

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Max Herrell
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 10:33 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Unrealistic PUC 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. Max Herrell

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of William Propest
<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.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. William Propest

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jean Burkard
<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.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jean Burkard

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of clay adams
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 12:03 PM
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. clay adams

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Lorraine Tomasino
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 12:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: no raises in Electricity rates

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. Lorraine Tomasino

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of James E White Jr
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 12:03 PM
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 E White Jr

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Anne Rippy
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 12:33 PM
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. Anne Rippy

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Pat Simons
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 12:34 PM
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. Pat Simons

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Tommy Wilkes
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:04 PM
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. Tommy Wilkes

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Richardson <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: They to lower the dividend they pay to share holders before taking more NC senior citizens on fix incomes.

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 KathyLynn Gariboldi <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:04 PM
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,

Miss KathyLynn Gariboldi

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jonathan Allen
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Electric rates

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. Jonathan Allen

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Richardson
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: They to lower the dividend they pay to share holders before taking more NC senior citizens on fix incomes.

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 Dagmar Canonge
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:34 PM
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. Dagmar Canonge

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Thomas Blizard
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 1:34 PM
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 Blizard

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Laurie Horner
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 2:03 PM
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. Laurie Horner

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Cheryl Vecellio
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 2:03 PM
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. Cheryl Vecellio

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of HAROLD WILLIAMSON
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 2:04 PM
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. HAROLD WILLIAMSON

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Dwight Doig
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 2:33 PM
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. Dwight Doig

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gail Colihan
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 2:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: No Increase in Duke Energy Progress

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 am on a fixed income due to being disabled. An increase in Duke Energy Progress will prevent me from buying food or paying other necessities. Please think about those who are struggling now without any help from any utilities company. For once, have a heart.

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Wilma Procter
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 2:34 PM
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. Wilma Procter

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Diane Laskowski
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 3:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Rates go up but my fixed income remains level

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. Diane Laskowski

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of VICKI WINSTEAD
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 3:04 PM
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. VICKI WINSTEAD

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of david gandolfo
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 3:33 PM
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. david gandolfo

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Margaret Young
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 3:34 PM
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. Margaret Young

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of James Roman
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 4:03 PM
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 Roman

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Ann Burns
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 4:04 PM
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. Ann Burns

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Sandra Turner
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 4:18 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes : 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,

Ms. Sandra Turner

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Vicki Mistr
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 4:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Electricity cost decrease, not increase

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,

Dr. Vicki Mistr

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Cynthia Harris
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 4:48 PM
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. Cynthia Harris

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Corrinne Williams <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 5:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Reject Duke Energy rate proposals and recommend 6% decrease

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. Corrinne Williams

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Lynn Wolfgram
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 5:04 PM
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. Lynn Wolfgram

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Thomas Harbaugh
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 5:18 PM
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,

Dr. Thomas Harbaugh

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gloria Wright
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 6:03 PM
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. Gloria Wright

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Susan Edelstein
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 6:34 PM
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. Susan Edelstein

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Denise Cornell
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 8:18 PM
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. Denise Cornell

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Sue E Feldkamp
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 8:49 PM
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. Sue E Feldkamp

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Donna Varner
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 9:04 PM
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. Donna Varner

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jorge Esguerra
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 9:04 PM
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. Jorge Esguerra

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of constantine Goulas
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 9:34 PM
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. constantine Goulas

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of constantine Goulas
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 9:34 PM
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. constantine Goulas

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Thomas Hadley
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 9:34 PM
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 Hadley

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Susan Thompson
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 9:49 PM
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. Susan Thompson

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Barbara Martin
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 12:34 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. I am on a fixed income and cannot afford this kind of increase in prices.

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.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (Even \$11 a month before we even turn on a light is excessive.)

I understand the company has an obligation to its shareholders, but who is going to take consideration for customers. the return on equity the company is seeking is outrageous and will mean subsidizing people who could afford the residential billions in unnecessary costs. That's highway robbery!

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.
Remember who does the voting in this country.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Barbara Martin
8 Rosetta Ln
Arden, NC 28704

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of MaryAnn Ingram
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 1:04 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Duke Energy, as a senior citizen who has been paying for energy since 1995 during my working years, I could afford your hikes...

