**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Naveen Odnam
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2022 12:09 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Naveen Odnam

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Naveen Odnam

### Email

naveenodnam@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject the proposal from Duke about changes to net metering.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Kory Wilmot
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:18 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Kory Wilmot

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Kory Wilmot

### Email

kwilmot@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I am concerned about changes related to: - higher fixed monthly fees - time-of-use billing where the price for the electricity bought from or exported to the grid would vary by time of day, with peak rates applying from 6-9pm (summer) or 6-9am (winter) when little solar power is being produced; this does not even coincide with Duke's actual peak demand -compensation for excess solar exports at a wholesale rate (instead of rolling over from month to month as excess credits do now, you would be paid out for them at the end of each month, but at less than 3 cents per kilowatt-hour instead of retail rates of around 10 cents) In short, Duke Energy should not be allowed to change the economics of your solar investment decision after the fact. Existing customers should be allowed to stay on their current net metering plan for the life of their system.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Michael Broughton
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:15 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Michael Broughton

# Statement of Position Submitted

**Name**

Michael Broughton

**Email**

broughton.michael@gmail.com

**Docket**

E-100 Sub 180

**Message**

NC House Bill 589 requires that the NCUC investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made, and that investigation has yet to be conducted. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. Demand that the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. Reducing the value of solar will make it more difficult to hit North Carolina's established climate goals. Thousands of rooftop solar jobs are at risk if Duke's proposal passes. The proposal is extremely complex, which could lead to unpredictable bill increases for solar customers. As one solar industry professional recently said of the plan, "complexity is anti-consumer." North Carolina should retain its current, straightforward net metering policy. Depending on what the NCUC decides, existing solar customers could be forced onto the new plan as soon as 2027. The plan could include: higher fixed monthly fees time-of-use billing where the price for the electricity bought from or exported to the grid would vary by time of day, with peak rates applying from 6-9pm (summer) or 6-9am (winter) when little solar power is being produced; this does not even coincide with Duke's actual peak demand compensation for excess solar exports at a wholesale rate (instead of rolling over from month to month as excess credits do now, you would be paid out for them at the end of each month, but at less than 3 cents per kilowatt-hour instead of retail rates of around 10 cents) Duke Energy should not be allowed to change the economics of your solar investment decision after the fact. Existing customers should be allowed to stay on their current net metering plan for the life of their system.

**Dunston, Antonia**

---

**From:** Jenell Jordan Grier
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:15 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jenell Jordan Grier

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jenell Jordan Grier

### Email

jenell.jordan12@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I am a new Solar consumer. I based my decision to convert on the current rules of net metering. I urge you to reject Duke Energy's proposal to change that policy. Thank you

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Mary Frank
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:14 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Mary Frank

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Mary Frank

### Email

mary-frank@nc.rr.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

The state of North Carolina needs to be progressive in its green energy resources. Solar energy is clean and renewable a great way to plan for the future of the state and the people who live here. Slowing the growth of solar and other green energies is signaling to the rest of the world that North Carolina is not a progressive state. This in turn makes the state a less desirable place to live.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Jeremy Nevins
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:11 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jeremy Nevins

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jeremy Nevins

### Email

jernevims@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Hello I am very concerned with the proposed changes to the roof top solar program. I placed solar panels in my roof to help off set the coal power Duke Energy uses for their power sources. On top of that when inevitable contamination happens at a coal plant/mine they charge its customers to clean up. We need to break this cycle. The proposed changes will not just impact future roof top solar customers but the current ones. Changing the rules on already installed units is an unfair practice done by a monopoly. We have no other grid options to hook our panels up to. I urge you to fight this monopoly by first rejecting this proposal and look to further improving the net metering program. It is very unfair the date selected by the power company for the zeroing out is just before the peak use season. The gains most rooftop solar arrays make during the late winter and spring are just given over to the Duke for free. I propose no reset date would be fair but for most of us we built our panel arrays knowing the current net meeting rules so did not build an array larger then the household usage in a year. So if we could change the rules so that if carrying forward credits for 12 consecutive months then the credits would be zeroed. That is still not exactly fair but it's a heck of a lot more fair than the proposed changes or even the practice done now. I feel the investment made by me is at danger to becoming a poor one under the new rules. My solar KWhrs are being valued at less then I am billed at how is that fair? We have no other options for power sources and depend on the government to police this monopoly so I urge you to use your power and do so!

