Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Manickam <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. John Manickam

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Sharon Davis <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. Sharon Davis

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Judy McClung <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. Judy McClung

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Manickam <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. John Manickam

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Manickam <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. John Manickam

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robbi Lycett <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. Robbi Lycett

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kathleen Klesh <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Stop the exorbitant Duke rate increase request

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

I agree with the Utilities Commission's Public Staff that Duke Energy should revisit it's proposed date increase and focus on the consumer.
Since Duke is a monopoly, it must feel that it can out the screws on a captive market. However, consumers should not be forced to pay to mitigate Duke's coal Ash mess nor for gold-plated infrastructure costs.
Finally, why should it cost $14 before electricity is even used? Roll back the base cost to $11.15.

Please trim the rate hike requests to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Thank you.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Kathleen Klesh
305 Luke Meadow Ln
Cary, NC 27519
(919) 267-9996
kklesh@gmail.com

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Valecia Jones <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. Valecia Jones

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Peter Chai-Seong <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Excessive Rate Increases hurt Retirees on Fixed Incomes

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.

Excessive 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. Peter Chai-Seong

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Delbert Schwab <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. Delbert Schwab

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Pamela Noah <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here: rate hike requests are unfair and punitive!

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. Pamela Noah

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Hotch <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. John Hotch

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of JAMES KELLY <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 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 KELLY

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Paul Schlemmer <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 PM
To: Statements
Subject: You really must consider the little. Guy! Why should we pay for the incompetent actions of Duke Energy?

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 Larry Ficych <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 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. Larry Ficych

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Maria Cardone <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 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. Maria Cardone

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Whitener <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Duke power is monopolizing on our need for electricity.

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.

It just seems like we're being penalized for the mess that gave power themselves made. They are also definitely a for-profit company, his only concern seems to be making their shareholders happy.

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 Ernest Zapetis <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Lower power 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. Ernest Zapetis

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Mcallister <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 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. Robert Mcallister

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Sakakeeny <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 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. John Sakakeeny

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Pamela Noah <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Le Subject Line Goes Here: Rate hike requests are unfair and punitive especially for seniors who are on a fixed income...

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 George Favretto <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:01 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 Favretto

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kirk Spurgin <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Just Say No to Unfair Rate 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.

Please put NC electricity customers first and say no to greedy corporate interests.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Phillip Walker <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. Phillip Walker

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Luciano Delgado <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. Luciano Delgado

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of David LeClair <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Excessive rate hike on power

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. David LeClair

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Luciano Delgado <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. Luciano Delgado

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Luciano Delgado <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. Luciano Delgado

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Schroeder <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. Robert Schroeder

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Peter Cregger <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. Peter Cregger

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Richard Ball <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter STOP ROBBING YOUR CUSTOMERS

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. Richard Ball

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Patricia Reid <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,

It's time to hold lawbreakers accountable especially when the US Senate abdicated its duty.

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 Melissa Payne <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: No rate increases on energy!

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. Melissa Payne

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Luciano Delgado <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. Luciano Delgado

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Charles Eison <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Statements
Subject: keep Our Energy Costs Down

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 Eison

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert McCeney <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:34 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. Robert McCeney

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Harry Moehring <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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. Harry Moehring

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Barron Asady <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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. Barron Asady

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kenneth Marks <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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 Marks

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Marianne Newman <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Please do not use rate-payers to subsidize corporate issues

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force rate-payers to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup but include an $8.7 billion grid improvement plan over ten years. I understand that the company has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I want to pay for the actual energy I use without the unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke. The company's excessive monthly customer charge should also be rolled back, as recommended, to $11.15 a month.

I urge you to recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to a reasonable amount.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Marianne Newman
32 Gaia Lane
Asheville, NC 28806-8828
(828) 257-2136
mariannenewman12@gmail.com

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Magyar <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: I am Retired and on fixed income.

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. John Magyar

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Anne Pelak <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 5, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

Hello,

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 simply can't afford another increase on my limited income.

Sincerely,

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Michael Bovelsky <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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. Michael Bovelsky

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Magyar <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: I am Retired and on fixed income.

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. John Magyar

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of William Caldwell <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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. William Caldwell

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of William Caldwell <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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. William Caldwell

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of jack padgett <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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. jack padgett

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Paula Clowers <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress

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. Paula Clowers

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Kristi Mizen <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 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. Kristi Mizen

Conyers, Tamika

From: AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Janet Huen <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 5:33 PM
To: Statements
Subject: No raising of Electrical rates

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. Janet Huen