

1 STAFF CONFERENCE

September 26, 2022

2 CHAIR MITCHELL: Good morning. Let's come
3 to order and go on the record, please. I'm
4 Charlotte Mitchell, Chair of the Utilities
5 Commission, and with me this morning are
6 Commissioners Brown-Bland, Clodfelter, Duffley,
7 Hughes, McKissick, and Kemerait.

8 In compliance with the State Government
9 Ethics Act, I remind members of the Commission of
10 our duty to avoid conflicts of interest, and inquire
11 at this time as to whether any member of the
12 Commission has a known conflict with respect to
13 matters coming before us?

14 (No response)

15 The record will reflect that no conflicts
16 have been identified, so we will proceed with Public
17 Staff, Item 1.

18 MR. McLAWHORN: I'm James McLawhorn with
19 the Public Staff's Energy Division. Item 1 is a
20 joint filing by Duke Energy Progress and Duke Energy
21 Carolinas in Docket Number E-2, Sub 1214 and Docket
22 Number E-7, Sub 1210. It is a request for an
23 extension of the waiver of Commission Rule
24 R12-11(m)(2) regarding premise disconnection visits.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1 We have reviewed the Application and
2 recommended approval. I do want to note for the
3 Commission that it appears that an incorrect version
4 of the proposed order was sent over to the
5 Commission. It does not change the meaning or the
6 recommendation, it just has some typographical
7 errors. We will make sure the correct version makes
8 its way over after Staff Conference.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Move approval
10 of the recommendation.

11 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

12 CHAIR MITCHELL: It's been moved and
13 seconded that the recommendation of the Public Staff
14 be approved. Any questions or discussion?

15 (No response)

16 Hearing none, all in favor indicate with
17 an aye.

18 (All Commissioners say aye.)

19 CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?

20 (No response)

21 The motion carries. Thank you,
22 Mr. McLawhorn.

23 All right.

24 MS. ZHANG: Good morning Chair, and

1 Commissioners. Fenge Zhang with Public Staff,
2 Accounting. I'm combining the Items P2 and 3 to
3 present first.

4 Items P2 and 3 are the requests by DEC and
5 DEP for interim true-up adjustment for storm cost
6 recovery filed on August 31st, 2022, in Docket
7 Numbers E-7, Sub 1243 and E-2, Sub 1262 for rate to
8 be effective October 1st, 2023 through
9 December 31st, 2023.

10 The Public Staff has reviewed the filings
11 and workpapers provided by DEC and DEP for
12 mathematical and clerical errors and is satisfied
13 that there is no such errors contained in the
14 filings.

15 The Public Staff has not reviewed all of
16 the ongoing financing costs and servicing fees
17 incurred for the review period and reserves the
18 right to review them in the interim true-up -- I
19 mean the semi-annual true-up. I'm sorry.

20 The Public Staff recommends the Commission
21 approve the requests of the rates.

22 CHAIR MITCHELL: Ms. Zhang, the Commission
23 notes that this is the second true-up -- this is the
24 second interim true-up that the Companies have

1 requested. To the extent that the Public Staff is
2 aware, has the Company identified a cause or the
3 need, the reason for this second true-up.

4 MS. ZHANG: Yes. For this interim true-up
5 and in the December annual true-up, this one, they
6 identified a few reasons. The primary one is they
7 are changing the correction code. Originally, they
8 are putting 100 percent on the monthly billing but
9 now they change it to -- depends on the Company want
10 is to like between eighty-seven or -- on the month
11 after the billing. So they're changing the
12 correction code. And the other reason is they have
13 some estimates among the rate classes because the
14 rate is different so it should bring the estimate a
15 little bit and it will be different.

16 CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. And so -- can I
17 take from your explanation that these corrections
18 the Company has made will ameliorate or will
19 eliminate the need for true-ups other than the call
20 for a true-up going forward?

21 MS. ZHANG: Okay. Yes. Per discussion
22 with the Company, they say that it won't be
23 eliminated because all the information are based on
24 estimates so there may be a potential that they will

1 have those interim. But they say that in the next
2 semi-annual true-up they are going to propose the
3 more accurate estimate and the way to calculate
4 their rates.

