

Austin & Rogers, P.A.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

C.C. HARNESS, III
(1949-2010)

TIMOTHY F. ROGERS
RAYMON E. LARK, JR.
RICHARD L. WHITT
EDWARD L. EUBANKS
W. MICHAEL DUNCAN

COLUMBIA OFFICE:
CONGAREE BUILDING
508 HAMPTON STREET, SUITE 300
POST OFFICE BOX 11716
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 256-4000
FACSIMILE: (803) 252-3679
WWW.AUSTINROGERSPA.COM

OF COUNSEL:
WILLIAM FREDERICK AUSTIN
JEFFERSON D. GRIFFITH, III*

* ALSO ADMITTED IN N.C.

May 12, 2016

VIA, ELECTRONIC FILING

The Honorable Jocelyn Boyd
Chief Clerk and Administrator
The Public Service Commission of South Carolina
101 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, South Carolina 29210

Re: ● **Docket Number 2015-362-E**
● **SC Solar Development, LLC's Proffer**

Dear Ms. Boyd:

Enclosed for filing, please find SC Solar Development, LLC's Proffer, Cover Sheet and Certificate of Service. This offer of proof contains the comments that my client would have placed before this Commission for its review and comment, in Docket 2015-362-E

All parties of record have been served. Please notify the undersigned if you there is anything else you may need.

Respectfully Submitted,

/S/ _____
Richard L. Whitt

RLW/cas

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) **PROFFER**
Electric & Gas Company for Approval)
of the Revised South Carolina)
Interconnection Standard.)

INTRODUCTION

This Proffer, in the above referenced Docket, by SC Solar Development, LLC, (hereinafter as, “SC Solar”) contains the comments that SC Solar would have placed before this Commission for its review and consideration, had this Commission not denied SC Solar’s request, transmitted by correspondence to the Honorable Joseph Melchers, Esquire, on March 7, 2016, to carry over the Agenda Item related to this Docket and for this Commission to receive and review SC Solar’s comments. SC Solar’s Proffer follows:

SC SOLAR’S COMMENTS

“SC Solar did not participate in discussions at ORS concerning this matter and SC Solar is in disagreement with omissions from the Joint Application. Namely, there is no differentiation between Small Generator Projects and Large Generator Projects, with a 1 MW Project being “treated” the same as an 80 MW Project. Also, important provisions normally found in a Large Generator Interconnection Procedure (“LGIP”) and Large Generator Interconnection Agreements (“LGIA”) are not available in the Standard adopted by this Commission. For example, under the FERC form LGIP, large generators are able to suspend the project for up to three years. The Standard approved by this Commission provides no ability for a Large Generator to suspend the project for three years. Additionally, the FERC form LGIP requires the utility to reimburse an interconnection customer, such as SC Solar, for system upgrade costs paid by customer. However, the Commission approved Standard contains no such requirement. Each regulated utility’s current OATT differentiates between Large and Small Generators in alignment with FERC’s Small Generator and Large Generator Interconnection forms. As a result, this Commission’s approved Standard is materially more unfavorable for Large Generators as compared to the previous Interconnection Standard. In SC Solar’s opinion, this is adverse to the interests of the South Carolina rate payers, as they are less likely to benefit from the potential savings available from cost competitive Large Generators.

SC SOLAR'S COMMENTS, (Cont.)

Because the Docket was approved as stated, it applies to all generators, regardless of size and technology, and it will (1) have a negative impact on competition, (2) increase 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 of South Carolina and within the communities where the projects would have been located.”

Respectfully Submitted,

/S/

Richard L. Whitt
AUSTIN & ROGERS, P.A.
508 Hampton Street, Suite 300
Columbia South Carolina, 29201
803-251-7442
Counsel for SC Solar Development, LLC

May 12, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina

**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)
of the Revised South Carolina)
Interconnection Standard.)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Carrie A. Schurg, an employee of Austin & Rogers, P.A., certify that I have served copies of SC Solar Development, LLC's Proffer, Cover Sheet and this Certificate of Service, as indicated below, via electronic mail on May 12, 2016.

- (1) Charles Alex Castle**
Email: alex.castle@duke-energy.com
- (2) Andrew M. Bateman**
Email: abateman@regstaff.sc.gov
- (3) Shannon Bowyer Hudson**
Email: shudson@regstaff.sc.gov
- (4) Frank R. Ellerbe, III**
Email: fellerbe@robinsonlaw.com
- (5) E. Brett Breitschwerdt,**
Email: bbreitschwerdt@mcguirewoods.com
- (6) K. Chad Burgess,**
Email: chad.burgess@scana.com
- (7) Matthew W. Gissendanner,**
Email: matthew.gissendanner@scana.com
- (8) J. Blanding Holman, IV**
Email: Bholman@selcsc.org
- (9) Lauren Bowen**
Email: lbowen@selcnc.org
- (10) Robert Guild**
Email: bguild@mindspring.com
- (11) Sky C. Stanfield**
Email: stanfield@smwlaw.com
- (12) Timothy F. Rogers**
Email: tfrogers@austinrogerspa.com

/s/ _____
Carrie A. Schurg

May 12, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina