

Grant, Lakisha

From: Bretton Little
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 8:50 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Bretton Little

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Bretton Little

Email

bclittle0107@gmail.com

Docket

E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55

Message

Hello, I have a Masters degree in Public Administration and I believe you should deny Duke's proposed new methane gas plant's Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for three main reasons. These three reasons are: 1. The methane gas plant is not in the public interest. 2. It is not the least-cost pathway for meeting electricity needs. 3. It is not the best solution for reliable electricity. I have given support for each of these reasons below because the health and finances of North Carolina citizens are important to me. First of all, a methane gas plant would not be in the public interest. The proposed gas plants would require a new methane gas pipeline, which would impact properties in Person County. These pipelines can explode and catch fire without warning, causing injuries, deaths, and millions of dollars in damages. On average in the U.S. across the past 13 years, a fire occurs every 4.2 days, an injury every 6.5 days, and nearly \$1.6 million worth of property damage is incurred from pipeline incidents. Furthermore, the pipeline is proposed to be built near an elementary school. Person County is already burdened by environmental pollution. This community has already been impacted by the coal plant's air pollution and coal ash leaching into groundwater. Public health data show that residents in this area have a higher risk of cancer in their lifetime from air pollution than the state average, despite being a rural area away from cities & traffic. Building a new gas plant is inconsistent with a bipartisan state law that requires Duke to reduce carbon emissions. Duke should focus on removing emitting sources from its electric generation, not adding more that will have to either undergo expensive upgrades to burn hydrogen or get turned off in 2050, 7-12 years earlier than the normal 25 to 30-year lifespan of a major power plant. Secondly, a methane gas plant is not the least cost pathway for electricity needs. Building more gas plants is risky for customer bills. Methane gas prices are unpredictable, and price spikes are paid for by customers through their high electricity bills. High methane gas prices have driven up electricity bills in NC. Increases in methane gas prices have caused 46% of electricity price increases for residential customers in Duke Energy Progress territory since 2017. Additionally, gas plants are

expensive and paid for by Duke customers. The cost of building new gas plants is passed on to customers through higher electricity bills, with a built-in profit for Duke. The cost of the proposed gas plant is hidden from the public. Duke spent \$817 million to build a much smaller gas plant in Asheville, suggesting that this larger plant could cost even more. The plant will also require expensive upgrades because it did not consider federal environmental regulations in its original proposal. It would need to use carbon capture and storage which isn't feasible with NC's geology. Duke says it plans on converting it to hydrogen, which is unproven at scale in NC, and this would require hydrogen pipelines to be built. Finally, a methane gas plant would not be the best solution for reliable electricity. During Winter Storm Elliot in 2022, half a million people across North Carolina lost power due to rolling blackouts. During the storm, 63% of lost power across the Eastern U.S. was because of failures with methane gas generation. Failures of methane gas infrastructure were also a main cause of blackouts during four other extreme winter weather events across the past 12 years. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this and for your time and consideration.

Grant, Lakisha

From: Stuart Matthews
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 6:37 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Stuart Matthews

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Stuart Matthews

Email

stuartleencsu72@gmail.com

Docket

E-2, Sub. 1318/EC-67, Sub. 55

Message

Building new gas facilities is totally wrong. It is money down the drain. Duke Energy has to move to clean energy NOW!! NO TO GAS!! Stuart Matthews- Angier, NC

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Geoffrey Saign
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 8:08 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Geoffrey Saign

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Geoffrey Saign

Email

geoff@geoffreysaign.net

Docket

No. E-2, Sub 1318 / EC-67, Sub 55

Message

Dear Members, Why, in the face of overwhelming science that says this is bad for health, the planet, our children, our lives, are we even having to submit comments on this stupidity? Stupidity is action that is against science, against health, against planet=MVP's in service plan. WHAT DO YOU SUPPORT, SCIENCE OR STUPIDITY? Building more gas plants is risky for customer bills. Methane gas prices are unpredictable, and price spikes are paid for by customers through their high electricity bills. High methane gas prices have driven up electricity bills in NC. Increases in methane gas prices have caused 46% of electricity price increases for residential customers in Duke Energy Progress territory since 2017. Gas plants are expensive and paid for by Duke customers. The cost of building new gas plants is passed on to customers through higher electricity bills—with a built-in profit for Duke. The cost of the proposed gas plant is hidden from the public. Duke spent \$817 million to build a much smaller gas plant in Asheville, suggesting that this larger plant could cost even more. The gas plant will require expensive upgrades, need to run less often, or be at risk of closing early. The original proposal for this gas plant did not consider changes to federal environmental regulations, which will reduce air pollution and require the plant to either operate less efficiently than it was designed to, take on expensive upgrades, or close early. A new federal regulation would require the gas plant to either use currently expensive carbon capture and storage technology (which is unlikely to work in North Carolina due to our geology and the captured carbon dioxide would need to be sent out of state by new pipelines) or run much less efficiently or often than it was designed to skirt the threshold that would require carbon capture. Duke Energy has said that it plans on converting the gas plant to burn hydrogen. However, hydrogen is unproven at scale in North Carolina. The future cost and availability of hydrogen is very uncertain, and upgrading gas plants to hydrogen could be very expensive. Upgrading the plant to run from 100% hydrogen would also require new hydrogen pipelines to be built. Thank you. Sincerely Geoffrey Saign