5 CHAIR MITCHELL: Any additional questions
6 for Public Staff on this item? Go ahead,
7 Commissioner McKissick.

8 COMMISSIONER MCKISSICK: I guess the other
9 question relates to the amount of proposed true-up.
10 I mean, it seems like the magnitude is greater than
11 what I would have recently thought would have been
12 necessary. But, I mean, was there any explanation
13 provided -- it seems like the first true-up there
14 was some computational errors that resulted, but on
15 this particular occasion, you know, I did not
16 anticipate true-ups being in an amount or magnitude
17 that the last two have been.

18 MS. ZHANG: Yeah, based on our
19 conversation with the Company -- basically as I said
20 before, because original, the estimate, the
21 correction code to be 100 percent to be corrected on
22 the month after the billing so -- but the reality is
23 not like that so there are some, because there are
24 DSC system, but they have a billing cycle. DEC is

1 38 days I believe and DEP is 29 days. So your
2 billing cycle will fall into different months.
3 That's for one -- and after you bill you have the
4 correction period. It may fall even further. So
5 that's what they are saying that they will adjust
6 that issue and they realized the reality that that's
7 more correction in the month after -- in the second
8 month after the billing. So that can contribute a
9 major ordeal with it.

10 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: I see. So it was
11 the number of days being calculated, like 29 days, I
12 think you said, versus 38 days.

13 MS. ZHANG: Yeah. The billing cycle --

14 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: I see.

15 MS. ZHANG: -- the billing cycle because
16 all the customers, they don't bill in the same cycle
17 so you still have the -- the timing may fall outside
18 of that.

19 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Okay. That helps
20 clarify a little bit. So, I guess moving forward we
21 anticipate relatively minuscule adjustments,
22 relatively small.

23 MS. ZHANG: I can't say that, because only
24 just trying to just assume they will because -- I'll

1 say probably because this is new to them and they
2 are also trying to understand their system and
3 receive their correction and see what will be the
4 best estimate. And as the Public Staff, we don't
5 want them to over-estimate and charge the customer
6 more.

7 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Too much.

8 MS. ZHANG: Yeah. And then, but on the
9 other hand because the fund, it had to be correct
10 enough in order to avoid default on the bond.

11 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Exactly. You
12 need the proceeds coming in to pay the bonds as they
13 become due and payable in the sequence of --

14 MS. ZHANG: Uh-huh (yes).

15 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Thank you.

16 MS. ZHANG: You're welcome.

17 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: It provides
18 greater clarity.

19 CHAIR MITCHELL: So I'm looking out into
20 the audience and I see representatives of the
21 Companies here. Anyone that's prepared to -- all
22 right. Come on up.

23 If you would, please, ma'am, just identify
24 yourself for the record.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1 MS. RICHARD: Yes. Good morning, Chair
2 Mitchell. Kathleen Richard on behalf of Duke Energy
3 Carolinas and Duke Energy Progress. We do have some
4 witnesses here today, some expert witnesses that
5 will join us up here. We've got Tom Heath, the
6 Director of Corporate Finance; Heather Ford, Senior
7 Accounting Analyst; and Morgan Beverage, Manager of
8 Rates and Regulatory Strategy. If you all will join
9 up here. They're available for questions.

10 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Richard.

11 Good morning, Mr. Heath. If you would,
12 sir, identify yourself for the record, and then just
13 respond if you would to the questions that we've had
14 for the Public Staff this morning.

15 MR. HEATH: Sure. Tom Heath. I'm a
16 Director of Structure Finance for Duke Energy
17 serving for these storm bond transactions for DEP
18 and DEC.

19 So to clarify, the DSO lengthening that
20 was mentioned is a contributing factor although it's
21 not a major factor, but so we did refine the
22 calculation for DEC to account for cash coming in
23 later than one month. So our initial calculations
24 showed, you know, billings in say July, all that

1 cash coming in in August. The DSO for DEC has
2 lengthened out to 37/38 days and so we have more
3 accurately shown that in this filing to account for
4 that delay. That's not the primary factor for DEC
5 however.

6 The question around frequency of future
7 interim true-ups, we do believe, we're confident at
8 this point that the likelihood of future interim
9 true-ups is greatly reduced with the refinements
10 that we have made in this interim true-up. And
11 further refinements that we plan to make in the
12 scheduled semi-annual true-up, that will be made in
13 November for rates to be effective in January.

