

Mountain Home Town Hall Meeting on BESS

with

Commissioner Rich Paces

richard.paces@ccourt.kerrcountytexas.gov

(830) 343-9107 cell

www.RichPaces.com



Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Example



NAME: Key Capture Energy TX 12 Lithium BESS

LOCATION: Pflugerville, Travis County, TX, HWY 45


PROJECT: 100 MW shown at left

LANDOWNERS: LCRA, Key Capture Energy, a subsidiary of South Korean Energy

CONCERNS:

- New technology with foreign components
- Inadequate State Regulations
- Foreign parent companies with fiduciary integrity concerns
- Thermal runaway of aggregated Lithium batteries
- Containment of fire & smoke requires excessive water volume in a "PGMA."
- Cybersecurity of key infrastructure
- No site reclamation mandate

Battery Energy Storage System



Typical BESS Facility (*under construction*) adjacent to an Electric Substation



Battery Energy Storage System Concerns

- Lithium batteries have a history of instability and overheating, leading to thermal runaway, fires and explosions (e.g. Moss Landing, CA).
 - Raises concern regarding their installation in the pristine Texas Hill Country that is prone to frequent severe drought and to rapidly spreading wildland fires.
 - Extremely difficult to extinguish a lithium battery fire.
 - Our rural volunteer firefighters lack sufficient foam and water to extinguish a BESS fire.
 - Environmental impact from a BESS runaway fire - toxic gases are released & contaminants would find their way into our creeks, rivers & precious shallow groundwater on which we all rely.
 - Risks far outweigh any benefit associated with BESS power stabilization.

Battery Energy Storage System Concerns

- Inadequate regulations on eventual disposal of BESS lithium batteries.
- BESS facility dramatically lowers the property value of the adjacent land, just ask Christopher Dyer in Mason County.
- BESS is not a renewable or new source of energy and has a power discharge cycle limited to only a few hours, rendering it useless in any prolonged power outage.
- Lithium battery components are mined and manufactured abroad, primarily benefiting foreign adversaries.
- Many BESS components, controllers & circuit boards are manufactured in China, creating major cybersecurity and grid vulnerability concerns.
- Unmanned facilities with no long-term local jobs associated with BESS.
- Property taxes are the only economic benefit associated with BESS for our local community.

Moss Landing, Monterey, CA

- Vistra Energy's 300 MW BESS fire on Jan. 16, 2025 burned for 5 days.
- Resulted in a huge plume of toxic smoke containing carbon monoxide, methane, hydrogen fluoride, hydrogen cyanide and formaldehyde, which contaminated the soil and water in the surrounding area.
- The January '25 fire led to evacuation of 1,500 people, closure of parts of State Highway 1, and lawsuits against Vistra Energy and PG&E.

Moss Landing BESS Event History

- September 2021 – Overheating event caused a month long outage.
- February 2022 – Another overheating event led to further operational disruptions.
- September 2022 – A small fire occurred at the **adjacent PG&E Elkhorn battery system**.
- January 16, 2025 – A runaway fire destroyed a large portion of the 750-MW/3-GWh Moss Landing Battery Storage Facility, consuming most of a 300-MW/1,200-MWh phase of the complex.
- February 18, 2025 - Batteries reignited.
- March 2025 – A fire occurred at the Moss 300 Lithium-Ion BESS building.
- March 2025 – The January fire reignited as hazardous materials crews begin removing burned batteries.
- June 2, 2025 - Batteries reported to be smoldering.


Other BESS Fires

- South Korea (2018-2019) – A series of **23** BESS fires led to extensive investigations and safety improvements.
- Surprise, Arizona (2019) – A thermal runaway event caused an explosion, injuring four firefighters.
- Gunwi-gun, South Korea (January 2022) – Firefighters entered a burning BESS facility unaware of explosion risks, sparking controversy.
- Chandler, Arizona (April 2022) – A fire in a containerized BESS unit lasted over ten days, requiring continuous sprinkler use and robotic intervention.
- Chaumont, New York (July 2023) – A fire at a solar farm's lithium-ion battery storage facility burned for four days before being extinguished.
- May, 2023 a NextEra Energy Resources BESS in East Hampton, New York caught fire.
- June, 2023 a Convergent Energy and Power BESS in Warwick, New York caught fire.
- Otay Mesa, San Diego (June 2024)
- Dec. 2025, the Convergent Energy & Power Church Street BESS caught fire in Warwick, New York. The fire was confined to a single container, but burned for two days, requiring a multi-agency response.