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Kacedia Beamon
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:10 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Kacedia Beamon

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Kacedia Beamon

### Email

evebeamon@yahoo.com

### Docket

E 100 Sub. 180

### Message

I am writing to urge Governor Cooper to block the bill allowing Duke Power to lower the price of solar power bought back from solar energy. The cost of living is to high for the income that people have to live on. Please block the bill.

**Dunston, Antonia**

---

**From:** Joan O Raney
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:10 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Joan O Raney

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Joan O Raney

### Email

JOANIE13@GMAIL.COM

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

It's not fair for Duke to change the value of my solar investment retroactively The Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Jordan Rodrigues
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:09 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jordan Rodrigues

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jordan Rodrigues

### Email

coretekjordan@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject this proposal. This is a conflicting move towards a cleaner, more energy efficient system. By manipulating the prices of energy, this organization intends to place profits over people. Especially people who are doing their best to make a positive contribution towards the community and environment. Please reject this proposal

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Jason Fryar
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:06 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jason Fryar

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jason Fryar

### Email

jasonfryar1@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

As a current Solar customer please do not approve the net metering change that Duke power is proposing.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** William Mowery
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:05 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by William Mowery

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

William Mowery

### Email

bjjerky@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 sub 180

### Message

People do not let Duke change the net metering for solar customers. We are helping the environment and don't need to discourage new customers for adding solar. With all ev cars coming to the market we don't need to follow the Texas delimia.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Gideon O'Daniel
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:04 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Gideon O'Daniel

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Gideon O'Daniel

### Email

gideonodaniel@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Hello, In regards to Docket E-100 Sub 180, I am asking you to please OPPOSE it! I got solar panels for my home for the good of the environment as well as the reality that Duke Energy has continued to prove that they will do anything to make the maximum profit possible at the expense of the people like me who cannot shop around for the best deal on energy. Duke has the monopoly and will raise rates as high as they can and as quick as they can. Please do not make my investment in my environment mean nothing. Please oppose Docket E-100 Sub 180. Sincerely, Gideon O'Daniel

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Lisa Kastelic
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:00 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Lisa Kastelic

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Lisa Kastelic

### Email

lkastelic@frontier.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject the net metering proposal submitted by Duke Energy. We need MORE incentives for homeowners to install solar panels, not FEWER. At the very least, please do a thorough investigation of cost vs benefits before making any changes to net metering. Thank you.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Javier Castro
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:54 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Javier Castro

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Javier Castro

### Email

JAVIWPHS@YAHOO.COM

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I think that it's crazy that Duke energy is trying to nullify most of the benefits of solar power. We need to incentives more people to go green and help save our beautiful planet vs trying to make investors a little bit richer.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Daniel Peplinski
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:54 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Daniel Peplinski

