

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Carolyn Rhode
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 7:19 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Carolyn Rhode

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Carolyn Rhode

Email

crhode@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I just got my solar installed a month ago. What do you mean Duke Energy is changing the terms. This is crazy! Can't we be grandfathered??????

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Robert D Monroe
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 7:28 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Robert D Monroe

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Robert D Monroe

Email

rmonroe67@att.net

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I am opposed to any changes to the current net metering system.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Mark Rudd
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 7:33 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Mark Rudd

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Mark Rudd

Email

mrudd1251@gmail.com

Docket

E-100, Sub 180

Message

Dear NCUC, Do not let Duke Energy choke the growing solar power industry by attacking net energy metering (NEM), and the rules for how solar customers are compensated for excess power they send to the grid. Solar power owners generate clean, renewable energy for North Carolina. The NCUC must reject this proposal and prevent Duke Energy from slowing the growth of solar in North Carolina, and changing the NEM compensation of solar power owners. Sincerely,
Mark Rudd

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Stephen Chobot
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 7:57 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Stephen Chobot

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Stephen Chobot

Email

smchobot@embarqmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

My system was installed December of 2018, with an upgrade in 2021. If this plan is was in place when I was evaluating the feasibility and benefit of installing solar I would not have installed it. As it is now the ROI of the system was about 12 years this plan would have pushed it over 20. I would like to see the system owner select the date the carrier over zero out is done or have Duke Energy reimburse at the retail rate of about \$0.11 per Kwh. The way it is now it is being zeroed out just after the period that my system has the most surplus. This May 31 I lost 1744 Kwh. Please complete a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. Make sure the peek time is really when there is the most demand of the grid. Do not allow this plan to take effect. Thank you. Stephen M chobot

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Judith Henry
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 7:58 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Judith Henry

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Judith Henry

Email

njwhenry74@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 sub 180

Message

Duke should not be authorized to change the value of a citizen's solar investment retroactively. And without the Commission doing the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) , no changes in net metering rules should be allowed at all.

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Tom Vogl
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 8:26 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Tom Vogl

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Tom Vogl

Email

tjv1974@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Request that Duke Power not be allowed to collect excess credits in May of each year. Excess credits produced by the homeowner should be retained by the homeowner and not taken by Duke Power. May is the best time for Duke to do this as well since the most solar power is produced from Feb-May and that is also the period when the least amount of power is used by the homeowner so that this the time when homeowners bank the most credits and Duke then takes them. This is not right.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Katie Olson
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 8:33 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Katie (Catherine) Olson

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Katie (Catherine) Olson

Email

katieonc1@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

We need to make solar more accessible to help with climate change! Please reject Duke's plan!

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Scotty Utz
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 8:40 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Scotty Utz

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Scotty Utz

Email

scottyutz@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Dear Utility Commissioners. We need to be encouraging more North Carolina folks to put up solar panels. Duke already strips my rooftop solar array of energy not giving me and my family full credit for all the electricity we produce. Their new proposal is even more unfair. Duke should not be allowed to reduce the value of our solar investment retroactively. The Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. The commission should be making it more attractive for folks to use clean energy not making it harder. Thank you, Scott Utz

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Choua Xiong
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 8:57 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Choua Xiong

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Choua Xiong

Email

chouayaxiong@gmail.com

Docket

r E-100 Sub 180

Message

I'm not sure what is Docket Number was?

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Brenna Appel
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 9:18 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Brenna Appel

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Brenna Appel

Email

bappel42@gmail.com

Docket

E 100 Sub 180

Message

Our family purchased Solar Panels in 2020. The commission should not retroactively change the rules of solar metering. HB 589 requires a cost analysis that has not been performed yet but should be done. We support solar power in North Carolina.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Rodney Tillinghast
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 9:38 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Rodney Tillinghast

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Rodney Tillinghast

Email

rodney.tillinghast@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

The net metering rules proposed do not benefit the growth of the distributed energy via solar. Duke Energy cannot be allowed to kill this vital manner in creating sustainable energy for the good of all North Carolina citizens.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Tom Koontz
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 9:40 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Tom Koontz

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Tom Koontz

Email

koontz.tom@gmail.com

Docket

E-200 sub 180

Message

A drastic reduction in refund rate for consumers with solar panels would negate a much needed incentive for panels. Although I agree that the full retail rate may be too generous, the wholesale rate is too low. Time off day metering can be fair, but only if it is based on highest demand periods. It should not coincide with lowest solar production periods. We need to increase rooftop solar, not discourage it.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Sharon Cline
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Sharon Cline

