

**From:** [Angela R Cook](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Angela R Cook  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 20, 2022 12:33:43 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Angela R Cook

### Email

angelacook007@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

This is ridiculous! Let people do the right thing and don't allow them to be charged for this! Why would you deter people from helping your children to have a safer & cleaner place to live? Why? We buy water and now we will pay for the sun. Money-hungry industries make this world a sad place.

**From:** [Wulf Haget](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Wulf Haget  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 11:51:43 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Wulf Haget

### Email

Haferwulf@gmail.com

### Docket

123

### Message

Promote, never impede, transfer to supplemental solar power. You have been requested nicely so Please allow US survival!

**From:** [Chris Soderberg](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Chris Soderberg  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 9:34:05 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Chris Soderberg

### Email

chrissody@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

If the NCUC can make a decision based solely by the energy provider, why can't they NCUC make the decision based on home rooftop solar owners like myself? The money we save is minimal, and with Duke Energy imposing new fees and minimums, that will eat into our minimal savings. Why isn't there a study on the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar? Homeowners with rooftop solar provide provide clean energy and produce no negatives. We help ease the stress on Duke during peak hours by providing our neighbors with our excess production. In fact, many feel we should be reimbursed at a significant premium for the surplus power generated by rooftop solar, not nickle-and-dimed or reimbursed less than 100%, as this is power they are not required to produce, and it is clean energy. It also seems absurd that the NCUC would entertain any proposal to force solar customers onto a complicated "time of use" schedule according to which the highest rate of solar credits would be awarded between 6 and 9 p.m. I've owned solar panels for 7 years and have produced a total of exactly 0 (ZERO) kilowatts between 6 and 9 p.m. since installation. We, as others did, based our decision to spend thousands of hard earned income on Duke's existing structure for fees/net-metering and all things solar. Now, they are impacting those decisions by imposing new fees, onerous requirements, and reduced payout for our grid supplied kilowatts, pushing back our breakeven and making us now question when that breakeven might be. As existing rooftop solar owners we should be grandfathered in and keep our existing fee-based structure for the life of our solar panels. Why would changing the cost of the meal after it's been eaten even be entertained against existing owners? It's ok to change the rules going forward, but for new owners of solar panels only, given they can make that decision for themselves if it is worth the 20-year breakeven on the system. We made our decisions based on the numbers presented and please do not let them change them in the middle of our system.

**From:** [Ra'Iysa Rice](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Ra'Iysa Rice  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 8:46:25 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Ra'Iysa Rice

### Email

raiysa.rice@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal!

**From:** [Donell M Kerns](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Donell M Kerns  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 7:53:48 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Donell M Kerns

### Email

donellkerns@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

To the NCUC: NCUC has failed to comply with a state law known as House Bill 589, which requires a cost-benefit analysis of rooftop solar. In its own filing with the NCUC, the Attorney General's Office agreed that Duke's internal study does not satisfy the statutory mandate to investigate costs and benefits, noting that, while it investigated the costs, "it did not analyze potential benefits . . . [which] are many—from reducing carbon emissions by offsetting fossil fuel generation to improving grid resilience—and they should be studied and quantified." I call on you to represent the people of North Carolina, not Duke Energy. Sincerely, Donell Kerns

**From:** [Courtney Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Courtney Johnson  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 7:00:53 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Courtney Johnson

### Email

courtneilynejohnson@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal. NCUC has failed to comply with a state law known as House Bill 589, which requires a cost-benefit analysis of rooftop solar. Their joint brief states: House Bill 589 sets forth a requirement that the Commission perform an investigation of the costs and benefits of customer-sited generation, including NEM.... In contradiction of the requirements of House Bill 589, [Duke Energy] would have this Commission impose a new NEM tariff based upon an in-house Embedded and Marginal Cost Study. This is precisely the type of one-sided study that House Bill 589, which requires an investigation, was intended to prohibit. House Bill 589 became law in 2017, but the commission did not conduct such a study, instead relying on Duke's own flawed and one-sided internal review to justify its proposed NEM tariff, which essentially imposes a solar tax. The failure to conduct this assessment clearly violates state law, the brief says. Duke Energy has argued against a commission-led study.

