

Dunston, Antonia

From: Angela Weiland
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:48 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Angela Weiland

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Angela Weiland

Email

euroangela@aol.com

Docket

Solar Investment HARMED by Duke Energy

Message

I reject this proposal and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina and you should too!

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Kent Robertson
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:43 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Kent Robertson

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Kent Robertson

Email

kentr1@yahoo.com

Docket

Kerley and Cornwallis

Message

Please do a complete investigation of the cost of my use of the grid versus the amount I already pay to support the grid before changing the rate. I purchased my solar unit with the agreement that Duke would pay me for the extra electricity I produce. That original agreement should last for the life of my rooftop solar panels. To change it now would be like swich and bait. Don't be a party to pulling the rug out from under us after we paid to help our state be more energy and environmentally responsible.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Michael J Sheldon
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:41 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Michael J Sheldon

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Michael J Sheldon

Email

michaelsheldon4@gmail.com

Docket

Unknown

Message

My wife and I just installed rooftop solar to our house this past March through NC Solar. We pumped our life savings into the install. If net metering is abandoned by Duke Energy, that'll be devastating to our long-term savings goal. Duke's decision to potentially change the net metering reeks of corporate greed. Please don't let the big shots come after us little guys. Thanks, Michael Sheldon Louisburg, NC

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: William Fridrich
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:39 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by William Fridrich

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

William Fridrich

Email

wm.fridrich@gmail.com

Docket

NC House Bill 589

Message

I am a DUKE consumer and a rooftop solar panel owner. I have been disappointed in Duke energy about the "Solar rebate" which turned out to be a private lottery and the amount Duke energy is paying contributors to the grid now. I say Duke energy's claims are untrue. I humbly ask that the NCUC look closely at NC House Bill 589 which 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.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: SUBRAMANIAN THANGAVELU
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:27 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by SUBRAMANIAN THANGAVELU

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

SUBRAMANIAN THANGAVELU

Email

subramanian.thangavelu@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Dear Sir/Madam, I understand that Duke Energy has submitted a proposal to change how net metering is done going forward. I would like to request that the commission reject the proposal on the basis that: 1. It is anti-consumer, it only benefits Duke Energy but not in the interest of end consumer 2. Solar customers do pay for the usage of the grid in-line with non-solar customers even though they draw low power from the grid 3. My decision (and thousands who did) of going solar was based on a ROI within the life of the system whereas the proposal will make it harder to realize the ROI in that period 4. If there was no ROI for solar installation, people (myself including) will not think about climate change and not do good things to reverse or slow down climate change 5. Duke's proposal is hard to understand and there is no predictability of bill amount at all which will stress economic condition of all customers 6. Residential solar customers are not wholesale business entities that Duke wants to treat us w.r.t. selling electricity at higher rate but excess bought at lower rate. This further reduces the incentive to go solar, increases ROI period much beyond the life time of the system thus making the investment totally worthless. Actually I would like commission to recommend Duke to buy clean energy at a higher rate 7. The economics of my (and other people's) solar investment is severely threatened by this proposal and changes that decision after the fact. I sincerely request the commission to do thorough cost benefit analysis, pros and cons to the consumer (there are only cons in this proposal than any pro). I also hope that the interest of the state towards clean energy and customer's investments are considered. At the minimum, I request the commission to consider that the current net metering policy stays intact for the life of the system with no other changes introduced for customers like me who went to solar not just to lower the bill but also to support clean energy movement. I hope the commission will make decision that will encourage more customers to go solar so that our state is able to produce more clean energy for years to come. Regards, Subbu

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Jon C Potter
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:17 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Jon C Potter

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Jon C Potter

Email

jonandonna@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please reject Duke Energy's proposed net metering reduction and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina.