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Sharon Cline

Email

scline7512@gmail.com

Docket

E-100, Sun 180CS

Message

Do not let Duke Energy change the rules on net metering. We just installed solar rooftop panels last fall in an effort to help decarbonize.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Christopher McGrath
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 10:00 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Christopher McGrath

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Christopher McGrath

Email

chrismcgrath.leicester@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

The proposed NEM Tariff rider is a fanciful wordplay predicated upon a "study" conducted by a for-profit company and replicated by additional for-profit companies across the United States to make them more money. If you attempt to simplify what this filing's impact upon an individual customer is, I think it looks like a MMB of \$28 (DEP) plus a Grid access fee of \$1.50/kW/month. So a typical (say with a 10kW solar system) residential solar customer of DEP would see a monthly bill of \$43 for the mythical "cost recovery" avoidance of "cross subsidization", plus the usual monthly access charge that all customers pay and then of course actual consumption charges. What that suggests, however, is that DEP is receiving \$43/month (through rates imposed) from every single non-solar customer in their service area. That notion is preposterous and reflects the bias of for-profit utility companies in design and execution of the so-called "rate study". I suggest an independent organization conduct a rate study to ensure that non-bypassable cost recovery and GAF be determined by unbiased comparisons of costs and benefits.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Jonathan Vogel
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 10:13 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Jonathan Vogel

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Jonathan Vogel

Email

jonathanvogel@me.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

We recently had solar panels installed at our home with the hope of supporting a green energy. It's not fair for Duke to change the value of your solar investment retroactively. The Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. Plus do not allow Duke Energy to take us backwards.

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Tara Blomquist
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 10:38 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Tara Blomquist

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Tara Blomquist

Email

ballade.bluffs.0k@icloud.com

Docket

E 100 sub 180

Message

It's high time we supported solar generation in our state. The dirty ways of coal have cost us dearly. Let's support those who take the bold step and generate power on their rooftops. Keep an equitable amount in place for power from homeowners and businesses that are forward thinking.

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Nancy Creamer
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 11:01 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Nancy Creamer

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Nancy Creamer

Email

nancycreamer60@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

I am writing to strongly urge a rejection of Duke's proposed changes to net metering rules. I am an agricultural scientist and know full well the negative impact climate change is already having on food production, and the future is bleak from this impact, and so many other impacts. We cannot afford to delay the changeover to solar and other green energy and Duke energy knows this and doesn't seem to care. Please, please, please, don't accept their plan to make it economically harder for people to transition. Do a full-cost accounting, and you will see this. Duke is rigging the system against a transition that the people and planet need to survive. You can't allow them to do this.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Kevin Nestvogel
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 11:14 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Kevin Nestvogel

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Kevin Nestvogel

Email

knestvogel@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Hello, It's not fair for Duke to change the value of my solar investment retroactively and the commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. Thank you for taking the time to read my comment. Best, Kevin

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: James McMillan & Ellen Joyce McMillan
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by James (Mike) McMillan & Ellen Joyce McMillan

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

James (Mike) McMillan & Ellen Joyce McMillan

Email

mikemcmillan23@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

After installing solar panels on our current home at a cost of nearly \$30,000 in early 2022, it's not honorable nor ethical for Duke to change the value of our solar investment retroactively. We, like many others, respect and value the quality of life here in the U.S. as well as for our Mother Earth. Because of this, our most compelling reason for installing the panels was to do something/anything to help reduce emissions and help the environment for all mankind. This is despite the fact that both my wife and I, being in our early seventies, know very well that we most likely will not live to see a total return on our solar investment. In addition, the Commission should respect and complete the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before attempting to change net metering rules

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Pavlo Kononenko
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 11:27 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Pavlo Kononenko

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Pavlo Kononenko

Email

pkononenko@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please keep the current net metering in place - it is key for viability of residential rooftop solar projects in the state that are starting to chip away at the need for expensive new power plants

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Ellen McMillan
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 12:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Ellen McMillan

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Ellen McMillan

Email

emcreate@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

After installing solar panels on our current home at a cost of nearly \$30,000 in early 2022, it's neither honorable nor ethical for Duke Energy to change the value of our solar investment retroactively. We, like many others, respect and value the quality of life in the U.S. as well as for the planet Earth. Because of this, our most compelling reason for installing the panels was to do something/anything to help reduce emissions and help the environment for all humankind. This is despite the fact that both my wife and I, being in our early seventies, know very well that we most likely will not live to see a total return on our solar investment. In addition, the NC Utilities Commission should respect and complete the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar required by law (HB 589) before attempting to change net metering rules.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Hollis Wellman
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 12:08 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Hollis Wellman