**From:** [Henry Hartleb](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Henry Hartleb  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 6:38:18 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Henry Hartleb

### Email

hhartleb@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Each home should be considered a mini power plant in order to strengthen the grid. Just think of the implications from a natural disaster standpoint. Less people would be without power. This would also reduce the need for as many fossil fuel Peaker plants

**From:** [Donna Von Bargaen](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Donna Von Bargaen  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 6:32:20 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Donna Von Bargaen

### Email

dvbphd51@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject Duke's cost-benefit study which doesn't meet requirements from House Bill 159. If our family installed solar panels to try to do our part to preserve Earth's liveability for future generations, I don't think we should have to pay extra charges.



**From:** [Eleanor Kinnaird](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Eleanor Kinnaird  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 5:18:20 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Eleanor Kinnaird

### Email

ekinnaird2@gmail.com

### Docket

E100 sub189

### Message

I am opposed to the Duke Power proposal which would greatly increase the cost of solar in North Carolina. We are facing a severe crisis over climate change and this measure would increase that direction.

**From:** [Patricia Nielsen](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Patricia Nielsen  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 5:06:58 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Patricia Nielsen

### Email

tnielsen1@ec.rr.com

### Docket

E100-Sub 180

### Message

North Carolina regulators must reject a Duke Energy plan to impose new fees and onerous requirements on residential solar customers-

**From:** [Steve Vidal](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Steve Vidal  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 5:02:29 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Steve Vidal

### Email

vidaldba@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke Energy must not be allowed to penalize homeowners with rooftop solar panels via their net metering proposal. This "sun tax" penalizes those of us who are trying to reduce carbon emissions and our carbon footprint on this earth. Please say NO to Duke Energy! Thank you.  
Steve Vidal, RN

**From:** [Karen Mallam](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Karen Mallam  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 4:49:34 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Karen Mallam

### Email

[ladylibertyusa@protonmail.com](mailto:ladylibertyusa@protonmail.com)

### Docket

E-100 Sub180

### Message

North Carolina regulators must reject a Duke Energy plan to impose new fees and onerous requirements on residential solar customers. The plan ignores a state law that requires an assessment of solar's benefits and would harm the rooftop solar industry and all state power users. Our efforts to reduce our carbon footprint requires more use of renewable and sustainable energy, such as solar.

**From:** [Eileen Nunez](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Eileen Nunez  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 4:31:47 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Eileen Nunez

### Email

enuneznc@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I urge you to reject Duke's idea to impose a new minimum monthly bill as part of the net energy metering (NEM) policy that applies to rooftop solar owners within Duke's service areas. Duke's two monopoly utilities in the state, Duke Energy Carolinas and Duke Energy Progress, would charge solar customers minimum bills of \$22 and \$28, respectively. This is wrong and unlawful.

**From:** [Paul F Reinmann](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Paul F Reinmann  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 4:27:46 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Paul F Reinmann

### Email

reinmannpf@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal as referenced in docket above. Their changes do not reflect residential customer's current plans and is not fair to us. They should not be allowed to change the rules regarding residential solar use that have previously been agreed to. Thank you for listening to my point of view.

**From:** [Dawn Butler](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Dawn Butler  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 4:15:13 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Dawn Butler

### Email

dawn.butler7@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I urge you to reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal.

