

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA**

**CM #19-19**

**June 26, 2019**

**2:00 ~ 3:22 P.M.**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** Comer H. ‘Randy’ RANDALL, *Chairman*; Justin T. WILLIAMS, *Vice Chairman*; and COMMISSIONERS John E. ‘Butch’ HOWARD, Florence P. BELSER, Swain E. WHITFIELD, Thomas J. ‘Tom’ ERVIN, and G. O’Neal HAMILTON

**COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:** —

ADVISOR TO COMMISSION: Joseph Melchers  
GENERAL COUNSEL

PRESENTING AGENDA: Josh Minges, Esq.  
LEGAL ADVISORY STAFF

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jocelyn Boyd, Chief Clerk/Executive Director, B. Randall Dong, Esq., and Jerisha Dukes, Esq., Legal Advisory Staff; Douglas K. Pratt, William O. Richardson, Norman Scarborough, and John Powers, Technical Advisory Staff; Colanthia Alvarez, Clerk’s Staff; Randy Erskine, Information Technology Staff; Melissa Purvis, Livestream Technician; and Jo Elizabeth M. Wheat, CVR-CM/M-GNSC, Court Reporter.

**TRANSCRIPT / MINUTES  
OF  
COMMISSION BUSINESS MEETING**

---

***PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA***

101 EXECUTIVE CENTER DRIVE  
COLUMBIA, SC 29210

POST OFFICE BOX 11649  
COLUMBIA, SC 29211

[WWW.PSC.SC.GOV](http://WWW.PSC.SC.GOV)

**I N D E X**

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b><u>NEXT COMMISSION MEETING SET</u></b> .....	3
<b><u>SUPPLEMENTAL UTILITIES AGENDA</u></b> .....	3
<b><u>UTILITIES AGENDA</u></b> .....	5
<b><u>TRANSPORTATION AGENDA</u></b> .....	22
<b><u>UTILITIES AGENDA (Cont'g)</u></b> .....	23

*In accordance with S.C. Code § 30-4-80(E), the Public Service Commission hereby certifies that it has notified all persons, organizations, local news media, and all other news media requesting notification of the time, date, place, and agenda of this public meeting, by posting a copy of the Notice in its principal office, by e-mailing such Notice to all who request same, and by posting the Notice on the Commission's official Internet website.*

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2           **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Please be seated. Welcome,  
3 everyone, to this afternoon's meeting. Before we  
4 begin, we'd like to ask everybody to take a moment  
5 and bow your head in silent reflection.

6                           [Brief pause]

7           Amen. Thank you.

8           Mr. Minges.

9           **MR. MINGES:** Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman,  
10 Commissioners. Our next agenda meeting is  
11 scheduled on Wednesday, July 11th – or, I'm sorry,  
12 Thursday, July 11, 2019, at 2 o'clock.

13           **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thursday the 11th at 2 p.m.  
14 That works for everyone, right? Thursday the 11th,  
15 okay. Thank you.

16           **MR. MINGES:** On our Supplemental Agenda, Item  
17 1, Docket Nos. 2019-176-C, -184-E, and -185-E, and  
18 -186-E. We have a petition for a consolidated  
19 schedule.

20           **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Mr. Chairman?

21           **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Belser.

22           **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I would note, at the  
23 outset, that there have been comments filed by a  
24 number of the parties over the last week, 10 days,  
25 even comments filed today, raising issues with  
26 regard to these dockets that were established  
27 pursuant to Act 62, also known as the South  
28 Carolina Energy Freedom Act that was House Bill  
29 3659. There is a lot of interest, as there should  
30 be. And I would move that, at this juncture,  
31 because we have so many comments and thoughts  
32 floating around, that the parties and any

1 interested persons that may wish to file comments  
2 on the scheduling and how these dockets are  
3 handled, to do that, file those comments by July 5,  
4 2019. And, in particular, regarding Johnson  
5 Development Associates and the South Carolina Solar  
6 Business Alliances's Petition to set a consolidated  
7 schedule, or other scheduling issues. And then  
8 that way, there can hopefully be some coordinated  
9 reasoning on some of these comments that are going  
10 around.

11 And that would be my motion, to file by July  
12 5th. Thank you.

13 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

14 You've heard Commissioner Belser's motion.  
15 Are there questions or comments?

16 [No response]

17 So this is just basically to get all the  
18 comments that we can, on what we've done so far and  
19 what we're looking at, before we move forward with  
20 any sort of –

21 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Yes, sir.

22 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – hearing.

23 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

24 Johnson Development Associates and the South  
25 Carolina Solar Business Alliance filed comments on  
26 scheduling. I think before that, I think Duke –  
27 both DEC and DEP – had filed something, and also  
28 Dominion. And today was a letter, I believe, from  
29 the Office of Regulatory Staff. Things have been  
30 kind of flying around. When somebody files,  
31 somebody files a response. I would just like to  
32 see where we are, consolidated. You know, the

1 parties can just say, "This is our position," so  
2 that it kind of narrows the focus, rather than  
3 we've got to reply to this part and a response to  
4 that part. Let's just have something where we can  
5 go through logically and see what their – and we  
6 can take that into consideration. I know we're not  
7 going to satisfy everybody, but I'd like to at  
8 least have a good idea of what we're doing and see  
9 where – have a good idea where the parties are, so  
10 we can see where we want to go with that. That's  
11 what I'm asking for. So –

12 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

13 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** – if anybody has  
14 anything else to say, file it by July 5th, and then  
15 we're not doing this back-and-forth after that.  
16 Thank you.

17 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** I understand. Great. Any  
18 other questions or comments?

19 [No response]

20 If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

21 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

22 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

23 [No response]

24 The motion carries. Thank you.

25 **MR. MINGES:** On our Utilities Agenda, Item 1,  
26 Docket No. 2019-3-E, we have a petition to  
27 intervene.

28 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Mr. Chairman?

29 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Ervin.

30 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** I move that we grant the  
31 Petition to Intervene on behalf of the South  
32 Carolina Coastal Conservation League and the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

Southern Alliance for Clean Energy.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

You've heard Commissioner Ervin's motion. Are there questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

**COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MR. MINGES:** Items 2 through 14 are petitions to intervene by the Solar Business Alliance in the following dockets, respectively: That's Docket Nos. 2019-3-E, 2019-197-E, 2019-196-E, 2019-195-E, 2019-212-E, 2019-207-E, 2019-210-E, 2019-211-E, 2019-224-E, 2019-225-E, 2019-208-E, and 2019-209-E, as well as 2019-226-E.

**COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Hamilton.

**COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** Mr. Chairman, I would move we grant the Petitions to Intervene in the Utility Items 2 through 14, as placed into the record by Mr. Minges. So moved, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you, Commissioner Hamilton.

You've heard Commissioner Hamilton's motion. Are there questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

**COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MR. MINGES:** Item 15, Docket No. 2019-226-E, a renewable power purchase agreement has been filed.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Williams.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept filing of the Renewable Power Purchase Agreement between Eastover Solar, LLC, and Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated. So moved, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

You've heard Commissioner Williams' motion. Are there questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

**COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MR. MINGES:** Item 16, Docket No. 2019-89-E, Duke Energy Carolinas is requesting approval for an Amended Application for Rider 11, Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency for 2020.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Ervin.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** On June 11, 2019, Duke Carolinas filed an Amended Application seeking approval of Rider 11 to its Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency Programs for Calendar Year 2020. In conjunction, Duke also requests that it be allowed to recover the costs of its Interruptible Service and Stand-By Generator

1 Programs – also known as “Existing DSM Programs” –  
2 as a component of this Rider 11.

3 On June 14, 2019, the Office of Regulatory  
4 Staff filed a review report, stating the company is  
5 seeking recovery of \$82,903,103, with \$37,077,223,  
6 which represents 45 percent of the total,  
7 attributed to residential customers and  
8 \$45,825,880, which represents 55 percent,  
9 attributed to non-residential customers, to cover  
10 the revenue requirements of Rider 11. Based on its  
11 review, ORS recommends a reduction of \$2,536 to the  
12 company’s total system program costs to account for  
13 the removal of certain expenses that were either  
14 not allowable for ratemaking purposes or were  
15 incorrectly categorized.

16 ORS finds that the programs continue to  
17 perform well. Realized cumulative energy savings  
18 have exceeded the anticipated energy savings by 57  
19 percent. And although the number of non-  
20 residential opt-outs has increased, the company has  
21 responded by creating an additional opt-in window  
22 and by adding programs that target non-residential  
23 customers. ORS also finds that the updated DSM and  
24 EE Rate Riders were developed in accordance with  
25 the terms and conditions set forth by this  
26 Commission and are based upon reasonable estimates  
27 of participation in the company’s DSM and EE  
28 programs.

29 This rider would be effective from January 1,  
30 2020, through December 31, 2020. Accepting the ORS  
31 adjustment, the average residential customer using  
32 1000 kilowatt<sub>[sic]</sub> per month would experience a



1 decrease of approximately \$1.60 per month.

2 Based on this information presented in Duke's  
3 Amended Application, as well as the ORS report, I  
4 move that we approve Rider 11 to its Demand-Side  
5 Management and Energy Efficiency Programs for  
6 Calendar Year 2020, along with the recovery of  
7 costs associated with the existing Interruptible  
8 Service and Stand-By Generator Programs.

9 I recommend that we strongly encourage the  
10 company to consider the parties' comments in this  
11 docket as the company evaluates and implements  
12 these programs.

13 So moved.

14 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

15 You've heard Commissioner Ervin's motion. Are  
16 there questions or comments?

17 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Mr. Chairman?

18 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Belser.

19 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Thank you.

20 I agree with Commissioner Ervin's motion and  
21 will be voting for it. I particularly agree with  
22 the part where we are recommending that the company  
23 consider other parties' comments. In this docket,  
24 Walmart filed a letter, as well as SACE – or  
25 Southern Alliance for Clean Energy – and South  
26 Carolina Coastal Conservation League filed some  
27 detailed comments. Interestingly enough, Walmart  
28 is requesting that Duke Energy Carolinas engage  
29 with Walmart to streamline the opt-out procedures,  
30 to align them more with the Duke Energy Progress  
31 procedures. Walmart asserts that the DEP  
32 procedures are more streamlined than the DEC

1 procedures. But then again, SACE and CCL, they  
2 expressed, on one issue, concern that there are a  
3 lot of non-residential opt-outs in the State. I do  
4 find that some of SACE's comments, they were  
5 laudatory to some degree of what DEC has done, and  
6 those are appreciated, and – but they do have some  
7 suggestions where they – and they indicate they  
8 will continue to support DEC's DSM and EE Programs,  
9 and they acknowledge that these programs are  
10 achieving substantial savings and benefits, but in  
11 addition to concern over the high number of non-  
12 residential opt-outs, SACE and CCL do suggest  
13 increasing offerings for low-income customers,  
14 which, given our population in South Carolina,  
15 would be a welcome addition. And they indicate  
16 their willingness to continue to work with DEC and  
17 the collaborative that was established in another  
18 docket and where many of these suggestions have  
19 been fleshed out.

20 And one of the other things that I found  
21 interesting in the SACE and CCL comments is the  
22 suggestion of development of some sort of annual  
23 standardized reporting protocols to try to bring  
24 transparency to the DSM-EE efforts and the recovery  
25 rider. And I join – certainly join and encourage  
26 the company to work within the collaborative and  
27 with these other parties to see if they can reach  
28 some common ground on some of these issues. But I  
29 think that the parties did raise some good issues,  
30 and SACE and CCL were – I will say, they were very  
31 complimentary of DEC for working within the  
32 collaborative and addressing these issues, and it's

1 nice to hear that they are working together and  
2 going forward with this. But I think if they can  
3 engage in the collaborative with all parties  
4 working together, with these suggestions, it will  
5 certainly help strengthen the offerings and what's  
6 being done on the DSM and EE front. Thank you.

7 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

8 Any other questions or comments?

9 [No response]

10 If not, all in favor please say "aye"?

11 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

12 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

13 [No response]

14 The motion carries. Thank you.

15 **MR. MINGES:** Item 17, Docket No. 2018-281-E,  
16 this matter concerns Duke Energy Carolinas'  
17 Application requesting approval for the transfer  
18 and sale of hydroelectric generation facilities,  
19 acceptance for filing of a power purchase  
20 agreement, and an accounting order to establish a  
21 regulatory asset.