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Hollis Wellman

Email

hollypcb@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I believe in clean energy such as solar, wind, etc. I have invested in solar panels. Please vote to defeat Duke Energy's proposal to change net metering rules for its residential customers in North Carolina. These are the rules by which solar owners get compensated for excess rooftop solar that they share with the grid. Changing rules retroactively by Duke should be illegal. I was also one that did not win the Duke Lottery for the rebate on solar power. Yet they advertise there they give out these rebates. Businesses, especially monopolies should not be permitted to change rules anytime they want. Plus the Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. With the accelerating climate crisis changes, we need to encourage more solar usage, not less. Thank you for your time.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Matthew thomas
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 12:58 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Matthew thomas

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Matthew thomas

Email

Thomac4@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

The North Carolina power consumers should require the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar conducted by a third party independent company. Dukes study determined it is not beneficial because this will cut in to Duke Powers bottom line. So consumes that have no choice but to purchase power from Duke should have a transparent study that proves that solar customers are being over paid with not positive benefits to the power grid.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Herbert Pomfrey
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 1:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Herbert Pomfrey

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Herbert Pomfrey

Email

pomfrey@ret.unca.edu

Docket

E-100 sub 189

Message

I is time Duke puts it's money where it's mouth is. Their website proclaims they support clean energy, but at every turn they fight solar. Their latest netmeeting proposal is proof.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: John Farley
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 1:23 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by John Farley

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

John Farley

Email

455buffalo@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Dear Commissioners: On behalf of myself and the thousands of other Duke Energy customers, please reject Duke Energy's proposal to change the net metering rules for residential customers. Reducing the amount customers are paid for the excess solar energy shared with the grid will extend the time needed to recoup the solar installations initial financial investment and be a disincentive to potential future solar customers. This proposal will be a step backwards in the quest for the transition to clean energy. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, John Farley Chatham County Resident

OFFICIAL COPY

JUL 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Natalija Aleksandrova
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 1:59 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Natalija Aleksandrova

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Natalija Aleksandrova

Email

natalija.aleksandrova@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

As an owner of home rooftop solar panels who values my investment and expects it to pay back as initially expected, I ask that the Duke Energy plan to change the net metering rules for residential customers in a way that would reduce the amount I am paid for excess solar energy I share with the grid be rejected. Thank you

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Don Ging
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 2:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Don Ging

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Don Ging

Email

gingdg@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

There should be a full cost benefit study of rooftop solar before there are any changes to net metering. In addition it should be considered that excess energy produced by rooftop solar be purchased by Duke Energy.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Roger Abrams
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 2:18 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Roger Abrams

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Roger Abrams

Email

roger.abrams@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

With respect to Duke Powers proposed changes to net metering I would ask you to refuse the proposed changes. I respect the fact that Duke Power has an obligation to maximize its income for investors but what is best for the investors is not always what is best for the people of North Carolina. As I understand the proposal, for every 5 kwh I send to Duke which they will credit at the wholesale rate (and promptly resell for the retail rate) I will have enough credit to receive 1 kwh back later. I do not believe it is appropriate to treat citizens to such an unjust pricing regime. Thank you for your consideration.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Kevin Fleming
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 2:30 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Kevin Fleming

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Kevin Fleming

Email

kffleming@casystems.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I reject the proposal from Duke Energy to modify net metering standards for existing roof top solar customers.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Bernard Waugh
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 2:41 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Bernard Waugh

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Bernard Waugh

Email

bernard.waugh@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I sincerely hope there will not be changes to the net metering protocol in any manner that would negatively impact homeowners with Solar. When we installed our solar, it was under the provisions that were in place with at the time. The cost of solar was pretty extensive, but we calculated our budget based on the agreements and decided we could do that. Changing that agreement for us at this point would have a disastrous effect on our finances. At a time with this inflation leading to much higher expenses for homeowners, changing this policy would be devastating for solar customers. Beyond that, NC has made a commitment to greener energy sources. The solar initiatives in NC have finally gained some traction and changes to these policies would be a huge hit to any of these initiatives. I appreciate you giving me the time to express my thoughts. I sincerely hope you will consider the very real and devastating effects of changing our agreement with Duke at this time. This is not just about numbers and data, this is about real families that could realistically lose their homes because of the increased costs associated. Bernard Waugh

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Becky Kraai
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 3:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Becky Kraai

