



Sierra Club Ohio Chapter
Talking Points for Duke Forecast Public Hearing
Docket # 10-503

HEARING LOGISTICS

WHAT: A public hearing is scheduled to allow comment on the new Duke Energy Forecast Plan. Duke Energy has submitted their long-term forecast report, which includes building a costly and dirty new nuclear plant. Duke has underestimated the efficiency potential in its service territory, which is cheaper, safer, and faster than building a nuclear plant. Duke has also said that one hearing in Columbus should suffice, even though it will be difficult for Duke customers to make the trek from Cincinnati.

WHEN: The public hearing will be held on Monday September 13th, 2010 at 10am.

WHERE: Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) in Hearing Room 11-C. The PUCO is located at: 180 E. Broad Street, 11th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

WHO: Citizen advocates are needed to raise their voices for energy efficiency and renewable energy at this public hearing. You do not need to be an expert. Contact Sierra Club if you need assistance – christian.george@sierraclub.org or 614.461.0734 ext 301.

NUCLEAR POWER IS EXPENSIVE

- Nuclear power is the most expensive form of electricity. Investing in efficiency costs one-fifth the expense of a new nuclear plant, and efficiency has immediate benefits, whereas nuclear plants take years to build. This new nuclear plant will raise the rates of Duke customers and could have a negative impact on the utility rates of those outside of Duke's territory.
- According to an article in the Cincinnati Enquirer, this plant will cost over \$10 billion to build, but it is likely to cost much more. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that over 50% of government loan guarantees for nuclear plants end in default, because of cost overruns and other economic challenges.
- The law requires Duke to obtain the least cost resource. Conservatively speaking, power from a new nuclear plant costs 18 cents per kilowatt hour, while wind, solar, and efficiency are far cheaper.
- Energy efficiency, wind power, cogeneration, and sometimes even solar power are cheaper than building a dirty and costly new nuclear power plant. PUCO has the responsibility to ensure that Duke invests in the least cost and safest options.

HEALTH, PUBLIC SAFETY & ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS OF NUCLEAR POWER

- Nuclear power cannot solve global warming. According to the Nuclear Energy Institute, a new reactor would have to come online every fifteen days from 2010 to 2050, and waste storage facilities the size of Yucca Mountain would have to be opened every three years.
- The waste produced by new nuclear plants is transported on average through forty-four states before reaching its final storage destination, putting the health of thousands, if not millions, of Americans at risk.
- On average, nuclear reactors generate more than 20 tons of radioactive waste each year. This waste remains dangerous to humans for 200,000 years, and exposure can cause cancer, birth defects, premature death, and other health effects.
- There are growing concerns that living near nuclear plants increases the risk for childhood leukemia and other forms of cancer – even when a plant has an accident-free track record. One Texas study found increased cancer rates in north central Texas since the Comanche Peak nuclear power plant was established in 1990, and a recent German study found childhood leukemia clusters near several nuclear power sites in Europe.
- According to Dr. Helen Caldicott, a nuclear energy expert, nuclear power plants produce numerous dangerous, carcinogens such as iodine 131, strontium 90, cesium 137 and plutonium 239 – which can induce thyroid cancer, breast cancer, leukemia, sarcoma, liver cancer, lung cancer, testicular cancer, birth defects, and more. Because safe, healthy and effective forms of power exist (like wind, solar, and combined heat and power), there is no need to rely on a power that is so dangerous to human health.
- Nuclear power and nuclear proliferation are directly related. Al Gore once said, “During my 8 years in the White House, every nuclear weapons proliferation issue we dealt with was connected to a nuclear reactor program.” We can’t develop a domestic nuclear energy program without confronting proliferation concerns in other countries like Iran and Korea.
- The stakes are too high for Ohio to build another nuclear plant. Natural disasters and human errors happen. Fallout from the Chernobyl disaster reached as far as Switzerland, forcing the evacuation and resettlement of nearly 400,000 people. People are still dying today from radiation exposure. Closer to home, the partial meltdown at Three Mile Island cost over \$1 billion in clean-up efforts and took over fifteen years to complete.
- Nuclear reactors are a natural target for terrorist attacks. Robert Kennedy Jr. found that there are 8 relatively easy ways to cause a major meltdown at a nuclear plant.

ABOUT OHIO’S ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARDS

- Through bi-partisan efforts, Substitute Senate Bill 221 set forth some of the strongest energy efficiency standards in the country, and the law is designed to create Ohio jobs and protect Ohio consumers from rising energy costs. Letting Duke Energy off the hook for its efficiency requirements would be bad for Ohio’s economy and the environment.
- Market potential studies conducted by the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy and other Ohio utilities have proven that it is feasible and cost-effective to meet Ohio’s efficiency standard. Not only should Duke meet its energy efficiency standard each year, Duke should do as much energy efficiency as possible,

because it is the least cost and safest option. PUCO needs to protect all Ohio utility customers and the environment by holding Duke accountable for the law.

- Duke is not required to invest in nuclear power, but it is required by law to invest in energy efficiency and renewables, like wind and solar. Many technologies are far cheaper, safer, and cleaner than nuclear power – it is critical that the PUCO protect Ohio customers, jobs, and the environment by upholding SB 221.

ABOUT HAVING HEARINGS LOCATIONS

- I am not even a customer of Duke Energy, and I am concerned about how Duke’s proposal will affect Ohio utility rates, public safety, and the environment. It is unfair for the PUCO to discourage participation by citizens in Southwestern Ohio by having only one hearing during the workday in Columbus – over an hour away from most Duke customers’ homes and workplaces. The people of Southwest Ohio deserve hearings in Cincinnati.
- As a Duke customer, I drove ____ hours/miles to get here today, and I am offended that the PUCO and Duke Energy are not willing to hold hearings in the utility’s service territory. Many people work during the day, and making the trip to Columbus to attend a hearing is difficult for many Duke customers. I urge PUCO to host at least two hearings in the Cincinnati area – one during the day and one in the evening.

THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ASKS

1. For strong enforcement of SB 221, in which Duke is required to meet its Energy Efficiency Resource Standard and Renewable Portfolio Standard each year.
2. For the PUCO to require Duke Energy to pursue the safest and least cost options – not a new nuclear plant.
3. For hearings to be held in the Cincinnati area, ideally one during the day and one in the evening.

THE FOUR MOST IMPORTANT TIPS

1. Be sure to introduce yourself as a concerned citizen and mention the docket number: 10-503
2. Use the tools provided by the Sierra Club
3. Make it personal, and feel free to put the talking points in your own words
4. Be sure to make at least one ask

For more information, for help with the public hearing, or to join the anti-nuclear power committee, please contact Christian George at christian.george@sierraclub.org or 614.461.0734 ext 301 or Jen Miller at jennifer.miller@sierraclub.org or at 614.461.0734 ext 304.