14 But there is, as was mentioned, we're
15 taking a fixed payment requirement and dividing that
16 by a forecasted kilowatt hours by rate class for a
17 given six-month period. And the one thing we know
18 for certain is that those forecasted kilowatt hours
19 will not be the actual kilowatt hours. The actuals
20 will be higher than those forecasted projections or
21 lower. And so if they are lower, that would drive
22 possibly the need for an interim true-up, for future
23 interim true-ups. But we think that that simply
24 forecast variance should, forecast variances should

1 be less likely to be a driver than the things that
2 we experienced in the first interim true-up and the
3 things that we experience in this interim true-up.

4 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Heath. I
5 think that additional explanation is helpful to us.

6 Any additional questions? Go ahead,
7 Commissioner McKissick.

8 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: First, I greatly
9 appreciate you being today and providing that very
10 detailed explanation. I think that really puts
11 everything in context. It's actually interesting
12 and good to see you live and observing you virtually
13 in meetings for six months.

14 MR. HEATH: Same here.

15 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: So, thank you for
16 being today and providing that information.

17 MR. HEATH: No problem.

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Move approval
19 of the recommendation.

20 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

21 CHAIR MITCHELL: It's moved and seconded
22 that the items be approved as recommended by the
23 Public Staff. Questions or discussion?

24 (No response)

1 CHAIR MITCHELL: All in favor, indicate
2 with an aye.

3 (All Commissioners say aye.)

4 CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?

5 (No response)

6 The motion carries.

7 MS. ZHANG: Chair Mitchell, if you don't
8 mind, I will present Items 6 and 7 first.

9 CHAIR MITCHELL: Please proceed.

10 MS. ZHANG: Item P6 is a notice of
11 Affiliate Transactions filing pursuant to General
12 Statute § 62-153(a) and Regulatory Condition 3.1(a)
13 by Dominion Energy or Dominion. In the notice,
14 Dominion filed two affiliate agreements. One is the
15 Asset Transfer and Assumption of Liability Agreement
16 between Dominion and Dominion Privatization
17 Virginia, LLC, or DPV. The other is a System Usage
18 Agreement between Dominion and Dominion
19 Privatization Holdings, Inc., or DPHI.

20 Through the Asset Transfer Agreement,
21 Dominion will transfer Privatization assets and
22 contracts for a military installations in Virginia
23 to DPV. Through the System Usage Agreement, DPHI
24 will pay Dominion a one-time customization fee and a

1 monthly fee for use of the systems. The monthly
2 fees were based on the system cost and the customer
3 ratio.

4 The Public Staff has reviewed the
5 Agreements and recommends the Commission recognize
6 the notice of filing with the condition listed on
7 the proposed order.

8 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Move approval
9 of the recommendations for Items 6 and 7.

10 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

11 MS. ZHANG: Only 6.

12 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Only 6. You
13 said only 6.

14 CHAIR MITCHELL: Only 6.

15 MS. ZHANG: Yeah. The first one is 6.

16 CHAIR MITCHELL: It's been moved and
17 seconded that Item 6 be approved as recommended by
18 the Public Staff. Questions or discussion?

19 (No response)

20 All in favor, indicate with an aye.

21 (All Commissioners say aye.)

22 CHAIR MITCHELL: Anyone opposed?

23 (No response)

24 That motion carries.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1 MS. ZHANG: Item 7 is the Petition of
2 limited waiver of the Code of Conduct by Dominion in
3 Docket Number E-22, Sub 634.

4 Dominion requests the limited waiver for
5 30 employees who will be transferred to its
6 affiliate DPHI. These employees are currently
7 employed by Dominion or Dominion Energy Services,
8 Inc., and used Dominion's system including the
9 customer information system to perform their daily
10 work for military installations. After the
11 transfer, these employees still need access to the
12 system to perform their work. As stated in Section
13 III.A.2(b) and (g) of the Code of Conduct, Dominion
14 shall not disclose the customer information to any
15 affiliate or non-affiliate without the customer's
16 consent, and shall take appropriate steps to store
17 the customer's information.

18 Dominion states that the current customer
19 information system, CMBS, cannot prevent employee
20 who use it from improper asset to the customer
21 information. This CMBS system will be replaced by a
22 new customer information system in second quarter of
23 2023. The new customer information system will have
24 the security measures to prevent employees with

1 improper access. Dominion requests the waiver until
2 the new system is in service.

