

Finley, Ed

From: Finley, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 11:29 AM
To: 'DiamondtelDeb@aol.com'
Subject: RE: DocketE-100Sub 124.Lowest Cost Utility Resources from private Rooftop Suppliers

Ms. Diamond,

Thank you for your email and for your continued interest in issues before the Commission and the State. We will place your correspondence in the Commission's official file in the IRP docket.

Ed Finley

FILED

MAR-24-2010

From: DiamondtelDeb@aol.com [mailto:DiamondtelDeb@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 3:13 PM
To: Finley, Ed
Cc: budd.berro@nc.gov; carrie_cook@hagan.senate.gov; Pricey.Harrison@ncleg.net; Pryorg@ncleg.net; Jennifer.Roberts@MecklenburgCountyNC.gov
Subject: DocketE-100Sub 124.Lowest Cost Utility Resources from private Rooftop Suppliers

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

13-10-10 for Public Comments 3-15-10

RE: Docket E-100 Sub 124.

Chairman Edward S. Finley Jr, NC Utilities Commission, 4325 Mail Service Center, Raleigh NC 27699-4325

PURPOSE:

Integrated Resource Plans for NC Utilities over the next 15 years to include the lowest cost mix of resources

SOLUTION:

Eliminate the need/expense of new power plants using a financing tool that is effectively doing just that in cloudy Germany and in less than one year in Gainesville Florida - feed-in-tariffs paid to private rooftop suppliers to eliminate the need for new power plants. Save \$Billions for the State of North Carolina. Achieve grid parity for solar in 5 years versus 15 years without feed-in-rates as per Gainesville Regional Utility Strategic Planner, John Crider 12/21/09.

SIDE BENEFITS:

Although I realize the NCUC is not interested in addressing other issues besides cost, FITs financing plan for clean distributed local rooftop solar energy has created JOBS and local small business prosperity, upgraded communities and, if applied to NC, would make our State the green energy hub of the nation with cleaner air PLUS reduce fuel/capital costs to utilities. All proven effective results. All sustainable and without government bailout funds. And, all at cost savings to supply NC with energy for decades to come.

See <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2009/0903.blake.html>

IMPEDIMENTS:

NC "COSTS WHILE IN PROGRESS" are a financial drain on the State and its citizens that MAKE real cost solutions unattainable.

Currently, the State of NC has in place a law under the previous governor to guarantee payment to large power companies for Billions of Taxpayer/Ratepayer Dollars for NEW construction. As long as these for-profit corporations are assured that no matter whether new coal or nuclear plants ever come on line, they will be repaid, there is no hope for local entrepreneurs to compete on a level playing field. Senate Bill 3 from 2007 needs to be repealed -

<http://avram.sustainablewnc.org/>

UTILITY RESISTANCE BASED ON HUGE FINANCIAL GAINS AT STATE/RATEPAYER EXPENSE:

The Mayor of Gainesville Florida recently spoke on a panel with Duke Energy Brett Carter to present their successful plan based on the German model. (NC Sustainable Energy Alliance Event Feb 24, 2010 at the White Water Center in

Charlotte NC). When Brett heard how much was being paid per kwh to local citizens for their generated energy (eliminating the need for their utility to build a new power plant), he immediately compared that to the low prices Duke currently pays to produce power from EXISTING power plants. This was disingenuous because it compared NEW SOLAR to OLD COAL/NUCLEAR while also excluding associated costs of waste storage and disposal, fresh water issues, ongoing rising fuel costs, transportation, clean up of air quality AND potential carbon fees. Of course, other expenses to Duke and Progress for marketing, lobbying and financially backing legislators who will support their corporate welfare are not considered, but are very real and should also be of concern to the Utilities Commission.

If Duke had to pay on its own (and Wall Street thinks its too risky to finance it!), they would have to consider NEW construction costs and many other currently rising expenses as well as the time it would take to implement these facilities, the interest they would be charged, the risk of failure to their shareholders, etc. (I happen to be a shareholder in Duke by the way and do not approve of their backward investment policies or being on the legislative dole which will only harm the company further). I urge the repeal of this expensive CWIP bill in the State Legislature. The big power companies would then WELCOME rooftop energy from their customers! Until that time, I believe it is the duty of the NCUC to find and use every means at their disposal including Feed-in-Rates to avoid expensive loan guarantees to for-profit corporations.

I also learned from Gainesville Regional Utility that new underground power lines cost \$5 million per MILE. Using local feed-in-rates over existing transmission lines, there is no need to run expensive new lines to import wind or solar from far-away locations. I hope that the NCUC has taken these extra costs of mega solar and wind projects into consideration as well when evaluating Duke and Progress costs.

FEED-IN-RATES UNDERWAY:

Pricey Harrison in the State Legislature is involved in a study of this exciting and practical financing method to bring clean, inexpensive, distributed energy to our State. US Rep Jay Inslee is expected to bring it to the federal legislature in the spring. I highly recommend you help to implement FITs in some form with all NC electric utilities so we can begin a healthy recovery and not waste billions of dollars the citizens of this State do not have on unnecessary new construction. This must not be billed to the people of NC.