State Fire Marshall's Presentation to Kerr Commissioners Court 1/27/25

- "Are battery energy storage system safe?"
 -"However, when malfunctions occur, data shows they happen in less than **2%** of the installations."
- The problem is that ERCOT & PUCT are planning for +/-1000 (*and growing*) BESS facilities across Texas
 - **Are 20 thermal run-away fires acceptable?**

Kerr County BESS Project in Mt. Home



NAME: EAST-WEST ENERGY BESS
7750 MOUNTAIN HOME LCRA SUBSTATION

LOCATION: RANCH ROAD 479 AND I-10

PROJECT: 2026-27 \$90M LITHIUM BESS PLANT PROPOSED BY ESVOLTA / EAST WEST ENERGY. 120 MW BESS PROVIDING 2 HR POWER FOR KERR. OPERATIONAL 6/30/2027.

LANDOWNERS: SOLAREIT2-A-III LLC

CONCERNS:

PROXIMITY TO I-10 IN CASE OF FIRE


CONSIDERABLE UNDEVELOPED LAND ADJACENT

THERMAL RUNAWAY OF LITHIUM BATTERY AGGREGATION

VFD CONTAINMENT OF FIRE, SMOKE, REQUIRING EXCESSIVE WATER USAGE IN A "PGMA."

CYBER SECURITY OF KEY INFRASTRUCTURE

East – West BESS, Mountain Home *Kerr Appraisal District Map*



BESS Regulations?

- BESS developers target unincorporated areas of small counties, acquiring land adjacent to an electricity transmission substation.
 - No local approvals are required, unless the developer is requesting a variance from Codes or Standards.
 - Counties without a permit requirement may not know that a BESS facility is being proposed or installed.
 - Only approvals appear to be from ERCOT consisting of an interconnectivity study, a cybersecurity study, and final authority to energize.
 - State and National Codes & Standards apply.
 - NFPA 1 (Fire Code), NFPA 70 (Electrical Code), NFPA 855 (Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems) and UL 9450 (ESS safety standard ensuring that inverters and batteries are tested together for electrical, mechanical, and fire safety).

BESS Root Cause


- Texas increasingly relies on intermittent renewable energy.
- As of Nov. 2025, according to ERCOT:
 - Wind generation capacity was 40,719 MW (24%) of total generation capacity,
 - Solar generation capacity was 37,443 MW (22%) of total generation capacity,
 - Both failed Texas in the 2021 extreme winter storm Uri.
- Inconsistent power from renewables creates the need for BESS.
 - *“BESS facilities are NOT storing power during the day to be used at night. They are providing artificial inertia to the grid, as well as frequency control and ancillary services. None of these services would be required absent wind and solar power” (per Francis Menton, Manhattan Contrarian)*
- Renewables benefit from government subsidies, tax abatements, and transmission company guaranteed RORs.
- Instead of unreliable wind & solar energy, Texas should expand power generation capacity using reliable fossil fuels such as natural gas.
 - Texas is blessed with abundant natural gas, which is the cleanest source of energy.
 - Natural gas production benefits Texas as opposed to renewables that primarily benefit foreign adversaries.

ERCOT Grid Fuel Mix *(as of: June 3, 2026)*

	<u>Current Generation</u>	<u>Monthly Capacity</u>
Solar	20,887 MW (29.6%)	39,378 MW (20.7%)
Wind	6,556 MW (9.3%)	40,586 MW (21.3%)
Hydro	61 MW (0.1%)	579 MW (0.3%)
Power Storage	-889 MW (-1.3%)	20,704 MW (10.9%)
Other	51 MW (0.1%)	643 MW (0.3%)
Natural Gas	32,481 MW (46.1%)	69,756 MW (36.6%)
Coal and Lignite	6,299 MW (8.9%)	13,705 MW (7.2%)
Nuclear	5,016 MW (7.1%)	5,268 MW (2.8%)
	70,462 MW (100.00%)	190,619 MW (100.00%)

Extract from ERCOT's "2025 State of the Grid"

SUPPLY: Fuel Mix Snapshot (MW Capacity)