Dunston, Antonia

From: Henry Hyatt
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:16 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Henry Hyatt

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Henry Hyatt

Email

hmhlake@aol.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please reject Duke Energy's proposal (change the net metering rules for Duke Energy residential customers)

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Nikhil Joshi
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:16 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Nikhil Joshi

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Nikhil Joshi

Email

nicksb123@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 sub 180

Message

specify Docket E-100 Sub 180. I am opposing this Net metering proposal by Duke.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Mike Sullivan
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:15 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Mike Sullivan

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Mike Sullivan

Email

LBiMike@gmail.com

Docket

specify Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

I understand that Duke Energy is proposing rewrite the parameters and rules regarding solar net-metering. I am asking that the NCUC, perform their due diligence and thoroughly examine their proposals before making a decision. Please ensure that consumers and small solar generators are fairly represented and protected. As a solar energy provider, net metering is an incentive to provide energy to the grid. On a hot day, I supply several thousand watts for my neighbors to run their AC and reduce the impact on overburdened powerstations. Without this incentive, there is no reason for me to continue to provide power to my neighbors, Duke or the grid. Without this incentive, much fewer are going to install solar. The net-metering arrangement, that Duke agreed to, is what has makes solar attractive and really diversifies our power generation. Thank you.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Joshua Skeeter
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:15 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Joshua Skeeter

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Joshua Skeeter

Email

jwskeete@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Hello, I am a current solar customer, who had a system installed a few months ago. As I'm reading about the proposed changes to net metering, I'd like to demand that a true investigation of solar costs and benefits of rooftop solar be conducted before we approve any changes proposed by Duke Energy. These proposed changes reduce the value of solar to the consumer, while protecting profit margins of the utility company. Additionally, I do not believe that solar customers are avoiding paying their "fair share" of grid use - we simply don't contribute as much to their profits. As you're investigating the cost-benefits of rooftop solar, be sure to ask Duke Energy for the number of kWh that they inherited from solar customers for free (without reimbursement or credits) as a result of their May 31st "rollover reset". Each year, solar customers have their rollover kWh balance reset to 0 after May 31st. As a single residential solar customer, I lost over 700 kWh alone! That is straight profit for the utility, so to suggest we don't pay our fair share is outrageous. Demand to see those numbers, and take that into consideration when you do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits -- before you approve any changes to net metering in North Carolina!

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Laurie O'Neill
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:15 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Laurie O'Neill

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Laurie O'Neill

Email

slowturnfarm@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I am a soon to-be retired middle income rooftop solar panel owner, soon to be low-income when I retire. We have 12 solar panels on our 100 year old house. I put significant money (for me) into this investment, figuring that it might eventually break even or pay off before I die. I mainly did this, instead of buying a new car (our cars were 12 and 20 years old at the time) because I felt it was contributing to good of our planet. How is it fair to people like us to raise fees, change the rules, and make my investment worth so much less? What sense does it make to do this when we need to encourage solar and alternative energy for our own lives' sakes? We should be paying more subsidies and tax breaks directly to people to install solar on their rooftops! Trust me, I don't make money from my solar panels. They don't quite produce enough energy for me to make a profit. I've never gotten a check from Duke at the end of the year. If Duke Energy needs the money, it can fire its lobbyists and stop spending money on all the greenwashing ads they do. There's a lot they can pare from their budget. I don't have those resources. Please rule on the side of the people and the planet, not Duke Energy. Laurie

Dunston, Antonia

From: George E.Martin
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:15 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by George E. Martin

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

George E. Martin

Email

gm48487072@yahoo.com

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.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Linda K McCarley
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:15 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Linda K McCarley

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Linda K McCarley

Email

lindamccarley@bellsouth.net

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

I realize that Duke Energy believes that large solar farms owned by utilities are the best way to incorporate solar energy into the grid. But Duke Energy is already a big monopoly. Solar customers are already required to plug into net metering instead of "cutting the cord". Solar energy, over the long term, is much more cost-effective than coal-fired plants. Do you think that Duke Energy will pass these savings on to its customers? I think not. I recently had solar panels installed at a significant expense. Why should I pay Duke Power more to use the energy the panels generate? And the fact that people who install solar panels will get a smaller return for that investment will discourage many from contributing to a carbon-free future. Right now I expect to break even on my investment in 10 years. Isn't that long enough?