22 **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Mr. Chairman.

23 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Whitfield.

24 **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Mr. Chairman, in this  
25 docket, Duke Energy Carolinas seeks approval of  
26 transfer and sale of five hydroelectric generating  
27 facilities to Northbrook Carolina Hydro II, LLC,  
28 and Northbrook Tuxedo, LLC. The company also seeks  
29 to establish a regulatory asset to defer the  
30 estimated loss resulting from the transaction in  
31 the amount of \$9.5 million on a South Carolina  
32 retail basis.

1 Duke Energy Carolinas represents that this  
2 transfer and sale is more economical than continued  
3 ownership of the facilities and will result in a  
4 net savings for customers over time.

5 Mr. Chairman, I would note that we have seen  
6 this before, and two examples that come to mind  
7 immediately are the Buzzards Roost facility Duke  
8 owned at Lake Greenwood that now belongs to Santee  
9 Cooper, and here in Columbia I believe Lockhart is  
10 now operating the hydro facilities here. So we  
11 have seen this before.

12 Mr. Chairman, I would also note that the  
13 Office of Regulatory Staff has no objection to the  
14 company's Application for approval of the transfer  
15 and sale of these facilities or for acceptance for  
16 filing of a power purchase agreement, and an  
17 accounting order to establish a regulatory asset,  
18 provided that the issuance of an accounting order  
19 in this matter will not preclude the ORS, the  
20 Commission, or any other party from addressing the  
21 reasonableness of these costs, any return sought,  
22 and including any carrying costs in a subsequent  
23 general rate case or any other proceeding.

24 Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I move that the  
25 Commission approve the Application, accept the  
26 power purchase agreement for filing, and approve  
27 the proposed accounting order. So moved.

28 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

29 You've heard Commissioner Whitfield's motion.  
30 Are there questions or comments?

31 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Mr. Chairman, if I may?

32 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Belser.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I just want to clarify in the motion part, where you were saying, you know, “I move the approval of the accounting order,” that’s with the language offered by ORS that no party is precluded from addressing the reasonableness of any of the costs or return or carrying costs in the next general rate proceeding,

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Yes, Commissioner Belser, that’s – with that language from ORS.

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

Any other questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say “aye”?

**COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, “no”?

[No response]

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MR. MINGES:** Item 18, Docket No. 2019-215-E, a contract for electric service between Dominion Energy South Carolina and Evonik Corporation has been filed, along with a request for confidential treatment.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Howard.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, this matter concerns the Contract for Electric Service between Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated, and Evonik Corporation, along with the confidential treatment of the contract. Specifically, Evonik is building a precipitated silica plant at the Charleston

1 International Manufacturing Center in Goose Creek,  
2 South Carolina, and that is to supply the tire  
3 industry. Dominion maintains that the Evonik  
4 operations represent an investment of \$120 million  
5 and 50 jobs in Berkeley County.

6 Additionally, the parties request the  
7 Commission find that the contract contains  
8 protected information and issue a protective order  
9 barring the disclosure of this contract under the  
10 Freedom of Information Act, due to the commercial  
11 sensitivity and proprietary nature of certain  
12 provisions of this contract and the highly  
13 competitive nature of the industry in which Evonik  
14 operates.

15 The Office of Regulatory Staff recommends  
16 approval.

17 Mr. Chairman, I move we approve the contract  
18 nunc pro tunc and grant confidential treatment. So  
19 moved, Mr. Chairman.

20 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

21 You've heard Commissioner Howard's motion.  
22 Are there questions or comments?

23 [No response]

24 If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

25 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

26 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

27 [No response]

28 The motion carries. Thank you.

29 **MR. MINGES:** Item 19, Docket No. 2019-100-C,  
30 we have the Application of City Communications.

31 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Mr. Chairman?

32 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Belser.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I move that the Commission approve City Communications, Incorporated's Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to provide resold and facilities-based local exchange, exchange access, and interexchange telecommunications services in the State of South Carolina, and for alternative and flexible regulation. I so move.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

You've heard Commissioner Belser's motion. Are there any questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

**COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MR. MINGES:** Item 20, Docket No. 1997-239-C, the Office of Regulatory Staff is requesting approval to combine the USF and Lifeline administrative expenses into one general USF administrative expense account.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Whitfield.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Mr. Chairman, in Order No. 2006-609, the Commission approved the recommendations of ORS related to the inclusion of administrative expenses in the State Universal Service Fund. Further, in Order No. 2005-296, the Commission authorized ORS to utilize Universal Service monies to increase the awareness and qualify households for participation in the State's

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

Lifeline Program.

The Universal Service Fund and Lifeline administration funds were initially established at \$106,198 and \$213,543, respectively. These amounts are unchanged today. There has been an increase in the workload related to the administration of the USF and a decrease in spending associated with the Lifeline Program. To accommodate this change, ORS has requested that the Commission combine the Universal Service Fund and the Lifeline administrative expenses into one general USF administrative expense account. This account would be funded in the amount of \$319,741, which is the sum of the amounts of the previous accounts. No additional funding is being requested at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that we find that this is a reasonable and practical request involving no additional funds. Therefore, I move that we grant the request of ORS to combine the USF and Lifeline administrative expenses into one single account. However, we request that ORS continue to account for the amounts in the USF and Lifeline funds individually.

So move, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

You've heard Commissioner Whitfield's motion. Are there questions or comments?

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Yes, sir, Commissioner Ervin.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Does anyone know whether these funds are kept in an interest-bearing



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

account? Is that known?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** I do not.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** If it's otherwise permissible, I would –

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** I think ORS manages that.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Right.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Commissioner Belser –

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** I would recommend that we add that to the motion, that the funds be kept in an interest-bearing account.

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** If I may, Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Yes, Commissioner Belser.

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I don't know if it's an interest-bearing account. I do recall that there are guidelines and laws and regulations, especially from the State Treasurer's office and the Comptroller General's office on the accounts for different agencies, and they are maintained in compliance with those. I don't know that ORS could just say, "We need to put this in an interest-bearing account"; they have to follow those guidelines for handling monies, even though they're coming in from another source.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** And that's the way I remember it, Commissioner Belser, and I know from your previous days, your previous career, you would know that, as well.