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Daniel Peplinski

### Email

dpeplinski@nc.rr.com

### Docket

E-100 sub 180

### Message

Hello, I am writing to expresss several concerns regarding Duke Energy's proposed chnages to net metering of residential solar customers. First, NC House Bill 589 requires that the NCUC investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made, and that investigation has yet to be conducted. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. Please conduct or have a third party conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar, including the benefit of lower line losses by having some portion of that power generated in a distributed fashion throughout their network, reducing the current traveling through their high voltage and distribution lines, leading to lower losses that they have the fuel coat to generate but no end customer to bill. Second, please be aware that Duke Energy effectively seizes any overproduction of solar power. On the billing cycle that includes May 31, Duke Energy resets anybremaining solar production credits to 0 without any recompense to the power provider. Last year, I had a credit in excess of 1 MWh. Duke Energy benefitted from my overproduction by selling this power to my neighbors and other parties living near me at full price while providing me no value in return, just to now claim that I do not pay enough to support their wires. Reducing the value of solar will make it more difficult to hit North Carolina's established climate goals. Thousands of rooftop solar jobs are at risk if Duke's proposal passes. The proposal is extremely complex, which could lead to unpredictable bill increases for solar customers. As one solar industry professional recently said of the plan, "complexity is anti-consumer." North Carolina should retain its current, straightforward net metering policy. Duke Energy's propsed peak rates applying from 6-9pm (summer) or 6-9am (winter) appears to be targeted towards times when little solar power is being produced rather than coinciding with Duke's actual peak demand. Finally, many solar rooftop providers were fortunate enough to benefit from Duke Energy's rebate program, which requires them to stay on Duke Energy's system and provide the benefit of their solar production for a minimum of 120 months (10 years). Meaning Duke Energy has removed the option some of these providers would pursue to separate themselves fully from Duke Energy's system should Duke Energy change the rules relating to the economics of a solar system. Since a solar production system typically has a long payback period on the orser of 15-25 years, Duke Energy should not be allowed to change the economics of a solar investment decision after the fact. Existing customers should be allowed to stay on their current net metering plan for the life of their system.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Brandon Abbott
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:54 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Brandon Abbott

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Brandon Abbott

### Email

brandon4040@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I am requesting that you reject Duke Energy's proposal to adjust net metering for residential customers in North Carolina, and ask that you complete a full investigation of solar costs and benefits prior to any bet metering changes. Thank you.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Ashok Vangal
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:54 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Ashok Vangal

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Ashok Vangal

### Email

ashok.vangal@protonmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject this proposal and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina. Please do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Chaffin Wesley
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:52 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Chaffin Wesley

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Chaffin Wesley

### Email

martywesley@yahoo.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I oppose parts of the proposed changes. First, I oppose the language that states: "During CPP- designated hours, the CPP rate applies to all imports, and any energy exports during the CPP hours will be considered non-CPP peak exports and will only offset non-CPP peak imports." Exports should be compensated at the rate in effect for that pricing period. The proposed change discourages production during CPP-designated hours. Second, I oppose the language that states that NEM customers should be paid "rates that the Companies pay to utility- scale qualifying facilities." NEM customers should be paid the same rate for exports as they would pay for imports during the pricing period in force at the time of the export or import. This is what "net" in the "net metering" means. Not "be paid some lower rate for exports and pay a higher rate for imports." Third, the TOU and CPP tariffs do indeed send appropriate price signals to customers. Paying those rates on imports to NEM customers would also send appropriate signals to increase their generation during those times. Fourth, the proposal for legacy NEM customers to change to "not be allowed to roll that excess energy credit over to the next month's bill" is not acceptable. Again, paying for imports at the end of the month at some reduced rate harms the NEM customer who could use that credit to offset TOU or PPM tariffs the following month. Contrary to the company's statement, this would cause financial harm to NEM customers. Please either maintain the current NEM tariff structure or eliminate these disincentives for NEM customers. As is the current proposal is unacceptable.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** varunadeepak vabilisetty
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:51 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by varunadeepak vabilisetty

# Statement of Position Submitted

**Name**

varunadeepak vabilisetty

**Email**

varunadeepak@gmail.com

**Docket**

E-100 Sub 180

**Message**

Please investigate true cost of solar cost benefit study.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** William Hay
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:49 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by William Hay

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

William Hay

### Email

haybill0@gmail.com

### Docket

E 100 Sub 180

### Message

Please stop Duke energy from breaking thei promise to solar producers. I made a significant investment in solar based on a contract w Duke that stated monthly minimum charges and net metering . I would not have invested in solar under the proposed Duke plan. Will Duke buy my solar panels etc from me? This has to be stopped. Thank you for your assistance!