**From:** [Ken Broome](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Ken Broome  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 4:12:08 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Ken Broome

### Email

ellesseye@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Hello! Please reject Duke Energy's efforts to undermine the solar power generation industry and its customers. Thank you, Ken Broome



**From:** [Alexa Kleysteuber](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Alexa Kleysteuber  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 3:49:42 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Alexa Kleysteuber

### Email

alexank@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Dear NC Utilities Commission, As a homeowner in Durham, NC and a long-time advocate for fighting climate change both in my personal and professional lives, I strongly urge you to reject a Duke Energy plan to impose new fees and onerous requirements on residential solar customers. Duke Energy's plan ignores a state law that requires an assessment of solar's benefits and would harm the rooftop solar industry and all state power users -- this, at a moment in time where we are in a climate emergency and must do everything possible to support our state's ability to reduce emissions, enhance resilience and reap the benefits from the transition to clean energy. Thank you for your hard work and dedication to our state, Alexa Kleysteuber Durham, NC

**From:** [Pam Bacon](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Pam Bacon  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 3:27:14 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Pam Bacon

### Email

pambacon2011@hotmail.com

### Docket

E-100 SUB 180

### Message

Reject Duke Energy's solar policy changes

**From:** [Kim](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Kim  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 3:07:35 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Kim

### Email

Kimanderberg1111@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 sub 180

### Message

It is clear that Duke Energy wants to capitalize off of people who are trying to generate their own power. The threat of solar panels to dukes fossil fuel industry could be enormous and have large monetary implications. However, the consumer should not be charged extra after trying to go the path of reducing their carbon footprints. Instead Duke Energy should shift gears and work on moving towards reduced fossil fuel usage by way of solar energy With up efforts to help consumers to establish solar panels and feed that energy back into the grid. I am opposed to duke imposing a fee on the bills of consumers who have solar panels.

**From:** [Curry First](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Curry First  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 2:38:25 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Curry First

### Email

[cfirst@mac.com](mailto:cfirst@mac.com)

### Docket

Duke proposal increase fees for homes w/ solar

### Message

We need to go forward, not backwards, on encouraging and assisting homeowners to have solar panels. This is not in dispute. Yes Duke cares about it stock price and the Commission needs to do the right thing. The right thing will not penalize Duke. Thank you for any consideration.

**From:** [Todd Huestis](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Todd Huestis  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 2:32:41 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Todd Huestis

### Email

gtoddh@hotmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke is asking the North Carolina Utilities Commission, or NCUC, to impose a new minimum monthly bill as part of the net energy metering (NEM) policy that applies to rooftop solar owners within Duke's service areas. Duke's proposed tariffs would burden NEM customers with many new charges that other low-usage non-solar customers would not be required to pay. This discrimination against rooftop solar is prohibited by PURPA. I urge you to reject this proposal as it unfairly impacts those of us with rooftop solar panels and does not contribute to North Carolina's effort to promote clean renewable energy. Thank you, Todd Huestis

**From:** [Virgene Link-New](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Virgene Link-New  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 2:16:54 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Virgene Link-New

### Email

linkerwan@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

To Whom It Concerns: Please reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal. Thank you.

**From:** [Jayne Boyer](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jayne Boyer  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 2:01:23 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jayne Boyer

### Email

dr.jayne.boyer@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

North Carolina regulators must reject a Duke Energy plan to impose new fees and onerous requirements on residential solar customers. The plan ignores a state law that requires an assessment of solar power benefits and would harm the rooftop solar industry and all state power users. New fixed fees for solar customers lead to rates that discriminate against them and raise legal questions.

**From:** [Fred Watson](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Fred Watson  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:52:09 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Fred Watson

### Email

fnwgoog@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

For the sake of future generations, please consider supporting distributed solar energy by rejecting Duke Energy's proposed Net Energy Metering changes. Fred Watson 704-791-0849



**From:** [Marvin Woll](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Marvin Woll  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:44:19 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Marvin Woll

### Email

mjwoll@nc.rr.com

### Docket

E-100

### Message

I want to ask you to reject Duke Energy's proposal regarding solar power. It is imperative that we do everything in our power to increase the use of solar. The future of North Carolina, the USA and the world depends on us using more solar power and wind power. If we do not increase the use of solar power we will see our oceans rise and the outer banks will no longer exist. The fires in the west and the draughts around the world will become worse. Our children and future generations are counting on us to do the right thing and we must not let them down.

