

Today I sent out the correspondence (below) to each NC Republican State Senator.

We recommendation is that you:

a) spend 15 minutes so that you can better understand this important issue, *and*

b) call as many [Senators](#) as you can to express your opposition against this special interest, anti-citizen bill.

[It is particularly important to call Senator Bill Rabon's office, as he is the chairman of the Senate committee where H589 will be first reviewed. His phone is [919-733-5963](tel:919-733-5963).]

Let me know any questions.

regards,

john droz, jr.

Morehead City, NC

Senator XYZ:

I'm *extraordinarily* concerned about a horrifically bad bill that was just quickly shoved through the House by a powerful special-interest lobby coalition – and now on its way to you: [H589](#).

If you only have two minutes to get the basic understanding of why this is bad for NC citizens, small

businesses, the environment and our military, then read [this](#) and [this](#).

The soundbite here is that H589 has: **2± pages of good material and 18± pages of handouts, perks, gifts, freebees, benes, subsidies, and other forms of welfare for the solar industry – almost all of which are a detriment to the state and its citizens.**

If you have the time to spend fifteen minutes on this exceptionally important matter, please read the material below.

In either case please **vigorously oppose the senate version of this very poor legislation.**

Let me know any questions.

John Droz, jr.
physicist
Morehead City, NC

That [H589](#) was passed with substantial Republican support is a black eye to our state, and the Republican party. Despite the self-serving pronouncements you might have heard about this bill, please consider the following:

1) If you knew nothing else about H589 other than it was written/supported by: The Southern Environmental Law Center, the Sierra Club, NC Sustainability Energy Association, the Environmental Defense Fund, The Nature Conservancy, etc. – would you think that it was a bill that benefitted consumers, small businesses and the military, **or** *the entrenched solar industry?*

2) If you knew nothing else about H589 other than it was being promoted by the same lobbying contingent that passed the disastrous [Senate Bill 3](#) (2007), would you think that these people are now suddenly acting in the best interests of the state and its people – *or to further promote their political agenda?*

3) If you knew nothing other than what the H589 bill sponsor [said](#): “all the renewable energy people standing up saying they’re in support of this.” Of *course* all the renewable industry is ecstatic about this measure – just like they were euphoric about the horrifically bad Senate Bill 3 in 2007! *Where’s the quote about this truly benefitting the public?*

4) If you knew nothing else than H589 was drafted up months ago – yet the total time between when it was officially posted on the state’s legislator website, and it had a House floor vote was about twenty four (24) hours, what would you think? Clearly it says that the bill’s

authors and sponsors *did not want legislators or citizens to be aware of what was transpiring.*

5) If you knew nothing else than the version of this bill that was presented to stakeholders (which included me) was *significantly* different from what appeared in H589 – wouldn't that tell you that this was not actually approved by the purported stakeholders, but rather *a suspicious back-room deal concocted by special interest lobbyists?*

One of H589's (Republican) sponsors wrote this week: "This bill will SAVE the ratepayers almost a Billion dollars over ten years, by putting new solar development out to bid. Conversely, if we DON'T PASS this bill, ratepayers would end up paying Millions of dollars in higher rates."

My response to that is:

1) Not to be picky, but it seems like there is a fundamental error in the math here. How can the choice be between saving a Billion or spending Millions???

2) He is laboring under the illusion that solar energy is a good energy option, and the more the better for NC. That is exactly the view of the solar proponents mentioned above, but it is an extraordinarily major **unproven assumption.**

4) The [State's Republican Platform](#) clearly says that they oppose anything that is contrary to free-market enterprise. Yet H589 not only continues the anti-democratic anti-

Republican concept of a forced mandate, but it appears to actually increase it from what it was!

3) If this H589 sponsor's true objective was to save ratepayers money, then he should be writing a bill that kills [Senate Bill 3](#) (2007) – which is the culprit behind this entire unscientific charade. *Where's that legislation?*

The same sponsor also said:

“In other words solar, to be used, must be the lowest cost energy - by being below ‘avoided costs’ - therefore guaranteeing ratepayers savings.”

This is a **much** more complicated matter than he is implying – or than he probably understands. The fact is that the NCUC “[Avoided Cost](#)” calculation has become a **political number** that is more about promoting renewable energy. **The main thing to understand is that in NC, the “avoided cost” has basically *nothing* to do with giving consumers the lowest cost reliable electrical energy option.** (Here is a NC [article](#) about solar avoided costs.)

The solar proponents who wrote H589 are well aware that their lobbyists have successfully gamed the system, and H589 is a logical expansion of their plan to continue to generate even more generous handouts for the solar industry (and subsequently the wind industry).

Another legislator's written response (to multiple constituents) in support of H589 was:

"H589 is supposed to be addressing the PURPRA reducing the number of years obligating the energy companies from 15 to 4.5 years to contract with the solar companies."

My comments about that:

1) This response gives another good indication of the superficial understanding of what most legislators have about H589, as there is no such thing as "PURPRA." They were trying to say [PURPA](#) (Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act).

2) Yes the PURPA part is a good thing. However that beneficial provision can be spelled out in one paragraph of H589 – so why do they need twenty pages?

3) The fact is that ALL of the benefits of this law can be written on a 2± pages. The other eighteen (18) pages are all about benefiting the solar industry, to the detriment of consumers, small businesses and the environment.

The bottom line here is that well-paid professional lobbyists have successfully snookered some conscientious legislators by playing a game of three-card-monte on them. **These lobbyists are taking advantage of Republican legislators who never read this 20 page bill, and who have little understanding of the technical issues involved.** Instead these legislators accepted superficial soundbites foisted on them by skilled marketers.

The hope NC citizens have at this point is that NC Senators see through this sham, and resoundingly send H589 to defeat.

In the next session legislators can strip out all the solar entitlement parts of H589, and pass a 2± page bill that genuinely benefits NC citizens, small businesses, the military and our environment.

Let me know any questions.