

**From:** [Jason Rudolph](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jason Rudolph  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:29:02 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jason Rudolph

### Email

[jason@jasonrudolph.com](mailto:jason@jasonrudolph.com)

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please hold an expert hearing on net metering. Don't rush this important decision. It deserves thoughtful consideration with all the information at hand. And please ensure that net metering rates remain unchanged for \*existing\* customers. Changing the net metering agreement for existing customers would be like telling someone that the price of their meal is going up when they're only part way through eating it.

**From:** [Jesse C Shaw](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jesse C Shaw  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:34:38 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jesse C Shaw

### Email

jessecpbshaw@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke Energy's claim that solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid. If every customer pays a standard connection fee, then how does this make sense? A standard connection fee is literally the cost of using the grid. If this is not the true cost of grid usage, what is? Please have the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. Jesse Shaw

**From:** [Michael J Broughton](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Michael J Broughton  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:37:49 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Michael J Broughton

### Email

broughton.michael@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

On November 8, the NCUC rejected our petition to hold an expert hearing on net metering. This is very disappointing. Net metering is under attack in California, too. But at least that proposal would let existing customers like you stay on their current net metering plan, because “no one wants to be told the price of your meal is going up when you are part way through eating it.” The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system.

**From:** [Lucy Wilson](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Lucy Wilson  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:41:33 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Lucy Wilson

### Email

lucy.wilson@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I am a Hillsborough, NC homeowner with rooftop solar on my house and net metering through Duke Energy. I have have serious concerns about Duke Energy's proposed changes to solar net metering contained in the petition submitted to the NC Utilities Commission on November 29, 2021. Please do not make net metering more complex. It is already hard for consumers to keep up with all the ins and outs of their utility bills. People often find themselves inadvertently overpaying because they were misbilled, but didn't have the time and/or energy to sort out these errors, and the companies rarely make refunds. Complicating our power bills is not wanted! My solar panels are close to 10 years old now and will need to be replaced eventually. If net metering changes, I may be forced to go back to fossil fuels. I don't want that.

**From:** [Yasmine Bourne](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Yasmine Bourne  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:51:27 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Yasmine Bourne

### Email

yasminebourne@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

On November 8, the NCUC rejected our petition to hold an expert hearing on net metering. That means a decision could come sooner rather than later. Tell them not to rush this important decision. Net metering is under attack in California, too. But at least that proposal would let existing customers like you stay on their current net metering plan, because “no one wants to be told the price of your meal is going up when you are part way through eating it.” The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system. 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. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. Demand that the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. The proposed net metering changes would make slightly better sense if approved together with a smart thermostat incentive that would be offered to new solar customers. But that incentive is being considered in a separate proceeding and is likely to be rejected. Tell the NCUC to decide on the smart thermostat before deciding on net metering.

**From:** [Brandon Bourne](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Brandon Bourne  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:52:11 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Brandon Bourne

### Email

bbourne2009@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

On November 8, the NCUC rejected our petition to hold an expert hearing on net metering. That means a decision could come sooner rather than later. Tell them not to rush this important decision. Net metering is under attack in California, too. But at least that proposal would let existing customers like you stay on their current net metering plan, because “no one wants to be told the price of your meal is going up when you are part way through eating it.” The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system. 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. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. Demand that the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. The proposed net metering changes would make slightly better sense if approved together with a smart thermostat incentive that would be offered to new solar customers. But that incentive is being considered in a separate proceeding and is likely to be rejected. Tell the NCUC to decide on the smart thermostat before deciding on net metering.

**From:** [Richard Mark](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Richard Mark  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 2:57:49 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Richard Mark

### Email

richardgmark@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please keep or improve our current net metering rules. You don't see people burning fossil fuels in science fiction movies, do you? Incremental progress will get us to teleportation and vacations in other solar systems. :)

**From:** [Daniel Glidden](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Daniel Glidden  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:02:37 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Daniel Glidden

### Email

danlglidden@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I understand you are considering changing the net metering program. We installed our solar panels in 2018 and fully expected to have our current net metering program for the life of our system. I ask that you grandfather those on the current program for the life of their systems.