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Becky Kraai

Email

rebecca.kraai@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Thank you for doing all you can to defeat Duke Energy's goal to change net metering rules. Duke should not be able to change the value of our solar panel investment after we had them installed. The Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. Thank you for doing the right thing in encouraging less reliance on fossil fuels.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: William Swart
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 3:34 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by William Swart

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

William Swart

Email

porsches4fun@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Any changes to NC solar power and anything related to Net Metering should include a "Grandfather Clause" protecting all solar power and Net Metering customers for the conditions in effect at the time of solar power and Net Metering turn-on that occurred prior to the time any conditions and changes are approved and made.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Richard Rappaport
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 3:39 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Richard Rappaport

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Richard Rappaport

Email

rich@beachcaremedical.com

Docket

E - 100 Sub 180

Message

Approximately 18 months ago, I had rooftop solar panels installed to help with clean energy production and to decrease my reliance on Duke Energy for power. It took Duke nearly 9 months and \$1500 in fees to allow us to interconnect with their grid. And since then, I have been generating more power than I consume, yet Duke still charges me \$250 per month as a minimum rate. Now, Duke is proposing further changes which negatively affect us. It's not fair for Duke to change the value of our solar investment retroactively. We need the protection of the commission or else Duke will continue to run roughshod over us. Further, the Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Benjamin D Brown
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 4:59 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Benjamin D Brown

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Benjamin D Brown

Email

bmanbrown@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

To whom it may concern, I'm asking for your help to please stop Duke Power from taking advantage of customer. They will continue to raise rates until someone calls them on it. I'm sure they'll put together really nice follow charts to show why they have to do what they are proposing but at the end of the day this is to help Lynn Good meet his matrix for that 14.5 million dollars performance based compensation. Iraq Veteran, Benjamin D Brown

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: brian gaulin
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 5:14 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by brian gaulin

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

brian gaulin

Email

korvinas@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

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

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Simon Jones
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 5:27 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Simon Jones

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Simon Jones

Email

simonwynjones78@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I writing to oppose Duke Energy's proposed changes to net metering rules for household rooftop solar. I installed a solar system on my house earlier this year with the belief that it would help contribute to our states lower carbon goals and because, rolling the numbers it was a long term investment, but one I thought was worth it. The solar sector also has great opportunity for job creation and economic growth in the state. The proposed rules change the economics of the investment I made retroactively and are unfair on consumers. We should be encouraging people to install solar, not discourage it! Duke Energy's arguments for the changes make no sense. Duke's plan hinges on the disproven claim that existing net metering shifts costs onto non-solar customers. In fact, studies show that net metering provides a benefit to non-solar customers by adding low-cost power to the grid, particularly during periods of peak demand. I request that their plan for net metering be scrapped. Best regards, Simon Jones

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Michael Piracci
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 5:27 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Michael Piracci

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Michael Piracci

Email

piraccim@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Hello. As a NC resident, current Duke Energy customer, and rooftop solar owner, I ask that you consider my recommendation to reject Duke's proposed changes to net metering. As I understand, NC House Bill 589 requires you to investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering. Therefore, adopting Duke Energy's proposal is premature. Lastly, given the importance of solar power to reducing the impacts of climate change, it seems obvious to me that you should be doing all you can to increase rooftop solar demand. Thank you for your consideration.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: boone.guyton@gmail.com
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 5:51 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by boone.guyton@gmail.com

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

boone.guyton@gmail.com

Email

boone.guyton@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Net metering helps everyone and saves Duke costs and reduces demand on the grid. Duke should not be able to change the compensation I have from 2013 because they want to save money. We need more solar not less. What is the real cost/benefit of rooftop solar? I don't think Duke want you to know that because it makes it better to have it net metered than not have it.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Charles Fewkes
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 6:18 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Charles Fewkes