Dunston, Antonia

From: Mary Fran Woods
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:14 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Mary Fran Woods

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Mary Fran Woods

Email

mfwoods48@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 sub 180

Message

I have a rooftop solar installation and have a net metering agreement with Duke Energy Progress. I am extremely concerned about Duke Energy's proposal to change that agreement. NC House Bill 589 requires that NCUC conduct a true cost/benefit analysis of rooftop solar systems before any changes are made to net metering. I demand that NCUC conduct a full such study as required by law. I signed a contract with Duke Energy Progress; they should not be allowed to unilaterally change that agreement after the fact. I and other existing net metering customers should be allowed to remain on our current plan for the life of our systems. Duke Energy's proposal is extremely complex. Why? In my opinion it is to maximize their profit at the expense of their customers. I strongly encourage NCUC to retain the current straight forward net metering policy. Why should I be paid less for the energy I produce than I pay for the energy I consume?

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: KENNETH A ROGERS
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:13 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by KENNETH A ROGERS

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

KENNETH A ROGERS

Email

KenRogers2@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Blue Ridge Mountain Electric does not reimburse any of their solar generated energy customers for the electricity they produce. I would like to see a state law mandating some reimbursement. Thank you, Ken Rogers

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Walter and Barbara Claxton
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:13 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Walter and Barbara Claxton

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Walter and Barbara Claxton

Email

stophacker52138@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

We are totally against this Duke Energy proposal!! We are doing what we can to provide clean energy to not only us but our excess energy to the grid which Duke turns arounds and sells to its customers. Even today any excess energy which we have provided Duke is wiped clean at the end of May of each year. We have done our part and we take exception to these large corporations trying to squeeze whatever they can out of their customers. We are already paid a much lower amount for the energy we provide to the grid through Duke than what they charge their residential customers. Enough is enough!!

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Steve Allen
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:13 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Steve Allen

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Steve Allen

Email

wyoming191652@gmail.com

Docket

E100 Sub180

Message

Duke can't Have it both ways. They (Duke Energy) already decides how much solar energy they choose to buy from me each month. Now they propose to pay less for the very little energy they buy each month anyway? I invested \$30,000 installing my system on their recommendation (and restrictions) so I could reduce power consumption and help " the planet". This is not right.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: lerin berwick
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by lerin berwick

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

lerin berwick

Email

freestargirl@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

As a voting, tax paying, solar panels on my roof citizen of NC, it has come to my attention that some crap going on with Duke Power and solar right here in NC. With all the crap and lies and stupidity of the world today, it doesn't surprise me that right here at home some shady crap is going on. I have heard that Duke Energy proposed a net metering change for solar owners, and a group of solar investors asked YOU the NCUS to notify Duke customers with Solar of this proposal. I've yet to hear anything from you. So this is why I'm writing today. 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, (I paid mine OUT OF POCKET AND UP FRONT) and some studies show the opposite. I 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. Increase the cost of electricity, for those who have already invested their hard earned money on green, renewable energy and then force them out of jobs in the face of a recession amid the highest inflation in most of our lifetimes? Do better NCUC. The proposal is extremely complex, which could lead to unpredictable bill increases for solar customers. We already invested to lower our bills in the future. This is bull crap. Penalizing us for being proactive and taking care of ourselves? 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. Lerin Berwick

Dunston, Antonia

From: Kristen Deskevich
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Kristen Deskevich

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Kristen Deskevich

Email

kdeskevich@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I ask that you reject Duke Energy's net metering proposal. It clearly is meant to slow the growth of solar in North Carolina. It is totally unfair for Duke to change the value of my solar investment retroactively ... North Carolina citizens -- especially those of us who are doing OUR part in fighting the climate crisis -- should not be treated so unfairly. At the very least, the Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was REQUIRED BY LAW (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. Please do not bend to Duke's unfair corporate influence over the best interests of the citizens of North Carolina. Thank you.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Sheri Chandler
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Sheri Chandler

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Sheri Chandler

Email

sd.chandler13@gmail.com

Docket

(specify Docket E-100 Sub 180)Hi

Message

DO NOT LET DUKE TAKE ADVANTAGE OF SOLAR CUSTOMERS. They already take and bank all of the solar earned at the end of May for the year and we must start all over every year. We do not get paid for the energy they take. 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 as well as new customers!

