

Conyers, Tamika

From: Jean Parks <jparks@grandcreative.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2022 4:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket #E-100 Sub 180

Dear Commission Members,

I am very concerned that the changes Duke has proposed to the pricing structure for privately owned solar generation will discourage North Carolinians from investing in solar power just when we need clean energy the most!

Please consider the following three measures:

Require Duke to reimburse excess energy produced by privately owned solar during critical peak pricing periods at the same rate as a customer would buy it.

Allow customers to retain or sell renewable energy credits under any new rule.

Keep the current annual expiration of account balances. Monthly netting would mean Duke will get more energy without paying for it.

In summary, please devise new rules that provide incentives for the generation of more solar power rather than less!

Sincerely,
Jean Parks
Asheville

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Janet Blanchard <janet.blanchard@me.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2022 4:42 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are:
Janet E Blanchard
304 Allen Mountain Drive
Black Mountain, NC 28711

I disagree with the changes to Net Energy Metering Tariffs described by Docket E-100 Sub 180. The fundamental premise of a cross-subsidy (funds to solar owners from other ratepayers) has been repeatedly debunked by independent studies. In fact, many studies indicate that the reverse is true: solar owners are subsidizing other ratepayers. For a particularly compelling example, see <https://emp.lbl.gov/publications/putting-potential-rate-impacts>

I ask the the Public Utilities Commission to:

1. Allow excess energy produced by rooftop solar during critical peak pricing periods to be reimbursed at the same rate as a customer would buy it. This rate schedule has three different costs: off-peak, on-peak and critical peak pricing. The schedule focuses on undervaluing and discouraging solar, instead of properly valuing rooftop solar contributions to the grid. The critical peak price times are late summer evenings and early winter mornings, when solar isn't generally producing at high levels even though the summer times don't correlate to the hours when the grid is most stressed in the summer.
2. Allow customers to retain or sell their renewable energy credits (RECs) under any new rule. Duke currently gets to retain the RECs generated from energy delivered by rooftop solar. Duke can then turn around and sell them through programs like Renewable Advantage which does not contribute to more solar capacity and misrepresents "support for solar" to the customers.
3. Keep the current expiration of account balances. In the current rule, account balances are zeroed out annually. The new rule moves to monthly netting, meaning in any month where the rooftop owners produce more power than they use, they lose those credits. This will mean that more energy will be exported to the grid without appropriate compensation to them.

Thank you for taking my input.

Janet Blanchard
janet.blanchard@me.com
704.906.9438

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Charles Brown <drcharlie@me.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2022 4:47 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are:

Charles H. Brown, Jr.
304 Allen Mountain Drive
Black Mountain, NC 28711-2606

I disagree with the changes to Net Energy Metering Tariffs described by Docket E-100 Sub 180. The fundamental premise of a cross-subsidy (funds to solar owners from other ratepayers) has been repeatedly debunked by independent studies. In fact, many studies indicate that the reverse is true: solar owners are subsidizing other ratepayers. For a particularly compelling example, see <https://emp.lbl.gov/publications/putting-potential-rate-impacts>

I ask the the Public Utilities Commission to:

- 1. Allow excess energy produced by rooftop solar during critical peak pricing periods to be reimbursed at the same rate as a customer would buy it.** This rate schedule has three different costs: off-peak, on-peak and critical peak pricing. The schedule focuses on undervaluing and discouraging solar, instead of properly valuing rooftop solar contributions to the grid. The critical peak price times are late summer evenings and early winter mornings, when solar isn't generally producing at high levels even though the summer times don't correlate to the hours when the grid is most stressed in the summer.
- 2. Allow customers to retain or sell their renewable energy credits (RECs) under any new rule.** Duke currently gets to retain the RECs generated from energy delivered by rooftop solar. Duke can then turn around and sell them through programs like Renewable Advantage which does not contribute to more solar capacity and misrepresents "support for solar" to the customers.
- 3. Keep the current expiration of account balances.** In the current rule, account balances are zeroed out annually. The new rule moves to monthly netting, meaning in any month where the rooftop owners produce more power than they use, they lose those credits. This will mean that more energy will be exported to the grid without appropriate compensation to them.

