

From: Patricia Mckenzie (pattymckenzie2001@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:31 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Patricia Mckenzie
3430 Kirklees Rd
Winston Salem, NC 27104
pattymckenzie2001@yahoo.com

(336) 765-6438

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Kurt Nichols (kurt411@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:30 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Kurt Nichols
 12059 Copper Mountain Blvd
 Charlotte, NC 28277
 kurt411@gmail.com

(239) 248-6864

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Leslie Hardie (hardie603@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:29 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Leslie Hardie
3805 Garden Rd
Burlington, NC 27215
hardie603@gmail.com

(336) 584-5602

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

TL

From: Carol Perniciaro (dixienj@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:29 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Carol Perniciaro
1505 Grove Point Rd
Wilmington, NC 28409
dixienj@aol.com

(973) 476-3563

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Kathleen Smith (katsmith176@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:28 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Smith
4228 Mouseys Corner Ln
Grimesland, NC 27837
katsmith176@gmail.com

(252) 717-9482

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Aaron Lavallee (aaronlavallee7@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:26 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Aaron Lavallee
952 Bryansplace Rd
Winston Salem, NC 27104
aaronlavallee7@gmail.com

(336) 972-9988

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Kim Brower (littlebit_27248@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:25 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Kim Brower
440 Tall Pine St
Asheboro, NC 27205
littlebit_27248@yahoo.com

(336) 629-6718

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: William Shelton (apla4061@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:23 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

William Shelton
6590 Coltrane Mill Rd
Greensboro, NC 27406
apla4061@gmail.com

(336) 674-7587

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Tiffany Randall (tifferand@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:22 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Randall
6546 Eaglecrest Rd
Charlotte, NC 28212
tifferand@yahoo.com

(704) 502-2178

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: John Bastian (jrbastian88@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:22 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

John Bastian
28 Arbor Hill Pl
Mc Leansville, NC 27301
jrbastian88@gmail.com

(757) 630-0664

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Ti ta

From: Gus and Linda Preschle (exploor@triad.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:20 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

As a senior citizen, I am living on a fixed income. Please do your best to keep North Carolina Affordable for us.

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Gus and Linda Preschle
1023 Feldspar Ln

Lewisville, NC 27023
exploor@triad.rr.com
(336) 201-2026

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Dom Frate (dcfrate2@uncg.edu) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:20 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

The Gas coming down this pipeline is gas to be sold overseas. This is another example of the Taxpaying citizen subsidizing Corporate Profit. GIVE US A BREAK- we are not a stupid people.

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Dom Frate

510 Charter PI
Greensboro, NC 27405
dcfrate2@uncg.edu
(336) 273-8237

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Walt Dietrich (727fr8dog@embarqmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:19 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In addition, the corporations should be made to pay for all future environmental impacts that arise from poor construction and substandard piping used for this pipeline. As a taxpayer I am tired of paying for their errors or neglect of considering impacts to the environment and our health.

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Walt Dietrich
429 Summerlea Dr
Fayetteville, NC 28311
727fr8dog@embarqmail.com
(910) 488-3118

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Barbara Bray (obagldog@bellsouth.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:19 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bray
2348 Scotts Hill Loop Rd
Wilmington, NC 28411
obagldog@bellsouth.net

(910) 686-0293

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

OFFICIAL COPY

Sep 27 2018

From: Jennifer Kain (bskain@ameritech.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:19 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Kain
264 Oxfordshire Dr
Fuquay Varina, NC 27526
bskain@ameritech.net

(317) 837-9402

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Roger Coates (rrjcoates@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:17 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Roger Coates
5616 Glenkirk Rd
Charlotte, NC 28210
rrjcoates@yahoo.com

(704) 552-6815

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Deborah Fox (rkmommycat@msn.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:17 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Deborah Fox
102 Balboa Ct
New Bern, NC 28560
rkmommycat@msn.com

(252) 259-9663

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

TL- ...a

From: Christine Payden-Travers (paydentraverson@verizon.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:16 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Christine Payden-Travers
108 E Devonshire St
Winston Salem, NC 27127
paydentraverson@verizon.net

(434) 384-4744

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Marcia Summers (summersmarcia@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:13 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Marcia Summers
8044 Glengarriff Rd
Clemmons, NC 27012
summersmarcia@hotmail.com

(336) 778-8747

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Ms Mary Hill (wbartramnews@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Ms Mary Hill
141 Country Club Dr
Edenton, NC 27932
wbartramnews@gmail.com

(864) 242-2176

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Diane Wallace (dianew@cityofws.org) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Diane Wallace
2503 Nc Highway 66 S
Kernersville, NC 27284
dianew@cityofws.org

(336) 554-3869

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Laurie Carroll (sunshinegal123@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

I DO NOT TRUST ANY GROUP AFFILIATED WITH DUKE ENERGY! DUKE HAS REPEATEDLY TRIED TO CHARGE THEIR COSTS IN DIRTY ENERGY CLEANUP BACK TO THE PEOPLE WHO PAY DUKE'S ELECTRIC BILLS. THIS IS WRONG, AND THE PIEDMONT CHARGES SHOULD NOT BE PAID BY COMMUNITIES AND RATE-PAYERS!

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Laurie Carroll
128 Jordan Dr
New Bern, NC 28562
sunshinegal123@yahoo.com
(252) 631-2417

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Thru

From: Jack Dewar (jandjdewar@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:11 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Jack Dewar
714 Murray Hill Rd
Fayetteville, NC 28303
jandjdewar@aol.com

(910) 868-5405

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Thre
a

From: Angela Guinan (anniekay44060@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:11 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Angela Guinan
554 Watts Rd
Lumberton, NC 28360
anniekay44060@yahoo.com

(910) 674-3087

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Michael Sommer (michael@sommer.us.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:10 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Michael Sommer
17925 Kings Point Dr Apt I
Cornelius, NC 28031
michael@sommer.us.com

(704) 987-0540

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: David Galloway (dhgallow@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:08 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

David Galloway
2332 McClintock Rd Unit 201
Charlotte, NC 28205
dhgallow@gmail.com

(919) 495-1107

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: W. Marvin Winstead, Jr. (marvinwinstead@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

W. Marvin Winstead, Jr.
540 Sandy Cross Rd
Nashville, NC 27856
marvinwinstead@gmail.com

(252) 459-2544

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Geneva Metzger (geneva.metzger@outlook.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:07 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Geneva Metzger
2604 Overbrook Dr
Greensboro, NC 27408
geneva.metzger@outlook.com

(336) 288-1877

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

From: Fred Martin (famiv@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:05 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Fred Martin
820 Woodruff Pl
Charlotte, NC 28208
famiv@yahoo.com

(704) 604-0096

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

OFFICIAL COPY

Sep 27 2018

From: Cw Langston (cwstringston@nc.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:04 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Cw Langston
10 McDonald Rd E
Pinehurst, NC 28374
cwstringston@nc.rr.com

(910) 295-1980

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.