

RE: M-2017-2631527

Dear Sirs/Madam,

The need to stimulate Pennsylvania's renewable energy independence is important to our commonwealth and encouraging in-state individuals and businesses to invest in renewable energy is part of this process. The legislature has realized that, by allowing entities outside of PA to sell their energy credits inside of the state, Pennsylvania is not-acting in its best interests.

I invested in solar energy 10 years ago. The positive effect it has on my electric energy consumption is amazing: I save at least \$700 per year on my electric bill. The solar panels have also increased the value of my home and I look forward to making a return on my initial investment when I sell the home to another who will continue to reap the energy rewards. Additionally, I am creating a better environment within the commonwealth.

Closing the borders to outside energy credits will stimulate the in-state entities to invest in renewables. This will increase jobs within the state; increase investment in the state; decrease our dependence on outside energy sources; and provide for a better future for our citizens. Additionally, as a citizen, I am committed to see that the state monies stay within the state and I vote that way.

The PUC is overstepping its authority to interpret Act 40 to grandfather in out-of-state providers. This interpretation of the Act is not within the PUC jurisdiction and, even if it was, the PUC is bound to act in the best interests of the citizens of the commonwealth. The current interpretation cannot be defended using either test.

Please change your ruling grandfathering out-of-state providers. If it is the feeling of the commission that due notice needs to be provided to those out-of-state providers, then institute a short phase-in period of 6 months to 1 year.

Respectfully,

Vincent J Paul

948 Baylowell Drive

West Chester, PA 19380