

Conyers, Tamika

From: Wanda Urbanska <wandaurbanska@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2022 5:09 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-11, Sub 180 CS comment

Dear Members of the NC Utilities Commission,

I am writing as a voter, a citizen of North Carolina and a sustainability advocate. As you consider Duke Energy's petition, I would ask you to consider that we are experiencing a global climate emergency. This is not the time to make life easier for big companies, but rather for those of us on the front lines trying to make rooftop solar more accessible and affordable.

Everyone to whom I've spoken on both sides of the aisle agrees with this position.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Wanda Urbanska
wandaurbanska@gmail.com
Landline: 919.322.5203
Cell: 919.710.5645

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Judith Lechner <outlook_FEBF9029B0CB18CF@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2022 5:56 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Do not knuckle under Duke Energy's demand to wreck net metering for rooftop solar panel owners. We must move to renewables and end our dependence on carbon-polluting non-renewable sources immediately. We truly have no time to lose, as you probably know, based on the UN's latest dire report on the climate crisis. The pandemic we've all suffered from was just a foretaste of the chaos, which will include more pandemics, as well as hunger, clean water shortage, heat of unmanageable levels, and floods in our near future. We can't pussy-foot around with foolish, shortsighted concessions to profits for large polluters such as Duke Energy, whose every attempt is to make as much profit as possible and to do as little as possible toward a green energy future.

Sincerely,
Judith V. Lechner
311 Oakland Lane
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Sent from Mail for Windows

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Boone Guyton <boone.guyton@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2022 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket #E-100 Sub 100

I disagree with the changes to Net Energy Metering Tariffs described by Docket E-100 Sub 180. The fundamental premise of a cross-subsidy (funds to solar owners from other ratepayers) has been repeatedly debunked by independent studies. In fact, many studies indicate that the reverse is true: solar owners are subsidizing other ratepayers. For a particularly compelling example, see <https://emp.lbl.gov/public.../putting-potential-rate-impacts>

I ask the the Public Utilities Commission to:

1. Allow excess energy produced by rooftop solar during critical peak pricing periods to be reimbursed at the same rate as a customer would buy it. This rate schedule has three different costs: off-peak, on-peak and critical peak pricing. The schedule focuses on undervaluing and discouraging solar, instead of properly valuing rooftop solar contributions to the grid. The critical peak price times are late summer evenings and early winter mornings, when solar isn't generally producing at high levels even though the summer times don't correlate to the hours when the grid is most stressed in the summer.
2. Allow customers to retain or sell their renewable energy credits (RECs) under any new rule. Duke currently gets to retain the RECs generated from energy delivered by rooftop solar. Duke can then turn around and sell them through programs like Renewable Advantage which does not contribute to more solar capacity and misrepresents "support for solar" to the customers.
3. Keep the current expiration of account balances. In the current rule, account balances are zeroed out annually. The new rule moves to monthly netting, meaning in any month where the rooftop owners produce more power than they use, they lose those credits. This will mean that more energy will be exported to the grid without appropriate compensation to them.

Thanks

Boone Guyton
85 Laughing Crow Rd
Alexander, NC 28701
boone.guyton@gmail.com

--

Boone Guyton
828-683-3688

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Ginny Davis <gdavisbg@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2022 7:35 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS in the subject line

Please reject Duke Energy's plan that will harm North Carolina's efforts with solar panels and clean energy.
I was a homeowner for many years and will always be concerned regarding energy and a healthy environment.

Thank you,
Virginia Davis
Davidson, NC

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Angie Robinson <skirtgirl@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2022 8:14 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket #E-100 Sub 180

To the Public Utilities Commission:

Please vote in support of the solar consumer who has gone to great expense to help our country's environment and their own financial situation in the long run. Please do this by considering:

1. Allowing reimbursement of excess energy produced by rooftop solar during critical peak pricing periods to be reimbursed at the same rate as a customer would buy it. This rate schedule has 3 different costs, off-peak, on-peak, and critical peak pricing. The schedule focuses on undervaluing and discouraging solar, instead of properly valuing rooftop solar contributions to the grid. The critical peak price times are late summer evenings and early winter mornings when solar isn't generally producing at high levels even though the summer times don't correlate to the hours when the grid is most stressed in the summer.
2. Allowing Customers to retain or sell their renewable energy credits (RECS) under ANY new rule. Duke currently gets to retain the RECS generated from energy delivered by rooftop solar. Duke can then turn around and sell them through programs like Renewable Advantage.
3. Keeping the current expiration of account balances. In the current rule, account balances are zeroed out annually. The new rule moves to monthly netting, meaning in any month where the rooftop owners produce more power than they use, they lose those excess credits. This will lead to more energy exported to the grid being uncompensated.