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 Anne Armen
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 7:19 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Don't Raise Our Rates!

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,

Ms. Anne Armen

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jaco Davis
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 8:05 AM
To: Statements
Subject: No to 14.6 rate hike

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

Duke Energy wants us to pay for your negligence that resulted in coal ash cleanup which you don't want to do. This does not set well with me. We the public and working class finance your bonuses off our backs. I'm retired Army and we fought for every American and it's time that you give back. How much money do you need.

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 Michael Martino
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 8:49 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Help Us Fight Duke Energy Rate Hikes

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

We need your oversight of Duke Energy Progress and it's proposed rate hike!

Duke Energy Progress is a monopoly trying to hold hard-working NC citizens hostage with its bad decisions. When it comes to our electricity, we want to pay for the actual energy we use. We do not want unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

1. Duke Energy Progress is responsible for the coal ash mess that has devastated our beautiful state. We have been disgusted with the poor decisions allowing this environmental destruction. Our disgust is now compounded by the thought that Duke Energy Progress wants NC citizens to pay for the company's mistakes. Duke Energy Progress needs to take responsibility for its destructive behavior. We need you to serve your hard-working constituents to protect our earnings from paying for Duke Energy Progress mistakes.

2. We also do not agree with supporting an excessive grid improvement plan. Many citizens work more than 1 job to put food on the table and keep the electricity on. We cannot afford excessive spending in our lives and do not approve a rate hike by Duke Energy Progress to pay for its suggested excessive spend of \$8.7 billion spend over ten years. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

We need your oversight of Duke Energy Progress to ensure the company's spending plan is ONLY for the essentials.

3. Additionally, the monthly Duke Energy Progress customer charge is too high! It's \$14 a month before we even turn on a light! I agree with other parties that it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month. The return it is seeking is exorbitant and seeks to cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs. We'd like to see the return to 9.3%.

I hope you recognize your constituents' interests. Support the recommendations by Public Staff and other intervenes to promote the rate decrease and oversee the grid improvement plan. We need you to help us with this fundamental utility need. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Michael Martino
315 Boltstone Court
Cary, NC, 27513

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Michael Martino
315 Boltstone Court
Cary, NC 27513
(919) 941-5050
mmartino@nc.rr.com

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Charles Dillingham
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 9:19 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. Charles Dillingham

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Nancy Zeleniak
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 8:49 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Help us fight Duke Energy Progress suggested rate hikes!

Mar 7, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

We need your oversight of Duke Energy Progress and it's proposed rate hike!

Duke Energy Progress is a monopoly trying to hold hard-working NC citizens hostage with its bad decisions. When it comes to our electricity, we want to pay for the actual energy we use. We do not want unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

1. Duke Energy Progress is responsible for the coal ash mess that has devastated our beautiful state. We have been disgusted with the poor decisions allowing this environmental destruction. Our disgust is now compounded by the thought that Duke Energy Progress wants NC citizens to pay for the company's mistakes. Duke Energy Progress needs to take responsibility for its destructive behavior. We need you to serve your hard-working constituents to protect our earnings from paying for Duke Energy Progress mistakes.

2. We also do not agree with supporting an excessive grid improvement plan. Many citizens work more than 1 job to put food on the table and keep the electricity on. We cannot afford excessive spending in our lives and do not approve a rate hike by Duke Energy Progress to pay for its suggested excessive spend of \$8.7 billion spend over ten years. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

We need your oversight of Duke Energy Progress to ensure the company's spending plan is ONLY for the essentials.

3. Additionally, the monthly Duke Energy Progress customer charge is too high! It's \$14 a month before we even turn on a light! I agree with other parties that it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month. The return it is seeking is exorbitant and seeks to cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs. We'd like to see the return to 9.3%.

I hope you recognize your constituents' interests. Support the recommendations by Public Staff and other intervenes to promote the rate decrease and oversee the grid improvement plan. We need you to help us with this fundamental utility need. Thank you.

Nancy Zeleniak
315 Boltstone Court
Cary, NC, 27513

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Nancy Zeleniak
315 Boltstone Ct
Cary, NC 27513
(704) 221-2021
9nzh2o@gmail.com