

OFFICIAL COPY FILED

Mount, Gail

From: Joe Mounie <joemounie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 1:30 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

FEB 12 2016

Clark's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

To whom it may concern,I am asking you to make sure that Duke Energy is giving you full and transparent examination of their Asheville project. Not just rubber stamped as they often do. Like we should just take them at their word. I don't and you shouldn't either. Our mountains are too beautiful and precious to gamble with.Let's do much more solar and wind. Fondly, Laura and Joe Mounie

Mount, Gail

From: Fiddlin' Holley <fiddlinholley@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 1:58 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

I urge Attorney General Roy Cooper to use his policing authority over Duke's corporate influence and demand a full and transparent examination of Duke Energy's Asheville project — not a rubber stamp!

FILED
FEB 12 2016
Clark's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Mount, Gail

F I L E D

From: max <sandhillsfish@northstate.net>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

FEB 12 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Stop any fracking in NC, instead get jobs from inexpensive solar installed on as many homes in NC as we can at a fair price!! I am ready for this to happen to my house with cash and waiting. Lets get it done now. Max B, Lake

Mount, Gail

~~FILED~~

From: Debra Lewis <dkayl5@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 3:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

FEB 12 2016

Clark's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Citizens of North Carolina demand a full and transparent examination of Duke Energy's Asheville project — not a rubber stamp!

Please do right by us!

Debra Lewis
Apex, NC

Mount, Gail

FILED

From: Jennifer Weiss <jweiss@cleanenergy.org>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 3:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position, Docket # E-2, Sub 1089
Attachments: SACE_Comments_on_Duke_WesternCarolinassModernizationProject_021216.pdf

FEB 12 2016

Glenda O'Farrell
N.C. Office of the Secretary

Dear Ms. Mount,

Please find attached the public comments for the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (SACE) in reference to Docket # E-2, Sub 1089 (Duke Progress LLC's proposed Western Carolinas Modernization Project). We are not intervenors in the docket, but are very interested in providing our comments for the proceedings.

If you have any trouble with this file, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Thank you,
Jennifer Weiss

--

Jennifer Weiss | Energy Efficiency Policy Manager
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
jweiss@cleanenergy.org | 504-606-8148

FILED
FEB 12 2016

February 12, 2016

Ms. Gail Mount
Chief Clerk
North Carolina Utilities Commission
430 North Salisbury Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27606-5926

Clark's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

1.866.522.SACE
www.cleanenergy.org

P.O. Box 1842
Knoxville, TN 37901
865.637.6055

46 Orchard Street
Asheville, NC 28801
828.254.6776

250 Arizona Avenue, NE
Atlanta, GA 30307
404.373.5832

P.O. Box 310
Indian Rocks Beach, FL 33785
954.295.5714

P.O. Box 13673
Charleston, SC 29422
843.225.2371

Re: Comments on Duke Energy Progress, LLC's Proposed Western
Carolina Modernization Project (Docket No. E-2, Sub 1089)

Dear Ms. Mount,

The Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, a regional organization with an office here in Asheville that promotes responsible energy choices to ensure clean, safe and healthy communities throughout the Southeast, welcomes the chance to engage in a discussion about our community's energy needs.

SACE supports the closure of Duke Energy's 379 MW coal-burning plant in Asheville: ceasing to burn coal there while also cleaning up the facility's on-site coal ash ponds will simultaneously reduce air pollution and lower the risks that toxic coal ash poses to the French Broad River and health of local residents.

In their own words, Duke Energy's announcement spoke of "working with the community to reduce power demand across the region through energy efficiency, demand response, renewable energy and other technologies to work collectively to avoid building additional generation in the area for as long as possible."

However, we are concerned that Duke's proposed plan is not cost-effective in that it fails to maximize the use of energy efficiency and renewable energy to replace coal-capacity, but instead relies heavily towards another fossil-based energy source, natural gas.

Energy efficiency is the most beneficial for customers and is the most cost effective option for meeting electricity demand. Studies have shown that energy efficiency is the least-cost resource compared to investment in new generation capacity. Through our active participation in the quarterly Duke Energy Collaborative meetings, SACE continues to propose programs that can be used to reduce electricity demand. These include on-bill finance programs to increase customer participation in energy efficiency programs and Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems that provide a dispatchable solution to meeting peak demand.

While Duke Energy's initial coal retirement announcement last spring did not specify a target size for new solar development, we remained hopeful that the company would make a truly substantial investment in solar given the growth of the solar market here in North Carolina and the potential for job growth through further solar development in our state. SACE analysis on summer dependable capacity factors across the Southeast, which match solar production to peak utility loads, indicates that the area around Asheville has one of the best solar resources in a five-state region. Utility-scale solar development using today's single-axis tracking system technologies can provide nearly two-thirds of summer dependable capacity for Asheville and make a significant contribution to eliminating the need for the 186 MW natural gas "peaker" plant for which Duke is requesting approval alongside the proposed two natural gas combined-cycle generating units totaling 560 MW.