Dunston, Antonia

From: Ernest Bode
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Ernest Bode

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Ernest Bode

Email

patsern@aol.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

This is in regards to Duke Energy net metering proposal. Please reject this proposal and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina. We just installed an extensive solar energy system last Fall and would be disappointed if the proposal passes.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Michael Fulghum
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Michael Fulghum

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Michael Fulghum

Email

mkfulghum@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Reject this proposal and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina. Do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC. I am a Charlotte resident with a rooftop PV system. Residents with rooftop solar are producing extra energy during the middle of the days during the hottest time and highest amount of A/C use which helps stabilize the grid. This proposal will reduce the value of solar and 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. North Carolina should retain its current, straightforward net metering policy. 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. Thank you, Michael Fulghum

From: Brandon M Reese
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:11 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Brandon M Reese

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Brandon M Reese

Email

bantuman777@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please take the harm to solar customers into account and reject the Duke Energy proposal. Note the following points not considered in their proposal: 1. Solar-generating customers do Duke Energy (DE) a huge favor, by reducing grid demand during the hottest days of the year. This reduce in peak demand is already far more beneficial to DE than any additional fixed costs they are trying to assess. 2. I did a cost-benefit calculation when deciding to make a major investment in my home's solar in early 2021. I would not have made this \$37K investment if the proposed plan had been disclosed at that time. 3. If DE makes the net metering policy less than worthwhile for solar customers, we should have the option of going grid-independent. With additional battery storage and a fossil fuel backup generator, my house could become self sufficient without any grid connection. If I had to design my system all over again, with the new, restrictive proposed policy in mind, I would redesign my system to avoid grid connection altogether. This is not what DE wants. They want solar customers to remain connected and exact profit from them. If we leave, they are left with the same "fixed cost" problem they are suggesting to solve by charging us more. 4. As currently designed, my solar/battery investment will take roughly 18 years to pay back the initial investment. Under the new proposal, that payback period increases to approximately 21 years. My calculations show a roughly 14% reduced value from my system after the changes proposed by DE take effect. I will also see an immediate hit to the resale value of my home due to this proposal. 5. DE already profits greatly from solar customers under the existing net metering rules. Because the net metering credits roll over at the end of May, the large excess kWh from the most productive excess-solar-producing months of the year March-May are forfeited. This energy is used today to defray DE's costs, but the customers that produce the energy do not see any of that benefit. According to my most recent bill, this May, I forfeited 1,625 kWh of rollover credits. My home has a 16 kWh system and is sized to offset 80% of our electricity needs in the peak summer months.

From: Lucian Smith
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:11 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Lucian Smith

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Lucian Smith

Email

lwasmith@ironsidesx21.com

Docket

E100 Sub 180

Message

As a citizen who has invested significantly energy efficiency within my home including placing solar on my home, it disgusts me that Duke wants to change their net-metering agreements with its customers. I'm doing my part to offset the cost of electricity not only for today but years to come for myself and my family as well as my community. Duke power has many times made promises and not kept them with respect to incentives and programs related to solar. Once again Duke, our energy monopoly for electricity and natural gas wants to make changes to net metering which would benefit them and put those of us who have invested in this technology at a disadvantage. Please do not allow them to do this. Everyone is being hit by inflation. Duke needs to take their lumps like the rest of us. They shouldn't get to just ask for more while the rest of us are doing with less. My solar credits should be just that credits to use as I see fit when I see fit. This was the reason I chose to invest to keep my cost of electricity inflation neutral. Duke didn't have any issue with it suited them. Paying me less for each credit than what I would pay if I pulled from the grid is outrageous. The reason as a nation that we should not be moving so quickly to renewable energy is because we have not solved the biggest issue before us and that is storage. Duke should have thought of this before they agreed to the current terms. They also need to perform the required investigations which are not done. If you remove all the benefit of solar simply to line Duke's pockets you will find people will simply stop using alternatives and put the full weight back on the grid causing NC to miss its goals for net zero emissions. Instead, why not get some competition in here for Duke to ensure that they are doing everything they can to provide NC with the best service possible. Better yet, tell Duke to develop better storage capacity of generated power, so they can be a model to other states and then they wouldn't be worried about how many people were over-producing with their clean energy technology.

