

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Pecquet  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Pecquet

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Darren Ramsey  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Darren Ramsey

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Bruce Weitz  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Bruce Weitz

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Glenda Williams  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Please stop Unfair Rate Hikes

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Glenda Williams

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Doneda Sebastian  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Doneda Sebastian

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Catherine Frederick  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Catherine Frederick

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Dawn Ehli  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Dawn Ehli

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Thomas Walencik <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Thomas Walencik

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Lisa Kennedy  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Lisa Kennedy

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of paul babelay  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Rate hike unfair and unwarranted

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

To whom it may concern:

I could repeat facts and figures - you already know them. I could voice my personal complaints - you've heard them. So let's just say it...

You're making plenty already. Do the right thing, and charge a fair price. We already pay too much Please drop the proposed hike, and instead, how about giving your faithful customers a reward... a "thank you" for paying our bills faithfully.

How about a 4% reduction. Is that so ridiculous?

What a concept. You reward us, help us, recognize us, for making YOU money. Might go a long way in improving your image in the community. Which currently, is pretty low.

Sincerely,  
Paul Babelay.

PS I have every bill for the past 15 years at my current residence. Interesting.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. paul babelay  
55 heritage mtn place  
fairview, NC 28730  
(828) 542-0361

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of paul babelay  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Rate hike unfair and unwarranted

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

To whom it may concern:

I could repeat facts and figures - you already know them. I could voice my personal complaints - you've heard them. So let's just say it...

The proposed rate increase is a slap in the face to the loyal customers that have already been gouged for years. When is enough enough?

Please continue to fight for reasonable rates for us.

Sincerely,  
Paul Babelay.

PS I have every bill for the past 15 years at my current residence.  
Interesting.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. paul babelay  
55 heritage mtn place  
fairview, NC 28730  
(828) 542-0361  
pbabelay@bellsouth.net

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of James Smith  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. James Smith

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Irene McJLarty  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:34 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Irene McJLarty

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Becky Estes  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:34 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Becky Estes

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Michael Roberson  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Unfair Rate Hike

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Michael Roberson

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Sandra Hartford  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Oppose Duke Energy Progress Rate Hike

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sandra Hartford

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Julie Shaw  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:04 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Julie Shaw

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Rainey  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:04 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Rainey

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Deborah Prusisz  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:04 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Deborah Prusisz

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of James Jones  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:04 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** I cannot afford to pay more for my energy.

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. James Jones

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of George Mahaney  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Please don't increase rates - too hard on too many people

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. George Mahaney

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Linda Stovall  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** where will it end with these hikes to fix things that should not be my responsibility.

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When I researched places to live I found NC to be a lower cost of living which would help with my limited senior income. BUT I am paying much more for energy here than I did on the West Coast which is known for being among the highest in the nation. Something's wrong. People have less income here but pay more??

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Wilbur Thomas  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 11:34 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

I might add that many customers are on fixed incomes which make it especially difficult to maintain a living budget that has little room for such increases. And for the reasons put forth.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Elizabeth Garber  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Utilities Commission

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Elizabeth Garber

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kimberly Earp  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Don't Turn Out the Lights

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates. My husband and I have looked at ranch homes throughout the Piedmont Area of NC due to our needs to have better access to home, work and medical facilities. I worked in Rocky Mount, NC for 2 years as a nurse, driving 1-2 hours one way to work because we could not afford the utilities bill in Rocky Mount at more than 3 times the our current rate. We also looked at homes in Clayton and Johnston County but had to cancel a showing after investigating a home because it is in the city of Clayton and the utilities and taxes are 2-3 times what we are currently paying.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month. If your company could increase the access and incentives for solar power to all of your consumers this would help both locally and globally.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs. You also have an obligation to the consumer to provide fair market price for your service.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Again, Don't Turn Out the Lights! Be part of the solution not the problem.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Kimberly Earp  
1021 Snow Peak Court  
Raleigh, NC 27603  
(919) 818-7450  
kpearp@gmail.com

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jamie Sullivan <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 5, 2020 7:02 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Why should I subsidize shareholder returns?

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize citizens' interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Jamie Sullivan

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Patrick Doyle  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 5, 2020 7:02 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** PUC Commissioners

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Patrick Doyle

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of William L and Mrs.Gunilla M Alford <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 9:35 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. William L and Mrs.Gunilla M Alford

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Billie Goodman  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 11:05 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Duke has enough \$\$\$

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Billie Goodman

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of SARITA HARKNESS  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 11:20 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. SARITA HARKNESS

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Quince Reynolds  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 11:20 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Quince Reynolds

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kimberly Whitmire  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 11:35 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** No Rate Hike

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Kimberly Whitmire

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Alberta Chalileh <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 11:50 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Alberta Chalileh

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Elizabeth Radtke  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 3:45 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Elizabeth Radtke

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of d pal singh-kahlon <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 9:46 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes HereIn the age of solars...energy conservation, this increase in rates is uncalled for.

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of d pal singh-kahlon <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 9:46 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes HereIn the age of solars...energy conservation, this increase in rates is uncalled for.

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Nancy Bellamy  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 1:38 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Nancy Bellamy

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Karen Takas  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 2:07 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** I SAY "NO" TO UNFAIR RATE HIKES!

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates. I had nothing to do with the coal ash issue so I don't want to pay for it.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Karen Takas

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Carol Yeazell  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 2:08 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Being billed for the actual energy I need is my responsibility, but nothing more.

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Sincerely,  
Carol Yeazell  
520 Crowfields Ln.  
Asheville, NC. 28803

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Brent Hill  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 9:08 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Brent Hill

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Susan Thornbrough  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 11:47 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Do Not Raise our Rates!

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Susan Thornbrough

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of William Gladstone <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 9, 2020 12:08 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. William Gladstone

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of CR Spence  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 2:33 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** We Have PAID WHILE THIS FAT CAT FOR YEARS. Time for stock holders to PAY . NOT CONSUMER

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Janeen Veglahn  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 1:34 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** I don't want to pay for Duke Energy mistakes

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Janeen Veglahn

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jim Lieb  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2020 10:05 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Consumers are getting squeezed from future infrastructure upgrade charges, coal-ash cleanup charges and Duke Energy's bumbli...

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Albert Henderson  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 6:48 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** when is enough. Enough? We, your captured consumers can stand but so much.

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Albert Henderson

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of W. D. Jones  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 7:46 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Unreasonable and excessive

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. D. Jones

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Rodney White  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 10:47 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Barely afford rates as they are now!

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

Working class people, the poor, and many retirees cannot or barely afford the current rates! Think about young families with several children. Family are still a big part of the glue of our society.

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of SUZANNE PRATT  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 1:08 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** To whom it may concern:Adding this hardship to an already restricted budget in terms of income for me and alot of other famil...

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of SUZANNE PRATT  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2020 1:08 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** To whom it may concern:Adding this hardship to an already restricted budget in terms of income for me and alot of other famil...

Mar 8, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,