Conyers, Tamika

From: Ramona Lawson <rblawson47@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Duke Power and solar energy.

Please don't let Duke Energy sideline solar energy in NC. Ordinary homeowners should be offered a chance to obtain reasonably priced solar energy. Thank you,
Ramona Lawson

Conyers, Tamika

From: Frank Shorter <frank.shorter@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 5:22 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Hello,

As an owner of a 12 KW rooftop solar system, I am writing you today because I am alarmed at the proposed changes that Duke Energy wants to make to Net Metering in North Carolina.

It is premature to consider any changes to net metering in North Carolina until we have an objective study of the economic benefits of distributed solar to the electrical grid. Duke Energy is incapable of honestly modeling and reporting the benefits of rooftop solar to the NCUC as it is a direct competitor to their shareholder revenues. We need an independent study on the benefits and cost of rooftop solar on the utilities' system in North Carolina before any changes to how rooftop solar customers are compensated under Net Metering rules are enacted.

In addition to polluting our water with coal ash, and our air with greenhouse gases, Duke Energy is engaged in information pollution surrounding the future of net metering. They state that they are concerned about the accessibility and equity of Solar access as the reason to make changes to Net Metering, but the only equity they are concerned with is their shareholder equity. The myth that solar customers are raising bills of non-solar customers is nonsense.

If Duke was really concerned with accessibility of Solar to all customers, they wouldn't be sitting on their community Solar offerings, they wouldn't be dragging their feet on interconnection for new installations (3 of the sunniest weeks of my life when I was waiting to interconnect in April of 2019), and they would provide Net Metering credit information as part of the online account system (rather than a physical letter each month with the balance).

Duke energy wants to have it both ways, where they reap the benefits of solar generation without investing in the infrastructure, where they bill rooftop solar customers at the retail rate while paying the wholesale rate, and the changes to the netting period to harvest any surplus credits with the minimum billing amount are galling and infuriating. They undervalue rooftop solar's contributions to the electrical grid at every opportunity.

Please do not allow Duke Energy to diminish the value of my system in order to preserve their obscene and exhorbitant profits.

Net metering is essential for my family to afford solar and lower our carbon footprint. Reducing the financial viability for North Carolinians to be able to afford rooftop solar is unacceptable and should be rejected.

I am calling on the North Carolina Utilities Commission to stand up to a monopoly utility company that is leading the effort to essentially end North Carolinians' personal freedom to put solar on their property.

Conyers, Tamika

From: Harry Stalls <stallshd1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 6:18 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Please do not support or allow Duke Energy's 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.
Duke Energy has to much power over the citizens of North Carolina.

From: Joe Baum <baumjoe51@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 7:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

We 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

We 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 our input.

Lenore and Joe Baum
164 Ox Creek Road
Weaverville, NC 28787
828-645-1412

Conyers, Tamika

From:	Robert Simon <rc_simon@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, March 23, 2022 7:28 PM
To:	Statements
Subject:	Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

Hi- I'm Robert Simon and I am strong supporter of roof top solar and all of its benefits. I am looking at taking a job with a local solar company and see the positive effects it has on our local economy. Please do not let Duke Energy continue to put their profit ahead of our wishes to include solar in the grid. Duke Energy continues to make attempt after attempt to delay solar so that they can build new gas powered plants and keep old facilities functioning longer. We all pay the price for this in many ways. If you would like to talk further about this please feel free to contact me.

Thanks,
Rob
(828) 712-1511

My name and address are 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.

Conyers, Tamika

From: Kent A Barnes <kent.barnes@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 7:29 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are Kent barnes at 125 lat Lane l black mountain nc.

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.

Kent Barnes

Conyers, Tamika

From: Bruce Koloseike <koloseik@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 7:30 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are

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.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Linda Classon <lindaclasson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 7:39 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

Linda Classon
11 Fairway Drive
Asheville, NC 28704

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.

2. Allow customers to retain or sell their renewable energy credits (RECs) under any new rule.

3. Keep the current expiration of account balances.

Thank you for taking my input.

Linda Classon

Conyers, Tamika

From: EDWARD DEVERGES <deverges.edward@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 8:16 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are Edward J Deverges and Marie Eaton, 16 Reynolds Place. 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.

--
Sent from Gmail Mobile

Conyers, Tamika

From: EDWARD DEVERGES <deverges.edward@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 8:16 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are Edward J Deverges and Marie Eaton, 16 Reynolds Place. 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.

--
Sent from Gmail Mobile

Conyers, Tamika

From: stephen Tillotson <stephen.r.tillotson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 8:42 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are Stephen Tillotson
160 Haywood Knolls Drive Hendersonville NC

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.

I just installed solar panels on my residence this winter through a community supported program and Now Duke is going to change the rules just so their profits will continue to multiply at the expense of customers and deincentivizing environmental responsibility

Conyers, Tamika

From: Howard Maynard <jeral5142@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 9:13 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are :
Howard Maynard
18 cabin cove rd
Leicester, nc 28748

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.

Sent from my iPhone

Conyers, Tamika

From: Patricia Moore <pbm7338@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 9:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Stop Duke's plan to make money while NC burns

Please use your power as commissioners to stop the plan to continue plans to fracture the bedrock of North Carolina in Duke's drive to continue exploitation of its citizens and of our natural resources. Clean electricity with storage has no interest for Duke Energy. Their plan, to prevent rooftop solar and to continue to charge their customers for heat-producing methane, which must be blasted from the earth at great cost, then piped, causing pollution and leaks along the way.

Duke's plans have already been exposed by NCWARN and its allies as expensive, wasteful, and destructive. But they have had the power to wreak their plans on unsuspecting consumers. This is beginning to change, as the North Carolina utilities commission and others refuse to continue to give Duke permission to make money on the destruction of our beautiful lands. Please know that you have the strong support of many of your constituents as you move toward cleaner energy, thereby saving our natural energy, and our lands. We rely on you. Thank you for caring.

Pat Moore
Charlotte, NC

Sent from my iPad

Conyers, Tamika

From: JERRY BRUMMETT <brummettjbuk@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 9:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

Jerry Brummett
18 Cabin Cove Rd
Leicester, NC. 28748

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.

Sent from my iPhone

Conyers, Tamika

From: Steve Tarantino <stevetarantino78@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 11:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments on Docket #E-100 Sub 100

My name and address are:

Steve Tarantino
Asheville, NC

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.

Steve Tarantino