

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 2015-362-E

IN RE: Joint Application of Duke Energy)	
Carolinas, LLC, Duke Energy)	
Progress, LLC and South Carolina)	
Electric & Gas Company for Approval)	PETITION
of the Revised South Carolina)	FOR
Interconnection Standard.)	RECONSIDERATION

INTRODUCTION

The Order in the above referenced Docket was issued on March 16, 2016, as Order No. 2016-190, styled as, “**Order Denying Request for Postponement¹ of Decision**”, (hereinafter as, “Commission’s Order”). SC Solar Development, LLC, (hereinafter as, “SCSD”) received a copy of that Order on March 16, 2016. This Petition for Reconsideration is filed pursuant to R. 103-854, of this Commission’s Rules and Regulations and other applicable Rules and Regulations of this Commission. This Petition for Reconsideration follows:

SUMMARY OF PETITION

The rubric of the Commission’s Order misstates the *gravamen* of SCSD’s request. Factually, SCSD requested a continuance² of the approval of the Revised Interconnection Standard in Docket 2015-362-E, so that this Commission could receive and review SCSD’s comments on the Joint Applicant’s filing, (SCSD’s request by correspondence, is incorporated herein, by reference).

The effect of this Commission’s decision, is to equate participation by an Intervenor’s parent company before a different State agency, as coequal to participation, as an approved Intervenor before this Commission, as the decision making body.

The decision on the Interconnection Standard was before this Commission in the above-referenced Docket, and SCSD was permitted to intervene by Order of this Commission, dated December 2, 2015, in Order No. 2015-833. However, the Commission’s decision deprives SCSD from meaningful participation in this Commission Docket, prior to this Commission’s decision. This Commission’s decision to allow intervention by SCSD, was not fulfilled.

¹ Factually, SCSD requested this Commission to, “Carry Over Agenda Item”, so that SCSD’s comments could be received and reviewed by this Commission.

² The request for a continuance by SCSD, was not important, it was simply the method by which this Commission would have time to receive and review SCSD’s important comments on the Joint Application filed in this Docket.

To be clear, SCSD is not opposed to the language as adopted for small generators by the Order for those under 20MW, which this above referenced Docket initially sought to resolve, but does take issue with the application of the Docket to large generators, as it is an overstretch of the intent of the Docket. If the Docket is approved as stated and applied to all generators, regardless of size and technology, it will have (1) a negative impact on competition, (2) increased barriers to entry for all independent power producers regardless of technology type, (3) empower South Carolina regulated electric utilities greater than what the state or FERC intended for open access, (4) result in opportunity cost for South Carolina ratepayers, as well as, the rural South Carolina communities where the projects would have been installed – thereby eliminating any increased property tax base and resulting discretionary property tax income for these rural communities where every discretionary property tax dollar is incrementally more important than those within higher populace settings, and (5) result in loss of future construction and permanent jobs across the state within the communities where the projects would have been located.

COMMISSION ORDER

1. SCSD stated in its Petition to Intervene in this Docket that SCSD, “...has a direct and material interest in the issue to be addressed and resolved by this Commission in this Docket and Petitioner’s interests are not adequately represented by the current parties³ in this Docket.” (emphasis not in original), (Paragraph “10”, on page “3” of SCSD’s Petition to Intervene).

2. SCSD, is a wholly owned subsidiary of National Renewable Energy Corporation, (hereinafter as, “NARENCO”). The South Carolina Solar Business Alliance, (hereinafter as, “SBA”), of which NARENCO⁴ is a Member, participated in discussions at the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff, (“ORS”) as to the Revised Interconnection Standard to be approved by this Commission. The SBA membership consists of over fifty Trade Members, including Environmental entities, not directly impacted by the details of the Revised Interconnection Standard. As one of the fifty plus Trade Members of SBA, NARENCO had no control over the discussions or the agreement that resulted from those discussions. It was not apparent to SCSD that NARENCO’s participation at the ORS, would result in a claimed waiver of SCSD’s meaningful participation in this Docket, as an approved Intervenor before this Commission.

³ The SBA was also approved by this Commission, as an Intervenor in this Docket.

⁴ NARENCO did not participate individually in the discussions at ORS. Instead, the discussions were lead by the SBA, expressing the will of its over fifty Trade Members.

3. SCSD's approved Intervention was consistent with this Commission's long standing policy, "...in encouraging maximum public participation in issues before the Commission, and [Intervention] [is] allowed so that a full and complete record addressing...views and concerns can be developed." (Order No.: 2005-725, in Docket No.: 2005-270-G, dated December 16, 2005). Denying SCSD's request for this Commission to consider its comments on the Revised Interconnection Standard in South Carolina, stands in direct opposition to the Commission's stated mandate of allowing maximum public participation.

4. SC Solar Development, LLC is represented by counsel in this proceeding:

Richard L. Whitt
AUSTIN & ROGERS, P.A.
508 Hampton Street, Suite 300
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Telephone: (803) 251-7442
Facsimile: (803) 252-3679
RLWhitt@AustinRogersPA.com

5. This Petition for Reconsideration is timely filed with this Commission.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, and the facts of this case, this Commission should reconsider its decision refusing to receive and review comments from SCSD.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays for the following relief, that this Commission:

- (a) Reconsider and vacate its Order No.: 2016-190;
- (b) Receive and review the comments of SCSD and amend only so much of its Order approving the relief sought by the Joint Applicants in this Docket, to be issued, consistent with the comments of SCSD; and
- (c) FOR SUCH OTHER AND FURTHER RELIEF AS IS JUST AND PROPER.

[Signature Page Follows]

Respectfully Submitted,

/S/

Richard L. Whitt

AUSTIN & ROGERS, P.A.

508 Hampton Street, Suite 300

Columbia South Carolina, 29201

803-251-7442

Counsel for Petitioner, SC Solar Development, LLC

March 25, 2016

Columbia, South Carolina