

From: dwight pelton
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 11:24 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by dwight pelton

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

dwight pelton

Email

notlepds@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

i reject this proposal. if enacted, it will completely invalidate the financial justification for green/solar power for me and future generations. not to mention the impact that would have on global warming (due to lack of public acceptance of the technology)

Dunston, Antonia

From: Jeremy Booker
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 9:56 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Jeremy Booker

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Jeremy Booker

Email

jeremy.booker@gmail.com

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. A full cost-benefit study must be completed before any changes to solar net metering are allowed. The proposed rules are overly complex and make estimating costs (and verifying a an invoice) a time-consuming and error-prone process. Duke (with their monopoly power) should not be allowed to change the economics of my solar investment after the fact. This change would be a huge giveaway to a company that makes millions of dollars in profit every year, while taking funds away from individual homeowners who invested in solar under different terms. This change would not encourage others to choose rooftop solar investments, and would likely hurt North Carolina's sustainability and climate goals. This change would not benefit North Carolinians.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 19 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Randi and Daniel Fox
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 9:54 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Randi and Daniel Fox

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Randi and Daniel Fox

Email

foxrandi1980@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

Good morning, We are a homeowners who have invested nearly \$30,000 in roof top solar energy and we are concerned that the proposals being considered by the PUC are not well-balanced in terms of overall renewable energy goals for our climate future, and in terms of support for those of us who have invested to reduce our environmental impact. Our North Carolina Department of Insurance is a wonderful example of weighing the needs of industry and the costs to the consumer. We would hope that the outcome of your efforts are equally balanced, as today Duke is benefiting from our investment without proper compensation. That's what the PUC should be monitoring. One example - We are on Time of Use Rates and we pay a specific charge for the instantaneous power that we use in a 15 minute period (in addition to our KW-hr consumption over the month). We understand and support that approach. Typically, we draw 7-9 KW for our demand charge. HOWEVER, when we are supplying the grid on a sunny day, Duke Energy is drawing 12-15 KW of demand from OUR system. We get zero credit for their demand draws. Why ? They are getting power at peak times thanks to our investment in a solar system, charging customers, but not balancing out our Time of Use demand against their profit. Our minimum fair expectation would be that they would subtract their demand from our demand... and we would be at zero. The proper expectation would be that they pay us for their demand-draw, just as we pay them currently. Second example - Utilities claim we should be paying our fair share of the grid-maintenance, even though most of our power comes from our solar array. We agree. It's time to restructure ALL customer rates to have a grid - maintenance charge so we equally pay for our share, and do not include it in the per KW-hr charge. We all pay for our basic connection and meter, for example. There should be a easy-to-understand Grid Charge that all customers pay. Frankly, these inequities should be addressed by the PUC without us having to keep constant watch on the industry. The Insurance Commissioner advocates for North Carolina customers, and we enjoy some of the most competitive rates in the country when we compare with others outside of NC. Don't let Duke Energy or Dominion set the game plan - push back for the citizens of North Carolina. We can't fight a monopoly on our own, as we need your leadership to be fair. Most respectfully and in hopes of FAIR changes for both the consumer and industry. Daniel and Randi Fox

Dunston, Antonia

From: Andre Whisnant
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 8:35 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Andre Whisnant

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Andre Whisnant

Email

andy.whisnant@sodexo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Vote No! Duke Energy should not be allowed to change the economics of my 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.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 19 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: David Coppit
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 4:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by David Coppit

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

David Coppit

Email

david@coppit.org

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I'm a home owner who invested \$30k in rooftop solar. A big part of decision to invest was based on the 1-to-1 net metering that Duke Energy provides. Now I understand that Duke Energy is pulling a "Darth Vader", seeking to change the terms of the agreement to their benefit. This is not fair to me or other solar owners. I also understand that Duke Energy is obfuscating the issue behind a complicated scheme. They're doing this so that people won't realize that they are getting screwed. I encourage you to have an independent third party do an analysis of the Duke Energy proposal before voting on it, so that we can truly understand the impact on homeowners and businesses that have invested in solar. My understanding is that is is required by law anyway (HB 589). Finally, Duke Energy should be investing and encouraging solar energy instead of fossil fuel energy. Solar energy is finally becoming cost effective (even without government subsidies!). Duke Energy is trying to strangle the baby in the crib, rather than embracing the change we need in order to avoid global warming. Please make the right moral choice, and prevent them from taking us further down the fossil fuel road. I don't think I've ever engaged in a political issue like this in my life. I hope that shows you how concerned I am. Regards, David Coppit 8 Birchwood Park Durham, NC 27713