**From:** [Mark Kaisoglus](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Mark Kaisoglus  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:36:38 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Mark Kaisoglus

### Email

mark.kaisoglus@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

To Whom it May Concern, I am writing to voice my support, as a citizen and consumer who has made a solar investment for my home - for an independent, NCUC investigation of Duke Energy's proposed Solar rate changes. I understand it is the Attorney General's view that not conducting an independent investigation violates the law. In plain speak - trusting Duke's analysis of its own proposal, with no counterbalancing investigation, is akin to allowing the fox to watch the hen-house. Please, do the right thing by your citizens voluntarily - engage in an independent investigation. Best, Mark Kaisoglus

**From:** [Dane Johnston](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Dane Johnston  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:34:09 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Dane Johnston

### Email

ersatzdane@aol.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal

**From:** [David Auerbach](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by David Auerbach  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:31:02 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

David Auerbach

### Email

auerbach@ncsu.edu

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject Duke Energy's request for what amounts to a tax on solar. That's exactly the opposite of the energy direction we should be heading. Not only is it a bad idea it contravene a law. House Bill 589 sets forth a requirement that the Commission perform an investigation of the costs and benefits of customer-sited generation, including NEM.... In contradiction of the requirements of House Bill 589, [Duke Energy] would have this Commission impose a new NEM tariff based upon an in-house Embedded and Marginal Cost Study. This is precisely the type of one-sided study that House Bill 589, which requires an investigation, was intended to prohibit.

**From:** [Adam Versenyi](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Adam Versenyi  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:28:22 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Adam Versenyi

### Email

glideradam@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Dear NCUC, I urge you to reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal, which does not comply with the law as set out in HB 589. As a society we should not be discriminating against those who use solar energy, but encouraging the use of solar and all other non-fossil fuel forms of energy here in North Carolina. Sincerely, Adam Versényi 205 Oleander Road Carrboro, NC 27510

**From:** [Alisa Simonel](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Alisa Simonel  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:23:02 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Alisa Simonel

### Email

alisasimonelkeegan@gmail.com

### Docket

House bill 589

### Message

Vote no to Duke Power taxing solar use

**From:** [Eleanore Richards](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Eleanore Richards  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:17:50 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Eleanore Richards

### Email

ellyrvilca@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I have supplemented my electric bill with solar panels for 9 years. Duke switched me to Net metering without giving me any notice and now if I want to chance that they want to charge me to change. They also changed me off a plan of Peak and off peak hours usage without consulting me and eliminating that option. Unfortunately Duke's highest priority is making money for their CEO's and share holders, not good customer service or caring for the future of the environment of our only home. Their greed has made them myopic.

**From:** [Jody D Smith](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jody D Smith  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:14:59 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jody D Smith

### Email

kwjody@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Commissioners, I urge you to reject Duke Energy's plan to impose new fees and onerous requirements on residential solar customers. The plan ignores a state law that requires an assessment of solar's benefits and would harm the rooftop solar industry and all state power users. New fixed fees for solar customers lead to rates that discriminate against them and raise legal questions. The NCUC has failed to comply with House Bill 589, which requires a cost-benefit analysis of rooftop solar. Under the state's law, it is clear the commission must conduct its own cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar. Anything less, especially relying on Duke's own deeply flawed and one-sided study, violates the statute and ignores solar's clear benefits. In addition, under the federal Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA), the NCUC is prohibited from imposing differing rates on small rooftop solar customers than are charged to other customers with similar usage patterns. However, Duke's proposed tariffs would burden NEM customers with many new charges that other low-usage non-solar customers would not be required to pay. This discrimination against rooftop solar is prohibited by PURPA. In summary, I request that the NCUC deny Duke Energy's application, initiate a process for conducting a true cost-benefit analysis, and require Duke to file a new application based on the results of that study that exempts existing net metering customers from any new tariff for the life of their system.



