PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COMMISSION DIRECTIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER	☐	DATE	**June 20, 2018**
MOTOR CARRIER MATTER	☐	DOCKET NO.	**2018-9-E**
UTILITIES MATTER	☑	ORDER NO.	**2018-429**

THIS DIRECTIVE SHALL SERVE AS THE COMMISSION'S ORDER ON THIS ISSUE.

SUBJECT:
DOCKET NO. 2018-9-E - South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's Integrated Resource Plan - Staff Presents for Commission Consideration South Carolina Solar Business Alliance, Incorporated's Request for Commission Review of Order No. 2012-95.

COMMISSION ACTION:

First, regarding Item 9, I move that we grant the request for clarification as sought in the April 17th filing made by the South Carolina Solar Business Alliance (SCSBA). Upon review of Commission Order No. 2012-95, I move that we find SCE&G's IRP meets both the Commission and statutory standards. That said, the brief summary of the cost-benefit analysis of options considered "if available," as required by our 1998 Order, was discernable within the 2018 IRP. However, in an effort to improve transparency and in continuing to recognize the significance of future IRPs, I move that we require the company, in its 2019 IRP, to provide a table that explicitly lists the options reasonably considered and the related costs of those options.

Next, Mr. Chairman, regarding Item 10, I move that we grant SCE&G's request for a protective order, and I would further request that proposed orders for such protective order be filed with this Commission within ten days. However, SCE&G should not expect that it may – to apply the over-worn phrase – "have its cake and eat it too." It cannot fend off discovery in the IRP proceeding without expecting a concomitant expansion of allowable discovery in the next fuel proceeding. The timing of the SCSBA's discovery requests at the end of the comment period for the IRP process tends to indicate that the next fuel case may be the true target of such inquiry. I think that it may be entirely appropriate to have such discovery, but not for the inarguably limited uses it would serve past the end of the IRP comment period. In contrast, I would find such discovery sought in the next fuel case to be a better context for such inquiries. Because the IRP is simply a planning document, discovery regarding its development is best utilized during specific application of its contents in an active case.

My next comments apply to both Items 9 and 10, and are intended to facilitate a more thorough process of discovery and exchange of information in these cases. Fuel cases and integrated resource planning proceedings continue to evolve due to statutory changes and changes in the electric industry. These proceedings now incorporate more complexity and have the potential for far-reaching consequences. I think that these proceedings need to be carried out on a different schedule, going forward, that will ensure that all parties are given more time to conduct a thorough and robust discovery process. Further, the company's integrated resource plan includes data that is linked to the calculation of avoided costs in the fuel cases. Upon consideration of these changes, I move that we instruct Staff to schedule future fuel proceedings such that there is more time for thorough discovery of both the issues raised in testimony by the company in the fuel case and calculations that may be derived from

the underlying IRP process.

As previously stated in my motion on this year's SCE&G fuel case: "I have reflected upon the greatly increased complexity of fuel cases, going forward, and would request the Commission Staff set an appropriate procedural schedule in future fuel proceedings, affording the parties ample opportunity to perform analyses and make recommendations."

PRESIDING: Whitfield SESSION: Regular TIME: 2:00 p.m.

	MOTION	YES	NO	OTHER
BOCKMAN	☑	☑	☐	
ELAM	☐	☐	☑	
FLEMING	☐	☑	☐	
HAMILTON	☐	☑	☐	
HOWARD	☐	☑	☐	
RANDALL	☐	☑	☐	
WHITFIELD	☐	☑	☐	

(SEAL) RECORDED BY: J. Schmieding