**From:** [Roger Grant](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Roger Grant  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:11:35 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Roger Grant

### Email

2rogergrant@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I am a rooftop solar, net metering Duke customer. My equipment, installed and operated at my cost, helps Duke reach its mandated carbon reductions. In addition, I pay Duke a minimum monthly connection fee, standard residential per kilowatt charges for any usage exceeding my production set to the grid, and an insulting monthly renewable energy rider. Plus Duke steals any excess energy credits I have earned each June, the exact month when I am most likely to have these credits. Now they want me to pay more. How do you think I feel?

**From:** [Carl LaChapelle](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Carl LaChapelle  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:16:30 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Carl LaChapelle

### Email

lachapellece@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I was provide projections of ROI for a significant investment in rooftop solar. Both Renu Solar & Duke Energy are / have benefitted from the effort my family put forth based on those projections given to me in late 2021 / early 2022. Duke Energy reviewed all aspects of my application. As a highly regulated utility, I should be able to assume their review of what was projected by Renu Energy is equal to a NC State PUC review. For the state of North Carolina / Duke Energy to make changes that create a material changes to those projections for ROI on this Solar Panel Investment is in my mind equal to a Bate & Switch Fraudulent program & I will use every legal tool available to address it as such.

**From:** [Dane Johnston](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Dane Johnston  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:24:35 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Dane Johnston

### Email

ersatzdane@aol.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Reject Duke Energy's plan! The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system. Keep or improve our current net metering rules.

**From:** [Padma Dyvine](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Padma Dyvine  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:27:00 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Padma Dyvine

### Email

padmadyvine@gmail.com

### Docket

E100 Sub 180

### Message

Earlier this month, NCUC rejected our petition to hold an expert hearing on net metering. Here are some reasons why you should not rush your decisions: 1. 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. 2. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. I demand that the NCUC conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. 3. I have solar panels, and the NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system. 4. The proposed net metering changes would make slightly better sense if approved together with a smart thermostat incentive that would be offered to new solar customers. But that incentive is being considered in a separate proceeding and is likely to be rejected. The NCUC to decide on the smart thermostat before deciding on net metering. Thank you for taking these points into consideration. Sincerely, Padma Dyvine

**From:** [Matthew Cass](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:30:33 PM  
**Attachments:** [ce\\_logo\\_240x46\\_ddfcf290-2d69-4d4c-a5c7-ee3ac33e0e44.png](#)

---

## Reject Duke's Plan!!

Duke Energy has filed a 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. Please reject Duke's plan!

-Matthew Cass

**Matthew Cass, PE**  
SVP, OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE AND RISK  
o: +1.888.451.6822 Ext. 51125  
d: +1.919.957.6160



[consoreng.com](https://consoreng.com)

*The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.*

**From:** [Richard Jooss](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Richard Jooss  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:32:16 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Richard Jooss

### Email

joossgm@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Hi, Net metering is important for: 1. Existing NC solar customers who installed solar factoring in the benefits of Net Metering. Changing it would be unfair to those of us that adopted solar.  
2. Net solar customer to continue to drive NC to a carbon free future Cheers, Rick

**From:** [Bharad Rajan](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Bharad Rajan  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:42:43 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Bharad Rajan

### Email

modern.sage@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please let existing customers like me stay on their current net metering plan, because “no one wants to be told the price of your meal is going up when you are part way through eating it.” The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system.

**From:** [Robert Fowler](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Robert Fowler  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:44:18 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Robert Fowler

### Email

[rf4@aptudo.com](mailto:rf4@aptudo.com)

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Rooftop solar is very pro-consumer and is a common sense option. People love their solar panels with net metering and will be rightly outraged to have it hobbled. Please take the time to meet the obligations expressed in HB 589 and FULLY study rooftop solar and its ability to help our state meet carbon targets. This combined with smart thermostats is a slam dunk.



