

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Andrea Azcárate <andrea\_azcarate@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 12:58 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS in the subject line

It is ridiculous that here in North Carolina we are even considering the petition by Duke Energy to change the rules on net metering, making rooftop solar less accessible at a time when climate scientists say we must be moving full-steam to decarbonize.

Please reject this proposal, which would seriously impact the solar energy industry.

Respectfully,

Andrea Azcarate  
606 Rosemont Ave  
Raleigh, NC 27607

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Afifa Afifi <afifaafifi@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:01 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Duke's plan is still too complex.  
NCUC must perform the solar cost-benefit study required by law.

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** sibyl kleiner [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 10:55 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Do NOT allow Duke to change the rules on net metering. Duke's rule change would make solar less affordable to all customers and hurt NC's homegrown solar industry.

Duke already benefits from FREE solar energy produced by those solar customers who produce more energy than they consume in total (credits for any grid use are cleared to zero on an annual basis).

This rooftop solar energy, fed into the grid, is especially valuable to Duke in summer, as it helps to prevent power outages in NC. Customers do not receive compensation for this summer benefit.

NC needs MORE solar, not less.

Do not allow Duke to kill rooftop solar in NC.

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Elaine McCoy <revdrelainemccoy@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 12:42 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Duke Energy's Near Monopoly

Madam/Sirs

Please pay attention to domestic energy consumers' plea for a competitive structure in North Carolina's developing solar industry.

We depend on you to exercise diligence in insuring a fair and open market place.

Thank you for your consideration,

EMcC+

The Rev. Dr. Elaine McCoy, PhD  
10 Premier Court  
Durham, North Carolina 27713  
216-956-9703

OFFICIAL COPY

MAY 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Afifa Afifi <afifaafifi@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:01 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Duke's plan is still too complex.  
NCUC must perform the solar cost-benefit study required by law.

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Ramona Lawson <rblawson47@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:02 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Cc:** Ramona Lawson  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Duke Energy's plan is still too complex. Please perform the solar cost-benefit study required by law according to Josh Stein, Attorney General of North Carolina.

Sincerely,  
Ramona Lawson

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** joy kassas <jak02us@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:09 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

I expect full compliance with all established rules and protocols in the evaluation of net metering for those using rooftop solar energy. Do not bow low for Duke Progress Energy.

Joy Kassas

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** sarahstcyr@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:12 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

**Duke's plan is still too complex. PLEASE have NCUC perform the solar cost-benefit study required by law!! Our planet depends on clean safe energy sources both NOW and in the near future. We do not have another earth on which to live!! Stop Duke's selfish greed!**

OFFICIAL COPY

MAY 20 2022



**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Harry D Stalls <stallshd1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:13 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Please do not support Duke Energy! Stand up for the rights of citizens and Global Warming.  
You can make a difference.  
Thank You

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Michael Glaser <msglaser@smcm.edu>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:32 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS in the subject line

Please—

Support the people who are trying to lower their carbon footprint, Not Due Energy's efforts to make as much money as possible.

We need to work to save the environment, the earth, Not profits for energy companies and their shareholders.

Thank you,

Michael S/ Glaser  
Hillsborough

OFFICIAL COPY

MAY 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Forrest Chambless <therealforrest@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:40 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Duke Energy's recent compromise still leaves the net metering program way too complex. The NCUC must follow a 2017 state law that firmly prohibits any change to net metering rules until the NCUC conducts a cost-benefit analysis of its value to non-solar power users. New revelations last week show the eventual findings of that analysis will likely force Duke Energy to raise – instead of lower – the amount that it pays rooftop solar customers for the power they send to the grid, the process known as net metering.

"After months of public and legal pressure, Duke Energy was forced to seek a compromise," said NC WARN Executive Director Jim Warren. "If approved, however, the new proposal would still be a step backward for the solar industry and leave Duke executives trying to lock in a high-carbon, climate-wrecking future, even as the NCUC faces a year-end deadline to plan for drastic cuts in emissions. Only in the alternate universe inhabited by utility executives can carbon reduction efforts can be achieved while limiting solar power and massively expanding the use of methane gas."

"We understand that our solar company allies felt the need to compromise with Duke Energy in order to protect their businesses in the near term," added Warren. "Duke has long threatened that if its original settlement with other parties was not adopted, it would force through even worse changes to net metering."

"The fact Duke was forced to make these concessions to installers demonstrates that our position of resisting the company's demand for the state to quash the net-metering program was right," said EWG President Ken Cook. "But the settlement still falls significantly short when it comes to giving more people, particularly working-class families, the ability to access rooftop solar. Standing up to bullies like Duke Energy is the only language it understands, and we will continue to call on regulators to follow the law and do what is right for the company's captive ratepayers."

"The first rule of a monopoly is to maintain the monopoly, and Duke Energy is used to having its way with the state's legislature and its utility commission," said Cook. "The fight to expand consumer-owned rooftop solar is the only real option North Carolinians have to take control of their energy future. Clearly Duke Energy is worried it will not be able to compete if more of its customers put solar panels on their roofs."

Regardless of the settlement, the NCUC's failure to conduct the statutorily-required cost-benefit analysis would be a clear violation of North Carolina law, say NC WARN and EWG. They also say any additional fixed fees imposed on solar customers creates discriminatory rates against them, which raises legal questions under federal law.

Sincerely;  
Forrest Chambless

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Sykes, Jeannie <Jeannie.Sykes@conehealth.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:41 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Say no to Duke Energy solar proposal

As owners of solar panels on our home, we are not in favor of the net metering scheme proposed by Duke Energy, which would include the highest credit allowed during times of day with very little sunlight. This complicated system of metering would make it harder to calculate cost-benefit of solar installation, thereby imposing more barriers to rooftop solar. Duke Energy's plan would also reduce pay-back for solar owners, making it more difficult for low-income households to access solar power.

There are numerous other downsides to the Duke Energy proposal. I encourage NCUC to perform the solar cost-benefit study, which I believe is required by law, and to deny this faulty proposal designed to benefit Duke Energy at the expense of customers.

Sincerely,

Jeannie and Wayne Sykes  
4 Henderson Ct  
Greensboro, NC 27410

NOTICE: This message may contain confidential information intended only for the recipient. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Al Davidson <plcdoc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:44 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Rooftop Solar Jobs and Positive environmental effects are WAY more important to NC families than Duke's money and power grab. Please do your part as you should.

Marion Davidson  
202 Brookshire Lane  
Wilmington, NC

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Wayne Stanko <outlook\_57DCE48249C62186@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:45 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Duke's Solar Proposal

The recent change in Duke's proposal is a good first step, but more needs to be done to protect the rights of home owners with solar panels.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** acemar@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:48 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

The NCUC is required by state law -- before any change to net metering rules can be made -- to perform a thorough cost benefit analysis of net metering for value to non-solar power users. It is important that NCUC do its duty under this law before changing net metering rules to suit Duke Energy requests.

Patrick Martin  
homeowner and Duke Energy customer in Raleigh NC

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** Danny Stewart <danstewart4795@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 1:59 PM  
**To:** Statements

I will tell you very plainly how I feel about Duke Energy, especially after they brought Piedmont Gas and rates immediately went up. I hate Duke Energy. Solar energy is the only way to stop them from crippling seniors. And, over 21 million dollars a year for their CEO IS ABSOLUTELY CRAZY.

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022



**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** keith johnson <kmjohnso15@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 2:01 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub180 cs

Save NC Solar, do not change the rules on net metering as proposed by Duke Energy.  
Keith Johnson  
Siler City, NC 27344

OFFICIAL COPY

May 20 2022