

Rec'd 11/20/17 - M.H.

E2 Sub 1150

November 20, 2017



Mr. Christopher J. Ayers  
Executive Director Public Staff  
4326 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-4300

State of North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-2, Sub 1150 (Cleveland Matthews Project)

I am asking that <sup>the Commission</sup> <sup>KRC</sup> please deny Duke Energy Progress' request in the matter of North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-2, Sub 1150 (Cleveland Matthews Project), based on the following example of a conflict of interest.

I'd like to please ask the public staff and the Commission to review the Table 4-5 Weighted Route Scores Page 4-20, of Duke Energy Progress' (DEP) application. Weighted Route Scores included Engineering, Social and Environmental Factors. Western Route 4 has a score of -32.02, Western Route 1 has a score of -19.85 and the preferred route, Route 31 to the South has a score of -11.64.

In section 4.4.2 Weighting the Routing Factors, Page 4-11 of Duke Energy Progress' application, it states, "The Project team then assigned weights to the factors based on input from the public, agencies, Duke engineers, and experience with similar transmission line projects across the country."

I have copied from page 18 the direct testimony of Timothy J. Same and included bold, highlighted comments and references to Table 4-5 within his testimony.

Route 31 was selected as the best route for the following reasons:

- Overall lowest Residential Proximity Score among all routes, an indication of minimal potential impacts to residences and property

OFFICIAL COPY

Nov 21 2017

owners RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY SCORE INCLUDED IN TABLE 4-5

- Minimal input from concerned landowners as opposed to much greater

input along other lowest scoring routes, indicating less chance of

construction or access issues and a more positive public perception of

the Project REFER TO TESTIMONY FROM THE PUBLIC AND WRITTEN STATEMENTS

SUBMITTED TO THE DOCKET

- No open space (subdivision-owned) crossed OPEN SPACE/GREEN AREAS (ACRES) INCLUDED  
IN <sup>Kfu</sup>TABLE 4-5

- Least number of residences within 300 feet of centerline RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY SCORE  
INCLUDED IN TABLE 4-5

- No businesses or public facilities within 500 feet of centerline BUSINESSES WITHIN 500 FEET  
(NUMBER) INCLUDED IN TABLE 4-5

- No highly sensitive stream crossings STREAM SENSITIVITY SCORE INCLUDED IN TABLE 4-5

- Utilizes cropland acres when possible to avoid extensive removal of

forested areas along the route CROPLAND CROSSED (ACRES) AND UPLAND FOREST CROSSED

(ACRES) INCLUDED IN TABLE 4-5

- Crosses acres of wetland and hydric soils in a perpendicular manner,

where possible, which is beneficial not only from a construction,

access and maintenance perspective, but would also potentially require

less permitting effort in these areas WETLAND CROSSING SCORE AND ENGINEERING FACTORS

<sup>Kfu</sup>INCLUDED IN TABLE 4-5

I'd also like for the Commission to review the following testimony included in the Transcript of Testimony, Volume 2, Heard October 31, 2017, page 85 from DEP representative, "So what we do after we have the qualitative analysis is we take, you know, about the top 10 percent of the overall scoring routes and we have a further analysis with our construction and work planning organization. In this case we have a gentleman that actually lives in this area, grew up in this area, used to drive four-wheelers all over this area, and we had a very strong opinion as to the complexities of constructing the western route alternatives, you know, mapping you can look at. It's pretty clear that access and environmental concerns on the western routes was significantly higher, in our opinion, than the issues that we would have to go through on the routes to the south."

It appears that a representative of DEP, who lives and grew up in the area has a strong opinion as to the complexities of constructing the western route alternatives. The matrix that was provided by Burns and McDonnell Engineering, using criteria and data provided by DEP and using weighting factors based on input from the public, agencies, Duke engineers, and experience with similar transmission line projects across the country did not have a, "strong opinion," as to the complexities of constructing the western routes. I can cite many reasons that this project should be denied as submitted, but I will simply add that this is a glaring conflict of interest. I am sure that people who live and grew up in the southern routes would have a strong opinion as to the complexities of constructing the southern routes as well.

I am asking that you please deny Duke Energy Progress' request in the matter of North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-2, Sub 1150 (Cleveland Matthews Project), based on the conflict of interest cited, the project not being located in the area of need, lack of due process related to landowner notification and the unclear and ambiguous letters that were sent out to

landowners, among other reasons given by landowners who have submitted statements and testified in this matter.

Sincerely,

Kimberly L. Canady

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kimberly Canady". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "K" and "C".

Table 4-5 Attached

Kimberly L. Canady  
9506m Swamp Rd.  
Four Oaks, NC 27524