Dunston, Antonia

From: Kenneth Howard Jr
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:11 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Kenneth Howard Jr

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Kenneth Howard Jr

Email

kennethhowardjr@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please reject this proposal and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina. This will impact current solar investment with the complexity unpredictable with the new fees associated with solar panel. It also will harm future homeowners going solar and impede the process for the stated using more green technology. Please do a full unbiased investigation in solar cost and it's benefits, and you will see that this proposal only benefit Duke

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Heidi Dunlap
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Heidi Dunlap

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Heidi Dunlap

Email

thewildsalmoncompany@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

As a current solar producer, please don't change the rules for net metering. please do a true investigation of the solar costs and benifits before making any changes

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Richard Terry
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Richard Terry

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Richard Terry

Email

a2468@me.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please reject Duke Energy's proposal. We should be doing everything that we can to encourage the implementation of more solar energy as the earth warms. This proposal does the opposite.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Benjamin Schlaefer
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Benjamin Schlaefer

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Benjamin Schlaefer

Email

benschlaefer@yahoo.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180)

Message

Hi, please oppose Duke Energy's efforts to change the rules form net metering of rooftop solar systems in North Carolina. Sincerely, Ben Schlaefer

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: William Marsh
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by William Marsh

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

William Marsh

Email

bill.marsh73@icloud.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

I installed solar panels on my roof in July of 2020. Prior to installing them, I did an economic analysis of the feasibility based on the then existing Duke net metering process. To hear that Duke wants to change that in their favor without the required NCUC investigation (NC House Bill 589) is infuriating. They appear to want to change the rules (in their favor of course). Since installing the panels I have had a consistent bill of \$24/mo which includes the \$15 'interconnection' fee & the whole house surge protection. During sunny days I routinely produce enough electricity to power my home and 4-5 others (Duke appears happy to charge customers the going rate for this electricity that they did not generate). Each year I 'give back' hundreds of dollars worth 'credits' for power produced beyond my usage. Maybe, to be fair, you should have Duke reimburse us for unused credits rather than reaping the benefit of the free power (for them). If you must change the 'rules of the game' I would ask that you grandfather all existing installations until end of life. Thank you for your consideration.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Karl Hess
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Karl Hess

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Karl Hess

Email

khess4@aol.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

To North Carolina Utilities Commission: My name is Karl Hess. I live at 315 Bladen Street, Wilmington, NC. My solar array is installed at that address. It has come to my attention that Duke Energy is petitioning the North Carolina Utilities Commission for a change in the net metering rules for North Carolina residents who have installed solar systems that are connected to the Duke Energy Grid. I installed solar panels at my residence as my contribution to fighting climate change and to contribute to sustainable energy production and use in North Carolina. I did so with the understanding that excess electricity produced by my solar system and entering the Duke Energy grid would be compensated at the same rate that I pay for electricity from that grid. Any attempt to change the net metering rules to reduce the price received by small producers like myself would amount to an unnecessary and unjust subsidy to a large corporation and a disincentive, and punishment, to small energy producers such as myself. Therefore, I am resolutely opposed to changing the net metering rules in any fashion that would disadvantage and disincentivize residential solar producers and, in the process, allow Duke Energy to wield the powers of government - your commission - to inflate its power and profits at the expense of society at large.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Joseph P Donelan
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Joseph P Donelan

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Joseph P Donelan

Email

ej48@aol.com

Docket

E100 sub 80

Message

Please consider rejecting Duke Energy's recent proposal to change the rules for net metering. If adopted, this proposal will suppress the growth of solar in North Carolina

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Troy Allen Greene
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Troy Allen Greene, Jr

