Sean Lewis, submitting comments on behalf of myself.

### **Docket E-100 Sub 179**

First, my congratulations to all those in attendance at these marathon hearings. My day job prevented me from attending. Thank you for the recordings.

Second, my thanks to all parties to the hearings, especially you, commissioners, whose task here is heavy — only the weight of the world is on your shoulders. And enviable, as you have more influence on our collective future than almost all of us. Your determination and preparation are admirable.

## <u>Duke Energy</u>

Duke Energy (Duke) set a disappointing tone of business-as-usual. Its decision to punt the 2030 goal in Portfolios 2, 3 and 4 is an outcome of that lackadaisical viewpoint. If Duke were instead hellbent on eliminating carbon equivalents as soon as possible, they would. Instead they put their energy towards emphasizing the difficulty of the transition — while excitedly telling us how they intend to perform miracles. But taking on a revolution is indeed a big ask.

Duke refers many times to the law: "mandated by legislation, as the law requires..." They never add that "we wrote the first draft" or "thanks to our determined lobbying/generous donations to legislators, the law says..." The law in these matters generally favors the Duke Energy business model over ratepayers' or Mother Nature's concerns. "We have concerns" about making 70 percent by 2030," says Duke. We have bigger concerns if you do not.

# **Confidentiality**

Why is confidentiality allowed when all the costs are borne by ratepayers and there is no competition? And per Tyler Norris of Cypress Creek Renewables, the costs of nuclear are confidential because Duke uses confidential nuclear costs, not those of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

### Rates

In regard to discussion of low-income plans and energy efficiency, one way to help those struggling to pay bills would be to free them from paying the fixed fee, thereby allowing them to pay only for the electricity they use. Rates could also be adjusted, perhaps allowing some free or discounted electricity, with rates gradually increasing.

Likewise that fixed fee could be set as a percentage for all other users, so consumers who conserve would pay less, and those who consume more would pay more. This should also become the model for industrial and commercial customers: no discounted rates as usage increases.

#### Off Shore Wind

If off-shore wind (OSW) does proceed, the Long Bay site presents concerns. Duke Renewables is not under NCUC jurisdiction, is a new firm, and paid \$55 million fo purchase rights in Long Bay. Avengrid paid \$9 million for Kitty Hawk, a site with much more power. Duke's argument that Long Bay would be a better deal for ratepayers, because Duke's site would require half as much undersea cable, needs to be examined. And while Duke pointed out Avengrid's delays, Kitty Hawk is still years ahead of Long Bay.

#### Nuclear

In regard to Duke's ability to get nuclear on-line, one Duke staff member said "Duke can get things done." If only that also applied to solar, batteries, and wind. And I think two issues that were brought up warrant serious concerns: the tremendous water requirements and siting concerns. Where in NC is there excess water supply, now and in the future? How will NC residents react to having a nuclear reactor for a neighbor? And then there's the cost — far greater than renewable options.

### <u>Solar</u>

Duke urged caution on solar, as the price may go up. While acknowledging that may be possible for fossil gas, too, Duke does not urge such caution for that source. And would the companies go sprinting ahead with nuclear modules or hydrogen power, if they applied the same caution to them as they apply to solar? And if nuclear or hydrogen power ever go on-line, that

would occur long after 2030, a consensus deadline reached by the broad scientific community.

While there was much talk of 'when the sun is not shining' there was no mention of when the grid is down and the sun is shining. Community and household solar could play a much more substantial role in NC, not only as a general source of energy but also as a resiliency measure, without significant, costly transmission upgrades. Hopefully NC will take utmost advantage of the Inflation Recovery Act to spur residential and community solar.

And for increased reliability and decreased costs, no need to limit storage to solar, as Encompass did in Duke's runs.

### Price on Carbon

As the climate catastrophe worsens, what price will be put on carbon, and what is the financial risk to ratepayers? This is an important risk pertaining to Duke's fossil assets, In addition to supply and cost risks.

## Conservation

Ratepayers could help tremendously during critical peak periods, especially if they were educated to know that by conserving energy they could avoid carbon pollution and high costs by eliminating the need for combustion turbines. "Please use as little electricity as possible tomorrow from 6:30 to 9:00 am. Here are some suggestions..." Lee Ragsdale of NC Electric Membership Corporation had some good suggestions: widespread/universal thermostat control, microgrids: not only consuming less electricity but also less very expensive electricity.

# **Energy Efficiency**

Again, eliminating fossil-generated electricity as soon as possible is key. Yes, it would be better to achieve a 1.5 percent increase for ten years, and then fall back to 1 percent, than get to 1.5 percent gradually. Going as much beyond a 70 percent reduction as possible by 2030 needs to be the goal.

Thank you for your attention. There is more, but I have run out of time. Here's hoping humanity doesn't.