

# OFFICIAL COPY

**Threatt, Linnetta**

---

**From:** Scott Cameron (sbcam21@yahoo.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,

Scott Cameron  
2317 Gladiateur Ct  
Matthews, NC 28105  
sbcam21@yahoo.com

(704) 303-1300

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Andrew Angyal (angyal@elon.edu) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:02 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,

Andrew Angyal  
7149 Ludgate Rd  
Gibsonville, NC 27249  
angyal@elon.edu

(336) 447-0086

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Gene Fox (harborshire@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:02 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,

Gene Fox  
PO Box 628  
Kitty Hawk, NC 27949  
harborshire@yahoo.com

(207) 363-2821

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Robyn Swierszcz (r.swierszcz@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:02 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,

Robyn Swierszcz  
5716 Kemp Mundy Ln  
Charlotte, NC 28216  
r.swierszcz@aol.com

(704) 907-7867

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



## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Amanda Brewer (abrewerfamily@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:01 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,

Amanda Brewer  
735 Ann Rd  
Orrum, NC 28369  
abrewerfamily@yahoo.com

(910) 734-6730

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Pat Pavlak (ppavlak001@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:01 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,

Pat Pavlak  
3720 Worthing Ct  
Greensboro, NC 27455  
ppavlak001@gmail.com

(505) 980-7911

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Gregory Sinclair (gjhooker76@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:01 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,

Gregory Sinclair  
312 Okisco Trl  
Edenton, NC 27932  
gjhooker76@gmail.com

(252) 301-0157

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Jane Brody (janekb@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 2:00 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,

Jane Brody  
3500 Amber Dr  
Wilmington, NC 28409  
janekb@aol.com

(910) 399-4785

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



## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Toni Wiker (earthmom1960@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:59 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,

We pay - handsomely - to use our utilities and the utility companies and their stockholders reap huge monetary rewards from our usage of their services. Asking us to further pay to clean up from their negligent practices is wrong. They need to get it right and not make a mess in the first place. Further, Duke Energy is - and has been - fully aware of the dangers these coal ash pits pose for North Carolina and have done nothing to prevent an environmental nightmare. They need to be fined, punished, and their stockholders need to pay to clean up the mess from their earnings for their failure to insist on Duke Energy taking action before another calamity like the one on the Dan River .

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,

Toni Wiker  
106 Lee St  
Jamestown, NC 27282  
earthmom1960@yahoo.com  
(336) 814-1332

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** David Ralls (rallsdavid@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:59 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 Ralls  
4329 Silo Ln  
Charlotte, NC 28226  
rallsdavid@gmail.com

(704) 641-5596

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Elizabeth Bonzo-Savage (ebs\_nc@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:59 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,

Elizabeth Bonzo-Savage  
2041 Bethesda Church Rd  
Madison, NC 27025  
ebs\_nc@yahoo.com

(336) 427-2420

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Michael Marshall (mmmarsha@uncg.edu) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:58 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 Marshall  
605 Hannah McKenzie Dr  
Greensboro, NC 27455  
mmmarsha@uncg.edu

(336) 545-0171

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



## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Doug Porter (doug@macporter.net) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:58 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,

Doug Porter  
2992 Ormond Dr  
Winston Salem, NC 27106  
doug@macporter.net

(706) 742-2738

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Frances Ringley (fcringley@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:57 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,

Frances Ringley  
2702 Quailrush Rd  
Charlotte, NC 28226  
fcringley@gmail.com

(704) 362-0491

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Charlene Knop (cknop@catocorp.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:57 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,

Consumers should not be footing the bill on outlandish bonuses while having second rate service.

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,

Charlene Knop  
9307 Raintree Ln

Charlotte, NC 28277  
cknop@catocorp.com  
(704) 814-8956

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Gina Essa (gina.essa1@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:57 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,

Gina Essa  
901 Forest Hill Drive  
Greensboro, NC 27410  
gina.essa1@gmail.com

(757) 348-5596

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



## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Carolyn Smith (lorraine\_sm@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:57 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,

Carolyn Smith  
1101 Grogan Rd  
Stoneville, NC 27048  
lorraine\_sm@yahoo.com

(336) 422-0888

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Mark Durstewitz (mark@madelf.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:56 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,

Mark Durstewitz  
9725 Cadman Ct  
Cornelius, NC 28031  
mark@madelf.com

(973) 202-7578

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Kevin Sprouls (kevin@sprouls.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:56 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,

Kevin Sprouls  
1023 Harbour Pointe Dr  
New Bern, NC 28560  
kevin@sprouls.com

(252) 638-1399

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Jeff Chandler (jeffch@earthlink.net) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:55 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,

Jeff Chandler  
16108 Sunninghill Park Rd  
Charlotte, NC 28277  
jeffch@earthlink.net

(704) 543-5229

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



## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Sal Cornetta (salvatorecornetta@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:55 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,

Sal Cornetta  
10117 Hanover Woods Pl  
Charlotte, NC 28210  
salvatorecornetta@gmail.com

(704) 996-6561

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Robert Brown (rob1965@embarqmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:55 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,

Robert Brown  
333 Chinaberry Ln  
Angier, NC 27501  
rob1965@embarqmail.com

(919) 639-3053

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Sam Heaton (samiam4real@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 1:55 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,

Sam Heaton  
3180 US Highway 64 W  
Mocksville, NC 27028  
samiam4real@hotmail.com

(336) 492-5828

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Randal Kempka (rkempka@carolina.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 4:51 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,

We need to transition to clean non-fossil fuel energy sources ASAP not be passing unproven cost needs for fossil fuels onto the customers Piedmont serves. They must be made to prove they acting in the best interests of their utility customers.

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,

Randal Kempka  
10018 White Cascade Dr  
Charlotte, NC 28269  
rkempka@carolina.rr.com  
(704) 595-1776

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



## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** Mary Rand (mbridgers7@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 4:49 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,

Mary Rand  
1205 Old Coats Rd  
Lillington, NC 27546  
mbridgers7@gmail.com

(910) 814-0710

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

## Threatt, Linnetta

---

**From:** James Kelbaugh (jimlouk@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message  
<automail@knowwho.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2018 4:46 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,

James Kelbaugh  
733 Plantation Estates Dr Apt C103  
Matthews, NC 28105  
jimlouk@att.net

(704) 321-5127

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