less impact over the life of the project. Duke has not backed up their claims of rapidly growing electricity demand and has given no comparison of alternatives showing that this is the best plan for the public. Alternate plans must include investments in economically viable ways to reduce our demand via energy efficiency and demand side management and supplement generation with renewable energy. These are cost competitive, and in some instances, cheaper ways to meet our energy needs without doubling down on fossil fuels and marring the landscape.

In addition, the N.C. Utilities Commission should immediately schedule a public hearing in Western North Carolina so community members can make comment directly to the commission. South Carolina commissioners held a hearing in August and North Carolinians deserve to have our voices heard too.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Sam Hunt

883 Highland View Ln  
Mill Spring, NC 28756

+1 828-894-9833

FEB 16 2016

Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

Mount, Gail

**From:** Susan I Hunt <glasbrae@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 16, 2016 3:25 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** We Demand Actual MODERN Plans from Duke and a public hearing: NC Docket E-2-sub 1083  
E-2 SUB 1089

Dear NC Utilities Commission,

Duke Energy's grid modernization plans for upstate South Carolina and Western North Carolina IS NOT MODERN. Duke is conducting business as usual: Build too much fossil fuel-powered generating capacity and infrastructure, which they're incentivized to do by being guaranteed a return on capitol investments. I, and many others, TOTALLY OPPOSE THIS PLAN. Duke Energy should redo their plans to take a long-range look at what will really be the best, least-impact plan for providing reliable service to this area for years to come. Duke claims they are a community partner, but denies communities answers to the questions we're all asking and options for alternatives, other than who's back yard will be destroyed.

Duke Energy needs to immediately release detailed information on how they're forecasting that the region's electricity demand will grow by 15% and explain why we need much more than that made available, as this project will do. We need to know why it's impossible to accommodate more transmission with existing lines and easements and why there's been no consideration of lowering demand by expanding existing, successful, Duke Energy programs.

While I appreciate that N.C. public staff attended a meeting on September 3, the widespread concern and impacts of this project necessitate a N.C. Utilities Commission public hearing in WNC immediately.

Sincerely,

Susan I Hunt

883 Highland View Ln  
Mill Spring, NC 28756

+1 828-894-9833

Mount, Gail

FILED

From: Susan Hunt <glasbrae@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 3:40 PM  
To: Statements  
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

FEB 16 2016  
Clark's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

I oppose Duke Energy's request for a third gas powered plant in Asheville, based on "their own research" that this third plant will be needed by 2023. Just how do they know that? Supposedly, according to their public statements, Duke is committed to helping western North Carolinians reduce their power usage in the future. What if we, the public actually REDUCE OUR ENERGY USAGE TO THE EXTENT THAT THIS THIRD PLANT IS NOT NEEDED? WHAT IF DUKE, AGAIN, IN 2023, SAYS, "Well, we now think that we'll need this third plant by 2035, so let's build it now." Gee, we have too much electricity, let's sell it! Let's put in transmissions lines and sell it to: Alabama, South Carolina, Indiana, New Jersey.... hey, great idea. We'll become an even bigger MONOPOLY FOR ENERGY, just like Rockefeller with Standard Oil and Vanderbilt with railroads.... MONOPOLIES!!!! And the average citizen is hurt economically by this while the corporation and its stockholders get more and more wealthy.

Please do NOT approve this third gas powered plant. A new technology invented in 2023 may be better able to provide energy without damaging our environment or our climate. Use of fossil fuels is on the way OUT; why is Duke so far behind many parts of the developed world? They are greedy criminals, convicted criminals who have lied before and are lying again. Please stand up against Duke for the sake of ordinary North Carolinians. Thank you, Susan I. Hunt, living in NC since 1974.

**Mount, Gail**

---

**From:** Amy Grainger <aiim4it@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 16, 2016 4:59 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

**FILED**  
**FEB 16 2016**  
Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

Good afternoon,

As a citizen of North Carolina, I urge you to demand an open review of Duke's climate-wrecking gas expansion. Action is key at this juncture.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Amy Grainger