

# OFFICIAL COPY

E-2 Sub 1150

Docket E-2 Sub 1195

January 21, 2018

From:

Randy W. Johnson  
P O Box 624  
Four Oaks, NC 27524

TO : Chief Clerk, NC Utilities Commission.  
4325 mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27602

**FILED**

JAN 28 2019

Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

Pursuant to G.S 62-73 I am filing a complaint against Duke Energy Progress with the N. C. Utilities commission based on omission of Evidence in docket e-2 sub 1150 and "order" granted by N.C. Utilities Commission because of omission of required costs up to this date.

I am a rate paying consumer to Duke Energy Progress.

Docket E-2 sub 1150 does not meet the requirements for G.S 62-2(4a)-lower rates over the operating lives of such new facilities.

The N.C. Utility Commission granted an order for Duke Energy Progress to construct, operate and maintain a 230 kv transmission line in Johnston County. The route they chose is 11.5 miles long when there was a 6.27 mile route that was a viable option. There is no way that this will be in compliance with G.S. 62-2(4a).

Docket E-2 sub 1150 never had the costs of construction, maintenance and operation. My question is how did the public staff make this recommendation, and how did the N.C. Utilities Commission approve the docket without the "costs"? The proof that it is not in the docket is in the transcript. Timothy Same testifies under oath the costs are not in the docket.

Another matter I will contend is that Duke energy progress filed a late filed exhibit showing construction costs only. This exhibit was entered into the record without authorization. I have the transcript. The intervenor was not given notice this was going to be done, so he could not object or present on the topic.

This shows route 31 will costs N.C. rate payers **\$543,150.00** more to construct. This is in direct conflict with G.S. 62-2(4a)

I request N.C. Utility Commission to show me page # and line # where they authorized this into the record.

I would also like to speak to the dismissal request of Robert W. Kaylor. Mr Kaylor states that this is untimely and states Mr Canaday had an opportunity to present at a public hearing. Mr Canaday never had the costs before the hearing or during the proceedings. The only thing untimely in this situation is the omission of the associated costs of this project that were a requirement to start with. I would like to

~~E-2 sub 1195~~

give Mr. Kaylor the same opportunity to prove the costs of construction, maintenance and operation are in the docket. Show me page # and line item # for each.

As a taxpayer in north Carolina, I expect the General Statutes of north Carolina to be followed. I should not have to hire a lawyer, when the general assembly has Statutes in place to protect it's citizens.

As a rate payer, I expect duke energy progress to follow these statutes to protect rate paying consumers from wasteful spending.

I would like an opportunity to intervene in the the proceedings of docket e-2 sub 1195 on behalf of myself and every other rate paying consumer in north Carolina.

Duke Energy progress has not abided by the general statutes of north Carolina. The N.C. Utility commission has not abided by the general statutes of North Carolina.

Where are the costs that were ruled on??????? Page # line item #.

Where is the comparison of the routes with construction, maintenance and operation? What was the totals. To this date neither Duke Energy nor the N.C. Utilities Commission has provided the costs for public record.

Mr. Kaylor states in his dismissal requests that this is "wasteful" of the commissions judicial resources." I would like to contend this statement. I pay the governors' salary and he appointed the Utility commission, so in a way I pay their salary as well. I would like this matter reopened. There are too many omissions of critical information that was required and to this date is not available. The only wasteful item here is the fact that Duke energy wants to build an 11.5 mile transmission line when a 6.27 mile line satisfies the general statutes (62-2(4a). Wasteful to the rate payer.

In closing, both Duke energy and the N.C. Utility Commission states that docket E-2 sub 1150 met the requirements of the general statutes. Just stating that will not suffice in this case. Show me page # and line item # for costs of construction, operation and maintenance. Then, lets do the math on the four routes and see which route complies-----reply requested!!!!!!