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 19 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Marvin Woll
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 2:34 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Marvin Woll

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Marvin Woll

Email

mjwoll@nc.rr.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

I want to encourage you to reject Duke energy's plan to continue using coal and gas to provide power. We must use more solar and wind and other renewables in order to reduce the pace of global warming. The heat wave in France, the fires and drought in the southwest of the United States, and the floods around the world are all signs we must do more to slow climate change. For the sake of our children and future generations the time to act is now and not 20 years from now!

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 19 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Julia Flowers
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 11:57 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Julia Flowers

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Julia Flowers

Email

juliaflowers243@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 SUB 180

Message

We have solar panels and it has been an excellent source of energy not only for us but for the environment as well.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 19 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: SUBRAMANIAN THANGAVELU
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 12:44 AM
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

Hi, I would like to register my view w.r.t. proposed net metering changes by Duke. At the moment Duke owns all the SRECs (Solar Renewable Energy Credits) for the solar system installed by its customers. Hence Duke is actually making more money through selling SRECs in open market or using these SRECs to offset its own carbon emission from plants even if Duke buys the electricity produced from solar system at the rate it sells to customers. By buying solar energy at a lower rate from customers but selling back to those same customers based on time of use tariff plan will only lead to Duke making much more money (selling rate minus purchase rate plus money made from SRECs) and leaving the customers who installed solar system at a much disadvantageous position. I request the commission to consider that existing net metering provisions to continue for the life of the system (i.e. Duke offsets each KWh energy exported by solar system with each KWh consumed regardless of the time of day) as long as SRECs are owned by Duke. If net metering rules are to change (even after some years but before the life of the system) then Duke must compensate the customer with the equivalent amount for which the SRECs are being sold in a competitive open market. I strongly believe the commission would weigh in on the disadvantages being placed on the customers with the proposed changes and consider the above suggestion to ensure customers also would get their fair share. Regards, Subbu

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 19 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: Breck Barker
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2022 6:23 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Breck Barker

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Breck Barker

Email

breckb104@gmail.com

Docket

Docket E-100 Sub 180

Message

I am a homeowner who has invested nearly \$100,000 in roof top solar energy and am concerned that the proposals being considered by the PUC are not well balanced in terms of overall renewable energy goals for our climate future, and support for those of us who have invested to reduce our environmental impact. Our NC Dept of Insurance is a shining example of weighing the needs of industry and the costs to the consumer. I would hope that the outcome of your efforts are equally balanced, as today Duke is benefiting from my investment without proper compensation. That's what the PUC should be monitoring. One example - I am on Time of Use Rates and I pay a specific charge for the instantaneous power that I am using in a 15 minute period (in addition to my KW-hr consumption over the month). I totally understand and support that approach. Typically, we draw 7-9 KW for our demand charge. HOWEVER, when we are supplying the grid on a sunny day, Duke is drawing 12-15 KW of demand from OUR system. I get NO credit for their demand draws. Why ? They are getting power at peak times thanks to my system, charging customers, but not balancing out my TOU demand against their profit. My minimum fair expectation would be that they would subtract their demand from my demand... and we would be at zero. The proper expectation would be that they pay me for their demand draw, just as I pay them today. Second example - Utilities claim I should be paying my fair share of the grid maintenance even though most of my power comes from my solar array. I most certainly agree. It's time to restructure ALL customer rates to have a grid maintenance charge so we equally pay for our share, and do not include it in the per KW-hr charge. We all pay for our basic connection / meter, for example. There should be a easy to understand Grid Charge that all pay. Frankly, these inequities should be addressed by the PUC without us having to keep tabs on the industry. The Insurance Commissioner has our backs, and we enjoy some of the most competitive rates in the country when I talk to others outside of NC. Don't let Duke or Dominion set the game plan - push back for the citizens of NC. We can't fight a monopoly on our own, as we need your leadership to be fair. Most respectfully and in hopes of FAIR changes for both the consumer and industry. Robert Breck Barker 919-614-1140