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Charles Fewkes

Email

ctfhome@icloud.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please reject the proposal contained within Docket E-100 Sub 180 from Duke Energy. Currently the rules are already in their favor, if we produce more electric than we use, at the end of their year they pay us nothing, which means all of that extra electric generated was given to them for free while they're charging someone else to use it and if we produce less than we use than we still owe them; win, win for them, not so much for the Americans giving them free power. We've only had our solar panels for a month and a half now but we've already produced 2.6MWh and have only used 1.6MWh, we will end up producing much more electric than we use but they will profit from it and they already make 18 billion in profits per year. They state that the "NEM Tariffs implement a monthly minimum bill ("MMB") that ensures recovery of costs related to the distribution system—costs that are largely fixed. Such costs are allocated per customer or vary based on the demand-related costs to serve rather than energy usage per customer. Under-recovery of fixed costs places upward pressure on rates because there is a mismatch between how these costs are incurred and how they are recovered. In those scenarios, customer-generators typically do not reduce these costs from the Companies' perspectives, but do reduce their bill—resulting in a gap that is recovered by the Companies from other customers. The Companies propose an MMB of \$22 for DEC and \$28 for DEP under the NEM Tariffs." but if it was true that more customer-generators "typically do not reduce these costs" than how is it that Duke Energy consistently earns a larger profit every year when more and more Americans are installing solar? By their logic their profit margins should be decreasing every year as more people install Solar. They would like to raise rates during the times when solar panels aren't producing energy, makes sense from a business standpoint because they want to make more money but the panels during the day have already produced more electric than the house uses all day so now they're selling the extra electric, that they're getting for free, to other people and then want to charge us extra for using from the electric they produce when our panels aren't producing, how's that fair? Sounds like double dipping to us. If it is a matter of too much electric being produced at one time during the day and struggling at night (Which is not what I've read anywhere but putting it out there just in case.) why don't they use some of that 18 billion in profits and build storage to hold all of the extra electric that they getting for free? We can go on with disputing their statements but the fact of the matter is that Duke Energy is earning more and more profits, year over year, by Americans giving them their excess Solar energy for free. This is nothing more than an attempt by Duke Energy to increase their profits for their shareholders without spending any of their profits on innovating new technologies. The median household income in NC is \$56,642 per year,

that's just gross income, not profits obviously, that means that Duke Energy makes approximately the equivalent of 317,785 household incomes just in profits; that's ridiculous. When is enough, enough? It's time to start doing what is right for the American people, not the corporations that are doing nothing more than trying to raise their bottom line. They even state in their own document "The Companies believe requiring all legacy NEM customers to go onto the NEM Tariffs would cause financial harm to those customers." that the new tariffs will increase costs to Solar customers, how is this beneficial for the American people or the state of North Carolina? It will just cause more people to not purchase Solar systems for their homes. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Charles and Tracy Fewkes

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Scott Crew
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 6:57 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Scott Crew

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Scott Crew

Email

crew.scott@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please do not allow Duke Energy to change its net-metering rules. It will discourage solar use which will subsequently cost jobs and drive further climate change.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Paul F Reinmann
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 7:30 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Paul F Reinmann

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Paul F Reinmann

Email

reinmannpf@gmail.com

Docket

docket number E-100 Sub 180

Message

Please do not reduce the benefits for homeowners seeking and owning solar PV. Changing the rules at this time is a "bait and switch" tactic. It stinks. Please be a good environmental partner on this.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Amy Lorang
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 8:06 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Amy Lorang

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Amy Lorang

Email

summercloud45@nc.rr.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I heard that Duke Energy wants to start paying rooftop solar owners less for the energy we sell back the grid. I installed rooftop solar last year and what made me decide to do so was that I could make the same selling energy as I can buying energy. I still paid a lot for the panels and it'll take me over 10 years to break even. Global climate change is the biggest threat facing Durham, North Carolina, the US, and the world. In the end, none of our other present problems matter compared to sea levels rising, mass extinctions, mass migration, etc. It's a huge problem and rooftop solar is on each house only makes a small difference--but that difference also can't be dismissed. We need to move more NOW to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and use more renewable energy. We need to stop building and operating power plants that burn fossil fuels, and we need to go all-in on green power. Duke Energy's plan is an utter disgrace and they cannot be permitted to get away with it. The best time to act was fifty years ago--but the second best time is now.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Alice Scott
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 8:17 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Alice Scott

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Alice Scott

Email

scottad63@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 sub 180

Message

Solar net metering is good but Duke Energy takes away any balance accrued May 31.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: William McSherry
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 9:21 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by William McSherry

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

William McSherry

Email

clintmcs@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180.

Message

I installed my 7.2Kw rooftop system in 2015 under a contractual understanding with Duke about how net metering works. I do not believe changing how net metering works at this point is fair, ethical, or even necessary. Furthermore, the Commission should do a cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. This appears to be just another attempt by Duke power to burden its customers with excessive charges for their negligence.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022

Taylor, Jeremy

From: Chris Burbach
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 10:24 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Chris Burbach

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Chris Burbach

Email

csburbach@outlook.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

It is unethical and misleading for Duke to change the value of my solar investment retroactively. I believe the Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 11 2022