**From:** [Jeffery Burdine](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jeffery Burdine  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 3:51:09 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jeffery Burdine

### Email

jeff.burdine@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Hello, I am an existing rooftop solar customer I have a rather large rated KW system at 17KW. I had to install many panels because my roof is mostly facing east-west. Even though I have the large Inverters my system can only produce at max 12KW because of the direction of the panels. East panels working in the morning and west panels in the afternoon. The new Net Metering proposal will punish me for having a larger system even though I am actually only able to produce a fraction of what a south facing roof would generate. Using the rating of the inverter to dictate net metering rules is an unfair and lazy method of accounting for high generation users. My system doesn't even offset my own power use so punishing me as if I am generating too much is not fair. In addition Duke's accounting is completely ignoring the migration to electric vehicles. After getting Plug in hybrid vehicles my power bill is back to what it was before I installed solar in the first place. If these new rules go into affect my break even point will be so far away that I would regret installing them in the first place. Rooftop solar for my house had a break even of about 10 years under the existing rules. Under these new rules I may never hit break even. This is even with the duke credit and Federal tax incentives. These new rules will absolutely devastate roof top solar. Only the uninformed would install rooftop solar if these rules are put into place.

**From:** [Terry and Beverly Burt](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Terry and Beverly Burt  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:21:12 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Terry and Beverly Burt

### Email

twburt@hotmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

On November 8, the NCUC rejected the SaveNCSolar petition to hold an expert hearing on net metering. That means a decision could come sooner rather than later. DO NOT rush this important decision. Net metering is under attack in California, too. But at least that proposal would let existing customers like us stay on their current net metering plan, because “no one wants to be told the price of your meal is going up when you are part way through eating it.” The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system. 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. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. The NCUC SHOULD conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar.

**From:** [Sharon Tripp](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Sharon Tripp  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:24:38 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Sharon Tripp

### Email

trippsl@hotmail.com

### Docket

E-100Sub180

### Message

We have invested a lot of money in our solar panelss with net metering. Please consider letting us be under a grandfather clause before you change the rules. We were given a bill of goods and it is only right we should continue under the same rules we started with. We are doing our part in helping the earth so now it is your turn to help us,

**From:** [William Price](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by William Price  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:26:27 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

William Price

### Email

810iredell@gmail.com

### Docket

E - 100 Sub 180

### Message

As a Duke Energy customer who has been using the current net metering system for our solar panels installed in 2013, I would like to object strongly to Duke Energy's proposed changes to net metering. Already, Duke Energy claims that we do not pay our fair share of keeping the grid up, despite the fact that we pay \$20 monthly to Duke Energy even in months in which we are supplying electricity to them and even though in June of every year they take, without payment, credits for excess electricity we have generated throughout the year. And they want to stack the deck even more in their favor? I strongly encourage you to write the rules so that Duke Energy profits every time they convince someone to install rooftop solar, and that the electricity generated this way is valued at the rates that Duke Energy feels is fair to charge to customers. If we need "all of the above" to make the transition to carbon free power, then I'm pretty certain rooftop solar counts.

**From:** [Michael Frick](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Michael Frick  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:29:44 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Michael Frick

### Email

green-energy@frick.dev

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

HB589 states "the rates shall be nondiscriminatory and established only after an investigation of the costs and benefits of customer-sited generation." Where is this cost-benefit study that the Commission has conducted? The Commission should, at the very least, protect existing customers by allowing them to continue at the current net metering rate for the life of their system - no bait and switch.

**From:** [Deidre Duffy](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Deidre Duffy  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:33:00 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Deidre Duffy

### Email

ddduffy88@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

We recently purchased rooftop solar for our home. Duke's proposed changes to net metering would be a hardship. Thank you for regulating the rates and services of our utilities. House Bill 589 requires that you investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made, and that investigation has yet to be conducted. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. You must conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. As you know, climate change threatens our future. Decreasing the affordability of solar makes no sense. As a utility commission, you are responsible to North Carolinians, not Duke. Thanks in advance for doing what is in our state's best interest.