Cybersecurity - Lack of Enforcement

- BESS cybersecurity risks: unmanned, controlled remotely and many have CATL* batteries and various circuit boards and control equipment made in China.
 - *Contemporary Amperex Technology Co. Limited (CATL), a China based company that is the world's largest battery maker and a dominant supplier of cells for U.S. BESS.
- In July 2023 the San Antonio grid infrastructure was taken over for 4 hours by Volt Typhon as a result of the Chinese made cameras that were connected.
- Lone Star Infrastructure Protection Act of 2021, now Chapter 117 of the Texas Business and Commerce Code (TBCC), aims to protect Texas' critical infrastructure (electric grid) by prohibiting contracts with, or access by companies or government entities from China, Iran, North Korea, and Russia. The Code was recently amended to include components made in China.
- The Governor's Executive Order GA 48 dated November 19, 2024 specifically requires all state agencies to require any company that submits a bid or proposal with respect to a contract for goods or services to the agency to certify that the company and any of its holding companies or subsidiaries is not listed in Section 889. **> 700 attestations are missing!**
- Department of Energy's Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response (CESER) found that **over 90% of grid-scale BESS deployed in the U.S. contain critical components manufactured in China**, including battery management systems (BMS), power conversion systems (PCS), and supervisory interfaces."
- **What are PUCT and ERCOT doing to enforce TBCC Chapter 117 and GA 48 & 49 to ensure that the grid is protected from cybersecurity threats?**

Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ)

1. County Commissioners' Court (CC)
 2. ESD if contracted with the CC
 3. County Fire Marshal if appointed by the CC
- *State Fire Marshal's Office will inspect facilities for compliance once constructed, but only advise the AHJ of any deficiencies*
 - *Counties may also contract with fire & safety code experts who review plans & documentation submitted (within 30 day timeframe) and/or inspect facilities and advise the AHJ of any deficiencies*

Applicable BESS Fire & Safety Codes

- NFPA 1 (*National Fire Code*), 2021 Edition
- NFPA 101 (*Life Safety Code*), 2021 Edition
- NFPA 70 (*National Electrical Code*), 2021 Edition
- NFPA 855 (*Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems*), 2020 Edition
- UL 9540 (*ESS safety standard ensuring that inverters and batteries are tested together for electrical, mechanical, and fire safety*), 2016 Edition
- TX SFMO is planning to adopt later versions in 2026

Outside Expert Review & Testimony

- Dr. Robert Steele*, President of Columbia Power Systems, Inc.,
 - Recognized subject matter expert in the energy storage market sector with 42 years of progressive experience in interoperable power system design, analysis, and safety. He supports the Energy Storage Market Sector as a UL 9540 and UL9540A Technical Committee Member and a contributing author to NFPA 855.
- Scope of Work:
 - Review of Construction and Operations Permit Submittal Documentation for compliance with IFC, State of Texas, Kerr County Guidance and Regulations, NFPA 855, and UL 9540.
 - Silent participation in County/Project meetings, providing technical opinions only to the County unless otherwise authorized.
 - No direct interaction with Applicants without County authorization and participation.
 - Consultant does not act on behalf of the County but provides recommendations for mitigation. All correspondence will be through or approved by the County prior to Applicant engagement.

* *highly recommended expert for BESS document review*

Fire Marshal Permit & Fee Schedule

- This fee schedule is adopted by Kerr County Commissioners Court pursuant to Texas Local Government Code §352.016(c), which authorizes Commissioners Court to permit the county fire marshal to charge reasonable fees to owners of business or commercial property for plan review and inspection.
- The fees in this schedule are intended to recover the County's costs associated with plan review and inspection activities conducted by or under the authority of the Kerr County Fire Marshal, including associated administrative and technical review services necessary to perform those functions.

BUILDING PLAN REVIEW FEES

- This fee is for processing building plans submitted for approval and must be paid at the time of submission.