Sincerely, Deb and Arne Arnason
360 Webb Rd, Wadesboro, NC 28170 704-851-3925
Cell 386-288-4454 diamondteldeb@aol.com

CC: Gov Bev Perdue, Rep Pricey Harrison, Rep Pryor Gibson, Sen Kay Hagan, Sen Richard Burr

Member of Greenroots Community Group formed at Energy Efficiency Community Block Grant public meetings in November 2009, met with Charlotte Mayor Foxx in December, 2009. We traveled to Gainesville Florida Jan 29, 2010 to bring back information on their successful Rooftop Revolution model similar to Germany using Feed-In-Rates.
<http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2009/0903.blake.html>

Articles in the Gainesville Sun on the day of our visit:

Vision of the Future - Innovative Gainesville Economic Development Plan Unveiled

<http://www.gainesville.com/article/20100129/ARTICLES/1291014>

Jobs Created in 2009 Highlighted at Chamber of Commerce Event

<http://www.gainesville.com/article/20100129/ARTICLES/1291012>

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.

Finley, Ed

From: Finley, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 11:24 AM
To: 'K. K. Mersereau'
Subject: RE: Coal

FILED

MAR 24 2010

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Director Mersereau,

Thank you for your email. The Commission does not anticipate receiving applications for the construction of a coal plant from one of the state's utilities in the near future. With the exception of Duke's Cliffside #6, the current trend is to retire older coal plants. Thank for your concern and your interest.

Ed Finley

From: K. K. Mersereau [mailto:microwavetheatre@mindspring.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 14, 2010 2:23 PM
To: Finley, Ed
Subject: Coal

Mr. Edward Finley
Chairman
NC Utilities Commission

Dear Chairman Finley,

I would like to voice my objection to the continued future use of coal in solving our energy problems in North Carolina. Coal has proven to be detrimental to our environment and we should stop its use as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
K. K. Mersereau
Director
The Microwave Theatre of North Carolina

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.

MAR 24 2010**Finley, Ed**

From:	Finley, Ed	Clerk's Office
Sent:	Wednesday, March 24, 2010 11:18 AM	N.C. Utilities Commission
To:	'Mary Cridlebaugh'	
Subject:	RE: Possible Spam TMW: Remarks for the North Carolina Public Utilities Integrated Resources Plans of Duke Energy and Progress Energy	Hearing on

Ms. Cridlebaugh,

Thanks you for your comprehensive email. We will include it in the Commission's official file in this docket. As to one of your suggestions, the Commission has approved a Duke distributed solar proposal under which Duke is placing solar panels on the roofs of a number of its customers. This is proving to be a popular program. Thank you for your interest and suggestions.

Ed Finley

From: Mary Cridlebaugh [mailto:cridlebaugh@northstate.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 14, 2010 4:40 PM
To: Finley, Ed
Subject: Possible Spam TMW: Remarks for the North Carolina Public Utilities Hearing on Integrated Resources Plans of Duke Energy and Progress Energy

**Remarks for the North Carolina Public Utilities Hearing on Integrated Resources Plans of Duke Energy
and Progress Energy, March 15, 2010**

Docket Number E-500 Sub 124

From: Mary C. Cridlebaugh
3632 West Lexington Avenue Extension
High Point, NC 27265

Duke Energy already has the model which should be followed for electricity production in the next 15 years.

It is the SunEdison Solar Farm at Linwood in Davidson County. SunEdison obtained a commitment from Duke Power which agreed to purchase the production of solar panels on about 300 acres of land. The panels tilt with the sun and there are conversion facilities which allow the electricity to go into the Duke Energy system. I understand that enough electricity is produced to serve the needs of approximately 40,000 households.

Before SunEdison could complete the installation of the panels and receive tax breaks, which have now expired, SunEdison was gobbled up by MEMC Electronic Materials, Inc. which had supplied some of the materials and which recognized a sure money-maker when it saw one. MEMC plans further solar farms in Spain and Italy. Let them build some more here.

The same general concept should be applicable to sites smaller than 300 acres thereby saving vital farmland. The relatively flat site was some of the best farmland in Davidson County. Why can't the same solar farm idea be applied to large flat-roofed buildings such as schools and industrial plants? Perhaps older buildings must be ruled out, but new structures with re-enforced roofs should work beautifully. The electricity supplied from the roof panels could reduce the electrical need and thereby reduce expenses for the owners. Extra production could be sold to Duke Energy, reducing that company's need for large new production facilities, such as

Cliffside, while at the same time Duke would sell electricity to the roof-owner, if for some reason, roof production proved inadequate.

The best thing is that it is all so simple. It is all so non-polluting. After a while, the solar panels—while initially an expensive investment—should pay for themselves as the solar panel owners receive reduced electricity bills. Duke Energy should continue to make profits because it will be able to reduce its expenses as it reduces initial production costs.

