

Conyers, Tamika

From: Stephen Campbell <stevemcampbell@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 5:32 AM
To: Statements
Cc: 'Laura Burns (Rep. Vernetta Alston)'; divine.earth-dowd@ncleg.gov; 'Ben Phillips'
Subject: Duke Energy's proposal for Net Metering 2.0

To Whom it May Concern,

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

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Kelly Lockamy <sustainably.living@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 8:37 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Duke Energy is trying to undermine our rooftop solar industry. Most of the state's solar companies are opposing Duke's proposal to the NC Utilities Commission, and 50+ nonprofits are standing with them.

Duke is attacking net energy metering (NEM) – the rules for how solar customers are compensated for excess power they send to the grid – at the very time that climate scientists insist we must stop building fossil fuel infrastructure and convert to clean energy at top speed. Solutions like rooftop solar and battery storage are cheaper and more reliable than new fracked gas-burning power plants. But Duke Energy is putting the brakes on solar so it can earn billions by building 50 new gas-burning units.

I vote for clean energy- and that's how I plan to spend my donation budget this year, and every year until we have truly clean, renewable, affordable energy for all!!

Very Sincerely,
Kelly Lockamy

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Kevin Childs <kwchilds@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 8:55 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

good morning and hope all is well NC Utilities Commission! ;) we are emailing to let you all know that we just installed our solar panels on our roof last month and are looking forward to doing our part here in being less of a footprint on carbon emissions. we are hoping you guys do not cave in to the lobbyist and organizations that are trying to dismiss this enormous concern and give consumers the right to do their part for our future as a planet.

take care and best regards,

Kevin Childs
Mobile: 469.766.2102

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Brian Lowery
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Brian Lowery

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Brian Lowery

Email

brianlowery@yahoo.com

Docket

unknown

Message

I am writing to oppose Duke Energy's proposed new net metering buyback plan. I am a homeowner and have had 40 solar panels since 2017. I purchased them under the buyback assumptions at the time- and based my payback on that. Since I own the solar panels and the equipment, it would seem that I should "own" the energy that it creates. I understand that the rules won't affect me for a couple of years but it greatly negates the value of the panels and the worth of my property. Duke already gets "free" power from me because they re-set my carryover at the end of May and I lose what I have not used. As usual, the homeowner gets screwed while big companies win. With the push for renewable energy, it looks like we should be promoting it not putting more money in Duke's pocket.

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Murray Merner, K4MHM <mmmm0320@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 12:29 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Rooftop solar is the best way to generate "new" electricity. It has the most reasonable cost and can be put into use *immediately* with little carbon usage in its creation. Everything possible to encourage and initiate its use must be implemented as soon as possible. There must be no impediment in any form by fossil fuel companies to rooftop solar. This is the most economical, fastest and cost-sharing method (including electric vehicles) to do our part in carbon reduction.

We are talking about our planet and our children. It is not time for "politics" or company greed.

Murray Merner
Raleigh, NC

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Dave Walsh <iamdavewalsh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 3:05 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

To NCUC members,

I am a concerned citizen who knows that Duke - as a for profit company- often acts with its profits and stockholders in mind, more than the public good.

As the entity in charge of ensuring Duke acts in good faith as a monopoly public utility, I urge you to reject the current proposed changes to Net Metering.

The fact that most Solar companies and 50+ Nonprofit environmental groups are opposing this change says volumes about its likely impact.

They project that Duke's plan would make rooftop solar:

- more complicated
- a weaker investment for all
- even less accessible for low- to moderate-income households and
- harder for solar companies to sell

We need solar to grow dramatically in NC, not for Duke to slow walk solar so it can build 50 new gas-burning units. The IEA clearly stated that to meet needed goals, there is no need for any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Please reject this proposal and help us push NC faster into the renewable energy economy.

Dave Walsh

1168 Hollyheath Lane, Charlotte, NC 28209

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Charron A <charronandrews@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 4:30 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Please take action against : Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Dear NCUC members,

Today I read this in USA Today, summing up the UN Climate report, "Rapid mitigation measures – reductions in fossil fuels and better building practices – are needed to avoid unsustainable global warming." It doesn't take a UN report. Anyone can see we are in extremely serious trouble.

Please consider that our current solar policy has helped to expand the use of solar power by homeowners in North Carolina. Duke Energy's proposed changes would make rooftop solar less affordable and more complicated at a time when we should be moving full speed toward clean energy. Please send Duke Energy back to the drawing board and insist on a rooftop solar policy that increases solar growth rather than hampering it, and makes it accessible to everyone, especially to low- and moderate-income households who struggle to pay their electricity bills.

Sincerely,
Charron Andrews
108 Cottonwood Ct
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Cheryl McGraw <chrrlgrrl@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 10:26 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS in the subject line

Duke Energy's monopoly status must require strict regulation and adherence to the greater good of the customers and citizens of North Carolina.

Please do not use any of Duke's proposals which would make roof top solar harder to access for any of us. We must go full-steam toward decarbonizing our energy sources.

Thank you,
Cheryl McGraw
1004 Braxton Ct.
Raleigh, NC 27606

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Jo Shell <octocrazycocoanut@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 11:27 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Please, reject Duke Energy's plan to limit solar energy—making it more complicated, less accessible to many households, and removing jobs from proper working in solar.

There is still time for all of us to make a difference.

Thank you,

Samantha Shell

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Jonathan <jonathan485@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2022 8:35 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS in the subject line

NC Commission, you work for the consumers, so please make sure that you are looking for our best interest and not for a corporation. There is no real reason for the NC commission to approve Duke Energy change request to solar power net metering.

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Steven M. Reardon <smrarctec@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2022 10:52 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Protect Solar Energy from Duke Energy's Changes to Net Metering

To the NC Utilities Commission,

Duke Energy has filed a petition with the NC Utilities Commission 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. The proposed rules changes for solar power inhibit homeowners' ability to participate. Most solar companies oppose Duke's plan.

We have literally just signed our contract to add solar panels to our home, and the costs are based on Duke Energy's current net-metering rules. Any change to the net metering rules would change the equation that made solar energy feasible for our home.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M Reardon
204 Luftee Lane, Holly Springs, NC 27540
630-721-2389

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Evan Halas <ejhalas@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 6, 2022 3:13 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Dear NCUC,
Green and clean energy are the future. Gas plants will only push us further back, help us make a better future.
Sincerely,
Evan
Sent from my iPhone

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 07 2022