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Larry McCallie
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:49 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Larry McCallie

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Larry McCallie

### Email

larrymccallie@hotmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject Docket E-100 Sub 180. It is not fair to change the rules on solar net metering. Shame on Duke Energy for trying to do so. Larry McCallie (

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Teddy & Vickie Brooks
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:47 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Teddy & Vickie Brooks

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Teddy & Vickie Brooks

### Email

broo839@bellsouth.net

### Docket

E 100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject the proposal by Duke Energy in docket E 100 Sub 180...Thanks Teddy and Vickie Brooks

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** lorraine tomasino
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:46 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by lorraine tomasino

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

lorraine tomasino

### Email

lorraine1tomasino@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

It's time for NCUC to do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC. Move Duke Power out of the investigation as it will be on sided. NC House Bill 589 requires that the NCUC investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made, and that investigation has yet to be conducted. North Carolina should retain its current, straightforward net metering policy. Duke Energy should not be allowed to change the economics of consumers solar investment decision after the fact. Thank you, Lorraine Tomasino, homeowner

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Simon and Rose Curran
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:45 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Simon and Rose Curran

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Simon and Rose Curran

### Email

rosetcurran@att.net

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

it's not fair for Duke to change the value of solar investment retroactively. I respectfully ask the Commission to do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. Please investigate the solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** David bergmark
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:44 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by David bergmark

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

David bergmark

### Email

davebergmark@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

As a recent solar panel customer and environmental sustainability advocate, I would like to strongly urge you to refuse the proposal to reduce the environmental and consumer benefits of Duke energy's net metering program. As a consumer, I strongly oppose changing the rules for solar customers such as myself who made significant and long-term financial investments, based significantly on the return on investment one can expect over time from the net metering program. Although I oppose changing. The rules for new customers as well, it seems doubly unfair and unethical to not grandfather the rules for consumers who have already made sunk costs or are locked into a contract based on their solar panel system, which was purchased in good faith based on the current net metering rules. Beyond that, as we face increasing risks and financial costs associated with climate change, the proposed change and its regressive stance on climate control seems to be the exact opposite of what we should be doing and damages the perception of North Carolina as a supportive environment for solar companies. I urge you to deny these changes , or at the very least, delay action until definitive studies can be conducted on the cost-benefit rooftop solar panels prior to changing net metering regulations, as required by existing law. Thank you.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Michael Rocco
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:41 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Michael Rocco

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Michael Rocco

### Email

mrocco@wakehealth.edu

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

NC House Bill 589 requires that the NCUC investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made, and that investigation has yet to be conducted. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. Demand that the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. Reducing the value of solar will make it more difficult to hit North Carolina's established climate goals. Thousands of rooftop solar jobs are at risk if Duke's proposal passes. The proposal is extremely complex, which could lead to unpredictable bill increases for solar customers. As one solar industry professional recently said of the plan, "complexity is anti-consumer." North Carolina should retain its current, straightforward net metering policy. Depending on what the NCUC decides, existing solar customers could be forced onto the new plan as soon as 2027. The plan could include: higher fixed monthly fees time-of-use billing where the price for the electricity bought from or exported to the grid would vary by time of day, with peak rates applying from 6-9pm (summer) or 6-9am (winter) when little solar power is being produced; this does not even coincide with Duke's actual peak demand compensation for excess solar exports at a wholesale rate (instead of rolling over from month to month as excess credits do now, you would be paid out for them at the end of each month, but at less than 3 cents per kilowatt-hour instead of retail rates of around 10 cents) Duke Energy should not be allowed to change the economics of your solar investment decision after the fact. Existing customers should be allowed to stay on their current net metering plan for the life of their system.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Albert Takatsch
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:39 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Albert Takatsch

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Albert Takatsch

### Email

al_taka@yahoo.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Getting rid of grid tie incentives to go solar is a slap in the face of all the families trying to help reduce power costs for the rest of the citizens of the State of North Carolina. We are constantly bombarded literature about being more efficient, use less power, change your light bulbs, change your water heater, upgrade your air conditioner and refrigerator all in the name of conserving power. Because if we didn't, the Power Company cannot keep up with the demand and would have to build more power plants. This cost would be born by the citizens of NC. We were given incentives to install roof top solar systems to reduce the demand on our aging power plants and keep kilowatt costs lower for all of us. These tax incentives were only valuable to people who are working and paying taxes. If we are only receiving social security there is no tax advantage at all. I was tricked into buying a $39,000 to receive $10,000 incentive which never happened. Battery technology can't help with excess kilowatts during the day, because by the time a battery packs cost is paid for by the savings of not using Grid Tie, the battery needs to be replaced after 10 years. $12,000 is far too expensive if it doesn't last for a least 20 years. Which brings us back to where we started, Grid Tie systems were the only choice for the the average Roof top Grid Tie citizen. It made the costs manageable for a Roof top Solar System if the system never breaks down in 25 years. For every 100 kilowatts I send to the Grid, I only get back 50 kilowatts, I'm already paying 50% fee for my storage of extra power. And now I'm told they want more than 50%. My costs should be going down, not up. Haven't I shown that I care about my neighbors and State? Since electric usage is going up, build more power plants, costs to be born by all citizens, not the citizens who have spent 39000.00 who have been mislead about the benefits or tax breaks of solar power.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Brian Grovenstein
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:38 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Brian Grovenstein

