Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Grace Jurkoski <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: potential rate hike

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,

Ms. Grace Jurkoski

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Alisa Hixson <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: PLEASE SAY NO TO DUKE ENERGY RATE HIKES!

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

I am outraged and disgusted that Duke Energy is proposing to raise our electricity rates.

The proposed 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 CRITICAL.

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. Alisa Hixson
155 Chatham Road
Asheville, NC 28804

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Rochelle Pascoe <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Mrs. Rochelle Pascoe

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gary Jung <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Gary Jung

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Bernard Vaudrin <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Bernard Vaudrin

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Vicki Eckman <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Duke is Poisoning Asheville NC!

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,

Ms. Vicki Eckman

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Charles Drake <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Charles Drake

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Nirbhay Singh <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Dr. Nirbhay Singh

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Thomas Swanson <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Thomas Swanson

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kathryn Walker <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Ms. Kathryn Walker

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of George Moran <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. George Moran

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Ksrl DeKing <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Ksrl DeKing

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of MITCHELL DEMSKO <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Stop The Increase

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. MITCHELL DEMSKO

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Vicki Eckman <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Duke is Already Poisioningrget Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Ms. Vicki Eckman

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Marjorie Latta <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Mrs. Marjorie Latta

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Marjorie Latta <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Mrs. Marjorie Latta

Conyers, Tamika

From: Elizabeth Acker
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:20 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Elizabeth Acker

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Elizabeth Acker

Email

eacker67@gmail.com

Docket

Docket No. E-2 Sub 1142

Message

Dear NC Utilities Commission, I would like to take this opportunity to ask that you do not approve Duke Energy's purposed asking rate increase of 14.3% for residential customers on October 30. I feel like this increase is too high for the people that depend on Duke Energy for their electric needs. I currently work with families as a Care Coordinator for the Easterseals Child First program in New Bern NC and the surrounding counties. I have seen many families struggle to pay their electric bills throughout the year, especially during the colder and warmer months. Families are just starting to try to get back to normal after Hurricane Florence devastated the area less than two years ago. Please consider these issues when making your decision. Thank you for your time, Elizabeth Acker

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Joseph Lauritzen <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Ultimately, as a customer, I have issues with subsidizing their imposed penalties for their "nistakes".

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 Barry Segel <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

I am disabled and live on Social Security. Every bill is increasing.

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.
Please help ensure I do not end up homeless

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Patrick Downey <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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 Downey

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Dennis Maurer <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Lower my rates

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

The coal ash problem is something you caused and you should be responsible for assuming the cost of cleanup, so don't raise my rate because of that. Based on the information below, you should lower my rate.

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 William Stewart <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: No higher rates, please.

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. William Stewart

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Marc Ribaudo <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Duke Energy Progress rate hike

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,

Dr. Marc Ribaudo

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Joan Pedersen <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Ms. Joan Pedersen

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Linda Woolard <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Dear Electric Company, God has blessed you in so many ways so why not be a BLESSING to your customers in Jesus Messiah name ...

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,

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Janice VanDine <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Mrs. Janice VanDine

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Chris Sokolowski <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Chris Sokolowski

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Stephen Boletchek <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Stephen Boletchek

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Ladd Smith <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Dr. Ladd Smith

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Judith Schmidt <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Ms. Judith Schmidt

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Deborah Hoffman <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: A 14% increase is unacceptable

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

It is inconceivable you would consider such a hefty increase in rates! The increase places all the burden of coal ash blunders on the customer! Your concern should be with the constituent not making sure Duke realizes an exorbitant and unnecessary profit!

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 Donald Sahly <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Dr. Donald Sahly

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kermit Brown <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Kermit Brown

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gary Abode <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Gary Abode

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Theresa Eaton <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Mrs. Theresa Eaton

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gary Barbato <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Gary Barbato

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Steven Smith <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: No new increase on customer's Duke Energy bills

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. Steven Smith

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Claire Tiernan <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

I do my best to conserve electricity and get reports from Duke each month about how efficient I am in my usage. I do not want to pay for increased electricity costs that are unnecessary. I should also not be paying for Duke's coal ash cleanup. The fact that Duke continues its efforts to raise rates on residential customers shows the company's interest is mainly to its shareholders. That is wrong.

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. Claire Tiernan
35 Brookstone Place
Candler, NC 28715
(828) 633-2442
clairetiernan1027@gmail.com

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Ben Gentry <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. Ben Gentry

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Donna Etheridge <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Ms. Donna Etheridge

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of kenneth stallings <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:03 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. kenneth stallings

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Linda Phillips <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Miss Linda Phillips

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Vicki Wilson <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Ms. Vicki Wilson

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of James Dicke <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Unfair and unnecessary rate hikes

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 (my) 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. James Dicke

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Minnie Jones <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Mrs. Minnie Jones

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Sharon Treadway <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Keep rates fair

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.
Thank you, Sharon A. Treadway

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 Van C Joffrion <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Dr. Van C Joffrion

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Dona Gartrell <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

Negligent decisions made by Duke executives sound not fall on my shoulders but come out of their pay and bonuses! 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 Johnnie Fields <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 12:02 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Dear NC Uilities Commission:

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. Johnnie Fields

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of sylvia nelson <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 11:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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,

Mrs. sylvia nelson

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of James Parker <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 11:32 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

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. James Parker