We are, therefore, disappointed that Duke Energy is only planning to build a modest 15 megawatts of new solar generation and 5 megawatts of utility-scale solar storage and has provided no tangible plans to develop any of this new renewable energy in the short-term. As utilities throughout our region have demonstrated, solar power can be used effectively to reduce the amount of natural gas burned during peak demand periods when electricity is most expensive to produce - thus avoiding the need to build expensive new plants, protecting ratepayers from volatility in natural gas prices, lessening our dependence on fossil fuels and improving air quality. In 2014, North Carolina installed almost 400 megawatts of new solar and our state currently boasts more than a gigawatt of solar power – generating clean energy for the grid and creating new, well-paid jobs in the process.

We urge the North Carolina Utilities Commission to direct Duke Energy to make additional investments in efficiency programs and to increase their investments in low cost, job-creating clean energy projects before approving additional natural gas units, which may prove unnecessary and costly for ratepayers here in Western North Carolina.

Thank you.



Toni M. Nelson
Renewable Energy Manager



Jennifer Weiss
Energy Efficiency Policy Manager

Mount, Gail

From: Fortner, Sharon <fortnesl@wfu.edu>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 3:37 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket # E-2 Sub 1089

FILED

FEB 12 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Please reject Duke Energy's proposed Asheville gas plant. It will not be good for the community or state in the long run. We need to protect our environment and promote clean energy including wind and solar.

Thank you.

--

Sharon Fortner

Mount, Gail

From: jeanine crum <jeaninecrum@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 3:48 PM
To: Statements
Cc: ncago@ncdoj.gov
Subject: Deny Duke Energy

F-2 SUB 1089

FILED

FEB 12 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Deny Duke Energy's application to build a huge natural gas power plant in Asheville because it is not needed, would be high-risk economically, and would accelerate the global climate crisis at the worst possible time.

Concerned citizen of Asheville,

Jeanine Crum
828-691-2519

Mount, Gail

From: bob woods <b2wood@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 4:16 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-2 Sub 1089

FILED

FEB 12 2016

Clark's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Dear NC Utilities Commission,

At this critical point in our energy future, the public needs the protection of the Utilities Commission in planning for our energy needs in WNC. It needs the UC to reject the current Duke Energy plan and redirect Duke to coming up with a smarter plan for WNC that moves us away from fossil fuels and an unsound financial investment, and builds a stronger foundation for alternative energy, more efficient use of energy and a more long-term solution of our energy future. Most urgently, we need a plan that moves us away from the health and environmental risks of the continued extraction and burning of another fossil fuel, natural gas. With the clear evidence we now have and that political and business leaders throughout the world are acting on, it is not dramatic to say that a livable future for our children and grandchildren depend on a well-thought out energy plan that leaves fossil fuels in the ground.

While Duke Energy has reliably provided power, they do not have a good history of planning and supporting the development, production and distribution of energy sources that are safe for our health and the environment, or forward-thinking about our future life on earth, or financially prudent for customers.

We have witnessed the damage caused by the promotion and burning of coal by Duke Energy, while its risks were clearly known. The side effects of increases in asthma and respiratory diseases, as well as mercury poisoning and acidification of our inland waters are a few examples. The Dan River coal ash spill, one of the worst toxic waste spills in U.S. history, has an estimated \$4 billion clean-up price tag that Duke wants customers to pay for and there are other piles of toxic coal ash waiting to be cleaned up. Duke has a history of promotion of and singular focus on fossil fuels, with their known risks and damaging effects, to the detriment of our health and environment and the development of real clean alternative energy sources. Their current energy plan continues their historical focus on fossil fuel with its known damaging effects.

The reality of natural gas is that it is not clean and it is deceptive for Duke Energy to call it that, as their representative did at the public meeting. While gas produces less CO₂ than coal when burned, it still releases CO₂ into the atmosphere. Natural gas is, as repeated studies have shown, highly toxic and damaging to our health and environment. Extraction by fracking injects toxic chemicals into the earth and groundwater, which destabilizes the earth causing earthquakes, and releases methane, a greenhouse gas up to 100 times as strong as CO₂. Communities throughout the U.S. have been seriously damaged by fracking. It is unwise and lethal to continue getting our energy in a way known to have such devastating, deadly human consequences.

There is the matter of the cost of the proposed plan that the public would pay for. There is clear evidence that Duke's plan at 746 MW would greatly overbuild the capacity without demonstrated need. The \$1.1 billion price will be borne by the customers, the public. To make a long-term publicly-funded investment of that magnitude needs careful and thorough review. Part of that review should consider the long-term financial risk. Given what is known in the world now, Duke's plan has a high level of financial risk given a volatile gas market, the destructive extraction process, and the smart money betting on a diminished role of fossil fuel in the future. World leaders, including financial experts, have spoken at the recent Paris Climate Summit: we need to move away from fossil fuels for the health of our planet.

At this critical time, the public needs a plan from Duke using the best science and future forecasting. At the public hearing, the public voice was clear, united and unequivocal: over 90% of the many public comments urged the Utilities Commission to reject Duke's plan. The public needs Duke to rethink its plan, free us from entrenchment in the dirty fossil fuels of the past and their attendant damage to our health and environment, and offer a 21st Century energy plan for WNC.

I urge you to slow this process down, reject Duke's plan, and establish a transparent and collaborative process going forward using the best public and private science and financial information to create a future energy plan for WNC that will give us and future generations the best opportunity to live healthily lives in this region.

Sincerely,

bob woods