Dunston, Antonia

From: James and Mary Beth Stahle
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2022 2:47 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by James and Mary Beth Stahle

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

James and Mary Beth Stahle

Email

jgandmbs@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

We are so disappointed in the 4 portfolios that Duke are putting forward as ways to reach the mandated reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2030. Instead of reducing the carbon dioxide, most efforts will result in an increase in methane gas which will contribute more to the greenhouse effect. Some of the proposals also rely upon technologies that have not been developed let alone proven. We cannot afford to take steps backward in this global battle. We have technology that is currently available in solar, wind and wave but because of shareholders profit driven motives Duke plays these processes down and promote those that result in a quick dividend return. Duke does not have a good track record regarding the environment (coal slag) and also has a strong determination to make the customer pay for their poor choices. We can only see that Duke will invest their customer's fees into this technology only to see green technology replace it in a decade. And guess again who is left with the bill. We can also see Duke's hand in reducing the economies of rooftop solar by manipulating the reimbursement rates for excess solar production by moving to time of use. Why do this? Profit for the shareholders again and driving homeowners away from investing their own monies , not only in saving their utility costs in the long term, but to aid the environment. Duke once again fails to see the long term benefit to them of having the homeowners invest, which will profit the homeowner, but also helps to keep the cost of electricity down. Let the homeowners invest for the public good instead of only making utility payments to Duke. One other comment. Why are the North Carolinians forfeiting excess energy annually that they produce from solar to Duke? And why is Duke doing the annual reconciliation in May when the homeowner has the largest amount of excess produced electricity? Please help us with allowing the solar homeowner to get a fair return on their personal investment. Stop the time of use ploy, have Duke pay for the excess electricity produced (as they do in South Carolina) or at least move the reconciliation to February or August. What Duke is proposing is not how a Public Utility should honestly and morally act.

From: Anthony S.Policastro
Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2022 1:16 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Anthony S. Policastro

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Anthony S. Policastro

Email

anthony@outerbankspublishing.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Suggested Solution for Net Metering credit program Take the average kW cost to Duke Progress Energy (DEP) over a given year and during non-peak and peak times in a given area, region or section – however DEP calculates cost for its power. The delta or difference should be used to determine a customer’s kWh credits. For example, a customer has generated a credit of 1000 kWh from June 1 of the previous year to June 1 of this year and the cost to DEP was 10% more during the peak months. The customer with 100 kWh credit would pay DEP 110 kWhs from the credit. Going forward, give less credits for the excess power generated over the peak months. If was 25% less, then for every 1 kW hour credit, the customer gets only a .75 kWh credit for the months during peak cost times. (100 kWh would give the customer 75 kWh credit.) A 10% increase in DEPs cost per kWh during peak times would give the customer with 100 kWh credit only 90 kWh in credit. This accounting could be done every June 1 or monthly during the peak months, the customer would get 10% less credits for kWh credits during these peak months. Background information Cummins, Sara J Attachments Thu, Jul 7, 12:16 PM (9 days ago) to me Good Afternoon Mr. Policastro, Here is the information Mr. Williamson promised. Thank you. Respectfully, Sara Sara Cummins Regulatory Complaint Analyst PSNCUC sara.cummins@psncuc.nc.gov

From: James Dunn
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 9:10 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by James Dunn