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I think if it was allowed, that the Treasurer's office would allow it, but I just don't know that it's even allowed.

1 I do know that they do have to maintain those in  
2 accordance with the regulations that are propounded  
3 for handling of State funds.

4 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Very well.

5 Just as a matter of interest, could you check  
6 on that? I won't make any amendment at this time,  
7 but if we can just get a response from ORS, I'd  
8 just like to know as a matter of information  
9 whether it is or is not allowed to be in an  
10 interest-bearing account.

11 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay. We will do that.  
12 And so you want to not make a –

13 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Not at this time.

14 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay.

15 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** If it's prohibited,  
16 obviously, we're not going to –

17 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Right.

18 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** – do that. But if it's  
19 otherwise allowed, then I hope that they're doing  
20 it.

21 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay. Any other questions  
22 or comments?

23 [No response]

24 If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

25 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

26 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

27 [No response]

28 The motion carries.

29 **MR. MINGES:** Item 21, Docket No. 2019-139-C,  
30 in the Complaint of *Dunagin Concrete Construction*  
31 *versus Windstream Communications*, the parties  
32 report they've reached a settlement agreement.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Hamilton.

**COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** Mr. Chairman, I would move we grant the request to close this matter, as the parties are in agreement, and instruct Staff to close the docket. So moved, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

You've heard Commissioner Hamilton's motion. Are there questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

**COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MR. MINGES:** Item 22, Docket No. 2017-292-WS, the Office of Regulatory Staff is requesting to discontinue filing of monthly reports pursuant to Commission Order No. 2018-677 regarding the correction of the sewer problem in the Forty Love Point Subdivision.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Williams.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm sure that members of the Commission remember the issue regarding Forty Love Point where we heard testimony that some of the residents had substantial sewage flowing up through their basements. It's my understanding that monthly filing was conducted to report on the correction of that problem.

1                   We received a letter from ORS requesting that  
2                   the monthly reporting requirement come to an end.  
3                   Mr. Chairman and fellow Commissioners, I'm  
4                   concerned that we have not heard from Ms. Valtorta,  
5                   the attorney for Forty Love Point or a resident  
6                   regarding the condition of the sewage problem, if  
7                   there is one, and I think it's important that we  
8                   give them an opportunity to state whether or not  
9                   the problem has been appropriately addressed.

10                  As such, Mr. Chairman and fellow  
11                  Commissioners, I request that Ms. Valtorta, the  
12                  attorney for Forty Love Point Subdivision in this  
13                  docket, or any interested party, provide comment by  
14                  July 8th, regarding the status of the correction of  
15                  the sewer problems in the Forty Love Point  
16                  Subdivision. So moved, Mr. Chairman.

17                  **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

18                  You've heard Commissioner Williams' motion.  
19                  Are there questions or comments?

20                  **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Mr. Chairman?

21                  **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Belser.

22                  **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I was involved with that  
23                  case as an attorney, when it was presented to the  
24                  Commission. Therefore, I have recused myself from  
25                  this docket and would ask that the record reflect  
26                  that I am recused and not voting.

27                  **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay, the record will  
28                  reflect that you are recused and not voting on this  
29                  matter.

30                  Any other questions or comments?

31                                 [No response]

32                  If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**COMMISSIONERS**<sub>[except Comm'r Belser]</sub>: Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL**: All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

[Please note: Commissioner Belser cast no vote in this matter/item.]

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MR. MINGES**: Item 23, Docket Nos. 2019-232-A and 2019-233-A, these dockets concern the establishment of a timeline for public comments.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN**: Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL**: Commissioner Ervin.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN**: In the decision regarding Duke Energy Progress's Application for a rate increase, which is Order No. 2019-341, we required the establishment of administrative dockets on both the non-allowable expenses and deferred costs.

The dockets identified by Mr. Minges satisfy this instruction. Since these dockets have now been established, we are required to set a procedural timeframe for the public to file comments. To meet that requirement, I move that we set the deadline for the public to file comments for Friday, September 6, 2019.

So moved.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL**: Thank you.

You've heard Commissioner Ervin's motion. Are there questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

**COMMISSIONERS**: Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL**: All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

1 The motion carries. Thank you.

2 **MR. MINGES:** We'll hold Item 24 until after  
3 the Transportation Agenda. That concerns a  
4 presentation regarding House Bill 3659.

5 Turning to our Transportation Agenda, Item 1,  
6 Docket No. 2019-231-T, we have the Application of  
7 CJ Watson Transportation, LLC.

8 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Mr. Chairman?

9 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Belser.

10 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I move that the  
11 Commission approve the Application of CJ Watson,  
12 LLC, for a Class C (Non-Emergency) Certificate. So  
13 moved.

14 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

15 You've heard Commissioner Belser's motion.  
16 Are there questions or comments?

17 [No response]

18 If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

19 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

20 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

21 [No response]

22 The motion carries. Thank you.

23 **MR. MINGES:** Item 2, Docket No. 2019-105-T, we  
24 have a request to amend.

25 **COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Mr. Chairman.

26 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Howard.

27 **COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Thank you. I move we  
28 grant the request of Cougar Moving Company, LLC, to  
29 amend the tariff, to amend the scope of authority  
30 to operate statewide, and to waive the hearing.

31 ORS does not object to Cougar Moving's  
32 requests.

1 So moved, Mr. Chairman.

2 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you.

3 You've heard Commissioner Howard's motion.  
4 Are there questions or comments?

5 [No response]

6 If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

7 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

8 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

9 [No response]

10 The motion carries. Thank you.

11 **MR. MINGES:** Mr. Chairman, we'll revisit Item  
12 24 on the Utilities Agenda. That's Non-Docketed  
13 Item 2019-11-E, and, again, this concerns a  
14 presentation regarding House Bill 3659.

15 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you. We've been  
16 taking this up for a few weeks, now, and I think  
17 we're going to get toward the end of it and then  
18 try to wrap a few things up, so we can move ahead.

19 So, Ms. Boyd and Mr. Scarborough.

20 **MS. BOYD:** Yes. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.  
21 We are planning to finish the slide deck that we  
22 created a couple of weeks ago, and then there are  
23 some issues I want to briefly inform the Commission  
24 of, as a result of our advisory committee meeting  
25 on June 14th. So...

