

OFFICIAL COPY

OFFICIAL COPY

Oct 01 2018

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Katherine Rickett (krick002@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 5:59 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,

Katherine Rickett
1694 Scarborough Rd
Greenville, NC 27858
krick002@yahoo.com

(252) 355-4931

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Barry Smith (barrydsmith@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 6:18 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,

Barry Smith
120 Hampton Cir
Salisbury, NC 28144
barrydsmith@gmail.com

(704) 637-0647

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Thomas Blanton (tebmtn@charter.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 5:30 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Thomas Blanton
2228 Russell Dr
Granite Falls, NC 28630
tebmtn@charter.net

(828) 313-0960

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Kimberly Masonturcios (kamturc1960@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 12:35 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,

Kimberly Masonturcios
1443 Capri Rd
Winston Salem, NC 27103
kamturc1960@gmail.com

(336) 725-1569

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Lucille Cassidy (casadicassidy@verizon.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 11:55 AM
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,

Lucille Cassidy
723 Mainsail Arch
Corolla, NC 27927
casadicassidy@verizon.net

(252) 453-9164

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Emma Thomas (theadventurecompany@earthlink.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 11:41 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

Governor McCorry and his friends at Duke Power have now succeeded in polluting our beautiful state. We don't want the pipe line! And we want the power companies to pay for cleaning up our rivers and communities!

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,

Emma Thomas

310 N. Atlantic Ave
Southport, NC 28461
theadventurecompany@earthlink.net
(704) 904-0845

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Janice Wakefield (jwakefield1@triad.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 11:34 AM
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,

Janice Wakefield
252 Oakwood Ct
Winston Salem, NC 27103
jwakefield1@triad.rr.com

(336) 722-0587

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Nicole Sheronas (nsheronas@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 10:48 AM
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,

Nicole Sheronas
4222 Town and Country Dr
Charlotte, NC 28226
nsheronas@gmail.com

(828) 238-0278

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Ann Lindberg (alind395@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 10:40 AM
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,

Ann Lindberg
206 Hermitage Rd
Greensboro, NC 27403
alind395@aol.com

(336) 707-3739

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Mckayla Peoples (rosegoldbreeze@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 12:25 AM
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,

Mckayla Peoples
131 Jewel Ln
Four Oaks, NC 27524
rosegoldbreeze@gmail.com

(984) 234-8123

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Paula Fales (prfales@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 29, 2018 4:54 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,

Paula Fales
3202 White Wood Way
Castle Hayne, NC 28429
prfales@hotmail.com

(910) 777-4514

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

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Cathy Armstrong (cmat117@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 29, 2018 11:17 AM
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,

Cathy Armstrong
9041 Milton Morris Dr
Charlotte, NC 28227
cmat117@att.net

(704) 545-1210

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