Thank you for taking my input.

Charlie Brown
drcharlie@me.com

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Joe T. Kasben <jtpot44@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2022 3:05 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are
Joe T. Kasbewn
31 Governor Thomas Terrace
Weaverville, NC 28787

HOW CAN THESE PEOPLE SLEEP AT NIGHT?? We are in a time period of possible catastrophic environmental catastrophe and the greedy, unconscionable Duke people are more interested in their bottom line (their wallet) than what is happening to our environment.
My family invested heavily in solar for our homes, NOT for profit, but to do what is right for the environment.. and now Duke want's to not only hurt us financially, but what will end up discouraging others from investing in solar. SHAME!!

I disagree with the changes to Net Energy Metering Tariffs described by Docket E-100 Sub 180. The fundamental premise of a cross-subsidy (funds to solar owners from other ratepayers) has been repeatedly debunked by independent studies. In fact, many studies indicate that the reverse is true: solar owners are subsidizing other ratepayers. For a particularly compelling example, see <https://emp.lbl.gov/publications/putting-potential-rate-impacts>

I ask the the Public Utilities Commission to:

1. Allow excess energy produced by rooftop solar during critical peak pricing periods to be reimbursed at the same rate as a customer would buy it. This rate schedule has three different costs: off-peak, on-peak and critical peak pricing. The schedule focuses on undervaluing and discouraging solar, instead of properly valuing rooftop solar contributions to the grid. The critical peak price times are late summer evenings and early winter mornings, when solar isn't generally producing at high levels even though the summer times don't correlate to the hours when the grid is most stressed in the summer.
2. Allow customers to retain or sell their renewable energy credits (RECs) under any new rule. Duke currently gets to retain the RECs generated from energy delivered by rooftop solar. Duke can then turn around and sell them through programs like Renewable Advantage which does not contribute to more solar capacity and misrepresents "support for solar" to the customers.
3. Keep the current expiration of account balances. In the current rule, account balances are zeroed out annually. The new rule moves to monthly netting, meaning in any month where the rooftop owners produce more power than they use, they lose those credits. This will mean that more energy will be exported to the grid without appropriate compensation to them.

Thank you for taking my input.

Peace, Joe T. Kasben family

Conyers, Tamika

From: Amy Martin Jewett
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2022 10:21 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Amy Martin Jewett

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Amy Martin Jewett

Email

craftygirl50@gmail.com

Docket

DOCKET NO. E-100, SUB 180

Message

I strongly oppose the petition to change the rules on net metering. We need to end our dependence on fossil fuels and harness the free energy of the sun if we are going to save the Earth for humanity. Profits should not come before this. Keep the existing rules and save solar! Amy Jewett 99 Lookout Rd, Woodfin NC

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Anne Peoples <apees53@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 11:13 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Duke Energy's plan to change net metering

Duke Energy's plan to change the existing net metering system is regressive and exactly the wrong thing to do when North Carolina and the whole planet need to reduce fossil fuel use. This is an existential matter for the only home humanity has.

Thanks,

George and Anne Peoples

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Jim McNealy <jimmcnealy@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 1:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Save NC Solar from Duke Energy. We need affordable solar power in or state.

- Jim McNealy
Raleigh, NC

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Cat Hannah <cathannah@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 1:22 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

There should be no change in net metering that would make solar energy systems less affordable or usable by homeowners who are in Duke Energy systems.

Thank you for everything you do!
Catherine Hannah

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: David Reed <dwreedclt@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 7:55 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

I am totally for MORE home owners rooftop solar access as well as incentives to do so.

Sincerely,

David Reed

Realtor/Broker NC & SC
Southern Homes of the Carolinas
704-488-2073 - mobile

"Like" us on Facebook

www.facebook.com/

<https://www.facebook.com/davidreedrealtor/>

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 31 2022