**From:** [Paul F Reinmann](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Paul F Reinmann  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:35:52 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Paul F Reinmann

### Email

reinmannpf@gmail.com

### Docket

“E-100 Sub 180”

### Message

Please do not rush this important decision on NET METERING. The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system. 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 not been done. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. One point is that Residential rooftop solar allows Duke to avoid some peaking costs and this should be considered. The NCUC should conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. The proposed net metering changes would make slightly better sense if approved together with a smart thermostat incentive that would be offered to new solar customers. But that incentive is being considered in a separate proceeding and is likely to be rejected. The NCUC should decide on the smart thermostat before deciding on net metering.

**From:** [Dan Kellen](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS - Homeowner and Voter's Comments  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:36:06 PM

---

Greetings NC Utilities Commission,

My name is Dan Kellen and my wife Deneen and I are residents of Huntersville, NC. We own a home here, and have chosen NC as our retirement home state, so will be fully contributing residents to the state of NC and our communities for the balance of our lives. It also means that although we will be paying our fair full share of all types of taxes, we are on a fixed income. So the steps you are considering regarding home rooftop solar have the potential to affect our whole financial stability in our retirement.

We feel like the rule changes as proposed by the energy monopoly in this area (Duke) would:

1. Give them even more power,
2. Would allow them to further enrich themselves at the expense of those who would independently choose to try to ease this world's energy problems,
3. Would hugely and disproportionately affect those who have already reached into their own pockets to invest in making the energy grid more stable/efficient/dispersed/balanced,
4. And would deepen the disincentive for any other homeowners to ever make this investment/sacrifice again.

I strongly urge the Commission to consider:

- We should all - me, you, Duke, all citizens and companies on the planet - seek to find ways to reduce humanity's carbon footprint. Businesses especially should be looking for ways their companies and their industries can play a role in "de-carbonizing" the world's enterprises
- The energy industry needs to have a plan on how they will help the world get to "zero". It is absolutely okay to make sure your business stays whole in the meantime, but as a company who drives the whole global carbon/warming cycle, as Duke is, you MUST have a plan to get to zero. That DOES NOT mean putting up roadblocks in the way of any entities that seek that goal. It means seeking ways to SUPPORT those efforts. Especially the "little guys", the individuals who invest their own money to help solve this issue!
- I believe Duke considers themselves a "public utility". If this is true, shouldn't they treat the PUBLIC'S interest as more paramount than their profit motive? Shouldn't they be seeking to "net-zero" their profit, while investing all above zero money in their company to the overall betterment of the public's energy picture?
- Shouldn't Duke, and every company, be seeking to aim any future investments their company makes toward the betterment of their world, their customer's communities, and their company's long term health? By taking their planned approach they are actually going against all of those! Their addition of more "same-old-same-old" fossil fuel combustion generation facilities will increase their contribution to the global carbon/warming issue; it will continue to lock their customer base into an ever-increasing cost base with increasingly aged technology with an increasing human and real cost to their customers; and it will allow them to continue to delay and defer any



upgrades in their thinking or approach making their eventual "waking up" and "finally coming to the modern energy table" more expensive, perhaps prohibitively so. There is nothing "public" oriented AT ALL in their proposed approach - it is purely profit driven, intended to extend the status quo as long as they possibly can while not having to do the hard work of meeting the actual future.

I believe the NCUC should be proactive in their public stewardship responsibility by using principles which answer the following questions when deciding your path:

1. "Does this help the average homeowner, little guy?"
2. "Does this decision extend the status quo without advancing or addressing any of the challenges our customers face, or our communities face, or our state faces?"
3. "Does this make Duke, or any other public utility more profitable, or help them make their customers' (the PUBLIC!) lives better?"
4. "Is this forward-thinking, or head-in-the sand, retroactive thinking?"
5. "Will our children, or grandchildren, look back in 50 or 100 years and think you took a balanced, perhaps harder path which betters all of your stakeholders' lives, or will they think you took a path which was easy, served the few, made a bunch of money for the few, but did nothing for the betterment of anyone other than those precious few?"