**From:** [Carol Rados](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Carol Rados  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:10:46 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Carol Rados

### Email

carolrados7@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 S-180

### Message

We need to support and encourage solar energy.

**From:** [Suzanne Hachey](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Suzanne Hachey  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:10:07 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Suzanne Hachey

### Email

suehachey2@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

We need progressive solar incentives for residential and commercial solar to protect the investemnts made. We just added 41 solar pannels to our home in Mount Airy and feel betrayed by Duke for the penalty of producing extra energy, which benifits my neighbors and Duke as well! Florida makes the power companies reinburse all extra solar power generated by their customers. Now THAT makes sence!!!! No penalty for helping a company resell a product that is a necessity. Any surcharge on solar or wind producing customers is just wrong and immoral.

**From:** [pradeep](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by pradeep  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:59:19 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

pradeep

### Email

pgajjar@hotmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

The state of NC should be promoting roof top solar power generation by creating policies to encourage individuals, K-12 schools, colleges, office buildings everywhere in the state. NC state should be reinstate the state tax credits to offset the initial upfront cost of solar in the state. They shouldn't be giving more concessions and giveaways to monopolist utility organizations like Duke Energy, who have not even bothered to clean up the environmental waste that they littered all over the place where they had their facilities. The huge environmental cost of that is borne by the people of the state, either for cleanup or in terms of the impact on their health. Besides due to the coal ash that they littered everywhere, including our streams and rivers, everyone now has to suffer its health effects, for which Duke isn't compensating. We want Duke to compensate 1:1 for all the power that solar panels generate and feed back to the grid. They should stop the illegal practice of zeroing out the accumulated credit in the month of June - where there is no justification to do so. Keep it simple and keep it clean, just provide 1:1 compensation for energy being fed back to the grid; we don't need any complicated formula for this.

**From:** [Teresa J Ladd](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Teresa J Ladd  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:58:33 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Teresa J Ladd

### Email

teresa.j.west@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Dear Commissioners, Our family invested \$24,000 in rooftop solar in May of 2022 at our home in Pittsboro, NC. I'm done expecting Duke Energy Progress to truly embrace homeowner solar generation but they must not be allowed to levy an NEM tariff that is essentially a solar tax. Their TOU proposal is ridiculous and should also not be allowed. Duke continues to downplay the benefits of solar to ALL stakeholders in the generation of clean, sustainable energy. Their goal is to continue to justify the need for new, fracked gas plants whose methane leaks are a huge contributor to the carbon in our atmosphere. I am urging the NCUC to abide by HB589 and conduct your own cost/benefit analysis of homeowner and business solar generation of power. North Carolina is well positioned to be a leader in the generation of sustainable energy. Rooftop solar is beneficial to all stakeholders and the planet. Now, more than any time in the past, it is imperative the NCUC stand with the citizens of NC against Duke's policies of solar power suppression through punitive policies and rates. Thank you all for your service. Kind regards, Teresa Ladd Pittsboro NC

**From:** [d bellin](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by d bellin  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:56:31 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

d bellin

### Email

dbellin@davidbellin.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke's proposed changes would significantly increase the time required to pay back my initial solar system capital investment. No corporation should have the right to change the value of an individual homeowner's investment after the purchase is made. Please deny Duke Energy's application, initiate a process for conducting a true cost-benefit analysis, and require Duke to file a new application based on the results of that study that exempts existing net metering customers from any new tariff for the life of their system.

**From:** [Herb Goodfellow](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Herb Goodfellow  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:52:35 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Herb Goodfellow

### Email

herb.goodfellow@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal. It seems like another solution could be arrived at that avoids a rate increase. Duke already reaps the benefit of my panels when I produce more energy than I consume. I am ok w/that. Raising my minimum bill rate... not so much. Thank you.