With encouragement from Duke Energy and the Utilities Commission, the North Carolina General Assembly should enact tax incentives for the implementation of solar panels and other nonpolluting sources of electricity such as wind, wave action, the flow of water, thermal energy, as well as additional solar farm sites. Then Duke Energy in North Carolina could gradually change from a producer of electricity to a coordinator of electricity supply.

The general rule for energy production in this state should be that the source should not be something that is BURNED or SPLIT. Applications for permits for large facilities which burn coal or use nuclear fission to create steam to turn turbines should be denied in favor of smaller, more localized facilities which do not burn anything and which do not have problems with the disposal of ash, nuclear fuel rods, or toxic emissions. Clean coal is not going to happen. Experiments to force smoke, ash, scrubber filters, etc. underground show that we are not going to be able to deal with the massive amount needing treatment. Coal-fired plants are a real cause of greenhouse gases at the poles where, accept it or not, measurable Earth-changing effects are under way. Of all of the electricity-production-by-burning proposals, Fibrowatt is the absolute worst because it releases even greater amounts of toxins and gases than even coal. It is not just chicken litter which would get burned. With nuclear energy there is the ever-present possibility of a catastrophic mishap or terrorist incident. With the discarding of the Yucca Mountain possibility, there is no long-range plan for storing dangerous nuclear waste. Besides that, new nuclear energy facilities are prohibitively expensive.

Although natural gas production is relatively clean, natural gas is not free. Sunshine is free; the wind is free; even Canute could not stop the waves which are free; falling water is free. We need to go with what is free natural energy. The beauty of it is that all of the free energy sources are pollution free also. Aside from possible television interference caused by windmill blades, they are also pretty problem-free.

During the next 15 years North Carolina should move as quickly as possible to electricity produced by solar or other natural energy. It should move toward localized production rather than mass-scale production. If this happens, a company like Duke Power should be able to greatly reduce its production costs. Among the costs which I hope it is able to give up are the mess and ugly proliferation of light poles and electric lines, cable lines, telephone lines and anything else which can be attached to a light pole which I see in my neighborhood as being double-positioned so as to bear the great weight of the lines. Do you know how many hundreds of thousands of acres of land are rendered useless for other uses because they are strung full of power lines? Put them underground!

I hope to live long enough to see local solar production provide enough electricity so that many of those power lines become unneeded with the remainder placed underground. If you have ever looked at a photograph of a major street in New York City in the 1890s, you probably noticed that the area beside the street was black with lines and poles. Too many places in North Carolina resemble that now. How much longer can we keep placing more poles and hanging more lines? A goal for the next 15 years should be to start placing all utility lines underground, so that in 30 years that is where they will be. Then maybe we can admire the actual beauty of an ice storm without worrying about freezing to death.

Finley, Ed

From: Finley, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 11:06 AM
To: 'Bob Cherry'
Subject: RE: Docket E-100 Sub 124 Integrated Resource Plans

FILED
MAR 24 2010

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Mr. Cherry,

Thank you for your email. We will make it a part of the official file in this case. The hearings on the issues in this docket have now been completed. The Commission now will carefully weigh the evidence and the parties' post hearings filings and attempt to issue an order that fairly resolves the outstanding issues.

Ed Finley

From: Bob Cherry [mailto:cherryleigh@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 10:15 PM
To: Finley, Ed
Subject: Docket E-100 Sub 124 Integrated Resource Plans

Chairman Finley,

I will be unable to attend any of the public hearings but wanted to pass on my concerns about energy generation and use in North Carolina.

I am very concerned by my children's future about climate change and air quality. I feel that it is very important that to do whatever is necessary to reduce the amount of energy consumed in the state. Please do what you can to establish more effective energy conservation programs and to increase the efficiency of our use of electricity in the state. This includes both home energy conservation and at electricity generating plants.

I am concerned that we get a lot of our coal to produce energy from regions that are destroying people's homes by allowing mountain top removal. Electricity at the expense of fellow Americans' well being is inexcusable and needs to be stopped. NC utilities should not be purchasing coal from companies that destroy mountains, cover rivers and harm their neighbors by polluting their drinking water and degrading the air they breath.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Bob Cherry
301 Perkins St.
Boone, NC 28697

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.

Finley, Ed

From: Finley, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 1:54 PM
To: 'Callie Justice'
Subject: RE: Docket No. E-100 Sub 124

FILED
MAR 24 2010

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Ms. Justice,

Thank you for your email and your interest in issues before the Commission. We will place your correspondence in the Commission's official file in this docket.

Ed Finley

-----Original Message-----

From: Callie Justice [mailto:justice.callie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 2:13 PM
To: Finley, Ed
Subject: Docket No. E-100 Sub 124

Dear Chairman Finley:

In reference the NC Utilities Commission upcoming hearing, Docket No. E-100 Sub 124, I hope that the Commission will act to eliminate coal (and nuclear) power plants in North Carolina, and to develop alternative energy sources. As a tax payer with a concern for future generations, I am more than happy to make short term sacrifices for the sakes of our children's children.

Sincerely,
Callie Justice
2027 Pershing Street
Durham, N.C. 27705

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.