Grant, Lakisha

From: Christopher A Berg
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 12:48 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 No. E-2, Sub 1318 / EC-67

Message

I will echo Will Scott's recent post at www.ncnewsline.com. The basic problem is that this proposed plant near Roxboro is part of an inappropriate Duke Energy strategy that pays insufficient heed to 2021 NC legislation (HB 951). Here's Will Scott: "investing as heavily as Duke is proposing in new gas plants is the risky route. Bringing clean energy resources — especially offshore wind — online more quickly and strategically to meet growing electricity demand in North Carolina is the better path. "Duke Energy is proposing to build 10 new gas plants in the next 10 years. That aggressive construction project comes with a high-dollar price tag, for which Duke will recoup all the costs from ratepayers and pocket a return of about 10 percent on top of that. It's a perk Duke is entitled to by state law, and one that inevitably compels the company to build more and spend more because that's the easiest and fastest way to make more money for their company's shareholders. "Not only do North Carolina ratepayers cover the construction costs and fork over the 10 percent in profits to Duke, we also cover fuel costs to run the plants. Ratepayers are on the hook for every penny of cost and every ounce of risk. Duke is guaranteed a profit and we are guaranteed to be paying on our monthly power bills for Duke's new fossil fuel investments into the 2060s, well past the 2050 deadline by which state law requires Duke to have zeroed out carbon pollution from its facilities." Substantial revision of this Duke Energy strategy, including disapproval of this proposal to build a new gas plant in Person County is clearly in the better interest of North Carolinians.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Karen Mallam
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 5:30 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Karen Mallam

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Karen Mallam

Email

ladylibertyusa@protonmail.com

Docket

E-2, Sub1218/EC-67, Sub 55

Message

I write to urge that you reject this proposal. Building more gas plants is risky for customer bills, due to the volatile price of methane gas. Gas plants are expensive and paid for by Duke customers. To comply with federal regulations that reduce climate pollution, the gas plant will require expensive upgrades, need to run less often, or be at risk of closing early. Solar and wind are a more cost-effective alternative to gas plants. The proposed gas plants would require a new methane gas pipeline, which would impact properties in Person County. Person County is already burdened by environmental pollution. This community has already been impacted by the coal plant's air pollution and coal ash leaching into groundwater. Building a new gas plant is inconsistent with a bipartisan state law that requires Duke to reduce carbon emissions. For all these reasons, reject the Duke proposal.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Diane Wallace
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 8:12 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Diane Wallace

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Diane Wallace

Email

dianew65@gmail.com

Docket

E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55.

Message

FROM DIANE WALLACE, FORSYTH County, North Carolina Resident- Let's use renewable energy and protect ALL species and retain their habitats. Once the permafrost thaws past a certain point then the temperature of the Ocean will rise such that plankton will die off leading to an oxygen poor atmosphere starting above sea level.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: John Bromer
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 7:38 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by John Bromer

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

John Bromer

Email

jwbromer@yahoo.com

Docket

Docket No. E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55.

Message

No new gas plants! Fracking and gas are killing the planet. Renewable energy is what we should be using.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Patricia Nielsen
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 7:44 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Patricia Nielsen

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Patricia Nielsen

Email

tnielsen1@ec.rr.com

Docket

No. E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55.

Message

Do not allow Duke to build a new gas plant- Building a new gas plant is inconsistent with a bipartisan state law that requires Duke to reduce carbon emissions.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Suzanne Post
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 7:51 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Suzanne Post

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Suzanne Post

Email

suzanne_pst@yahoo.com

Docket

E-2 Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55

Message

The proposed methane gas project is not a good idea. I am disappointed in my electric raise in the latest months and more increase is just awful.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jun 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Shannon Andrews
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 8:02 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Shannon Andrews

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Shannon Andrews

Email

shannonwandrews@gmail.com

Docket

No. E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55.

