

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of George Quinn  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. George Quinn

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gregory Mattson  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Gregory Mattson

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Susan Kelley  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 9, 2020 9:47 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 9, 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. Susan Kelley

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Woon Cheung Tong  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 12:02 AM  
**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 thooe 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. Woon Cheung Tong

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Nancy Wilson  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 12:02 AM  
**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. Nancy Wilson

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of William Radke  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 12:32 AM  
**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 Radke

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Harold Dawson  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 12:32 AM  
**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. Harold Dawson

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Breque Tyson  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 2:02 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Breque Tyson



**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of William H. Oliver  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 2:32 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Nothing seems to affect Duke's steady march to more and bigger profits. Do we not have any mechanism of accountability for t...

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Richard Artis  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 3:32 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Increases in electric

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Richard Artis

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Payne  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 4:02 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Citizens on Fixed Income Can't afford continued increases

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

Dear Sir

My Wife and I are on a fixed income cannot continue to see increases in basic utilities. Each month it seems as if Duke energy is requesting another rate hike. All to pay for there mistakes and clean up coal ash pond spills they created themselves. We the customers did not cause this issue. If I would spill in my kitchen it would be my responsibility to pay to clean it up.

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 Payne  
113 D White Pine Circle  
Building D  
Franklin, NC 28734  
(828) 360-1060  
johnpayne@morrisbb.net

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Mary O'Connor  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 4:32 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Unfair Rate Hikes

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Dr. Mary O'Connor

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Errol Stone  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 4:32 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Errol Stone

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Patricia Burks  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 4:32 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Patricia Burks

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Linda Toon  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 4:32 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Miss Linda Toon

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020



**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Libda Woolard  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 4:32 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Duke Progress Energy, I command you in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth that you will not raise your rates rate is NC - A...

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Robert Ferone  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 5:02 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Ferone

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Susie Nesbitt  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 5:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Susie Nesbitt

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Mary Sapp  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 6:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Mary Sapp

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Hank Burnett  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 6:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Hank Burnett

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Suzanne Fix  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 6:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Please remember those of us on fixed incomes! Say NO to Duke

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

The rate increase being requested by Duke is unreasonable and unfair!

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,

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Peter McHugh  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Rate increase unwarranted

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Peter McHugh

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Cindy DeGrave  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Cindy DeGrave

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020



Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Signora Parks  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Signora Parks

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of George Quinn  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. George Quinn

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Nontombi Tutu  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Nontombi Tutu

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of lorraine degeas  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. lorraine degeas

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Olen Roberts  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 7:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Olen Roberts

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of STEVEN KOZLOW  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. STEVEN KOZLOW

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Nicole Rodeia  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Nicole Rodeia

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gary Browning  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Barely getting by

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

Social security doesn't go very far. Rate hikes just compound our frustrations and worries.

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

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020



**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Shawn Carr  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Shawn Carr

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Gladys Beach  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Gladys Beach

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of PAMELA SMITH  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. PAMELA SMITH

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jimmy Dean  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Jimmy Dean

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Henry Tedder  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 8:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Henry Tedder

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of JAMES Michael  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** We are retired on fixed incomes. We just can't continue to have constant increasing utility payments. Please do not allow DU...

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Peter Veit  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Peter Veit

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Donald Seal  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Donald Seal

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020



Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Donald Seal  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Donald Seal

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Donald Seal  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Donald Seal

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Henry Parrish  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:03 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Henry Parrish

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Sandra Beard  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Ms. Sandra Beard

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of George Middleton  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. George Middleton

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Brian LEWIS  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Brian LEWIS

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Lisa Leppo  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Dr. Lisa Leppo

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of John Chokota  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. John Chokota

OFFICIAL COPY

Mar 09 2020



**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Arthur Hughes  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mr. Arthur Hughes

**Conyers, Tamika**

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Jeff Gilleland  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** DO NOT ALLOW Duke Energy to Pass the Costs of their Criminal Activity to NC Citizens

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

PLEASE -- Do Not Allow Duke Energy to Pass the Costs of their Criminal Activity to NC Citizens.

If we allow DUKE's RUSE, we are endorsing criminal activity (effectively saying: "YES, COMMIT A CRIME, and when you get caught, CHARGE THE COSTS OF YOUR CRIME TO NC CITIZENS.").

I recommend that NC Utility Commission consider actions similar to CA's approach to PG&E's mismanagement that led to "wild fires" that destroyed hundreds of thousands of acres ...and >\$21-billion in losses... including human life. CA took their REGULATORY RESPONSIBILITIES very seriously! --- and so should NC.

It's time that NC HOLD DUKE ACCOUNTABLE!!!

NC CITIZENS ARE WATCHING THIS ISSUE CLOSELY.

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. Jeff Gilleland  
200 Weston Estates Way  
Morrisville, NC 27560-6988  
(919) 678-0918  
gilleland.jeff@gmail.com

Conyers, Tamika

---

**From:** AARP <aarpwebact@action.aarp.org> on behalf of Amy Rich  
<aarpwebact@action.aarp.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 6, 2020 9:33 AM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** Target Letter Subject Line Goes Here

Mar 6, 2020

NC Utilities Commission

Dear Utilities Commission,

When it comes to our electricity, I want to pay for the actual energy I use without unfair shifts in cost being proposed by Duke which would hike our rates.

Rate hike requests by Duke Energy Progress would not only force us to pay for the company's coal ash cleanup, but includes a grid improvement plan that is excessive: \$8.7 billion over ten years. Since the company earns a return on its infrastructure spending, "gold plating" grid improvements with unnecessary items makes our rates unaffordable.

That is why your oversight of the company's spending plan is essential. I agree with interveners who suggest this spending be dealt with elsewhere.

Additionally, the company's monthly customer charge is too high (\$14 a month before we even turn on a light). I agree with other parties it should be rolled back to \$11.15 a month.

I understand the company also has an obligation to its shareholders, but the return on equity the company is seeking is too high and could cost residential payers billions in unnecessary costs.

I hope you recognize consumer's interests and support the Public Staff's and other interveners' recommendations to trim the rate hike requests and to lower the return on equity to the 9.3% percent.

Docket Number: E-2 Sub 1219

Sincerely,

Mrs. Amy Rich