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

James Dunn

Email

jimdunn4@yahoo.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180CS

Message

Docket E-100 Sub 180 Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC's and Duke Energy Progress, LLC's Joint Petition for Approval of Revised Net Energy Metering Tariffs I find many aspects of the Docket E-100 Sub 180 troubling and I encourage the Public Staff to advocate for consumers and NEM customers. The very definition of a tariff being a tax or charge of a select group. Having read the proposal multiple times, the most blatant omission is the lack of discussion about Renewable Energy Certificates (REC), which I had to surrender upon entering a NEM agreement with DEP. NEM customers generate REC's, but there is no mention in the proposal about the cost benefits granted to DEC or DEP. In the proposed filing, "To develop these revised rates, the Companies recently concluded a Comprehensive Rate Design Study (the "Rate Design Study") that investigated the costs and benefits of serving NEM customers in accordance with House Bill 589 ("H.B. 589")." I question the data used in that study based on my previous comments submitted on June 30, 2022 at 5:31 PM. In my previous comments I stated how DEP had erroneously credited my account with 1,000,000 NEM hours. Errors of such magnitude would skew any results obtained. Prior to last month, I could access DEP Home Energy Report (HERO) which showed my monthly energy usage compared to similar RES customers with comparable homes. The HERO displayed normal homes, EE homes and my home's consumption on a monthly and historical annual basis. Better than 80% of the time and on an annual basis, my consumption was less than the EE home. DEP has decided that I'm no longer qualified to access the HERO, but I'm sure DEP could provide that information. Although H.B. 589 mandates that the Companies file revised NEM rates, it is my understanding that the mandate is not required until 2027. In the proposed filing, "Upward Pressure on Rates Under Existing NEM Programs" it seems to asking for a rate increase, but only on a select group, without asking for a rate increase, per say. "Given that demand and energy costs are the two biggest cost classifications, cost causation is preserved for non-NEM customers because higher usage is highly correlated with higher costs and a higher bill." "This results in NEM customers having larger bill reductions than are justified by the smaller reduction in the cost to serve them. Ultimately, the net revenue shortfall from NEM is socialized and collected from all customers after each rate proceeding." Those statements can be interpreted to mean that it is okay for NEM customers to cross-subsidize non-NEM customers which are the ones increasing consumption and demand, but not the other way around. "The components of the NEM Tariffs necessarily work in a symbiotic manner, meaning that even the tweaking of one component would necessitate recalculation of every other component." Another troubling statement which is relative straight forward. "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.” Again it would seem NEM customers are cross-subsidizing non-NEM customers. If consumption is reduced it would seem demand would also diminish. “Although the TOU-CPP Tariffs are outside the scope of these proceedings, they are applicable to the proposed NEM Tariffs and will help serve the goals of H.B. 589 as well. TOU rates incentivize load to be shifted to low-cost times because when the Companies' cost of service is lower, the TOU customer's price of electricity is also lower. Likewise, the peak and CPP prices ensure proper cost recovery for higher cost peak periods by sending proper price signals to customers.” If TOU-CPP Tariffs are outside the scope of these proceedings (their own statement), why are they comingled in the request for NEM rate tariff? “The Companies believe requiring all legacy NEM customers to go onto the NEM Tariffs would cause financial harm to those customers.” Not only financial harm to legacy NEM customers, but also financial harm to future NEM customers. I urge the Public Staff to advocate for the customer and that serious thought be given to this proposed rate increase tariff.

Dunston, Antonia

From: Mary Jane Nirdlinger
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:46 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Mary Jane Nirdlinger

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Mary Jane Nirdlinger

Email

maryjane.nirdlinger@hey.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

North Carolina should be embracing the future, not taking steps back in terms of energy production. If we want to continue to be a "best place", investments in renewable energy should be promoted and encouraged. Continuing to promote the old industries' interests is like subsidizing horse-drawn-buggies. The energy commission should not allow Duke to diminish the value of homeowner's efforts to improve our collective energy use. Please support solar, wind, and other renewable sources for the sake of our future. The proposed changes in net-metering only benefit a dying approach to energy - let's be proactive and forward-looking. let's be a model for others. And let's see the data--the Commission should do the cost-benefit analysis for rooftop solar that was required by law (HB 589) before changing net metering rules. Make smart decisions, not lobbyist-influenced political decisions for the short run. Let's do the right thing.