Message

My family is strongly opposed to Duke Energy's proposed methane power plant. Please consider denying this large scale project and supporting more renewable projects and those that do not rely on methane gas.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Robert Austin
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 8:23 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Robert Austin

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Robert Austin

Email

bobandcharlotte@ec.rr.com

Docket

E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55

Message

The last thing we need as we plunge towards a climate disaster is another power plant powered by fossil fuels. We need to spend our money and expertise working towards renewable energy sources such as solar and wind, not wasting it in new plants burning fossil fuels with their inherent risks in transporting these fuels in pipelines subject to leaks into the environment and atmosphere.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Carol E Hoke
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 8:33 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Carol E Hoke

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Carol E Hoke

Email

carolhoke08@gmail.com

Docket

E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55

Message

Building more gas plants is risky for customer bills, due to the volatile price of methane gas. Gas plants are expensive and paid for by Duke customers. To comply with federal regulations that reduce climate pollution, the gas plant would require expensive upgrades, need to run less often, and be at risk of closing early. Solar and wind are a more cost-effective alternative to gas plants. The proposed gas plants would require a new methane gas pipeline, which would negatively affect properties in Person County. Person County is already burdened by environmental pollution. This community has already been affected by the coal plant's air pollution and coal ash leaching into its groundwater. Building a new gas plant is inconsistent with a bipartisan state law that requires Duke to reduce carbon emissions.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Richard Nelson
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 8:37 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Richard Nelson

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Richard Nelson

Email

rickl.nelson@yahoo.com

Docket

E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55.

Message

Methane is 87% more toxic to the environment than carbon over its 20 year lifespan. As such, it is a major contributor to global warming. Green, renewable energy sources are proving to be cheaper and do not contribute to our planet's warming. No to this proposed gas derived power plant.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jun 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Larry Hannon
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 8:42 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Larry Hannon

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Larry Hannon

Email

ms03923@gmail.com

Docket

Duke's proposed new gas methane plant

Message

Please deny Duke's proposed new gas methane plant!! Recent deep decarbonization analyses project that most of the near-term reductions needed to meet economy-wide carbon reduction targets will come from the power sector because of the availability of low-cost alternatives like wind, solar, and energy efficiency to replace coal and gas. For example, a new UCS study released in July found that cutting U.S. power sector emissions 80 percent below 2005 levels by 2030 would be a key tool in meeting these broader economy-wide reduction targets. The power sector reductions were achieved by tripling renewable energy generation (primarily new wind and solar) from 20 percent US electricity generation in 2020 to nearly 60 percent in 2030, phasing out coal generation, and reducing gas generation from 40 percent in 2020 to 26 percent in 2030 (see Figure). Getting to 80 percent zero carbon would drive that level of gas generation even lower, and is a worthy target given the slow pace at which other necessary sectoral transitions have been advancing.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Alan Linn
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 11:50 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Alan Linn

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Alan Linn

Email

3drockbiz@charter.net

Docket

E-2, Sub 1318 / EC-67, Sub 55

Message

Please stop putting your profits over our environment and your customers. You make more money than you really need. You could start by taking care of your customers by creating more renewable solar power sources for distribution to customers. You will earn profits from solar power and still help save our embattled environment and planet before it's too late. If that should happen, all your money won't buy you a safe new planet to live on when this one is destroyed because of the pollution fossil fuels create and the unprecedented and deadly extreme climate changes brought on by a world that wouldn't accept and believe the warning signs of a dying Earth.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Larissa Bowman
Sent: Sunday, June 9, 2024 6:34 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Larissa Bowman

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Larissa Bowman

Email

mvp@bellsouth.net

Docket

Docket No. E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55

Message

Please reject the Hyco Lake Building Project. As I understand it (and have been seeing the rate increases associated), building more gas plants is risky for customer bills, due to the volatile price of methane gas. Furthermore, gas plants are expensive to build and maintain, and paid for by Duke customers. To comply with federal regulations that reduce climate pollution, the gas plant will require expensive upgrades, need to run less often, or be at risk of closing early. It has been established that solar and wind are a more cost-effective alternative to gas plants and our state needs MORE clean energy options. Person County is already burdened by environmental pollution. This community has already been impacted by the coal plant's air pollution and coal ash leaching into groundwater. Additionally, the proposed gas plants would require a new methane gas pipeline. In closing, building a new gas plant is inconsistent with a bipartisan state law that requires Duke to reduce carbon emissions and is a backward idea for our state's power needs for all the reasons stated above.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024

Grant, Lakisha

From: Monika Wengler
Sent: Sunday, June 9, 2024 5:28 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Monika Wengler

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Monika Wengler

Email

monikawengler@aol.com

Docket

Docket No. E-2, Sub 1318/EC-67, Sub 55.

Message

Good afternoon, I am writing to ask you not to allow Duke to build its new methane gas plant. It is a shame that North Carolina still plans its energy future on fossil fuels. It is time to switch to renewable energy. Instead, Duke Power has been allowed to make it less desirable for those of us who have invested in private solar installations by taking away our ability to save credits. I installed solar panels and a new heating system three years ago. I was able to save enough credits over the year to lower my heating costs in the winter. Duke would reset my account to zero once a year, which was bad enough, but now they are allowed to do this every month, making it impossible for me to get the benefits of all the electricity my solar panels create over the year. Why does the North Carolina Utilities Commission allow Duke to behave in such a way? Please take decisive steps to force Duke to switch to renewable energy sources and to stop punishing those of us who have already invested in these technologies. Thank you, Monika Wengler

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 11 2024