Base Fee: \$50

- Projects with a valuation over \$1,000 use the following schedule:
- \$1,000 and less \$50
- \$1,001–\$50,000 \$50 plus \$7 per additional \$1,000
- \$50,001–\$100,000 \$393 plus \$6 per additional \$1,000
- \$100,001–\$350,000 \$687 plus \$5 per additional \$1,000
- \$350,001–\$700,000 \$1,888 plus \$4 per additional \$1,000
- \$700,001–\$1,000,000 \$3,284 plus \$3 per additional \$1,000
- Over \$1,000,000 \$4,181 plus \$2 per additional \$1,000
- E.g. \$90,000,000 BESS project would pay \$182,181

391 HCESRPC Progress Report

- Texas **Local Government Code Section 391.009** (c) states: *“in carrying out their planning and program development responsibilities, state agencies shall, to the greatest extent feasible, coordinate planning with commissions to ensure effective and orderly implementation of state programs at the regional level”.*
- 391 Sub-Regional Planning Commission with Kendall County
 - First HCESRPC Board meeting was held Feb. 14, 2025
 - Gillespie County joined HCESRPC on Nov. 18, 2025
- Held a coordination meeting with TCEQ to understand their approval process, make them aware of our concerns and move them to proactively study the worst case (major thermal runaway fire).
- Trying to hold coordination meetings with LCRA, PUCT and ERCOT on BESS development in Kerr & Kendall Counties.
- Working with legislators to pass Bills to regulate BESS facilities, promote safety and cybersecurity, and ensure responsible disposal of used batteries.

Correspondence with PUCT – “*the Problem*”

- Starting with our initial notification sent to PUCT on February 14, 2025, four notices were sent calling for a coordination planning meeting with our commission. PUCT responded with one letter dated March 31, 2025 and one email dated May 8, 2025 as follows:
- “PUCT does not have the ability to affect the location or type of electric generation, including batteries. **In the ERCOT region, power generation is largely deregulated.** Companies do not need permission from PUCT. The type and location of electric generation is made by developers and investors of each project.. .. A power generator must secure an interconnection agreement from the local electric distribution utility and ERCOT...the interconnection agreement does not dictate the location or type of electric generation.”
- “Participation in these 391 Commissions is dependent on the jurisdiction of the state agencies involved. In the situation relating to battery projects, we are not aware of any existing state programs related to battery storage facilities that involved PUCT administration. We are unable to participate as requested.”
- Copies of all correspondence are available on the commission’s website at www.HCESRPC.com under the Correspondence Page in chronological order.

Regulatory Strategy - 89th Legislative Session

- 12 House Bills and 7 Senate Bills were proposed
- Only 2 Bills passed both the House and the Senate
 - **HB 3824** requires BESS facilities to follow fire safety standards established by the State Insurance Commissioner (*State Fire Marshal is under this commission*). It also establishes strict standards, reporting, and operation plans. Applies to BESS with a commercial operations date on or after Jan. 1, 2027 as determined by the Commissioner. Also, forbids a city or county from superseding the bill with their own standards.
 - **HB 3809** mandates decommissioning requirements for BESS leases, other than those leased by an electric utility, & requires financial assurance to comply with these decommissioning obligations.

Legislative Efforts

The HCESRPC Legislative Working Group consists of:

- Rich Paces – Kerr County Commissioner, Precinct 2
- Pam Miller – Kendall County Landowner Representative
- David Nash – Gillespie County Resident
- Cheryl Grosso – Kendall County Resident
- Dr. Alex Rudd - Kendall County Resident
- Lind Bullard – Kerr County Resident

Contact Rich Paces if you are interested in supporting our legislative efforts.

SFMO Working Draft Rules relating to HB 3824 and Chapter 187 in the Utilities Code

- The Texas Department of Insurance (TDI) and the State Fire Marshal's Office (SFMO) requested comments on their informal working draft of concepts and rules relating to House Bill 3824 (89R, 2025) and the new Battery Energy Storage Facility Safety (BESS) Chapter 187 in the Utilities Code.
- HCESRPC submitted numerous comments on the SFMO working draft documents. *Example:*
 - Recommend Commissioner to refer to the US DOT's **2024 Emergency Response Guidebook and review Guide 147 in the Orange Section entitled "Lithium Ion and Sodium Ion Batteries."** Pay particular attention to the EVACUATION – Fire verbiage, "If rail car or trailer is involved in a fire, ISOLATE for 500 meters (1/3 mile) in all directions, also **initiate evacuation including emergency responders for 500 meters (1/3 mile) in all directions.**" There are only 3 other hazardous material guides out to the 62 guides in the Orange Section that call for the emergency responders to evacuate; 2 for explosives and 1 for ammonium nitrate (1947 Texas City explosion). **Hazmat Teams are required to first respond due to the uniqueness of these battery fires and the hydrogen fluoride toxicity, and they are typically hours away from BESS facilities located in rural areas protected only by volunteer fire departments.**

