

Comments by Jaymie Bellet, Chester

Docket # M-2026-3059601

We should never have shut down or ceased to build coal plants, or utilize our natural gas resources at the behest of the green new deal environmentalists whose data has been proven specious at best. Other countries such as China continue to build these facilities.

The data centers, to which I am opposed but that's beside the point, will require vast amounts of energy. There is no reason Pennsylvania residents should shoulder the costs or reduce their energy consumption because the powers of the state have decided this new "industry" is so vital all of a sudden.

I'll include the scripted talking points because they are factual data not a personal perspective.

The 21 coal, natural gas, and peaker plants identified in the report as candidates for redevelopment had a combined capacity of 4.8 GW when they were retired. That is enough energy to power 4 million homes. Of the 21 plants identified, 5 - 7 will eventually be redeveloped according to the PUC, but there's no reason to think that the number could be expanded as the number of data centers coming to PA grows., The 12 coal plants on the list account for roughly 4,122 MW of the retired capacity under review, or enough energy to power 3 million homes. Pennsylvania currently has 13 operational coal plants that have a combined capacity of 5.22 GW. If redeveloped, the number and total capacity of operational coal plants in the state would nearly double. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), coal is the single largest source of global temperature rise., In 2021, natural gas accounted for 2% of electricity production in Pennsylvania. By 2026, it was responsible for producing approximately 60% of PA's electricity. The surge represents the transition from coal to natural gas. Methane emissions from natural gas production are 86% more powerful than CO2 at warming the atmosphere, so the trade off was never a solution, but whatever benefits it provided would be erased with the return to coal production. Even worse, natural gas production continues to increase to serve data centers, further exacerbating fossil fuel's climate impacts.

The PATER report states, "Environmental considerations beyond existing site conditions were not evaluated as part of this analysis. Because the study focuses on redevelopment viability rather than specific redevelopment pathways, potential environmental impacts

associated with future end uses, such as air emissions, water use, wastewater generation, and other permitting considerations, were outside the scope of this assessment. Such impacts would need to be evaluated as part of project-specific planning and environmental review processes.” (P. 102) The cumulative impacts should be understood before any individual redevelopment project begins. If a subset of the list of plants is selected for redevelopment, a cumulative impact statement must be a requirement before the overall redevelopment project is approved., The PATER report states, “...a site ranking methodology will be developed to support a rigorous ranking of attributes and options and to ensure that the methodology is structured to incorporate all the criteria that arise through discussions with the PA PUC, Team PA, and other key stakeholders.” P. 103 Team PA operates as a non-profit that supports the Governor's agenda. It has been deeply involved in development of energy and data center projects. Its involvement in ranking sites would constitute an unacceptable conflict of interest.

In closing, if data centers are an unavoidable evil, and believe me that's exactly what they are, the least the state could do if it must build these huge surveillance plants, is not make taxpayers have to subsidize it by losing their power to power them. So wrong on so many levels. Thank you for your consideration