I believe if you are smart, sane, sober leaders in our state's government you can apply these "rules" very effectively. I think it is possible to take the harder path to benefit all, while still finding the compromises which help keep the utilities thriving. Please do the right thing for all of our future when you consider these matters!

Greatest regards,

Dan Kellen

**From:** [Edward Kreul](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Duke Energy Net Metering Proposal, Docket E-100, Sub 180CS  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:39:23 PM

---

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I want to encourage the NCUC to compel Duke to show, quantitatively and clearly, how this proposal furthers their effort to meet the States carbon emission reduction goals. By my read, what they propose discourages installation of rooftop solar with higher infrastructure fees, and more importantly, a contorted crediting system. Case in point, I read their proposal before I installed my rooftop solar earlier this year and downsized my plan by 30% because I would essentially be giving away generated power beyond my usage in any given month once I become subject to their new scheme. Make them show you how this furthers the climate emissions goals and serves their customers. I don't think they can because I don't think it does either.

Ed Kreul  
1106 Rollingwood Ct, Leland, NC 28451  
(910) 409-7304

**From:** [John & Lynne Garrison](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by John & Lynne Garrison  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:45:18 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

John & Lynne Garrison

### Email

[garrison461099@bellsouth.net](mailto:garrison461099@bellsouth.net)

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Docket # E-100 Sub 180, Net Metering When considering changes in net metering please consider the following: Existing agreements between small solar system owners and Duke Energy should be honored unchanged, and Net metering is a proven way to attract small solar systems into the energy production system and should have extensive review prior to decisions being made. Small scale residential, roof top systems, cost Duke Energy very little and are a successful means to add to the available energy and reduce homeowners energy costs. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. John & Lynne Garrison

**From:** [Becky Laskody](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Becky Laskody  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 4:52:32 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Becky Laskody

### Email

blaskody@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke Energy already makes me pay every month to buy my solar power with buy all/sell all. They need to prove the reasons to change their net-metering program too. House Bill 589 requires that the NCUC investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made, and some investigation like that needs to be conducted before changing the rules for net metering.

**From:** [Thomas M Potter](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Thomas M Potter  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:09:31 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Thomas M Potter

### Email

tmpotter@coastalnet.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Net metering needs to be preserved and enhanced in North Carolina. Many private citizens have expended millions of dollars to install solar systems at their homes. Currently Duke/Progress Energy does not pay these private owners for any excess electricity produced, which hinders further development of private solar systems. Many landowners like myself would be willing to expand their solar systems if it were profitable. This would have a two-fold impact on solar production in North Carolina. First it would provide the incentive for more private solar systems development; and second, it would lessen the impact on taking valuable farmland out of production for solar systems. There are thousands of opportunities across North Carolina for farmsteads to install solar systems on current buildings and adjacent open lands around their farmsteads. Such opportunities would allow minority and underserved farm operations as well as farm operations in general to be more sustainable and will offer them opportunities to maintain these important farming operations instead of having to sell their farms for development. North Carolina is experiencing one of the country's highest rates of open space conversion to development. This conversion not only significantly impacts the agriculture community but all of the citizens of our great state.

**From:** [Andrew Miller](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Andrew Miller  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:12:27 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Andrew Miller

### Email

drewphy@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I ask the utilities commission to please slow down this process. Duke, in their best interest, has made a seemingly compelling case for their argument regarding net metering, but there's more than one perspective worth considering here. I am a solar customer and became one under the net-metering arrangement of some 2 years ago. I believe I am helping Duke Energy maintain ample electricity supply, to the benefit of all Duke Energy customers, and I set up my residential solar with the understanding that net metering would work to my "even benefit" with electricity produced to the grid and received when needed. For reasons that, to my viewpoint, seem to benefit Duke Energy as a company, of which I am even a shareholder, Duke is pushing hard a plan that will change the rules after the game has started, so to speak, with their current solar customers. They desire to suggest that there is some unfairness with their non-solar customers, but they have no proof. If they have a good case to make, however, let the process slow down so there can be time to consider it widely and verify their assertions. If it should be found that Duke Energy does have ample proof in this matter for the board to desire recommending a change, it should be with a grandfathering in of current solar customers in the prior net-metering arrangement in which they set up their residential solar systems with Duke Energy. Make the needed changes apply to new customers going forward only. A fair arrangement includes the rights of current residential customers and grandfathering them in is only fair to those customers, myself included, in moving forward. I fear my comments, and likely similar ones of many like myself may not hold much weight against the overwhelming influence of Duke Energy and their platform in this matter. This said, I urge each commission member to be faithful to all parties involved and weigh out all comments and perspectives. Take the time needed for this. Rushing is not beneficial and if a change is the right thing to do today, then in time it will also be the right thing to do then. Time will give that assurance and I urge slowing down this process to insure the most faithful outcome for all involved.