Randy W. Johnson  
P.O. box 624  
Four Oaks, NC 27524

January 21, 2018

From: *ED Koontz*

TO : Chief Clerk, NC Utilities Commission.  
4325 mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27602

Pursuant to G.S 62-73 I am filing a complaint against Duke Energy Progress with the N. C. Utilities commission based on omission of Evidence in docket e-2 sub 1150 and "order" granted by N.C. Utilities Commission because of omission of required costs up to this date. In addition, Duke Energy is wasting resources that I have to pay for by selecting a higher cost route over the life cycle of such facility

I am a rate paying consumer to Duke Energy Progress.

Docket E-2 sub 1150 does not meet the requirements for G.S 62-2(4a)-lower rates over the operating lives of such new facilities.

This is wasteful spending by Duke Energy progress.

Docket E-2 Sub 1150 up to this date omitted operations and maintenance costs.

The construction costs of route 31 is \$543,150.00 more than route 4. As a rate payer, I object to paying this higher amount.

I request that G.S. 62-2(4a) to be followed.

*Ed Koontz*  
9333 Barker Road  
New Hope, NC 27562

January 21, 2018

From: James Tarrence

TO : Chief Clerk, NC Utilities Commission.  
4325 mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27602

Pursuant to G.S 62-73 I am filing a complaint against Duke Energy Progress with the N. C. Utilities commission based on omission of Evidence in docket e-2 sub 1150 and "order" granted by N.C. Utilities Commission because of omission of required costs up to this date. In addition, Duke Energy is wasting resources that I have to pay for by selecting a higher cost route over the life cycle of such facility

I am a rate paying consumer to Duke Energy Progress.

Docket E-2 sub 1150 does not meet the requirements for G.S 62-2(4a)-lower rates over the operating lives of such new facilities.

This is wasteful spending by Duke Energy progress.

Docket E-2 Sub 1150 up to this date omitted operations and maintenance costs.

The construction costs of route 31 is \$543,150.00 more than route 4. As a rate payer, I object to paying this higher amount.

I request that G.S. 62-2(4a) to be followed.

James Tarrence

3832 Copperhead Rd.

↓

7705 Woods Creek Rd:

Aper, NC 27539

January 21, 2018

From:

Betty Denmark

TO : Chief Clerk, NC Utilities Commission.  
4325 mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27602

Pursuant to G.S 62-73 I am filing a complaint against Duke Energy Progress with the N. C. Utilities commission based on omission of Evidence in docket e-2 sub 1150 and "order" granted by N.C. Utilities Commission because of omission of required costs up to this date. In addition, Duke Energy is wasting resources that I have to pay for by selecting a higher cost route over the life cycle of such facility

I am a rate paying consumer to Duke Energy Progress.

Docket E-2 sub 1150 does not meet the requirements for G.S 62-2(4a)-lower rates over the operating lives of such new facilities.

This is wasteful spending by Duke Energy progress.

Docket E-2 Sub 1150 up to this date omitted operations and maintenance costs.

The construction costs of route 31 is \$543,150.00 more than route 4. As a rate payer, I object to paying this higher amount.

I request that G.S. 62-2(4a) to be followed.

Betty Denmark  
3629 Hamilton Mill Drive  
Raleigh, NC 27626

January 21, 2018

From: Steven Anstoeffer

TO : Chief Clerk, NC Utilities Commission.  
4325 mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27602

Pursuant to G.S 62-73 I am filing a complaint against Duke Energy Progress with the N. C. Utilities commission based on omission of Evidence in docket e-2 sub 1150 and "order" granted by N.C. Utilities Commission because of omission of required costs up to this date. In addition, Duke Energy is wasting resources that I have to pay for by selecting a higher cost route over the life cycle of such facility

I am a rate paying consumer to Duke Energy Progress.


Docket E-2 sub 1150 does not meet the requirements for G.S 62-2(4a)-lower rates over the operating lives of such new facilities.

This is wasteful spending by Duke Energy progress.

Docket E-2 Sub 1150 up to this date omitted operations and maintenance costs.

The construction costs of route 31 is \$543,150.00 more than route 4. As a rate payer, I object to paying this higher amount.

I request that G.S. 62-2(4a) to be followed.

  
2816 Glastonbury Road  
Apex, NC 27539