



Jack E. Jirak  
Associate General Counsel

Mailing Address:  
NCRH 20 / P.O. Box 1551  
Raleigh, NC 27602

o: 919.546.3257  
f: 919.546.2694

jack.jirak@duke-energy.com

October 1, 2020

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Ms. Kimberley A. Campbell, Chief Clerk  
North Carolina Utilities Commission  
4325 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4300

**RE: Duke Energy Progress, LLC's Proposed Deviation of Approved, New  
230 kV Transmission line in New Hanover County, North Carolina  
Docket No. E-2, Sub 1215**

Dear Ms. Campbell:

On January 10, 2020, the Commission issued a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for Duke Energy Progress, LLC ("DEP" or "the Company") in the above-referenced docket to construct approximately 4.6 miles of new 230-kV transmission line in New Hanover County, North Carolina. Previously, the Commission had cancelled the public and expert hearings because there were no significant protests filed in the docket. In its Order Granting Certificate, the Commission held that (1) DEP had carried its burden of proof in demonstrating that the proposed transmission line is necessary for an adequate and reliable supply of electric energy to its service area, and that (2) DEP demonstrated that Route 34 ("the selected route") is the preferred route and the proposed costs associated therewith are reasonable.

Forty percent of the selected route is located on one property owner's land. After the Commission issued the CPCN, the landowner submitted a preliminary development plan to DEP. In the plan, the landowner suggested routing the transmission line immediately adjacent to their property line that included several hard angles. After further discussions, the parties agreed to a negotiated route ("the alternative route") that significantly straightened the alternative route and shifted the route to the western side of the subject property. The alternate route diverges from the selected route at a specific point and terminates at a nearby tap point along the existing Castle-Hayne-Folkstone 230-kV transmission line. The remainder of the selected route is in the same location as originally shown on all other properties. For reference, a map comparing the selected route and the alternative route is attached as Attachment A; the map also shows the section of the selected route that remains unchanged.

The alternative route has been deliberately located to avoid any additional impacts to other properties. This includes placement of the right-of-way with significant buffers to keep potential danger trees, structures, and guy wires and their easements on the subject property. No easements or other land rights will be required from any third parties as a result of this reroute. Thus, the alternative route avoids any impacts, minor or major, to other parcels of land.

The alternative route is nearly identical in total length. However, the route does appear to impact more areas classified as wetland than the selected route. As a result, the estimated cost difference is an increase of 4.5% from the original cost estimate. Notably, this increase is not of sufficient significance to change the routing decision.

Under Commission Rule R8-62(d), an applicant shall file a written summary with the Commission explaining any proposed deviation from the approved certificate, unless the deviation is insignificant. The Company views this proposed deviation as insignificant because (1) the proposed deviation only changes the location of the line on tracts of property owned by a single landowner, (2) the proposed deviation will not cause additional impacts to any other adjacent property owners, and (3) the costs of the proposed deviation are minor and would not impact the route selection decision. Nonetheless, because of the subjective nature of determining the significance of a proposed deviation, the Company is providing this notification of the proposed deviation before deploying surveyors and conducting due diligence on the alternative route.

Due to the minimal impacts resulting from this proposed deviation, the Company does not believe it should be required to file an application for an amended certificate. Furthermore, the proposed deviation does not require any amendments to the Company's certificate, and the certificate is still subject to all federal and state permits. However, if the Public Staff or Commission have any questions concerning the proposed deviation, DEP can provide additional information.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jack E. Jirak". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Jack E. Jirak

Enclosure

cc: Parties of Record

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a copy of Duke Energy Progress, LLC's Proposed Deviation of Approved, New 230 kV Transmission line in New Hanover County, North Carolina, in Docket No. E-2, Sub 1215, has been served by electronic mail, hand delivery, or by depositing a copy in the United States mail, postage prepaid, properly addressed to parties of record.

This the 1<sup>st</sup> day of October, 2020.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jack Jirak".

---

Jack E. Jirak  
Associate General Counsel  
Duke Energy Corporation  
P.O. Box 1551/NCRH 20  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602  
(919) 546-3257  
[Jack.jirak@duke-energy.com](mailto:Jack.jirak@duke-energy.com)