**From:** [Paul Wright](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Paul Wright  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:46:56 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Paul Wright

### Email

paulwright97@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub180

### Message

If Duke want to charge a minimum bill to roof top solar customers ,then they should be required to pay for the excess power that they produce on a yearly basis,in my case that would be well over 200 dollars worth that of course Duke now gets for free and gets to sell to others at regular rates

**From:** [Jonathan Schneider](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jonathan Schneider  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:44:46 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jonathan Schneider

### Email

ranger5664@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

It is my belief that the residents of NC should be allowed a fair chance to have an affordable option of adding solar to their home. Solar energy is both good for the environment as well as a solid financial investment for many homeowners. An additional fee imposed by Duke energy would make it more difficult and less cost effective for homeowners to make the investment into their home. This, in my opinion, would be a negative thing for North Carolina as a whole and only serve to create a larger monopoly for Duke Energy.



**From:** [Kelly Gloger](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Kelly Gloger  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:43:35 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Kelly Gloger

### Email

kelly@solfarm.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Dear NC Utilities Commission, Can you please do you job and commission an independent analysis of what, if any, changes need to be made to Duke Energy's net metering program for its solar customers? House Bill 589 sets forth a requirement that the Commission (that's you) perform an investigation of the costs and benefits of customer-sited generation, including NEM. In contradiction of the requirements of House Bill 589, [Duke Energy] is asking the Commission to impose a new NEM tariff based upon Duke's in-house Embedded and Marginal Cost Study. This is precisely the type of one-sided study that House Bill 589, which requires an investigation, was intended to prohibit. This is like letting a fox set the rules for the hen house! So do you job and follow the law. Reject Duke's internal cost study and have a competent 3rd party conduct and independent analysis of the current net metering tariff. And when the independent analysis is commissioned, make sure it factors in the multiple benefits of distributed roof-top solar to the grid; reduces the need and expense of building new generation and transmission infrastructure, reduces transmission losses & the delivered cost of power from centralized power plants, reduces power plant fuel cost, lowers utility carbon footprint, and improves grid resiliency (especially when roof-top solar is paired with batteries). It is time for the NCUC to ot longer be a rubber stamp for Duke Energy. Only use and independent 3rd party analysis to make any decision regarding the current Net Metering program in NC.

**From:** [Thelma S Garbutt](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Thelma S Garbutt  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:40:13 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Thelma S Garbutt

### Email

Sharongarbutt@earthlink.net

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I am urging the Utilities Commission to block Duke Energy's efforts to raise fees and mandate excessive requirements for rooftop solar. Rooftop solar represents one of our best paths forward as we expand alternative energy. Our State is feeling the impact of weather change now--sea levels are rising and storms are getting stronger and wetter--and we need to do everything we can to help slow this down. Duke doesn't pay the price for damage done by climate change--we, the citizens do! Please stand up for North Carolina citizens. Sincerely,  
Sharon Garbutt

**From:** [Maitri Meyer](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Maitri Meyer  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:39:59 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Maitri Meyer

### Email

maitrimeyer@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please do not make it harder for the few environmentally conscious customers in NC/SC that are doing the RIGHT thing by going solar. They have invested in on-site energy generation to supplement peak demand time while the sun is out. They should be rewarded not punished by higher flat connection fees.

**From:** [Candace Carraway](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Candace Carraway  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:37:04 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Candace Carraway

### Email

ccarraway50@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 ub 180

### Message

I am writing to urge the Commission to deny Duke Energy's request to impose a new minimum monthly bill as part of the net metering policy and to deny the request to reduce the price it pays for surplus power generated by roof top solar. First, the Commission has failed to comply with House Bill 589 which requires the Commission to do an investigation of the costs and benefits of net energy metering, among other issues. Where is the Commission's investigative research on this issue? Relying on a self-interested report from Duke Energy does not qualify as investigation and the Commission is short-changing the citizens it is supposed to protect when it fails to do an adequate investigation. Second, as a matter of policy, the Commission should be encouraging, not discouraging, the use of rooftop solar systems. The proposed reduction in the rate that Duke Energy must pay ratepayers for surplus power would eliminate an important part of the financial reward that promotes roof top solar. The same is true for the proposed new minimum monthly bill for net metered systems. Both of these measures will discourage the installation of new net metered systems. When the choice is new solar projects or more dependence on fossil fuels, customers choose and deserve affordable solar.