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Troy Allen Greene, Jr

Email

Trockdtd@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I hereby request NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar prior to any support to allow Duke Energy to change the solar compensation process in any manner that reduces the compensation provided to solar panel owners. Such changes to the existing agreement would set back efforts to create green energy and address the climate crisis. Duke energy has demonstrated their handling of coal ash spills and subsequent charging of customers for that mishandling they do not have the health of the environment as a priority in any manner and have prioritized profit over all other items.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Stephen Walker
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:09 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Stephen Walker

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Stephen Walker

Email

swalk01@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 sub 180

Message

NCUC needs to conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar, which has not occurred. Furthermore, 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. If nothing else, existing customers with solar panels should be allowed to continue with the current system of payment

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Robert Hollister
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:09 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Robert Hollister

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Robert Hollister

Email

rmhollister@bellsouth.net

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

As a person who invested in solar panels on my rooftop to help protect against Global Warming, I write to ask you not to allow Duke Energy to reduce payments to me and others for the power we send back to the grid. Their proposal goes backwards. We need MORE incentives to encourage folks to get rooftop solar—to save them money, to reduce emissions via fewer and smaller power plants, to be responsible citizens. Thanks, Bob Hollister, Chapel Hill

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Christopher de Beer
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:09 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Christopher de Beer

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Christopher de Beer

Email

debeer1@me.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I recently installed solar on my home in Black Mountain, NC, and I urged you to do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering. As an environmentally and fiscally conscious citizen, I have long wanted solar, but was not able to afford it until net metering meant that I could finance the expense of installing solar, knowing that my monthly loan payment would be at least mostly off set by my reduced electrical bill. Duke is benefitting from my capital expense - they didn't have to spend a cent to develop this infrastructure on my roof that puts clean energy back into the grid. The current system is simple, encourages consumers to expand solar production in our state, and is fair. 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. Don't allow Duke to present skewed data or only the results that are favorable to their financial interests. I will be watching to ensure you represent the consumers, and the interests of the State of NC in this issue.

Dunston, Antonia

From: Joshua Pettler
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Joshua Pettler

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Joshua Pettler

Email

japettler@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Hi, I am opposed to Duke Energy's plan to change net metering rules. This will greatly devalue solar rooftop installation when we need to be investing in renewable energy. The potential price increase and added complexity will make it more difficult for buyers to find value in future solar rooftop installation. Furthermore as someone who recently installed rooftop solar we anticipated certain price increase over time but not at this rate and not as soon as this proposal specifies and will create additional costs making it difficult to reach our life cycle costs. Thank you, Josh

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Jaafar Benabdallah
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Jaafar Benabdallah

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Jaafar Benabdallah

Email

jaaffer.benabdallah@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Duke Energy is already charging customer a fixed connection fee every billing cycle regardless of the net energy for that billing cycle. Duke energy is imposing a very unfair reset of the net metering balance at a critical time of the year: May 31st. Because of this arbitrary rule and more arbitrary choice of date, all the energy that was exported to Duke during Spring season (when we don't generally use A/C) can not be used to compensate the net imported energy from Duke in Summer months. This sneaky, arbitrary rule makes the whole concept of net metering not economically viable, unless we oversize the installation, which ends up exporting more electrical energy to Duke without compensation. NC homes with solar installations are already being penalized by Duke Energy by simply donating free electrical energy every year at the end of May. Please don't give more advantage to this already greedy, green energy hating company.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Teddy Howell
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Teddy Howell

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Teddy Howell

Email

os2redsow@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

We installed solar to help reduce our carbon footprint for future generations. This was done with out of pocket expenses. The fact that Duke wants to curb the benefits of OUR energy production only smacks of corporate greed. Please, Please do NOT consider their request.....Thank you, Teddy and Lisa Howell Asheville

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Derek Roberts
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Derek Roberts

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Derek Roberts

Email

dere1@umbc.edu

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

The biggest reason I switched to solar was to eliminate as much time spent talking to duke energy. They over charge us all the time, they double charge us, and they are given a script at the desk to avoid having to talk about the scam they do about over charging meters. Duke energy is a scam and we need to protect people that are finding alternate ways. Plus it's better for the planet so the more people involved the better, don't try and discourage them.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Samuel Lawrence
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Samuel Lawrence