26 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** So we have a handout for  
27 you, for the most recent version of this  
28 presentation. And when you receive that, if you'll  
29 flip over to page 25.

30 [Document distributed]

31 [Reference: Presentation Slide 25]

32 As I said, we're on Slide 25. If you'll

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

remember, last time we were talking about IRPs. And so, today, we're going to talk about Section 58-37-60(A). This part of the law authorizes the Public Service Commission and ORS to bring in an independent third party to create a study that evaluates the integration of renewable energy and emerging energy technologies into the State's grid.

It also says that the results of – oh, that you are to allow intervenors in that process. That's the second bullet. And the study shall be presented to the General Assembly.

And, finally, you are also authorized to require regular updates from the various utilities, regarding the implementation of these renewable energy policies.

Questions or comments on any of that?

**MS. BOYD:** Mr. Chairman, I think we'll put this on our timeline that we are creating. We'll show you that timeline this afternoon, too, that we've started. We'll put that on the timeline, and then you'll tell us when you want us to start receiving public comments, opening the dockets, so on and so forth.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay. So this is not one –

**MS. BOYD:** No, sir, we don't – we just wanted to inform you about this –

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay.

**MS. BOYD:** – requirement. Yes, sir.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay. Making sure I was on the same –

**MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir, you are.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – page.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Mr. Scarborough.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** You said something like emerging technology into the State electrical grid.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Are there any differences between the grid, from state to state? Or, are most of them pretty well historically universal?

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** That's a very good question. I don't know the answer to that.

Do you?

**MS. BOYD:** Commissioner Howard, I don't know the answer. If you'd like for us to find the answer or do some research –

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Well, I don't know the answer or I wouldn't ask you.

[Laughter]

**MS. BOYD:** Well, we don't – we haven't studied that, so – but I think we're capable of doing that, if you want us to look into that.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Okay. Well check some resources.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Okay. Yes.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** One quick question, Mr. Scarborough. That last bullet about –

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** – about updates from the all the utilities.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** I assume we'd get regular – or could ask for regular updates from

1                   ORS, like to have ORS come in and possibly give a  
2                   generic update of all?

3                   **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** That might be a very  
4                   efficient way to do that. A very efficient way. I  
5                   would also imagine that many of these utilities, as  
6                   part of their IRPs, would report some of that  
7                   information, as well.

8                   **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Right.

9                   **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Uh-huh. But you're right,  
10                  that may be a very efficient way to accomplish that  
11                  task. Thank you.

12                 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Anybody else?

13                 **COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Would that be covered in  
14                  the IRPs?

15                 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Pardon?

16                 **COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** Would that be covered in  
17                  the –

18                 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Cut your microphone –

19                 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yes, sir. That –

20                 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – on, Commissioner Howard.  
21                  You're not being picked up.

22                 **COMMISSIONER HOWARD:** [Indicating.]

23                 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yes, sir, I think those  
24                  would be covered in IRPs, and so you would be able  
25                  to see it there. But as Commissioner Whitfield  
26                  said, you know, maybe ORS would be able to provide  
27                  kind of a more generic overview for all of the  
28                  utilities.

29                 Yes, I think it would be included in their  
30                  IRPs.

31                 Other questions?

32                                 [Reference: Presentation Slide 26]

1           The next five slides deal with interconnection  
2 agreements. In this one, if you notice, Section  
3 58-27-460, what we're talking about here is the  
4 Commission's responsibility. You notice it says  
5 "shall" promulgate and periodically review  
6 standards, these interconnection standards. So  
7 that's part of the task that the Public Service  
8 Commission now has, to review these interconnection  
9 standards.

10           Then, in (B), there's a timeline. And we've  
11 added this into our – we've incorporated this into  
12 the timeline that we've created. Six months of the  
13 effective date of the amendments of this section –  
14 which is November 16, 2019 – the Public Service  
15 Commission will establish proceedings to consider  
16 revisions to the standards that are established  
17 here in this section.

18           The Public Service Commission has issued two  
19 orders, one in 2006 and one in 2016, that relate  
20 to these interconnection agreements and  
21 interconnection standards. And so, Staff is  
22 currently putting together a summary of what the  
23 existing standards are. And we'll be glad to brief  
24 you on those. We're also working on looking at all  
25 of the other states and their interconnection  
26 standards, how they set things up. And then we're  
27 going to kind of combine all of that into a list of  
28 questions that you might want to address as you  
29 consider revisions to these standards, because  
30 there are some practices in other states that  
31 appear to be maybe best practices that we could  
32 learn from, as a State, and maybe be able to

1 improve some of these interconnection agreements.  
2 So we'll be glad to either provide you that  
3 information in a hearing like this or in briefings.  
4 Whatever your preference is.

5 Questions?

6 **MS. BOYD:** Well, this was another one, Mr.  
7 Chairman, we will include on the to-do list.

8 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Right.

9 **MS. BOYD:** Because we just have to establish –

10 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** You're going to put this on  
11 that timeline you're going to show us?

12 **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

13 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Did you consider  
14 contacting the legal department at NARUC to see if  
15 they have already gathered some of this  
16 information?

17 **MS. BOYD:** I have not, Judge Ervin. Though,  
18 after our last meeting, I contacted the North  
19 Carolina Commission. I spoke to their General  
20 Counsel and he helped me find certain dockets and  
21 how to search their dockets, and I have a list of  
22 that information. But I haven't gone beyond North  
23 Carolina.

24 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** It might not be a bad  
25 idea just to contact NARUC. They're an excellent  
26 resource, when it comes to looking – you know, they  
27 probably already have a compilation of what other  
28 states are doing – possibly.

29 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** You're right. And that's  
30 what I'm going through.

31 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Right.

32 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** And I've also – they also

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

have some standards.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Correct.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** They have kind of a model agreement.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** A model agreement, best practices. That's a good starting point, I think. It may save you some time.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** It is, and we've got –

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Good.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** – copies of those model agreements.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Great.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** And there are other – I found other resources, too.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Great.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Your point is well taken. That's a good idea and that's what we're working on, so, thank you.

Others? Okay.