**From:** [Mary Hawkins](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Mary Hawkins  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:20:09 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Mary Hawkins

### Email

denmary14@mail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Several years ago, I invested in 34 rooftop solar panels on my home. I writing to urge you TO KEEP OR IMPROVE OUR CURRENT NET METERING RULES. On November 8, the NCUC rejected our petition to hold an expert hearing on net metering. That means a decision could come sooner rather than later. Please do not rush this important decision. Net metering is under attack in California, too. But at least that proposal would let existing customers like me stay on their current net metering plan, because “no one wants to be told the price of your meal is going up when you are part way through eating it.” The NCUC should protect existing customers for the life of their system WITH THE CURRENT NET METERING RULES!! 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. PLEASE CONDUCT A FULL COST BENEFIT STUDY ON ROOF TOP SOLAR HERE IN NC. The proposed net metering changes would make slightly better sense if approved together with a smart thermostat incentive that would be offered to new solar customers. But that incentive is being considered in a separate proceeding and is likely to be rejected. Decide on the smart thermostat before deciding on net metering. PLEASE LET CUSTOMERS LIKE ME STAY ON THE CURRENT NET METERING PLAN OR IMPROVE IT FOR CUSTOMER LIKE ME!!!

**From:** [Jay Libutan](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Jay Libutan  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:20:45 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Jay Libutan

### Email

jlibutan@yahoo.com

### Docket

628001061

### Message

Roof solar units should be encouraged and net metering with it. Investing in solar is will help our environment and local economy. We should be harvesting free energy. Duke Energy should be investing more in renewable electricity and doing research in battery/energy storage.



**From:** [Daniel Peplinski](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Daniel Peplinski  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:45:12 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Daniel Peplinski

### Email

dpeplinski@nc.rr.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

As a residential solar customer in this state, I am writing to urge you to keep the current net metering rules. At the time we completed our planning, figured out the financing, paid for our systems, and put them into operation, those decisions were all based on an understanding of the net costs and benefits of owning and operating such a system. To change the rules without grandfathering in existing systems is unfair. If the net metering rules change, at the very least, Duke Energy should be required to pay out the difference between the two sets of rules to every affected customer for the design basis of their system (for instance, I chose to go with 30-year panels and installed them approximately 3 years ago, so my payment should be based on the difference in rules over the next 27 years). Why should Duke's shareholders get the advantage of our planning when we are not allowed to?

**From:** [Arthur Shuster](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Arthur Shuster  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:53:14 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Arthur Shuster

### Email

artieshoe@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub-180

### Message

To the Committee: Please make every effort to continue support of privately owned net metering solar systems in North Carolina! Please work to continue supports and credits for existing owners of net metering systems and protect their rights for the life of their systems. Also please act in ways to promote expanding privately owned net metering systems which will ultimately work to reduce Reliance on fossil fuels.

**From:** [Stephen Walker](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Stephen Walker  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 6:09:05 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Stephen Walker

### Email

swalk01@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

regarding new metering: - current solar customers with net metering should be allowed to grandfather/continue under the current plan - House Bill 589 requires that NCUC investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar. this has not happened. NCUC must conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar. Stephen Walker

**From:** [David Benson](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by David Benson  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 6:09:28 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

David Benson

### Email

dbenson12345@yahoo.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Keep net metering. It's not fair for Duke to take power I paid for with my solar panels and sell it for 100% profit. It was a big investment to purchase solar panels. One of the reasons I made the investment was net metering. If Duke stops net metering it will reduce individual investment in clean energy. Don't give away our future so Duke can pocket more money.