**From:** [James Garbutt](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by James Garbutt  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:29:00 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

James Garbutt

### Email

[jcgarbutt@mindspring.com](mailto:jcgarbutt@mindspring.com)

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please do not allow Duke Energy to obstruct the development of rooftop solar! We desperately need alternative energy if we are to keep a somewhat habitable World. Duke is stuck in the past and does not have the interests of North Carolina citizens as a priority. Please stand up for North Carolina citizens and our future. Sincerely, JC Garbutt Pittsboro, NC

**From:** [Christine Westfall](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Christine Westfall  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:27:23 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Christine Westfall

### Email

chwestfall@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

E-100 Sub 180 Please don't allow Duke Energy to punish citizens with rooftop solar by charging them higher monthly fixed fees for net metering. To help tackle climate change we should be incentivizing people to get rooftop solar panels, not punishing them with higher fees. Please reject Duke Energy's plan. Thank you, a concerned NC citizen

**From:** [David Carlton](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by David Carlton  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:23:07 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

David Carlton

### Email

davidlcarlton@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I strongly object to Duke Energy asking the North Carolina Utilities Commission to impose a new minimum monthly bill as part of the net energy metering (NEM) policy that applies to rooftop solar owners within Duke's service areas. From what I understand, Duke Energy Carolinas and Duke Energy Progress would charge solar customers minimum bills of \$22 and \$28, respectively. This is unacceptable in my view since it penalizes customers who are trying to do their part to minimize our greenhouse gas emissions nationally and worldwide. For several years, I have been voluntarily paying an extra small fee to Duke that they tell me they will use to purchase energy from non-fossil fuel sources. I support that, but I also strongly support citizens who decide to install solar panels or geothermal heat pumps to reduce their overall energy usage from fossil fuels. Duke's proposed user fee on solar panel-using customers works against what should be everyone's goal of transitioning to clean energy sources, which should include our electric utilities.

**From:** [Keith Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Keith Johnson  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:17:20 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Keith Johnson

### Email

kmjohnso15@hotmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub180

### Message

Reject Duke Energy's plan regarding the net metering proposal.



**From:** [richard.milan](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by richard milan  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:11:04 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

richard milan

### Email

richardmilan318@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I do not have solar, because as a customer of the Electricities even worse policies, it is not feasible for me to get solar installed. Duke is clearly headed in the same direction, to stamp out individual use of solar, and keep a strangle hold on the excessive profits from the monopoly grid. Someone, and that is you, personally, has to protect and advance the interests of individuals, not the billion dollar enterprises which stifle innovation and individual freedom.

**From:** [Paula J Stober](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Paula J Stober  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 12:05:52 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Paula J Stober

### Email

paula@bucklen.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke Energy plans to rely on fossil fuels, a dangerous position. Cleaner, newer technologies are available. Natural gas will come from fracking land in North Carolina. It is a short sighted approach. Cleaner energy can provide jobs and job training for young people around the state. Duke has often acted as a bully, not considering the future of our environment or the needs of our growing population.

**From:** [Janet Rider](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Janet Rider  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 20, 2022 5:53:59 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Janet Rider

### Email

[jrider221@aol.com](mailto:jrider221@aol.com)

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please do not let Duke energy regulate / charge solar customers. Clean energy is the future and Duke Energy is only looking to their bottom line. No Duke energy charges for customers that are solar NO NEM. Thank you