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Brian Grovenstein

### Email

bgrovenstein@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I'm at a loss for words as to what Duke Energy is requesting for solar customer's. At a time when the grid itself is unstable we would want to be generating more energy not less. The proposals put forth by Duke make residential solar not economically viable. Sadly, when you have a monopoly on power in the state that makes sense. The less power Duke sells the less money they make. Yes, solar at a dollar to dollar match costs more than massive power generation. It's meant to cost more. That raises the overall rates for everyone, so more and more people put solar on their home. Duke energy produces less energy, and more and more people have renewable solar. Duke is not investing nearly enough in green power to meet large scale climate goals. Duke should not be allowed to change the current residential rules. If these changes go into effect I'll be forced to buy a battery system for my home to store localized energy. Once again this add's more money to the cost and will deter more from green energy. Please don't let Duke change the rules.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Claudia Allen
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:37 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Claudia Allen

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Claudia Allen

### Email

Purdyc@bellsouth.net

### Docket

E 100- Sub 180

### Message

Please protect our Solar Energy. We are providing enery for the power company yet they want to raise our rates. Not fair! Our Solar Panels cost enough.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Silvia Bracero Nolan
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:37 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Silvia Bracero Nolan

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Silvia Bracero Nolan

### Email

sbnolan55@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 sub 180

### Message

I object to Duke Energy getting to change and lower the meter rate we are receiving. A true investigation should be made as to a true $$$, cost and savings we are making as homeowners to Duke Energy. We are the ones helping Duke, North Carolina, and the planet. We should not be ripped off, when trying to do the right thing.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** William Stern
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:35 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by William Stern

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

William Stern

### Email

wstern@nc.rr.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Many of us have made Solar investments based in part on economic benefits, in addition to it being the right thing to do for the environment. This change would adversely alter the business case that we used to justify the significant capital expense. Furthermore it will slow the adoption of Solar right at the time we need it most. Please keep the existing rate structure in place. In the spirit of full disclosure, I buy power from the Town of Apex, However, just last year I had to make this same argument as Apex considered changing their rate structure. The held firm. I encourage you to do the same for Duke Power customers. Thanks...Bill Stern

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Mandel watty
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:34 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Mandel watty

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Mandel watty

### Email

Wattystephen@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made,

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Jeff Kleaveland
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:33 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jeff Kleaveland

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jeff Kleaveland

### Email

bbranchrd@icloud.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180)

### Message

Dear NCUC, I am a long-time solar customer and believe careful thought should be given to incentivize the wide adoption of solar power in NC. Advantageous net metering makes this especially appealing to new customers. It also works to make the North Carolina power grid more resilient by diversifying sources of energy production on a variety of scales. Please pursue deeper study into the benefits of rooftop solar to North Carolina before prematurely approving an ill-considered net metering proposal that fails to further incentivize the widespread adoption of rooftop solar in NC. Sincerely, Jeff Kleaveland

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Larry Sutton
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:30 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Larry Sutton

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Larry Sutton

### Email

lsutton5144@yahoo.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Oppose the proposal from Duke that would change the way consumers are paid for the Solar they are producing.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Fred Scott Crawford
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:28 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Fred Scott Crawford

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Fred Scott Crawford

### Email

iceman4u2c@aol.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke Energy is using it's customers that have spent their hard earned money to purchase a solar system just to have them decrease the amount they pay us for solar!!! Duke is a pathetic company that has used it's customers, employees and people who live near their coal fired power plants by polluting the air and water! Perform a real investigation on the power grid and ask Duke to prove their cost analysis of the power grid! They buy our solar power at an already reduced price and then sells and makes a profit!!!