3 The Public Staff has reviewed the
4 Application and agrees that the circumstances set
5 forth by Dominion justify the request of the waiver.

6 The public Staff recommends the Commission
7 approve the limited waiver with the conditions
8 listed on the proposed order.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Move approval
10 of Item 7.

11 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

12 CHAIR MITCHELL: It's been moved and
13 seconded that the item be approved as recommended by
14 the Public Staff. Are there questions? Discussion?

15 (No response)

16 All in favor indicate with an aye.

17 (All Commissioners say aye.)

18 CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?

19 (No response)

20 That motion carries.

21 MS. ZHANG: Thank you.

22 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you. Mr. Floyd, I
23 assume you've got Items 4 and 5.

24 MR. FLOYD: I hope so.

1 CHAIR MITCHELL: So do I.

2 MR. FLOYD: I don't want any more. Thank
3 you.

4 I'm Jack Floyd with the Energy Division of
5 the Public Staff. Item 4 are a pair of filings by
6 Duke Energy Carolinas and Duke Energy Progress
7 requesting approval to modify and expand their
8 EnergyWise for Business Programs. The changes will
9 incorporate a new Bring Your Own Kilowatt Option,
10 which will allow the customers to nominate
11 electrical load that they are willing to reduce at
12 Duke's request during a winter peaking event. The
13 incentives that participants will receive are based
14 on the actual load that they will reduce during
15 those peaking events.

16 On August 31st of this year, the Public
17 Staff filed a set of comments on these applications
18 highlighting our review and ultimately recommending
19 that the Commission approve the modifications as new
20 Demand-Side Management Programs and allow for cost
21 recovery consistent with each Company's DSM/EE cost
22 recovery mechanism.

23 The Staff also recommended that for
24 administrative ease that we maintain the existing

1 dockets rather than putting this modification in a
2 new docket.

3 The Public Staff also would like to
4 highlight that the improvements to the
5 cost-effectiveness that are the result of these
6 modifications, the cost-effectiveness are in the
7 Attachment B of each application, but we also
8 requested that the Company model the whole program
9 before and after the modification. And those
10 results indicated that for Duke Carolinas the
11 Utility Cost Test, which is our primary test, moved
12 from 1.54 to 1.88. And for Duke Progress the UCT
13 went from 0.87 to 1.38. In other words, the
14 modifications improve the cost-effectiveness of the
15 programs.

16 Based on our review, the Public Staff
17 recommends that you issue our proposed order
18 recommending approval of the programs.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Madam Chair, I
20 move that this item be taken into executive
21 conference.

22 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

23 CHAIR MITCHELL: All in favor indicate
24 with an aye.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1 (All Commissioners say aye.)

2 CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?

3 (No response)

4 We will take these items into executive
5 conference.

6 MR. FLOYD: Item 5 is a request by --

7 CHAIR MITCHELL: Actually, Mr. Floyd, let
8 me be clear, we will take Item 4 into executive
9 conference.

10 MR. FLOYD: Correct. Item 5 is a request
11 by Duke Energy Carolinas to modify their residential
12 Power Manager Load Control Service Program to
13 include a new Heating Load Control Option that would
14 allow the Company to interrupt service to customers
15 ducted electric resistance heating devices during
16 the winter. The customer would be allowed to
17 opt-out of no more than two winter control events
18 but if they do more than that they run the risk of
19 being bumped off the program.

20 On September 9th, the Public Staff filed
21 our comments highlighting our review and concluding
22 and recommending that the Commission approve the
23 modification as a new Demand-Side Management Program
24 and allow cost recovery pursuant to Duke Carolinas

1 cost recovery mechanism.

2 The staff would also like to highlight the
3 impact of cost-effectiveness of these modifications.
4 In these instances, the program, under the Utility
5 Cost Test, the overall cost-effectiveness goes down
6 slightly from 5.28 to 5.12; however, the
7 modification itself is still pretty cost-effective.
8 It's just so it happens to work out that the math,
9 the modification is slightly less than the average
10 overall cost-effectiveness of the program. But the
11 Staff also highlights the fact that this is a winter
12 peaking DSM program and we are trying to find ways
13 to improve winter DSM opportunities for the Company,
14 and that reduction in cost-effectiveness to us is
15 acceptable on that basis.