PUCT's TAC § 25.58 Proposed Rules Applicable to Electric Service Providers

Reference: Project Number 59523

- The PUCT is proposing rules applicable to Electric Energy Storage Facilities (**EESF**) under 16 TAC § 25.58, that would establish an avenue for transmission and distribution utilities to contract with power generation companies for EESF capacity and pass on costs to Texas ratepayers.
- The Hill Country Energy Sub-Regional Planning Commission requested a public hearing under Texas Government Code §2001.029 with respect to the proposed rules.
- **PUCT has granted a public hearing on June 25th starting at 9:30 am in their Austin office**

HCESRPC is opposed to EESF for the following reasons:

1. EESF does not generate electricity but rather is a net consumer of electricity and at best a very costly grid stabilizer, which would not be necessary if PUCT had not become overly reliant on unreliable wind and solar energy.
2. EESF has a power discharge cycle limited to only 2-3 hours, rendering it useless in any prolonged power outage.
3. Lithium batteries have a history of instability and overheating, leading to thermal runaway, fires and explosions (e.g. Moss Landing, CA).
4. The consequences of thermal runaway lithium battery fires, which cannot be controlled nor extinguished, and which release extremely toxic and harmful chemicals into the air, contaminate the surrounding soil, and eventually would likely contaminate our precious surface water and groundwater on which we depend, are dire indeed.
 - a. Raises particular concern regarding their installation in the pristine Texas Hill Country that is prone to frequent severe drought and to rapidly spreading wildland fires.
 - b. Rural volunteer firefighters lack sufficient foam and water to extinguish a EESF fire.
5. There is no oversight for the largely unregulated and hazardous facilities.
6. There are inadequate regulations on eventual disposal of EESF lithium batteries.
7. EESF also pose a cybersecurity risk because they are unmanned, controlled remotely and many have CATL batteries and various circuit boards and control equipment made in China. Our DOD has realized the threat associated with battery and control system components made in China and removed them from all US military facilities.

HCESRPC is opposed to EESF for the following reasons:

8. Over 700 attestations from EESF developers are missing. These attestations require the developer to attest to the fact that they have not Purchased Critical Electric Grid Equipment (CEGE) and Critical Electric Grid Services (CEGS) from a Lone Star Infrastructure Protection Act (LSIPA) Designated Company or LSIPA Designated Country and that their equipment will NOT result in access to or control of CEGE by an LSIPA Designated Company or LSIPA Designated Country.
9. EESF dramatically lowers the property value of the adjacent land, just ask Christopher Dyer in Mason County.
10. Lithium battery components are mined and manufactured abroad, primarily benefiting foreign adversaries.
11. Many EESF components, controllers & circuit boards are manufactured in China, creating major cybersecurity and grid vulnerability concerns.
12. Unmanned facilities with no long-term local jobs associated with EESF.
13. Property taxes are the only economic benefit associated with EESF for our local community.
14. Risks far outweigh any benefit associated with EESF power stabilization.
15. The PUCT proposed rules would allow TDUs to recover, or in reality to pass on to ratepayers, the “reasonable” costs claimed by a PGC for an EESF including a guaranteed rate of return on investment without a single megawatt of new power being generated.

HCESRPC is opposed to EESF for the following reasons:

16. Approving expensive EESF contracts and passing those costs onto ratepayers, with no say from the public, does nothing to fix the actual problem. The public pays more and gets less in return.
17. Proposed rule § 25.58 does not solve the reliability problem, it is like trying to stop an arterial bleed with a Band-Aid. Instead it incentivizes new problems and adds unwarranted risk to Texas citizens' safety, health and welfare and most certainly raises the cost of electricity for every Texan ratepayer.
18. Winter Storm Uri in 2021 proved that wind, solar and battery energy was not reliable and EESF would not have helped on the transmission side or the distribution side due to ice loads on the power lines. Further, the limited discharge cycle time had virtually no positive impact.
19. Texas needs new reliable (natural gas or nuclear powered) dispatchable electricity generation installed in close proximity to the demand (e.g. near data centers, A.I. centers, large high density urban areas, etc.).
20. Instead of spending billions of dollars on EESF, PUCT should encourage building new reliable (natural gas or nuclear) dispatchable power plants thereby strengthening grid resiliency and reducing transmission losses and eliminating the need for excessive expenditure on 764 kV transmission lines.
21. The last thing that PUCT should do is place our citizens at risk from potentially hazardous EESF that will raise the cost of electricity for all Texas ratepayers and that would never have been contemplated without the former administration's false climate crisis narrative and the federal funding for unreliable wind and solar energy.