Thank you for taking a stand to help people help our energy situation.

Kind regards,

Angie Robinson
134 Terrace Drive
Weaverville, NC 28787

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Larissa Pitts <pittshq@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2022 9:06 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Oppose Docket E-100, Sub 180

We oppose the petition to change the rules on net metering. Please keep existing rules that support solar energy in North Carolina.

Sincerely,
Boone and Larissa Pitts
43 Pinecroft Rd, Asheville, NC 28804

--

This email is considered confidential and is intended for information purposes to designated recipients from the Sender.

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: John Drake <drakesgunsmithing@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2022 9:54 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Don't let Duke energy build more environment destroying plants. Solar will save our environment and lower harmful gas's

Sent from my iPhone

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Herb Cunningham <herbcunningham@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2022 10:16 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Solar net metering

We had a \$300 bill from Duke last month, for two of us, with gas hot water and gas cooking, in a small house. Reducing the sharing energy plan, aka "net metering" is crucial to our putting panels on our house. I can see a requirement for a certain level of insulation or weather stripping, which would lower loads-if that makes Duke stay with the net metering program, so be it. Then we can plan with what is currently in place.

Herb Cunningham
2212 Lawrence drive
Raleigh, NC

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Ann King <akingphoto@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2022 9:03 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS in the subject line

Hi,

Duke Energy is going the opposite direction of what climate scientists encourage, proposing rules changes for solar power that inhibit homeowners' ability to participate. No wonder most solar companies oppose Duke's plan.

Please insist that Duke Energy aid rather than hobble the expansion of rooftop solar.

Thank you
Ann

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: mettacog@yahoo.com
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2022 10:05 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Hello,

At this time when we are watching climate change destroy our planet, this is no time to undermine alternatives to coal. Please do all you can to deny Duke energy efforts to change the rules on net metering. Pro environment voters are watching.

Christi Ulmer, PhD

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Evans Karas <evansicgseo@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2022 11:14 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Hello, ALL of us in NC support rooftop solar!! Please do your part in doing so as well.

Thank you

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Jim Hoer <jbhoer10@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2022 11:40 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

James and Nancy Hoer
8 Wandering Oaks Way
Asheville, NC 28805

I disagree with the changes to Net Energy Metering Tariffs described by Docket E-100 Sub 180. The fundamental premise of a cross-subsidy (funds to solar owners from other ratepayers) has been repeatedly debunked by independent studies. In fact, many studies indicate that the reverse is true: solar owners are subsidizing other ratepayers. For a particularly compelling example, see <https://emp.lbl.gov/publications/putting-potential-rate-impacts>

I ask the the Public Utilities Commission to:

1. Allow excess energy produced by rooftop solar during critical peak pricing periods to be reimbursed at the same rate as a customer would buy it. This rate schedule has three different costs: off-peak, on-peak and critical peak pricing. The schedule focuses on undervaluing and discouraging solar, instead of properly valuing rooftop solar contributions to the grid. The critical peak price times are late summer evenings and early winter mornings, when solar isn't generally producing at high levels even though the summer times don't correlate to the hours when the grid is most stressed in the summer.
2. Allow customers to retain or sell their renewable energy credits (RECs) under any new rule. Duke currently gets to retain the RECs generated from energy delivered by rooftop solar. Duke can then turn around and sell them through programs like Renewable Advantage which does not contribute to more solar capacity and misrepresents "support for solar" to the customers.
3. Keep the current expiration of account balances. In the current rule, account balances are zeroed out annually. The new rule moves to monthly netting, meaning in any month where the rooftop owners produce more power than they use, they lose those credits. This will mean that more energy will be exported to the grid without appropriate compensation to them.

Thank you for taking my input.

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Marsha Covington-Riggsbee <marshacovington@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2022 12:00 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

To Whom It May Concern:

PLEASE SAVE NC'S ROOFTOP SOLAR PROGRESS BY STOPPING DUKE ENERGY'S PROPOSAL/CHANGE! PLEASE *PREVENT NC* FROM TAKING A *BACKWARD STEP* IN OUR ENERGY SAVINGS!!

Marsha Covington-Riggsbee
23 Cedar Drive
Mills River, NC 28759

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Marsha Covington-Riggsbee <marshacovington@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2022 12:00 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

To Whom It May Concern:

PLEASE SAVE NC'S ROOFTOP SOLAR PROGRESS BY STOPPING DUKE ENERGY'S PROPOSAL/CHANGE! PLEASE *PREVENT NC* FROM TAKING A *BACKWARD STEP* IN OUR ENERGY SAVINGS!!

Marsha Covington-Riggsbee
23 Cedar Drive
Mills River, NC 28759

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 28 2022