

Conyers, Tamika

From: Lisa Gould <lisalgould@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2022 11:07 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Dear NC Utilities Commission:

Installing solar power is a BIG and growing industry in North Carolina, creating many new, good-paying jobs and helping us make steps toward mitigating climate change. We need all the incentives we can provide to continue the march toward clean energy in our state!

I am asking you to please prevent Duke Energy from decreasing credits for properties that have installed solar panels. We need to continue to reimburse solar producers at the current rate, rather than decreasing those credits and weakening this important industry in North Carolina.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Lisa Lofland Gould
272 N. Hawthorne Road
Winston-Salem NC 27104

In our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decision upon the next seven generations—from the Great Law of the Iroquois Confederacy

Conyers, Tamika

From: Jim Bryson <jim.bryson.147@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2022 6:25 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Opposition to Duke Energy's Net Metering change proposal Docket E-100, Sub 180CS

Dear NCUC,

As a North Carolina homeowner who has recently invested in residential roof-top solar, I am outraged by and wish to express my strong opposition to Duke Energy's proposed changes to NCUC's residential solar energy policy, specifically to the Duke's Net Metering policy, **Docket E-100, Sub 180CS**.

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.

Please work to advance North Carolina's overall health, and competitiveness in renewable energy by opposing Duke's current proposal.

Sincerely,
Jim Bryson
144 Murdock Ave.
Asheville, NC 28801

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Rusty Rogers <heel55@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 10:46 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

I'm a volunteer with Chatham Habitat for Humanity. It's my opinion that the NC Utilities Commission should not pass this policy proposed by Duke Energy. Chatham Habitat for Humanity puts rooftop solar on houses sold to low and middle income families in Chatham County. Under current net metering rules, families with solar on their homes are paying between \$30-\$50 for electricity per month. The proposed changes would severely increase that monthly amount and would make our families less financially resilient. Low and middle income households are already largely unable to take advantage of solar systems due to the high upfront costs, and this change would further widen that gap. Low and middle income households are often the most impacted by the short and long term impacts of climate change, and the use of renewable energy like solar has tremendous benefit to the families we work with. The solar program at CHFH may no longer be viable under the policy proposed by Duke Energy
Thank you

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Mary Lindsey <rossiel41@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 10:48 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

I am a supporter of Chatham Habitat for Humanity. I do not think the NC Utilities Commission should pass this policy proposed by Duke Energy.

Even though I am a stock-holder in Duke Energy, I believe that this policy would negatively impact low and middle income families that already are struggling. This reminds me of the story in the Bible where the rich man takes a ewe from a poor man to feed his guest. Let us not let "rich Duke" take solar from the poor to enrich its stockholders even more. (Yes, I have taught Sunday school for over 60 years..so there is usually a Bible story that fits most every situation!)

With climate change such a great problem, we need to make renewable energy as affordable as possible for everyone.

Anotherthyme,
Mary Lindsey
rossiel41@gmail.com

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Mark Korell <mlkorell@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 11:11 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS Comment from Habitat for Humanity

Hello, I am a volunteer with Chatham County NC Habitat. I urge your commission to DENY this policy proposed by Duke Energy. We at Habitat have been installing solar energy systems on homes for low income working families, and the savings have been significant for them. Many only can afford to pay the \$30-50 a month with solar, and the Duke proposal would increase the bills significantly. With the current climate concerns as well as high oil prices, Duke and your commission should be PROMOTING renewable energy, and not discouraging it.
Thanks for your consideration,
Mark Korell

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Janie Butler <jimbu_MS@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 11:17 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

Dear Commission Member,

As a volunteer for Habitat for Humanity in Chatham county and a local resident concerned about our energy usage, I ask you not to pass the NC Utilities Commission policy proposed by Duke Energy.

Alternative energy is clearly the sustainable direction for the future, and every effort needs to be made to support it for ALL residents' homes and in our community.

Regards,
Janie Butler

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Danny Keck <dannykeck@tomlinsoncompanies.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 11:24 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

To whom it may concern:

I am a volunteer with Chatham Habitat for Humanity and a net metering customer of Duke Power.

The NC Utilities Commission should not pass this policy proposed by Duke Energy.

Chatham Habitat for Humanity puts rooftop solar on houses sold to low and middle income families in Chatham County. Low and middle income households are already largely unable to take advantage of solar systems due to the high upfront costs, and this change would further widen that gap.

