

Some Adverse NC Consequences from Senate Bill 3

[Senate Bill 3](#) inadvertently caused several problems, that [H332](#) is trying to reduce:

- 1) The “All of the Above” energy policy that underlies SB-3 is unsound. By definition “ALL” would include **unreliable**, **uneconomical**, and **environmentally destructive** sources. *Would those be good?* Our NC energy mantra should be “All of the Sensible.”
- 2) SB-3 mandates several energy options (e.g. wind, solar, etc.) with no objective analysis to support its four justifications. [See Appendix A of my [Report](#) for details.]
- 3) SB-3 mandates energy options with zero proof that they are a NET societal benefit.
- 4) There will indeed be a few Niche winners from the SB-3 mandate. Legislators should be concerned about the NET economics to the entire state, and not be dissuaded by the clamoring of a privileged few wanting more preferential treatment. *See next item.*
- 5) The true costs of wind and solar energy are purposefully carefully hidden, and there is substantial evidence that such a mandate is a NET **economics liability** to the state.
[See Appendix B of my [Report](#) which lists forty (40) studies that have concluded that such a mandate is a financial loser.]
[See Appendix C of my [Report](#) which lists forty five (45) studies that have concluded that the renewable energy jobs claims are inaccurate.]
[See this [webpage](#) for several studies by independent experts who concluded that Solar energy is extremely expensive.]
- 6) Even though they are marketed as environmentally beneficial, there is zero scientific proof that either wind or solar energy is a NET **environmental** benefit to the state.
[See Points #8, #9, & #12 of my [Report](#) which identify some of the negative environmental wind energy impacts (as examples).]
[See an earlier [Environmental Report](#) that goes into the details of the adverse environmental consequences of wind energy (again, as an example).]
- 7) The NCUC [methodology](#) for calculating “avoided costs” is fundamentally flawed, and politically biased. This evidently came about as a way of supporting SB-3 – but at the expense of the vast majority of other NC businesses and consumers.
- 8) There is substantial evidence that the SB-3 mandate has created significant **military conflicts**. See [SB-3 Military Impacts](#) for more details.

The key point is that before the State gets involved with any mandate like SB-3, it should *independently* and *objectively* verify that such an edict will produce a NET SOCIETAL BENEFIT to the state. **That was never done for Senate Bill 3.** What's worse is that there is considerable evidence that the SB-3 directive is a NET technical, economics and environmental **loser** to the State.

That is why H332 is a very worthwhile step in the right direction. See this [Report](#) for much more information. Let me know if you have any questions.

john droz, jr. physicist Morehead City, NC “aaprjohn at northnet.org” 5/19/15