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Arin Jacobson
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:27 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Arin Jacobson

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Arin Jacobson

### Email

ArinJacobson@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180)

### Message

Hi, Duke Energys proposal to change the net metering for Solar customers should be rejected. They have been asked to conduct an audit of the charges and prove that solar customer are not being charged fairly, but have failed to do so. I believe they are actually overcharging solar customers. Again without an audit to prove it either way, it is just guessing . I am a solar customer and I routinely pay Duke energy some extra money each month for using more than my input. Thanks Arin

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Patrick Lallier
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:24 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Patrick Lallier

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Patrick Lallier

### Email

patrick.a.lallier@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject this proposal. Duke Energy should not be able to reduce the value of the solar we produce. 1 kwh should = 1 kwh. This will slow the movement towards solar and not only be a blow to individual homeowners but also be a blow to efforts to make NC a greener state.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Clinton Banner
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:22 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Clinton Banner

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Clinton Banner

### Email

bannerc@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I am retired Army Officer living in North Carolina, and have solar panels it my home. I am extremely concerned that Duke Energy is encouraging you to adopt metering changes that will increase our costs, and increase their own profits, using questionable claims that have not been confirmed. I respectfully request that a true investigation of solar costs and benefits is required before the NCUC make any changes to net metering in NC.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Jay J Rohr
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:21 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jay J Rohr

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jay J Rohr

### Email

JAYROHR@GMAIL.COM

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I strongly oppose Duke Energy's Solar net metering proposal. 1) I invested in rooftop solar for my home based on the metering plan offered by Duke Energy at the time of purchase and install. Changing it after the fact changes the economics of my system and resale value of my home. 2) Making Solar less attractive and affordable for future adaptors is detrimental to NC energy future and the countries climate change in general.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Kalithia Williams
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:20 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Kalithia Williams

# Statement of Position Submitted

**Name**

Kalithia Williams

**Email**

kalithia.adams84@yahoo.com

**Docket**

E-100 Sub 180

**Message**

Please conduct a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC. Key arguments against Duke Energy's net metering proposal include: NC House Bill 589 requires that the NCUC investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made, and that investigation has yet to be conducted. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. Demand that the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. Reducing the value of solar will make it more difficult to hit North Carolina's established climate goals. Thousands of rooftop solar jobs are at risk if Duke's proposal passes. The proposal is extremely complex, which could lead to unpredictable bill increases for solar customers. As one solar industry professional recently said of the plan, "complexity is anti-consumer." North Carolina should retain its current, straightforward net metering policy. Depending on what the NCUC decides, existing solar customers could be forced onto the new plan as soon as 2027. The plan could include higher fixed monthly fees, time-of-use billing where the price for the electricity bought from or exported to the grid would vary by time of day, with peak rates applying from 6-9pm (summer) or 6-9am (winter) when little solar power is being produced; this does not even coincide with Duke's actual peak demand compensation for excess solar exports at a wholesale rate (instead of rolling over from month to month as excess credits do now, you would be paid out for them at the end of each month, but at less than 3 cents per kilowatt-hour instead of retail rates of around 10 cents). Duke Energy should not be allowed to change the economics of my solar investment decision after the fact. Existing customers should be allowed to stay on their current net metering plan for the life of their system.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Dave Nordaby
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:19 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Dave Nordaby

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Dave Nordaby

### Email

dnordaby@nc.rr.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please prevent Duke Energy from reducing any payments to people who own solar systems now or in the future. I own my solar system and am proud to send any spare energy back to the network. We should be installing more solar systems on new construction, not limiting the payback. I am also a duke energy shareholder and even if it reduces the value of my stock I believe we need more solar, not less. More is better for the country and for the world and profit should not stand in the way of more.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Billy V Coe
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:18 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Billy V Coe

