BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2012-186-E - ORDER NO. 2012-628

AUGUST 30, 2012

IN RE: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's Annual Request for Revised Rates	)))	ORDER DENYING PETITION TO INTERVENE

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina ("Commission") on a Petition to Intervene submitted by Joseph Wojcicki. Mr. Wojcicki asserts he has standing to intervene because he lives within 25 miles of the nuclear units under construction in Jenkinsville, South Carolina and is a shareholder with some financial interest in SCANA, which is SCE&G's parent company. According to his Petition, the purpose of Mr. Wojcicki's request to become a party in this Docket is to assist the Commission and the Office of Regulatory Staff because he has "a good knowledge for Nuclear Renaissance" in Energy Utilization, Electric Grid Topology, Safety Systems, etc.

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company ("SCE&G") opposes Mr. Wojcicki's Petition because he does not meet the criteria to intervene specified by South Carolina law. SCE&G emphasizes that he is not a customer, and that he also fails to state an

actual or likely "invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized, and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical."[1]

We conclude that SCE&G is correct. The claims asserted by Mr. Wojcicki are both conjectural and hypothetical. Further, he has not stated a legally protected interest that is either (a) concrete and particularized or (b) actual or imminent. Accordingly, Mr. Wojcicki's Petition has failed to meet the legal standards for a Petition to Intervene in South Carolina, and we hold that Mr. Wojcicki's Petition to Intervene is denied.

This Order shall remain in full force and effect until further order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

David A. Wright, Chairman

ATTEST:

Randy Mitchell, Vice Chairman
(SEAL)

[1] *Smiley v. S. C. Dept. of Health & Envtl. Control,* 374 S.C. 326, 329, 649 S.E.2d 31, 32-33 (2007) (quoting *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife,* 504 U.S. 555, 560-561, 112 S.Ct. 2130, 119 L.Ed.2d 351 (1992» (internal quotations and citations omitted); *Sea Pines Ass'n for the Protection of Wildlife, Inc. v. S.C. Dep't of Natural Resources,* 345 S.C. 594, 550 S.E.2d 287 (2001).