16 Based on our review, the Public Staff
17 recommends that the Commission issue our proposed
18 order recommending approval of the program as filed.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Madam Chair, I
20 move that this item be taken to executive
21 conference.

22 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

23 CHAIR MITCHELL: All in favor indicate
24 with an aye, please.

1 (All Commissioners say aye.)

2 CHAIR MITCHELL: Anybody opposed?

3 (No response)

4 CHAIR MITCHELL: We will move this item
5 into executive conference as well.

6 MR. FLOYD: Thank you.

7 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Floyd.

8 Good morning, Ms. Patel.

9 MS. PATEL: Good morning, Chair. Good
10 morning, Commissioners. Thank you for accommodating
11 the change in the flow of the gas item presentations
12 for today.

13 Item 8 is Docket G-9, Sub 812, which is an
14 Application by Piedmont Natural Gas Company
15 requesting authority to flow through of certain
16 Alternative Motor Vehicle Fuel Excise Tax Credits to
17 its customers receiving compressed natural gas
18 service through a reduction in rates under its Rate
19 Schedule 142 and the Commission-approved special
20 contract fleet fueling agreements.

21 Exhibit A to the Petition reflects the
22 proposed CNG rate adjustments.

23 The Staff has reviewed the proposed rate
24 adjustments and recommends approval as filed.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Move approval
2 of the recommendation.

3 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

4 CHAIR MITCHELL: Ms. Patel, just one
5 question for you. I note that the credit, the tax
6 credit, will be used to benefit the customers who
7 are taking use of the CNG fuel. Was there any
8 discussion or analysis of applying the benefit of
9 the tax credit for the full body of the Company's
10 ratepayers opposed to just the customers taking the
11 CNG service?

12 MS. PATEL: So, based on discussions with
13 the Company, the customers who would run their
14 credit cards on, one, fueling the trucks would be
15 the customers who receive the credits from the time
16 that this adjustment goes into effect. This
17 adjustment was in place since January of this year
18 until December of 2024, so the customers who have
19 not received that adjustment so far, there would be
20 no way to go back and give them that adjustment but
21 there will be an accounting adjustment made to the
22 books for the Company.

23 CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Any additional
24 questions or discussion?

1 (No response)

2 All in favor, indicate with an aye.

3 (All Commissioners say aye.)

4 CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?

5 (No response)

6 The motion carries.

7 MS. PATEL: Thank you.

8 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Patel.

9 MS. PATEL: Item 10 is Docket G-9, Sub
10 813, which is an Application by Piedmont Natural Gas
11 requesting authority to increase its rates and
12 charges effective October 1st, 2022. This
13 adjustment is a result of the net effect
14 of reduction in the demand charge component of its
15 rates and a proposed increase in its Benchmark
16 Commodity Cost of Gas from \$6.00 per dekatherm to
17 \$8.25 per detect.

18 Exhibit A to the Petition reflects a
19 proposed rate adjustment.

20 And based on the review of the Public
21 Staff, we recommend the proposed rate adjustments as
22 filed in Exhibit A.

23 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Move approval
24 of the recommendation.

1 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

2 CHAIR MITCHELL: Ms. Patel, do we have any
3 sense of when the Company might be able to come back
4 in and reduce the commodity charge?

5 Has the Public Staff discussed that at all
6 with the Company?

7 MS. PATEL: Yes, we have. So generally,
8 October. The winter prices reflect a higher
9 commodity cost of gas compared to the summer gas
10 prices, but just today, this morning, we checked and
11 it was roughly in the \$6.00 range which is much
12 lower than what the September prices looked at.
13 Forward going into March 2023, based on what the
14 Company has, the balances would come back to a more
15 regulized level. They will go back and reevaluate
16 the prices based on what the NYMEX prices would
17 reflect.

18 CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. So do I understand
19 you to mean that they are likely not going to come
20 back in before March 2023?

21 MS. PATEL: That's what the Company
22 discussions -- the Company mentioned.

23 CHAIR MITCHELL: Any additional questions
24 or discussion? Commissioner Hughes.

1 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: I know there's a
2 decrease and an increase, but is it possible, and do
3 you have or do you or anyone in the Company have an
4 idea of what the net impact is for, say, the first
5 winter heating month?

