

Conyers, Tamika

From: Mara Frank
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 3:01 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Mara Frank

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Mara Frank

Email

mafrank@nc.rr.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

As a Duke Energy customer and neighbor of a Duke Energy solar customer, I'm writing to voice opposition to Duke Energy's attempts to reduce the financial compensation to homeowners for electricity generated by solar and put back onto the grid. Of course Duke Energy would want wide latitude in setting net-metering rules -- because the rules directly affect its profits. However, net-metering rates also directly affect ratepayers' ability to afford solar installation. I'd like to install solar panels just as my neighbor has, and I'm sure other neighbors of mine would as well. Many NC homeowners may need a guarantee of better/fairer credits for power returned to the grid in order to be able to afford solar and/or to justify the initial disruption and construction costs/problems related to retrofitting their residence for solar panels. North Carolina must be committed to encouraging/facilitating widespread rooftop solar installation, not inhibiting it! The NC Utilities Commission should adhere to current regulations that require a thorough and honest cost-benefit analysis before granting/approving any changes to net-metering rules.

OFFICIAL COPY

Sep 08 2022

From: Mara Frank
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 3:01 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Mara Frank

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Mara Frank

Email

mafrank@nc.rr.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

As a Duke Energy customer and neighbor of a Duke Energy solar customer, I'm writing to voice opposition to Duke Energy's attempts to reduce the financial compensation to homeowners for electricity generated by solar and put back onto the grid. Of course Duke Energy would want wide latitude in setting net-metering rules -- because the rules directly affect its profits. However, net-metering rates also directly affect ratepayers' ability to afford solar installation. I'd like to install solar panels just as my neighbor has, and I'm sure other neighbors of mine would as well. Many NC homeowners may need a guarantee of better/fairer credits for power returned to the grid in order to be able to afford solar and/or to justify the initial disruption and construction costs/problems related to retrofitting their residence for solar panels. North Carolina must be committed to encouraging/facilitating widespread rooftop solar installation, not inhibiting it! The NC Utilities Commission should adhere to current regulations that require a thorough and honest cost-benefit analysis before granting/approving any changes to net-metering rules.

From: Jochen Fischer
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 2:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Jochen Fischer

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Jochen Fischer

Email

jochen.elon@gmail.com

Docket

E-100 Sub 180

Message

We installed a solar system on our roof three years ago with the belief that the current net metering will stay in place for the foreseeable future to make our investment economically viable. We oppose the Duke Energy proposal to change the rules for the following reasons: The recent steep hikes in energy prices have not affected our family much. Our EV basically runs on sunlight and our high-efficiency heat pumps don't need expensive gas to run. I wish that everybody here in North Carolina, and for that matter the whole U.S., would have the same setup and benefits. The current net metering rules make all this possible and need to stay for even more reasons. Investment from private citizens helps build a low-cost and decentralized power generation system that generates jobs in the state and brings us closer to being independent from wildly fluctuating fossil fuel prices. Investments from businesses and private citizens into the power grid cannot be punished while a regulated, for-profit utility reaps the financial benefits. In contrast, the current incentives (net metering, tax benefits) should stay in place or even be expanded to incentivize more businesses and individuals to make investments that will benefit all participants on the power grid. Duke's argument that the net metering rules are unfair to the ones without a solar system is a flawed one. With the current number of solar systems on the grid, there is no reason why we should pay more for what we get from the grid compared to what we put into it. In many cases the opposite is true: we could reduce the need for net metering by charging our car during the sunny parts of the day, however, we help spreading the load on the grid by feeding electricity into the grid during the day when all air conditioners are running and we're using "cheap" electricity at night to charge the car. Once solar and wind make up a much, much larger part of the energy mix in NC, it may be time to break up Duke Energy into a power generating and a power transmission company and allow all willing players to participate in the market for energy generation with varying prices throughout the day. Again, even then, I'd like to sell my solar energy at a high price during the day and charge the car for next to nothing during the night. But we're not there yet. In all fairness, having been a Duke Energy customer for the past 29 years, I have been extremely pleased with the level of service and energy prices. The state of North Carolina has so far managed to strike a good balance between serving the people and keeping a profit-oriented monopoly in check. I fully expect the NC Utilities Commission to keep the good of North Carolina's people as their number one priority. To summarize, keep the current net metering in place. It fosters investments, creates local jobs, balances the grid and creates energy independence, all at no cost to the ratepayers nor Duke Energy.

From: Adam Matar
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 5:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Adam Matar

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Adam Matar

Email

adam.matar@solfarm.com

Docket

e 100 sub 180

Message

Duke Progress already has a net-metering system in place that is not true net metering. In other states / utility service areas, customer / generators are billed on a true annual billing cycle that nets out every year. They are not required to accumulate over-generation credits to offset future usage, they can offset retroactively. In DEP's system, a customer whose PV system is sized to net-zero may still receive a bill and be expected to pay it if the first month of their cycle is net-consumption, regardless of future over-generation credits. THIS IS NOT NET METERING. Additionally, the "true-up" date of May 31 is deliberately designed to set up C/G's for this scenario. When the cycle starts at the beginning of the heating season when usage increases, this is the highest probability of net-consumption. So the utility is essentially squeezing these folks for money that they should not have to pay if their systems are sized for net-zero annual usage. None of this would be so egregious if they would only shift the true-up date to March, for example, to allow CG's to accumulate some OG credits before the cooling season, but the way it's set up, a large % of CG's will owe money on their first several billing cycles through the heating season. Then in the fall, they cannot retroactively recoup the money that the utility has squeezed out of them. They can only offset future usage. In SC, for example, the utility is legislatively required to compensate their CG's for net over-generation at the end of their annual cycle, which resets in March. This could be considered true NEM, but Duke only does it this way because they are required to legally by the SCUC. Why can't our commission act similarly in the interest of the public, rather than that of the utility? So we've established that the DEP of net NEM is not NEM at all, but some bastardized version of it that benefits the utility. And now they have the nerve to propose additional changes to their NEM terms that would further harm existing CG's, discourage further deployment of renewable energy generation capacity necessary to stave off climate disaster, and boost their bottom line... all this to the detriment of their customer base, the community, and a world facing climate peril. It would be absurd if it wasn't so egregiously self-interested and short-sighted. In case further clarification is required, not only am I strongly in opposition to this docket, but I would propose that changes to DEP's NEM agreement be considered that require 1) a March True-up date, and 2) retail compensation for over-generation at the end of the annual cycle (system sizing limitations based on historical usage would be acceptable under these terms). These changes will spur growth in the solar industry required for a resilient state economy, and to tackle the climate crisis. The proposed changes will have a chilling effect, to the detriment of the utilities' customer base, to the state of NC, and to the world, all in the name of buffering their profits. It's unconscionable.