**From:** [Steven Miner](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Docket E-100, Sub 180CS  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 6:42:46 PM

---

Before any of Duke energies proposals are accepted, an independent study of the claims and costs must be undertaken. Duke's claim that rooftop solar users are not paying enough to support the grid is unfounded. Each month's bill has a separate charge that is paid whether any power is taken from the grid or not. This fee covers those costs. If it is not sufficient then charging only the rooftop solar customers is disingenuous at best, all customers use the grid. Also, the financial incentives are already biased in Duke's favor. The reset date excess rooftop generation occurs right before the time of year when rooftop solar customers are most likely to use the excess, the summer months. Duke picks that date to reduce our savings after we pay the bill for our systems. In addition, rooftop systems provide the most energy at exactly the time of year Duke needs it most, the summer. When demand for electricity is the highest is when rooftop solar provides the most. This reduces Duke's topping energy requirements, increasing the stability of the grid and reducing Duke's need for expensive topping cycles. There is no reason why Duke should receive any additional bottom line benefit at the expense of those who are providing the benefit at their own cost.

Regards,  
Steven Miner, PhD M.E.

**From:** [bert brown](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by bert brown  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 7:13:53 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

bert brown

### Email

roscowalker@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I recently made a huge investment in rooftop solar based on the economics at the time. It would be unfair to me and many others to raise my costs and lengthen my ROI timeframe. Please stop Duke from changing net metering rules. Protect citizens, not corporations. Protect our atmosphere, not Duke profits.

**From:** [Janis Olson](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Janis Olson  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 7:18:37 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Janis Olson

### Email

jan@kolson.net

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Duke Energy takes all accumulated net metering surplus as of June 1 away from the household and small business solar arrays. So a change in the amount of net metering given back to the customer is poorly thought out. We do not get compensated for this surplus. But now Duke wants to reduce the amount that current and future customers are paid for the electricity that solar produces for the grid. If Duke paid us for the surplus we produced, then perhaps a lower rate for that amount makes sense. But they do not want to pay for the surplus that they zero out on June 1 and they use that as part of the off set for renewables that is produced. Please reject the lowering of the rates that we pay. We do pay our fair share for the power grid. A better way to handle this is like the gas companies in Georgia did. There is a pipe fee and then you choose your provider - different ones have different rates. Duke should charge all customers a "Pipe" fee and then have a rate for the electric.

**From:** [Gail Waldman](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Gail Waldman  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 8:26:21 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Gail Waldman

### Email

ladyvet3@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180 AND E-100 Sub 179

### Message

My opinions have not changed since last submission in that environmentally friendly options should be continued (solar, home owner owned!-- without lowering owner allotments nor raising fees TO consumers for....what? may i ask?-- I plan to shortly go full battery back up which will take me off the grid and will stop any further contributions TO the grid-- which is counter productive really, so why cant we just play nice for EVERYones benefit please? thank you



**From:** [Rose Cnudde](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Rose Cnudde  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 8:54:57 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Rose Cnudde

### Email

rose.cnudde@icloud.com

### Docket

e 100 -sub180

### Message

In 2014 we installed roof top solar, added more panels and a battery later, and are very happy with the Net Metering we receive. Therefore Net Metering as it exists now should remain for all solar panel owners, both old and new installation. Installing Solar Power on one's roof is not cheap, we are very happy with the continued Federal Tax credits which alleviates some of the high upfront costs. Net Metering is also part of recuperating some of our costs. We should not only think about it as Saving Money, we should also think about Saving the earth for future generations. We all have to contribute, including the Power Companies. Please preserve Net Metering as we know it. thank you. Rose

**From:** [Robert Houghton](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Robert Houghton  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:22:55 PM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Robert Houghton