OFFICIAL COPY

Jul 19 2022

Dunston, Antonia

From: octavius sims
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 10:29 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by octavius sims

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

octavius sims

Email

ovsims@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

Where does North Carolina want to be when it comes to our clean energy future? Today is the time for North Carolina to lead the way by standing up to these energy companies ridiculous claims and Duke Energy's push to end independent clean solar producing power plants in our state of North Carolina. It's time for the commission, our legislators, our governor, and the responsible citizens of North Carolina to stop these attempts in their tracks. I'm asking for you to end the discussion today and tell Duke Energy to adapt for our future. Duke Energy has every opportunity to adjust their business model and invest in solar energy but yet the continue to use outdated fossil fuels and coal and they continue to pollute our rivers and land. Duke Energy can easily transition to partnering with the solar industry and selling solar as one of their product's which would offset its cost to build and maintaining the grid and provide them with more control of when to do upgrades and maintenance by using power from its solar partners to power the grid during the day instead of their own equipment. Duke Energy's failure to re-focus their business model to include clean solar energy should not be a burden to independent power plant owners that invested our own money in building a solar power plant. Whether it was for wanting be green, wanting to offset all these price increases that Duke Energy keep requesting and lower cost, or both. How does one Company get to control all parameters in its business dealing? Duke Energy is asking to lower that amount it pays me, an independent power producer for my power and treat me like a wholesaler, but then turn around and charge me more than a non-solar retail customer for their power. This relationship should be symbiotic! t should be one to one no matter what rate is used. I should be able to apply that same principle and treat Duke Energy as my retail customer. They are claiming that solar power plant producers shift cost to the other customers in an attempt to garner public support. They are painting solar producer as bad because we are not paying them the money we would normally pay without solar. This argument is ridiculous. Duke has a program where the gives it customers an energy saving kit. It sells and encourage you to buy LED bulbs and other energy saving equipment. They have a program that allows them to disable a homeowner air conditioner to take the load off the grid during the day to keep them from making more power. They give away free home energy assessments to push customers to use less power for the same reason. They send me emails monthly on tips to lowering my energy usage. They had a program where you could pay them on your monthly bill to develop solar farms if you wanted to be green and couldn't afford a solar power plant yourself. I think it was Go Green or something like that. How does it make sense that they encourage you to use less power and then ask the commission to allow them to charge, the people who paid a significant amount

of money to do that, more money? There's definitely a pattern here and it's been going on for years. On one side they encourage its customers to use less power and then asked the commission to allow it to increase rates when the customer does just that. I counted on the Net Metering information and terms that I got from Duke Energy's website to make my decision and Duke Energy should be held to those terms. I can't call my installers or bank and tell them the value of my investment has changed and I'm now altering the terms. North Carolina should not fold as Florida did. We must keep our current Net Metering policy. Duke should not be able to change its rate structure to burden North Carolina Solar producers with unfounded claims. McDonald's, or you name the company, does not get to charge me more because I eat there a lot less to be healthier. For every other company beside these big power companies, it's just a cost of doing business. These power companies get to dictate all the terms yet I live in the city limits and am required to be connected to the grid. The small number of Duke Energy customers in North Carolina that even have solar, has zero impact to their bottom line. What happens if all Duke Energy customers cut their power usage in half? Will you allow Duke Energy to double their rate? What if the 36,000 solar customers buy batteries and completely stop exporting or using power from the grid. What then? Will you allow the people, require to have a grid connection to be code compliant, to be charged an astronomical connection fee? My point is these power companies need to be forced to actually try to adopt clean energy. That will mean that they need to adjust their business model. That will never happen if the state's commission folds to their baseless request. I just think they are missing a huge opportunity to produce more green energy and make money, by them ignoring the opportunity to sell solar themselves. They can probably do it cheaper than Tesla Solar and they have more direct access to actual customers. And if they sold a maintenance plan billed monthly. Wow. Now, I will agree with Duke Energy on this point. I believe it should be a minimum monthly charge. While I enjoy paying such a low fee now, I do feel like it's too low. Just my 2 cents but a 5-8 year ramp up to around \$30-35 a month is probably fair. And a monthly or seasonal/quarterly payout of excess production may be fair. As neither excess production or Duke Energy's flat connection charge were guaranteed. And there's no expectation that can be argued for that, since they are both in flux. The Net Metering program and the current rate structure should be left alone, as that is information that many relied on when making the decision to purchase a solar power plant. It could possibly have a legal cause of action as we are being harmed by such changes. TL/DR I'm asking you to say NO to Duke Energy's proposed plan and request to change North Carolina's Net Metering program and rate structure. While I also concede that a 5-8 year ramp up to around \$30-35 a month minimum charge and a monthly or seasonal/quarterly payout of excess production may be fair.