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Samuel Lawrence

Email

samuelklawrence@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Dear commissioners, Please reject this proposal. I decided to put solar panels on my roof in reliance on the belief that the current two way metering compensation system would remain the same. This was a significant financial investment that I made not for my own economic self-interest but for the future generations of North Carolinians and all people across the globe to have a habitable planet. If the commission changes the rates in which owners of solar are compensated for the energy they produce it is not only a grave economic injustice. It is also a further obstacle to fighting the threat of climate change before it is too late. Thank you for your consideration.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Jesse C Shaw
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Jesse C Shaw

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Jesse C Shaw

Email

jessecpbshaw@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I oppose the proposal by Duke Energy to cut the amount paid to electricity producers. After paying connectivity fees (assuming they are for the maintenance of Duke's networks) to reduce the amount paid for kilowatt contributions in lieu of maintenance is contradictory. Duke energy should not be allowed to control the market in both directions.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Marilyn Allis
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:06 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Marilyn Allis

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Marilyn Allis

Email

mreallis@att.net

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

We installed our solar panels last September mainly to protect the environment. We did it because we could do it without paying extra for monthly energy costs and didn't mind that at the end of the year we would be "donating" our extra kilowatts to Duke. Considered that to be our contribution to the environment. The Duke plan is counterproductive to protecting the environment. It will discourage individual investment in solar panels and encourage Duke to maintain or increase their dependence on fossil fuels. Please do not rule in Duke's favor.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Stephen Campbell
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:06 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Stephen Campbell

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Stephen Campbell

Email

stevemcampbell@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I sent the following comment to the NCUC on 4/4/2022. I would like to update my comment with the response I received from a Duke Energy public relations specialist (presented after the copy of the original comment). I would appreciate receiving more than the automated response I obtained from statements@ncuc.net, primarily so that I know that a human being has read it *smile*. Original comment: My husband and I had solar panels installed to help us reduce our reliance on as well as the expense of Duke Energy's electrical power. (A side benefit is that, due to a combination of the battery we installed as part of our solar system and the house surge suppression device from Duke Energy is that we do not suffer the innumerable momentary [sometimes longer] power losses due to Duke Energy's grid's tendency to surge.) We really like using our solar panels during the day to power our house, and we are looking forward to being able to use the battery at night to maintain our low level of use of Duke Energy's grid. (We have not been able to rely on our battery as much since November 2021 because our Generac battery is sensitive to low temperatures.) However... Duke Energy's proposal to slash the amount they pay us per kWh by two-thirds (and to add a minimal monthly fee to our bill) is unacceptable to us because it is based on patently false assumptions. We do not use Duke's grid "for free"; rather, we pay for every kWh we obtain from that grid supply. In addition, we supply Duke with solar energy at a reasonable (retail) rate, which should make them happy because it helps them to move toward a better climate stance and may help reduce their reliance on coal, oil, and even nuclear power. And the part of their proposal in which they propose paying us only for power generated between 6pm and 9pm is laughable in the extreme. (Seriously, Duke Energy, who came up with that harebrained notion?) Solar panels do not generate power when the sun is close to the horizon or beneath it. This is nothing but an attempt to NOT pay for the power we generate for them between about 10am and 6pm (seasonally-dependent), and this is unconscionable. Finally, one other part of Duke's proposal which is as laughable as the previous part is their insistence that only all-electric houses may benefit from solar energy. This is laughable because there are exceedingly few all-electric houses - my parents, for example, told me recently that they would not give up their gas stove and ovens even to get solar because gas is a much better cooking agent for them. And I am certain that many homeowners share their sentiment, thus Duke is again attempting only to limit its costs for solar power. So I agree that, unfortunately, Duke Energy is going the opposite direction from the climate change direction proposed by President Biden, proposing (as it has) 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 and enable rather

than hobble the expansion of rooftop solar. Please contact me if you have any questions. Best wishes, Steve Campbell