Under current net metering rules, families with solar on their homes are paying between \$30-\$50 for electricity per month. The proposed changes would severely increase that monthly amount and would make our families less financially resilient.

Solar is the future for sustaining our environment and we must continue to make it more accessible and affordable to all!

Thanks,

Danny Keck

VP Manufacturing

Tomlinson
ERWIN LAMBETH • DIRECTIONAL • CARTER

P: (336)-472-5005 ext 258

dannykeck@tomlinsoncompanies.com

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: sfc714 <sfc714@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 11:24 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

Dear NC Utilities Commission:

- **I am a volunteer with Chatham Habitat for Humanity and a past board member**
- **NC Utilities Commission should not pass this policy proposed by Duke Energy**
- **Chatham Habitat for Humanity puts rooftop solar on houses sold to low and middle income families in Chatham County. Under current net metering rules, families with solar on their homes are paying between \$30-\$50 for electricity per month. The proposed changes would severely increase that monthly amount and would make our families less financially resilient**
- **Low and middle income households are already largely unable to take advantage of solar systems due to the high upfront costs, and this change would further widen that gap**
- **Low and middle income households are often the most impacted by the short and long term impacts of climate change, and the use of renewable energy like solar has tremendous benefit to the families we work with**
- **The solar program at CHFH may no longer be viable under the policy proposed by Duke Energy**

Sincerely,

Stacia Cooper
91 Dark Forest Dr
Chapel Hill, NC

Let your standard of success be your achievement of JOY.

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Richard Poole <rwpoole@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 11:33 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

Key Points

- I am a volunteer with Chatham Habitat for Humanity
- NC Utilities Commission should not pass this policy proposed by Duke Energy
- Chatham Habitat for Humanity puts rooftop solar on houses sold to low and middle income families in Chatham County. Under current net metering rules, families with solar on their homes are paying between \$30-\$50 for electricity per month. The proposed changes would severely increase that monthly amount and would make our families less financially resilient
- Low and middle income households are already largely unable to take advantage of solar systems due to the high upfront costs, and this change would further widen that gap
- Low and middle income households are often the most impacted by the short and long term impacts of climate change, and the use of renewable energy like solar has tremendous benefit to the families we work with
- The solar program at CHFH may no longer be viable under the policy proposed by Duke Energy

Thank you for your attention
Richard Poole

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: mach1loos <mach1loos@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 12:06 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

To whom it may concern,

As a volunteer for Chatham Habitat for Humanity, I recommend not adopting Duke powers proposal to alter net metering.

As a Solar owner I contribute to clean energy production and preventing potential brownouts and blackouts and CO2 production from fossil fuels. In fact helping the utility provide better service to its customers.

Adopting any limitation on net metering greatly impedes lower and middle income families the opportunity to do this as well as allowing them to lower their energy bills.

Sincerely,

Michael Loos

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: annie corrigan <acorrigan126@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 12:45 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

I am a volunteer with the Chatham Habitat for Humanity and I urge you NOT to pass the policy proposed by Duke Energy that would no longer enable our low-income families to have solar power at a greatly reduced rate. The proposed policy would substantially increase the electric bill by our present and future homeowners. This is an unfair policy which would only benefit Duke Energy and not hard-working people. Solar energy should be encouraged, not discouraged. I urge you to NOT pass this policy. Thank you very much.

Anne Corrigan
450 Abercorn Cir,
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
acorrigan126@gmail.com

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Jason Morris <jasnmorris@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 1:42 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

- Hello, I am a volunteer with Chatham Habitat for
- the NC Utilities Commission should not pass this policy proposed by Duke Energy
- Chatham Habitat for Humanity puts rooftop solar on houses sold to low and middle income families in Chatham County. Under current net metering rules, families with solar on their homes are paying between \$30-\$50 for electricity per month. The proposed changes would severely increase that monthly amount and would make our families less financially resilient
- Low and middle income households are already largely unable to take advantage of solar systems due to the high upfront costs, and this change would further widen that gap
- Low and middle income households are often the most impacted by the short and long term impacts of climate change, and the use of renewable energy like solar has tremendous benefit to the families we work with
- The solar program at CHFH may no longer be viable under the policy proposed by Duke Energy

Thank you,
Jason Morris

Sent from my iPhone

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Mary B Harris <Cooleyearl@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 2:13 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

Hello,

My name is Mary Harris, a Chatham Habitat for Humanity volunteer. Please reconsider the challenges placed on families who have limited resources as changes are being made that would directly impact those we serve.