Dunston, Antonia

From: Pelham Jacobs <pelham9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 8:22 PM
To: Hannah Jacobs
Cc: Statements
Subject: Re: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

I should say you make us so proud!

On Wed, Jul 13, 2022 at 8:20 PM Pelham Jacobs <pelham9@gmail.com> wrote:
You make me so proud!

On Wed, Jul 13, 2022 at 8:02 PM Hannah Jacobs <hannahlj@protonmail.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the North Carolina Utilities Commission,

I hope this note finds you all well and enjoying this beautiful, if hot, North Carolina summer. Thank you in advance for taking a moment to read and consider my note. I am writing to express deep concern regarding Duke Energy's petition to change the rules of net metering for rooftop solar.

Duke Energy's petition represents a clear and dangerous obstruction of efforts to combat climate change—efforts that aim to make North Carolina cleaner and safer for all and to preserve its natural resources for generations to come. We live at a time when communities need to be laying the groundwork for renewable forms of energy production and consumption that lessen the negative health and environmental impacts of energy sources such as coal and natural gas. The many individuals across our state who have invested in rooftop solar are doing their part.

By changing the net metering rules, Duke Energy seeks to make the process for installing rooftop solar on private residences far more confusing and costly for individual homeowners—especially the many, many moderate- and low-income citizens who might otherwise participate—than it is at present. Their changes would also punish all those homeowners who have already invested in solar *in good faith*. People like my parents, hardworking, middle-class homeowners whose investment in solar now not only powers their home but also their small farm. And Duke Energy's proposal would discourage existing solar companies from continuing to do business in North Carolina. The net metering petition is *bad* for North Carolina's citizens and *bad* for North Carolina business. Duke Energy's plan to build new gas-burning power plants instead is *bad for everyone*.

On December 2, 2020, the United Nations Secretary-General declared that the state of the planet is broken. He stated that “every country, city, financial institution and company should adopt plans for transitioning to net zero emissions by 2050...(and take) decisive action now.”^[1] He went on to emphasize that this work *must* protect the most vulnerable. Although he was addressing an audience at Columbia University, the Secretary-General was speaking directly to the North Carolina Utilities Commission. His words follow extensive reporting published by the IPCC in 2019^[2] that sounded the alarm around the world that carbon emissions are altering natural ecosystems that support all life on earth and impeding humans' ability to grow food and access clean water. Experts in North Carolina agree that climate change is alive and well in our state and will continue to wreak havoc on our communities if we do nothing.^[3]

So here is a moment when the NC Utilities Commission can *do something* to combat the environmental and associated public health threats brought to North Carolina rather than failing to support the shift to solar and thereby prolonging carbon emissions: you can say “No” to Duke Energy, “No” to changing the rules of net metering, “No” to continuing to support carbon emissions, “YES!” to supporting the many citizens of North Carolina who have the means and the goodwill to invest in solar and to help produce clean, renewable energy for their communities, “YES!” to protecting the many vulnerable populations whose health and well-being are negatively impacted by carbon emissions and other pollution directly connected to Duke Energy’s dragging it’s feet on the move to clean energy, and “YES!” to making sure that the rooftop solar program is a key part of our beautiful state’s move to decarbonize our energy.

Please, do your part to represent and support the citizens of North Carolina. The first point in your mission statement is to “Provide fair regulation of public utilities *in the interest of the public*.” Duke Energy’s proposal is designed to *unfairly* benefit Duke Energy, not the public. Therefore, you must *say no to net metering*.

Sincerely,

Hannah Jacobs
Resident of Durham, NC

^[1] “The UN Secretary-General speaks on the state of the planet.” *The United Nations Climate Action*. <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/un-secretary-general-speaks-state-planet>.