Update to the comment (this is copied from an email I sent to Ms. Divine Earth-Dowd of Senator Murdock's office as well as Ms. Laura Burns of Representative Vernetta Alston's office): Hi, Divine and Laura, I thought I should tell you that we got a phone call for a Duke Energy public affairs representative the other day. Unfortunately, as he was intent on changing my opinions and had not done his homework prior to the call by my standards the call did not go as well as I would have liked. About his undone homework -for example, he had only looked at our electric usage for the past 6 months so he thought we did not achieve independence from the grid (which we mostly did up until October) and he did not know that we had a Generac battery (despite our having registered it with Duke Energy as part of their Battery Study), nor was he aware that Duke Energy had extended its Battery Study to the Carolinas (he thought it was still only Florida). But, once we got past his ignorance and as long as I could continue to resist/ignore his attempts to persuade me that I was simply wrong about Duke's proposal (he told me at one point that he had worked for Duke for 25 years, which explains his "Go, Duke!!" attitude), we were able to talk with each other as normal human beings do . Examples of occasions where he tried to persuade me that I was wrong about something include where he told me, confirming something that Ben Phillips of YesSolar had already told me, that the changes would not affect us for 5 or 10 years (I pointed out that our solar panels had an anticipated lifespan of 25 years and joked that at my age 5 years was so small a duration that I could probably hold my breath for it)) and that we could handle the minimal fees they proposed (I pointed out that our finances are mostly based on a fixed income and are very finely balanced, so even a minimal fee might be quite an impact on us). We ended the call after about 90 minutes, neither of us having changed our minds. He promised to email me a link to Duke's original proposal but I still haven't received it after about a week. So there you have it.... please ask if you have any questions . Best wishes, Steve

Dunston, Antonia

From: Marvin Scott
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:05 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Marvin Scott

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Marvin Scott

Email

mwscott@gmx.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

As a North Carolina home owner who has recently installed solar panels on our home, I am writing to encourage that the commission reject the proposal to change the rules for net metering. It is only fair that all parties hold to the conditions of any agreement that has been generated.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Yasmine and Brandon Bourne
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:05 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Yasmine and Brandon Bourne

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Yasmine and Brandon Bourne

Email

yasminebourne@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

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 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. I wish I could just not be net metered at all. Definitely would not recommend or do again.

Dunston, Antonia

From: Brenda Moore
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:05 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Brenda Moore

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Brenda Moore

Email

Twistedxone@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Stop duke from stopping rooftop solar and net metering

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Reece Cardwell
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Reece Cardwell

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Reece Cardwell

Email

reececardwell@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Requesting that you do a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC. Renewal resources are more vital than ever, you cannot short change the customer just because big energy companies want to increase their profits.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: Diane Upshaw
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Diane Upshaw

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Diane Upshaw

Email

gdianewood@hotmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please reject this proposal and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina. It is bad that they are allowed to steal the solar energy put into the system by resetting the meters on June 1st. But to now ask for higher fixed monthly fees, have 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 that does not even coincide with Duke's actual peak demand and to compensate for excess solar exports at a wholesale rate and at less than 3 cents per kilowatt-hour instead of retail rates of around 10 cents is unconscionable! Duke is simply trying to make as much as they can off of customers without a thought to the needs of the environment or the people of North Carolina. Please perform a true investigation of solar costs and benefits before making any changes to net metering in NC. Thank you.

Dunston, Antonia

From: William Heffelfinger
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by William Heffelfinger

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

William Heffelfinger

Email

bill.heffelfinger@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please don't change the net metering policy for NC Duke Energy/Duke Progress Energy customers. As I read the proposed changes to this program it is unclear how the changes will benefit anybody other than the utility. Thank you for your consideration.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 29 2022

From: ROBERT DELAVEGA
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by ROBERT DELAVEGA

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

ROBERT DELAVEGA

Email

robdelavega@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

hello I'm a resident that has invested thousands of my personal money in creating energy for myself and my community with roof top solar panels and net metering through Duke Energy. The current price we're being credited for our energy is already extremely low and was barely feasible at the time. If it gets dropped to the amount they proposed, I can't see very many residential folks at all opting to add solar energy to the grid. The amount paid to producers should be increasing not decreasing, we should be incenting people to add clean electricity. Thank you.