[Reference: Presentation Slide 27]

Section 58-27-460(A)(3) goes on and says – this slide basically summarizes the standards that the law requires in those – I guess, the standards when you establish those requirements. And so you'll see here, efficient and timely processing of interconnection requests. This is pretty much standard, just routine standards.

Shall address the impact of additional energy storage. This is talking about battery storage technology, as that evolves. We all know that's changing very rapidly. So the law says that these standards should address – shall address – the

1 changes in energy storage technology, particularly  
2 battery storage.

3 And then, of course, requires the Commission  
4 to establish things that you would already do  
5 anyway: standards that are fair, reasonable, and  
6 nondiscriminatory.

7 Questions or comments on any of those?

8 [No response]

9 As I said, we'll be providing you more  
10 information in the near future about some of the  
11 standards in other states.

12 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Great, thank you.

13 [Reference: Presentation Slide 28]

14 The next slide is pretty straightforward. It  
15 simply says that if a customer, an interconnection  
16 customer, has a dispute with the utility, either  
17 party can bring that dispute before this  
18 Commission. And if they do, this Commission has  
19 six months from the date of the filing of that  
20 petition to render a decision.

21 [Reference: Presentation Slide 29]

22 **MS. BOYD:** And I'll do this one, Norman.

23 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Okay. And then, finally,  
24 I'm –

25 **MS. BOYD:** So, Mr. Chairman –

26 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** – going to turn it over to  
27 Ms. Boyd.

28 **MS. BOYD:** – you remember me saying rush,  
29 rush, rush, hurry, hurry, hurry, “There's this  
30 deadline we need to meet?”

31 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** I somewhat recall that –

32 **MS. BOYD:** -460(D)? Somewhat? Just a little

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

bit?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – Ms. Boyd.

[Laughter]

**MS. BOYD:** Okay. Well, I appreciate the fact that Commissioner Belser recommended that we have the Advisory Committee meeting. That was our first discussion with any interested persons regarding – external stakeholders – regarding Act 62.

So what happened is the Commission, after my hurry-hurry-hurry-rush-rush-rush recommendation – my reading of 58-27-460(D) was that there was a deadline for the Commission to establish for the Commission to make a decision regarding interconnection timelines and then there's some other language in that section regarding impact studies, final system impact studies.

So, on June 14th, there were several interested persons who attended the Advisory Committee meeting. And one of the sections where I learned of a different interpretation or different intent for Act 62 relates to this section. And that is that the language after the first comma in -460(E), the language that says, "including time requirements to deliver a final system impact study," so on and so forth, up to the words "prior to three months" actually does not relate back to the Commission; it relates back to the customers that execute that final system impact study.

So the deadline there – or, I'm calling it a deadline. The reference to three months does not refer to Commission action, Commissioner action. It refers to interconnection customers.

1           And there were some parties who actually filed  
2           on June 17th, so we had our Advisory Committee  
3           meeting on June 14th, and then on June 17th we  
4           received a letter on behalf of Duke Energy  
5           Progress, Duke Energy Carolinas, Dominion Energy  
6           South Carolina, Lockhart Power, the South Carolina  
7           Solar Business Alliance, Johnson Development  
8           Associates, and ORS – they’re the interested  
9           parties – basically stating that that provision  
10          does not relate to Commission action; it is akin to  
11          a grandfathering provision that brings those  
12          interconnection customers that have executed a  
13          system impact study prior to August 15, 2019,  
14          within the ambit of the statute. The letter goes  
15          on to state, “That is, within the guidelines to be  
16          established, the Commission must include the time  
17          requirements by which electrical utilities shall  
18          deliver a final system impact study to all  
19          interconnection customers that, prior to August 15,  
20          2019, have executed a system impact study  
21          agreement.”

22                 I asked Mr. Dong and he complied with my  
23                 request to, until we could get this issue back  
24                 before you, to issue a standing hearing officer  
25                 directive that basically held that issue in  
26                 abeyance, because not only had I asked you about  
27                 it; I had already written a letter – well, yes, I –  
28                 well, I wrote a letter, actually, with the deadline  
29                 in it.

30                 So now I’m bringing the issue back before you  
31                 based on the Advisory Committee meeting  
32                 participants and this letter, to ask that you – I



1 wouldn't say reconsider – find that there is not a  
2 deadline for the Commission to rule and/or for the  
3 parties to file reasonable interconnection  
4 timelines with the Commission. There is no  
5 deadline here, in this particular section, for any  
6 filing before the Commission or any action by the  
7 Commission at this time.

8 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Do we need to just withdraw  
9 that deadline?

10 **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

11 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Basically, what it is? Do  
12 we need a motion to do that?

13 **MS. BOYD:** I would, Mr. Chairman, because the  
14 directive that – I think – I know this issue was  
15 voted on. Give me one second, Mr. Chairman; I've  
16 got that [indicating]. Yeah, it was voted on for  
17 me to send a second letter to the electric  
18 utilities that states that, prior to August 16,  
19 2019, they were to file comments with you, and also  
20 that I was supposed to issue a notice of filing and  
21 hearing, and prefile deadlines. I had not issued  
22 that yet, even though we had a draft circulating.

23 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** What's that directive  
24 number, please, ma'am?

25 **MS. BOYD:** I don't have a directive number,  
26 Judge Ervin.

27 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** What was the date?

28 **MS. BOYD:** The date of it was June 12th.

29 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Did I make that motion?  
30 I believe I did.

31 **MS. BOYD:** I can tell you [indicating]. Judge  
32 Ervin, yes, you did.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** All right. I move the directive that we issued on June 12, 2019, be withdrawn.

**MS. BOYD:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you. You've heard Commissioner Ervin's motion. Are there any questions or comments?

One thing I'd like to comment, I know we were in a hurry looking at things and trying to make some quick deadlines, and that's okay, because we've addressed all these things, we've gotten out in front on a lot of issues that we may not have, had we not thought we had these deadlines. So I think we're in a much better place than we would have been. It's on the table now, and it's in everybody's mind, and we'll be able to address these things.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Yes, sir, Commissioner Williams.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** I'd also like to make a couple of comments. I would like to thank our Chief Clerk and her Staff, and also the Advisory Committee that was put together to give commentary on this law. I do appreciate the aggressive nature, if you will, of our Staff to ensure that we meet any and all deadlines in the law, and I also appreciate the Staff being open to hearing commentary from the Advisory Committee. So that hard work and effort has not gone unnoticed.