^[2] “Special Report: Climate Change and Land.” *IPCC*. <https://www.ipcc.ch/srccl/>.

^[3] “North Carolina Climate Science Report.” *North Carolina Institute for Climate Studies*. <https://ncics.org/programs/nccsr/>.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

Dunston, Antonia

From: Pelham Jacobs <pelham9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 8:21 PM
To: Hannah Jacobs
Cc: Statements
Subject: Re: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

You make me so proud!

On Wed, Jul 13, 2022 at 8:02 PM Hannah Jacobs <hannahlj@protonmail.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the North Carolina Utilities Commission,

I hope this note finds you all well and enjoying this beautiful, if hot, North Carolina summer. Thank you in advance for taking a moment to read and consider my note. I am writing to express deep concern regarding Duke Energy's petition to change the rules of net metering for rooftop solar.

Duke Energy's petition represents a clear and dangerous obstruction of efforts to combat climate change—efforts that aim to make North Carolina cleaner and safer for all and to preserve its natural resources for generations to come. We live at a time when communities need to be laying the groundwork for renewable forms of energy production and consumption that lessen the negative health and environmental impacts of energy sources such as coal and natural gas. The many individuals across our state who have invested in rooftop solar are doing their part.

By changing the net metering rules, Duke Energy seeks to make the process for installing rooftop solar on private residences far more confusing and costly for individual homeowners—especially the many, many moderate- and low-income citizens who might otherwise participate—than it is at present. Their changes would also punish all those homeowners who have already invested in solar *in good faith*. People like my parents, hardworking, middle-class homeowners whose investment in solar now not only powers their home but also their small farm. And Duke Energy's proposal would discourage existing solar companies from continuing to do business in North Carolina. The net metering petition is *bad* for North Carolina's citizens and *bad* for North Carolina business. Duke Energy's plan to build new gas-buring power plants instead is *bad for everyone*.

On December 2, 2020, the United Nations Secretary-General declared that the state of the planet is broken. He stated that “every country, city, financial institution and company should adopt plans for transitioning to net zero emissions by 2050...(and take) decisive action now.”^[1] He went on to emphasize that this work *must* protect the most vulnerable. Although he was addressing an audience at Columbia University, the Secretary-General was speaking directly to the North Carolina Utilities Commission. His words follow extensive reporting published by the IPCC in 2019^[2] that sounded the alarm around the world that carbon emissions are altering natural ecosystems that support all life on earth and impeding humans' ability to grow food and access clean water. Experts in North Carolina agree that climate change is alive and well in our state and will continue to wreak havoc on our communities if we do nothing.^[3]

So here is a moment when the NC Utilities Commission can *do something* to combat the environmental and associated public health threats brought to North Carolina rather than failing to support the shift to solar and thereby prolonging carbon emissions: you can say “No” to Duke Energy, “No” to changing the rules of net metering, “No” to continuing to support carbon emissions, “YES!” to supporting the many citizens of North

Carolina who have the means and the goodwill to invest in solar and to help produce clean, renewable energy for their communities, “YES!” to protecting the many vulnerable populations whose health and well-being are negatively impacted by carbon emissions and other pollution directly connected to Duke Energy’s dragging it’s feet on the move to clean energy, and “YES!” to making sure that the rooftop solar program is a key part of our beautiful state’s move to decarbonize our energy.

Please, do your part to represent and support the citizens of North Carolina. The first point in your mission statement is to “Provide fair regulation of public utilities *in the interest of the public.*” Duke Energy’s proposal is designed to *unfairly* benefit Duke Energy, not the public. Therefore, you must *say no to net metering.*

Sincerely,

Hannah Jacobs
Resident of Durham, NC

^[1] “The UN Secretary-General speaks on the state of the planet.” *The United Nations Climate Action*. <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/un-secretary-general-speaks-state-planet>.

^[2] “Special Report: Climate Change and Land.” *IPCC*. <https://www.ipcc.ch/srccl/>.

^[3] “North Carolina Climate Science Report.” *North Carolina Institute for Climate Studies*. <https://ncics.org/programs/nccsr/>.

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.