Adding \$40 to 50 dollars to an energy bill would stretch families with children. Please don't pass the policy as introduced by the NC Utilities Commission.

So much in this bill would place our families in dire and unreasonable straits. PLEASE DON'T WIDEN GAPS that would widen our families ability to function.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this plea.

Graciously,

Mary Harris

Sent from my iPad

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022

Conyers, Tamika

From: Mark Mattson <mark.mdme@juno.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 2:41 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity Volunteer

Commissioners of the NC Utilities Commission:

I am Mark Mattson, who resides at:
402 Stonehill Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
Chatham County

The NC Utilities Commission should not pass this policy proposed by Duke Energy.

I am a volunteer for Chatham Habitat for Humanity. Chatham Habitat for Humanity puts rooftop solar on houses sold to low and middle income families in Chatham County. Under current net metering rules, families with solar on their homes are paying between \$30-\$50 for electricity per month. The proposed changes would severely increase that monthly amount and would make our families less financially resilient.

Low and middle income households are already largely unable to take advantage of solar systems due to the high upfront costs, and this change would further widen that gap. In addition, this proposal even makes rooftop solar less likely for higher income households, as it makes the payback for the investment extremely long and uncertain. In addition, while I understand the argument that people with solar rooftops are being subsidized by people without solar, I believe that we should have these incentives in the marketplace to encourage solar generation of energy.

The electricity market is changing and we are rightly moving toward renewable energy sources. The idea that people should be held hostage by prior investments in non-renewable energy sources in that move is ridiculous. The people who invest in Duke Energy should not be guaranteed payback - they took a risk and should therefore be the ones who "subsidize" this transition. Duke Energy is currently earning greater than 14% net profit on their invested capital, and are paying dividends of over 3%. If they trimmed the payout of cash to investors, and did nothing else, they could recoup a lot of the past investments of capital from the correct source - the investors of capital. I say all of this as an investor myself. I realize that utilities might be less attractive investments, and this might require a little give-back of executive compensation and tightening of expenses, but that would be acceptable in my mind to reflect the reality that the market is changing.

Low and middle income households are often the most impacted by the short and long term impacts of climate change, and the use of renewable energy like solar has tremendous benefit to the families Habitat For Humanity works with. In addition, the solar program at CHFH may no longer be viable under the policy proposed by Duke Energy.

In summary, this proposal will slow the transition to renewable energy, and will harm low to middle income households disproportionately as a result. In addition, I see no incentive for Duke Energy to adapt to the market if they are allowed to proceed with this scheme.

I object and urge you to reject this policy change.

Mark Mattson
402 Stonehill Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Conyers, Tamika

From: James Ligon <jmligon@ncsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 3:40 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket E-100, Sub 180CS: Comment from Habitat for Humanity

Dear Sirs,

I am writing you to register my opposition to the recent request by Duke Energy to change the net metering rules in NC. I own my own roof top solar system that is mounted to the roof of my home and I am a volunteer with Chatham Habitat for Humanity. They install roof top solar systems on many of the houses they build for low income families so that their monthly electric bills are low. CHFH has calculated that the rule changes proposed by Duke Energy will drive the cost of solar out of reach for its new houses. In NC we should be increasing the incentives for people to install solar panels and the rule changes would do the opposite.

When I first installed the solar panels on my home I was pleasantly surprised to find that they generated 30 to 50% more power each month in the spring and fall than I consumed since I wasn't using much power for heating and A/C during those times of the year. I realized that Duke Energy gives me a credit for this extra power that is injected into their power grid. I thought that when I began using more power in the summer for A/C that I could apply my energy credit to my power consumption. But, as you know, I later learned that Duke Energy clears any unused credit each year on May 31, just before the A/C season begins. I believe that this rule is unfair as it forces me to give my extra electricity to Duke Energy without any compensation. I invested a significant amount of money in this system and feel that I should be compensated when I provide electricity to the power grid. I solved this problem for myself. I purchased an electric car so that all of my extra power now goes to fuel it. However, this inequity is a disincentive for people to install new solar panels and so it should be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

James Ligon, PhD
1023 Christopher Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

Sent from my iPad

OFFICIAL COPY

Apr 21 2022