**MS. BOYD:** Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you. Any other

1 questions or comments? Commissioner Hamilton.

2 **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** I just wonder if we  
3 should notify the parties that we notified of the  
4 deadline that we have just withdrawn, that it has  
5 been withdrawn.

6 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** And just – yes, part of  
7 the motion would be that the parties previously  
8 notified will be further notified that it has been  
9 withdrawn at this time.

10 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Good. Thank you,  
11 Commissioner Hamilton. We'll make that part of the  
12 motion.

13 Other questions or comments?

14 [No response]

15 Okay? All in favor, please say "aye"?

16 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

17 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

18 [No response]

19 The motion carries. Thank you.

20 [Reference: Presentation Slide 30]

21 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** The final summary slide  
22 deals with Section 58-27-460(E), and what this  
23 section addresses is that the Public Service  
24 Commission must consider whether to bring in,  
25 again, an independent party to conduct a review of  
26 the interconnection agreements and standards, and  
27 whether to require each utility to do these three  
28 things that you see listed here:

- 29
- Conduct a study to determine the scope  
30 and cost of necessary transmission  
31 upgrades to accommodate the renewable  
32 energy resources.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

- To evaluate the cost of developing and maintaining hosting capacity maps so that people might know, or participants might know where renewable energy is most feasible or whether an area is already saturated with that. And we'll talk about that in just a second; we've got some more slides that show how South Carolina stacks up in terms of renewable energy, across the Southeast.
- And then, finally, file a list of interconnected facilities with the Commission each quarter.

Questions or comments?

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Well, does the Staff have a recommendation as to how we should proceed on this, since it appears to be not a mandatory requirement but an optional requirement that we could take up at any time? Is there any urgency to go ahead and set it in motion, or is this something we could hold off on?

**MS. BOYD:** Judge Ervin, I don't think there is an urgent need right now. One of the issues I was going to ask the Commissioners to consider at the end is for the entire Act 62, to give the public a deadline for issues like this to recommend any dates that they feel and reasons for you proceeding, dates by which you should proceed, and then they can provide those comments and we could look at everything – everybody's comments, and maybe you can determine, "Okay, we want to handle this issue first, second, third," that way.

1                   **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Well, and I would think  
2                   that the way the statute is drafted, an interested  
3                   party or intervenor may even petition the  
4                   Commission requesting that we use this mechanism.

5                   **MS. BOYD:** Right.

6                   **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** But the only thing about  
7                   it is I don't think we should mandate it, because  
8                   requiring the utility to conduct a study and  
9                   evaluate the cost, and so forth, and provide a map  
10                  with a list, that's going to take time and money on  
11                  their part. We don't want to unnecessarily run up  
12                  the cost to the ratepayers for something that's not  
13                  needed. So, you know, whoever asks for it is going  
14                  to have to provide some justification as to why  
15                  it's needed at this time. Otherwise, it's a  
16                  balancing act of whether we should force the  
17                  utilities to go to this cost and take these steps  
18                  unless it's needed. I would think. That's just an  
19                  observation.

20                  **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

21                  **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** I would say that we  
22                  just – thank you for calling it to our attention,  
23                  but we'll just accept it as information at this  
24                  time.

25                  **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** That's good.

26                  **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** Mr. Chairman.

27                  **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Mr. –

28                  **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Hamilton.

29                  **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** Along with what  
30                  Commissioner Ervin is talking about, is a  
31                  possibility of thought that it might be good for us  
32                  to have a workshop or an ex parte, to bring the

1 companies in, where we can discuss these things  
2 with them across the table and kind of get a better  
3 understanding from them, and let them get one from  
4 us, to find out where we should be and the best way  
5 to do it, to do the same thing and not have a great  
6 deal of additional expense, but we've got a good  
7 understanding, it appears, that we could work in  
8 unity together to see that this is put forth within  
9 all the guidelines.

10 **MS. BOYD:** You mean all of Act 62?

11 **COMMISSIONER HAMI:** I think we need to cover  
12 it all.

13 **MS. BOYD:** Okay.

14 **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** They're under the gun  
15 as much as we are.

16 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Well, are you talking  
17 companies and all the parties that are involved in  
18 this? The four utilities, or – you know, because  
19 there's a vested interest, I think, out there with  
20 the solar companies, as well.

21 **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** I think that would be  
22 good. I mean, I think if we could get together and  
23 have a conversation, that usually you can come to a  
24 conclusion much better than trying to think  
25 what's – we could get all kinds of different things  
26 that are not going to mesh together and work.

27 **MS. BOYD:** Well, maybe –

28 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Would we take comments  
29 before doing that? Have a certain amount of time  
30 to take comments from – as you were saying, Ms.  
31 Boyd – from the public and from all parties, and  
32 then schedule, so we –

1                   **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** I don't know the right  
2 way –

3                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – have as much  
4 information –

5                   **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** – to do it, Mr. –

6                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Yeah, I don't –

7                   **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** – Chairman, but if  
8 Staff would maybe think about this and just – it  
9 might be a bad idea; I don't know.

10                  **MS. BOYD:** I think, instead of doing the  
11 briefing, because – just for you to consider,  
12 Commissioner Hamilton, maybe do a workshop, but  
13 then we could organize it by the sections of the  
14 bill – sorry – the law. The Act. Act 62.

15                  **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** Yeah.

16                  **MS. BOYD:** And then, as you said, the  
17 Commissioners can participate. You can also  
18 require comments be filed by X date, and still have  
19 your workshop. Your written comments are filed –  
20 if you want them 15 days before the workshop, you  
21 can do that. And so you'll have your written  
22 comments, but then the engagement I think that you  
23 want with the stakeholders, you'll be able to do.

24                  **COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:** We've done something  
25 like these in past years that have been very, I  
26 thought, beneficial.

27                  **MS. BOYD:** I agree with you.

28                  **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** And that way, we have as  
29 much information as we can get before we have the  
30 stakeholder workshop.