### Email

robert.houghton@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

In regard to net metering: Get all the data from all the stakeholders - hold an expert hearing on net metering. This is far too critical to bum-rush the decision making. I budgeted our rooftop solar based on the current net metering plan and then spent serious cash on the setup, and now you want to crush me on that? Quit making NC citizens angry. NCUC must protect existing customers for the life of our systems. House Bill 589 has gotten it right that the NCUC must investigate the costs and benefits of rooftop solar before any changes to net metering are made. What's the holdup in getting that done? NCUC must conduct a full cost-benefit study of rooftop solar using independent analysis then let Duke and other stakeholders critique that analysis before decisions are made. Also, approve a smart thermostat incentive that would be offered to new solar customers. The thinking on this needs to be merged with rooftop solar analysis. Thank you for the time and consideration you give the citizens of this state.

**From:** [Susan Appt](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Susan Appt  
**Date:** Friday, December 9, 2022 5:53:10 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Susan Appt

### Email

eriksuewilmisc@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

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. Duke Energy claims solar customers pay less than their fair share for using the grid, but that has not been proven, and some studies show the opposite. NCUC must conduct a full cost-benefit study of roof top solar. NCUC should decide on the smart thermostat before deciding on net metering.

**From:** [rolland elliott](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by rolland elliott  
**Date:** Friday, December 9, 2022 7:14:55 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

rolland elliott

### Email

rollandelliott@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

please do everything possible to make Duke energy promote rooftop solar on residential homes. is it possible to extend the solar rebates duke was offering? Please do anything you can to limit solar sales company from making loans that are predatory.

**From:** [Steven & Myra Vagts](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Steven & Myra Vagts  
**Date:** Friday, December 9, 2022 7:20:02 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Steven & Myra Vagts

### Email

[contact@swvagts.com](mailto:contact@swvagts.com)

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

We were not lucky enough to get a rebate from Duke Energy for our 1200Kw rooftop solar system. That means that we will not recover our initial cost for our solar system for more than 20 years - nearly the life of the system! Any changes to the net metering program will probably extend this recovery past the life of the project. This would be an unfair burden on anyone in a similar situation and must be a consideration toward any changes to the present net metering agreement.

**From:** [Donna Biederman](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Donna Biederman  
**Date:** Friday, December 9, 2022 7:26:00 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Donna Biederman

### Email

djbieder@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

I installed a new solar power system because I am an environmentally responsible person and also because I wanted to help out by putting power back out to the grid. When I installed my system, I did so with the knowledge of the net metering system; the credits I would receive and be able to apply to my future electric bills weighted heavily in my decision. Now I understand there is a proposed change to the net metering rules which would have a very negative affect on me and my family. I urge you to not change the rules for those of us who installed systems based on the savings we based our decisions on. I saw this type of change can be compared to being told your meal really costs more than it does after you've already ordered and are half through eating it. This is not fair. Also, anything that can be done to stabilize our fragile energy system should be done. The current net metering rules will likely help others to make the decision to install solar panels and do their part to ensure a clean and safe supply of electrical power to North Carolinians. Please, consider the people who have (and will) make the huge financial decision to "go solar" and prioritize their needs above the huge corporations who make plenty of money off each year because of our participation in this program. Thank you!

**From:** [Robert R Severs](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Robert R Severs  
**Date:** Friday, December 9, 2022 7:41:34 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Robert R Severs

### Email

bob.severs@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

Please consider deciding on the smart thermostat before deciding on net metering. Our state should do it utmost to support environmental policies that attract people to our mountains, foothills, and coast.

**From:** [Laura Oliver](#)  
**To:** [Statements](#)  
**Subject:** Statement of Position Submitted by Laura Oliver  
**Date:** Friday, December 9, 2022 7:42:02 AM

---

## Statement of Position Submitted

### Name

Laura Oliver

### Email

macsmymybaby@gmail.com

### Docket

E-100 Sub 180

### Message

PLEASE go with carbon plan! We are running out of time! THANK YOU!