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Billy V Coe

### Email

Vancoe@surry.net

### Docket

E-100 sub 180

### Message

Duke power is trying to change our net metering rates after my family has installed a solar system on our roof for the benefit of all human beings. This is wrong and unwarranted. I am an excess producer of energy because of changing my light bulbs and buying the new low amp inverter heat pump. Duke power already resets my excess in June of every year and steals what's in my overage account. Also, in light of what's going on in the world energy markets this request by Duke Power is totally inappropriate.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Peter Asmar
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:13 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Peter Asmar

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Peter Asmar

### Email

asmarpetern@gmail.com

### Docket

specify Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please conduct an independent investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Donald Wickline
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:11 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Donald Wickline

# Statement of Position Submitted

**Name**

Donald Wickline

**Email**

dwickline@gmail.com

**Docket**

Docket E-100 Sub 180

**Message**

I am a new solar customer and really like my solar panels and the positive impact they have on the environment. I ask that you perform a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before any change to net metering. Thanks

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Gail Waldman
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:09 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Gail Waldman

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Gail Waldman

### Email

ladyvet3@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Registered Voter commenting here--Strongly encouraging Gov Cooper (and ALL attached parties...) to NOT ALLOW Duke Energy to implement fee structure changes UNTIL AT LEAST (a) The Cost-Benefit Study on Roof top solar has been DONE (by a non-affiliated entity) and reviewed appropriately in a timely manner and (b) it is flat out unFAIR to impose retroactively, additional fees for ANY reason, in this case. Duke Energy has ALREADY recently imposed a flat monthly residential fee just because there is a line running to the home, whether it is occupied or consuming their product or NOT. (Their wording). I encourage Governor Cooper (and all affliated entities) to allow consumers who have ALREADY PURCHASED AND Installed solar to stay on the current Net-Metering Plan and essentially to vote AGAINST the current Docket Proposal as it is before you. "Grapevine" has it that Duke Energy WILL 'get their way' and just string it out over a few years such that the consumer is 'unaware' what the actual increases are for in the end.. which I anticipate can be avoided if addressed NOW. Thank You for your consideration.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Chad
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:08 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Chad, Naomi Thomas

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Chad, Naomi Thomas

### Email

chad.23thomas@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC. Thank you from a solar customer.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Nic Brey
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:08 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Nic Brey

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Nic Brey

### Email

nicbrey@gmail.com

### Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

### Message

The NCUC NEEDS to conduct a full cost-benefit study of consumer rooftop solar. Duke Energy's claims of solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid have not been proven. Do not let Duke's claims go unproven. Reducing the value of solar will make it more difficult for North Carolina to meet its climate goals. Duke Energy should not get to make this demand unchecked just because they are a legal monopoly. They should not be allowed to change the economics of my solar investment decision after I've made it. Existing customers should be allowed to stay on their current net metering plan for the life of their system!

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Richard Dyer
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:04 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Richard Dyer

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Richard Dyer

### Email

ncsuandunc@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I oppose the net metering change proposed by Duke Energy. Please do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC.

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Robert and Patricia Smith
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:01 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Robert and Patricia Smith

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Robert and Patricia Smith

### Email

p.leemckee@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please do not let Duke Power be able to lower the amount it pays us as solar panel owners for the electricity generated by our units. We are already not allowed to use our electricity from solar directly. We bought solar panels ( at a hefty price) with the understanding that our electricity costs would decrease and remain lower because we would be stable while utilities would only go up over time. If Duke can lower it's agreed to purchase price of our electricity, then they are effectively raising us twice ( cost of remaining electricity and then less for our electrify production. By the way, has Duke cleaned up the coal ash pollution it has given our state over the years???

**Dunston, Antonia**

**From:** Blake Kehoe
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 8:00 PM
**To:** Statements
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Blake Kehoe

# Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Blake Kehoe

### Email

kehoe527@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please do not change the net metering rules for solar energy production, people who spent the money, should be expected to stay with the current net metering rules the life of their system. Duke already get free energy based on their true up method every year. If anyhting make it more lucrative to individuals to install solar to help the energy grid and the environment. Thanks