6 MS. PATEL: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: I mean, is this a
8 20 percent increase or is this going to be more like
9 a 10 percent increase?

10 MS. PATEL: It's roughly about a
11 6.22 percent increase.

12 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: So --

13 MS. PATEL: I'm sorry. Go ahead. It's
14 \$5.48 going -- for the winter period until March of
15 2023.

16 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. When we --
17 this is just a side note. A couple of times we've
18 had questions -- with gas it's tricky because
19 sometimes the average gas usage, it takes into
20 consideration people that just have stove and also
21 heat. So when we get those numbers, if you could
22 kind of present it as an average for a family that
23 uses gas heat. And it may or may not be the case.
24 I know we've talked to some of the other LDCs about

1 this. It's just how they do it. But again, the
2 people we're going to hear from are the people that
3 do full gas heating and when they look at their bill
4 in December or January, so it might be \$5, it might
5 be higher. Does that make sense?

6 MS. PATEL: Sure. But again, talking to
7 the Company, there's no way they can segregate how
8 many families, you know, what kind of usage they
9 have, each house --

10 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah. I'm not
11 asking for a -- I understand that and I appreciate
12 that. I'm not asking for an exact number. But you
13 know, I think there's a lot of data out there about
14 what customers use so, I mean, it could be a range,
15 but it's very different to talk about a heating
16 customer versus mixing together, again a cooking
17 customer there. I mean, you can -- EIA has data.
18 And I realize it's all dependent on the weather it's
19 dependent on where they live. It's just -- it would
20 be a little bit more accurate than if that \$5 is
21 indeed blending. And it could just be maybe having
22 a benchmark usage that we use that customers in this
23 climate use X amount for that for heating.

24 MS. PATEL: Sure.

1 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Sometimes we get
2 numbers and it might actually disguise what's
3 actually happening. It might be people getting an
4 impact of a \$1 and people getting an impact of \$20,
5 and it averages together. I don't know if those
6 numbers are right, but --

7 MS. PATEL: Sure.

8 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Thanks.

9 CHAIR MITCHELL: Any additional questions?

10 (No response)

11 Just a reminder, there's a motion that's
12 been seconded that the item be approved as
13 recommended by the Public Staff. All in favor
14 indicate with an aye.

15 (All Commissioners say aye.)

16 CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?

17 (No response)

18 The motion carries.

19 Thank you, Ms. Patel.

20 MS. PATEL: Thank you.

21 CHAIR MITCHELL: Good morning, Mr. Nader.

22 MR. NADER: Good morning, Chair Mitchell,
23 Commissioners. My name is Jordan Nader. I'm with
24 the Public Staff, Energy Division. Item 9, Docket

1 G-5, Sub 652 is a request by Public Service Company
2 of North Carolina for approval to adjust rates under
3 Rider C and Rider D of its tariff effective October
4 1st, 2022.

5 The Public Staff has reviewed the
6 Application and information provided by PSNC and
7 recommends the Commission approve the Application as
8 filed.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN-BLAND: Move approval
10 of the recommendation.

11 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Second.

12 CHAIR MITCHELL: Questions or discussion?

13 (No response)

14 All in favor, indicate with an aye.

15 (All Commissioners say aye.)

16 CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?

17 (No response)

18 The motion carries.

19 Good work, Mr. Nader.

20 CHAIR MITCHELL: The Commission has before
21 us our minutes of September 19th for approval.

22 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Move approval of
23 the minutes.

24 COMMISSIONER KEMERAIT: Second.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1 CHAIR MITCHELL: Questions or discussion
2 on that motion?

3 (No response)

4 All in favor, indicate with an aye.

5 (All Commissioners say aye.)

6 CHAIR MITCHELL: Anyone opposed?

7 (No response)

8 Our minutes are approved.

9 Any additional business for the Commission
10 this morning before we adjourn?

11 (No response)

12 I'm not seeing anyone, so we will be
13 adjourned. Thank you very much everybody. Let's go
14 off the record, please.

15 _____
16 WHEREUPON, this conference is adjourned.
17 _____
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, KIM T. MITCHELL, do hereby certify that the Proceedings in the above-captioned matter were taken before me, that I did report in stenographic shorthand the Proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription to the best of my ability.

Kim T. Mitchell

Kim T. Mitchell

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION