

Clean Energy Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
January 12, 2026

Call to order at 1:00 pm

Attendance:

Present In-person: Richard Smith, Jeff Zuba

Present via Zoom: PJ Klein, Sean Sullivan, Andrea Bennett, Jessica Cannon, Valjeanne Estes, Phyllis Goodson

Not Present: Matt Massarelli

City Staff Present: David Ingram

Approval of October minutes: All ayes, and approval of the October minutes passed.

Item #1: New Member Introduction

David I introduced Jeff Zuba to the Committee and gave him the floor to provide some background and information. Jeff is currently retired but spend 40 years in the electric power business in various capacities. Jeff spent 20 years with an electric utility company in New Jersey, worked for manufacturers of electric power equipment, worked for an energy services company, and has experience in the alternative/renewable energy sector. Jeff is looking forward to positively contributing to the Committee.

Item #2: SSDN Draft Public Comment Letter on the 2025 Duke Energy CIPRP

David I briefed the committee on the draft Public Comment Letter on Duke's Carbon Plan/Integrated Resource Plan (CIPRP) being written by the Southeast Sustainability Directors Network (SSDN) staff. The purpose of the letter is to get local government sustainability staff input from across North Carolina on how the CIPRP will impact their carbon/GHG reduction goals and other community goals. The input will be drafted into the public comment letter, which will be signed by each local government and sent to the North Carolina Utilities Commission (NCUC).

PJ provided comment: Is the SSDN an intervening party, or is this part of the docket for public comment? David answered that some NC cities have been official interveners in the past, while some have chosen to just sign the group public comment letter. PJ believes the current draft of the public comment letter touches on important topics, including #3, the resource mix. However, it does talk about solar and wind energy, which a pitfall of is, it's not a dispatchable generation load. Which is why Duke is relying on natural gas and delaying coal plant retirement in the CIPRP, because those resources are more reliable and dispatchable. PJ cautioned on how the letter pushes the NCUC on the resource mix topic.

Rich asked PJ his thoughts on battery storage being a dispatchable load option. PJ replied that batteries may not provide the storage and generation capacity to be considered dispatchable. David commented that discussion he's heard that battery storage would be used to trim peak load so that natural gas plants would not need to come on-line to meet that peak demand. Jeff commented adding comments on the cost of running the old and inefficient coal plants.

Rich commented that the current draft intro section does not address environmental protection. Suggested adding language about "protecting the environment in NC that we all enjoy". Also, in section 2 on the economic implications, add comments on protecting consumers from "construction in progress" costs. Provide examples from other parts of the country of ratepayers being negatively impacted from cost/rate increase overruns from exaggerated demand load projections.

Rich and PJ both questioned what was Sections 2.d.iii: iii – "Open a proceeding to investigate co-located, large-scale behind-the-meter solutions for large load customers."

Rich also suggested including a graphic on natural gas price volatility.

PJ suggested re-ordering the public comment letter sections to move higher priority items closer to the start of the letter (Section 4 to Section 1).

Jessica commented on Section 2 regarding projected load growth from data centers and investigating having large load customers (data centers) generate power on site (Section 2.d.iii – “...investigate co-located, large-scale behind-the-meter solutions for large load customers.”). Jessica suggested adding more language about large-load customers paying their own way rather than raising utility rates for all customers.

Next Steps – David will take these comments back to the SSDN group to incorporate into the final public comment letter. The letter will then be presented to City leadership for approval to bring it before City Council in March.

Item #3: Updates

- **Energy Assessments of Skyline & Police HQ**

David I provided an update on the no-cost energy assessments conducted by Advanced Energy at the Skyline Center and Police HQ. Both of the assessments were completed in December. A report of the findings and recommendations will be forthcoming in Feb / March timeframe.

PJ asked whether Advanced Energy could provide a presentation of their findings to the Committee. David will check.

- **Fleet EV Transition Study**

The EV transition study is also progressing on schedule. Task 1 and 2 have been completed. A draft of Task 3 has been provided for review, Task 3 is the mapping city sites and quantities of EV's that will be stationed at each site. The study is on schedule for completion in March.

PJ requested revisiting a date and time for everyone to be able to participate live. We will bring it up at the February meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm

Recording of the meeting can be viewed at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nGOLWeGEdiQ>

Next meeting is Monday, February 9, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.