BESS Projects under TROs

- Van Zandt County


- 100 MW BESS facility proposed at FM 47 and FM 1651 near Canton, TX.
- Plaintiffs (Van Zandt County) filed an application for a TRO against Taaleri Energia North America, LLC, BT Amador Storage, LLC, Amador BESS Holdings, Inc., Renewable Energy Systems Americas, Inc. and Belltown Texas Power 2, LLC. on 4/9/25 for violations of provisions of the fire code.
- UL 9540a battery tests failed thermal runaway & flammable gases categories.
- Injunction prohibits developer from delivering lithium-ion batteries to any site in Van Zandt County until such a time as the County Fire Marshal or the Court determines that all applicable NFPA Codes & Standards have been met.
- Revised documents sent on 12/10/25 are under review.

- Gillespie County

- 145 MW BESS facility along FM 2093 in Harper less than 1,000' from Harper ISD K-12 School and day-care, in close proximity to the Pedernales River and a public health and safety nuisance.
- Plaintiffs (neighboring residents) filed a Restraining Injunction on 9/5/25 against ROGERS DRAW ENERGY STORAGE, LLC (owned by Peregrine Energy Solutions) and CACTUS CONSTRUCTION.
- 12/2/25 Gillespie County joined the plaintiffs' injunction against ROGERS DRAW ENERGY, but not CACTUS CONSTRUCTION.

Fighting BESS - Other Avenues:

- Concerned citizens can move public opinion and pressure government to stop distorting the energy market via subsidies, grants & loans by writing letters to media, and
- Send letters to the President, Governor, Lt. Governor, US Senators, US Representatives, State Senators, and State Representatives asking them to:
 - Stop installing unreliable renewable energy projects & BESS,
 - Stop offering government subsidies for unreliable energy and BESS,
 - Promote alternative reliable energy solutions and powerplant diversification (nuclear & nat. gas), upgrade transmission lines to reduce energy losses, and utilize smaller scale gas fired power plants closer to consumers (e.g. large urban areas, data centers & AI facilities), and
 - Ensure that sufficient regulations are in place regarding BESS installation and operation to protect the our landowners, communities, the environment, and our precious groundwater.
- HCESRPC may consider filing a lawsuit against PUCT to force a planning coordination meeting.



NAME: COMFORT LCRA SUBSTATION
7150/7046

LOCATION: FLAT ROCK CREEK RD AND
FM473

PROJECTS: 100 MW LITHIUM BESS BY
KEY CAPTURE ENERGY IS PENDING
APPROVALS. \$80M PROJECT. 18 MONTH
BUILD. OPERATIONAL 5/23/2028. ON
138 KV.
250 MW LITHIUM BESS PROPOSED BY
KENDALL ENERGY LLC / **EAST POINT
ENERGY** ON 345KV. OPERATIONAL
7/1/2027.

LANDOWNERS: LCRA, INDIVIDUAL LEASE
(E) AND SALE PENDING (S).

CONCERNS:

VERY LARGE FACILITY AND THERMAL
RUNAWAY OF LITHIUM BATTERY
AGGREGATION

VFD CONTAINMENT OF FIRE, SMOKE,
REQUIRING EXCESSIVE WATER USAGE IN
A "PGMA."

FIDUCIARY INTEGRITY PARENT COMPANY
CYBER SECURITY OF KEY
INFRASTRUCTURE
NOT ON PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM

Key Capture Energy has cancelled its plan to install a BESS in Comfort

Are we having an impact?

Power project cancellations by technology

2025 cancelled capacity (MW)



Chart: Michael Thomas / Cleanview • Source: Cleanview project tracker • Created with Datawrapper

Thank You!

www.RichPaces.com

www.HCESRPC.com