31                  **MS. BOYD:** Okay. If you're – just asking: If  
32 you all decide today that you want us to schedule

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

one, what I would ask is if you would consider the organization of the workshop by the order of this Act [indicating], meaning we would list – this is the order in which the Commission will hear comments: First, what I call the avoided-cost issues, and then whatever is next, so they know the order. And then they can file their comments in that order and your order in that proceeding will follow the order of this Act. That’s just a recommendation.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** I think that’s a good idea. That way, everybody is on the same page and everybody is following the same process.

Anybody –

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Whitfield.

**COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Mr. Chairman.

With all – Commission Ervin, with all due respect, I would – I’m certainly not wanting to put any costs – any unnecessary costs or studies on any of our utilities, but, obviously, the Legislature, in passing this section (E), these are all vital things that have to be considered for transmission upgrades that don’t – that they’ll support the development and not impact reliability. And we’re charged here at the Commission, of course, with protecting reliability.

Number two, we’ve already heard from utilities that some not only are in saturated areas, as we go out with DG – with distributed generation – but also some of the areas are so remote that the infrastructure out in those areas was not able to



1 handle it. And I'm talking about below the  
2 transmission level; I'm talking about down to the  
3 distribution level.

4 And then, number three, FERC does have  
5 jurisdiction- – there's always been this ongoing turf  
6 battle, if you will, of federal versus state, so  
7 some of these interconnections are under the  
8 jurisdiction of FERC, and this list does need to be  
9 known with the Commission each quarter.

10 So these are three things, obviously – I don't  
11 know who was advising them, but obviously, whoever  
12 was helping craft this legislation got three  
13 critical things that we have to think of and be  
14 aware of here at the Commission. So I would just  
15 point that out.

16 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** I'm just wondering  
17 whether the statute requires the Commission to  
18 conduct the comprehensive independent review of  
19 interconnection or whether we should have an  
20 outside expert do that. Is it clear to you?

21 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Let's see [indicating].

22 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** An independent review –  
23 if they just wanted us to do it, it seems like they  
24 would say a "comprehensive review," but when they  
25 threw in the word "independent," it seems to me  
26 that maybe this might require us to get outside  
27 expertise involved.

28 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** That's my understanding.  
29 Let me see if we can find that real quickly here in  
30 the document itself.

31 [Brief pause]

32 Yeah, it says the Commission shall, as part of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

implementing Section (A)(1), consider whether a comprehensive independent review of interconnection should be performed and consider whether to require each utility to do these things. So my reading is it would be an independent party –

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Okay.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** – to provide this report to –

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Right.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** – this Commission.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** All right. Why don't we give this some further thought, before we take any determinative steps, because I'd like – when does the working group get together again? That might be a good place to start.

**MS. BOYD:** We have not scheduled another –

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Okay.

**MS. BOYD:** – session yet, Judge Ervin. Are you thinking about having that group, like we did before or –

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Right.

**MS. BOYD:** – something like a generic workshop?

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** For example, you know, where I sit now, I have no way of knowing. The utilities may have already conducted a study recently, and evaluated the costs. We don't know. And just as a time savings, instead of setting a workshop or an ex parte, allowable ex parte hearing, maybe the working group can tell you if that's been – if it's needed, they can speak to it; if it's not, they can tell you that.

1                   But I think that would – it'd be helpful, now  
2                   that we're dealing with the specific provisions of  
3                   the Act, just to have their input upfront. And  
4                   maybe they already have it. And if they do, then  
5                   ask for a copy. And if they refuse to give you  
6                   one, then we may have to set a hearing, but, you  
7                   know, I'm sure they'll be happy to provide it, if  
8                   it's available. And if not, they can give you a  
9                   timeline on when it would be available.

10                   But just as a first step, it might be helpful  
11                   to know what their position is on it or what they  
12                   have. Is that – I'm sure that they – as part of  
13                   their long-term planning process, they have to have  
14                   something in place.

15                   **MS. BOYD:** Yeah, I agree. I agree.

16                   **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Is it all right with the  
17                   other members of the Commission just to get the  
18                   working group to look – to hear from them first,  
19                   and see where we are?

20                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** I think that's fine.

21                   **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Okay.

22                   **MS. BOYD:** Okay.

23                   **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Will do.

24                   **MS. BOYD:** Would – is it –

25                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Would we do that before we  
26                   have – so we're talking about doing that before we  
27                   have this –

28                   **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Workshop, yeah.

29                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – this –

30                   **MS. BOYD:** I think what I –

31                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – stakeholder workshop?

32                   **MS. BOYD:** Yeah, if you're okay with me doing

1 this, I would still send an agenda based on what we  
2 just – what I described, so it would still have the  
3 order of this [indicating].

4 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Yes.

5 **MS. BOYD:** And we would still want to ask them  
6 to just maybe file brief comments regarding 460(E),  
7 as Judge Ervin just mentioned, but then also maybe  
8 just procedural issues, any procedural issue that  
9 we have not – they've not filed with us already, to  
10 please do that before the Advisory Committee  
11 meeting. And then we'd ask Ms. Wheat to please sit  
12 and record this for us, so we get a transcript.

13 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay. That works for  
14 everybody?

15 **COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** If they have hosting  
16 capacity maps, tell them to bring copies. You  
17 know, if they have a study, a written study, and a  
18 cost estimate, ask them to bring the copies. You  
19 go ahead and distribute them, make them part of the  
20 transcript. That way we'll at least have – we'll  
21 have the available information and then we can  
22 decide what else we need.

23 **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

24 **MR. SCARBOROUGH:** We'll do it.

25 [Reference: Presentation Slides 31-32]

26 The next two slides are a repeat of the  
27 timeline that you saw at the very beginning of this  
28 presentation a couple of weeks ago, so we're not  
29 going to go back through that again. We just  
30 wanted you to see that we've created this timeline  
31 based on all of the events that are required in Act  
32 62. So that's the two slides there.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

[Reference: Presentation Slide 33]

We're going to jump over the down-the-road examples.

[Reference: Presentation Slide 36]

What I want to show you now is – I forgot to get mic'd up.

**MS. BOYD:** Okay, I –

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** I'm going to get mic'd up, because I want to stand up here and show you some things.

[Brief pause]

A few weeks ago, some of the Commissioners asked questions about how many small power producers there were across the Southeast, and so that's what you're saying right here. You can see in this slide that, in the seven states across the Southeast, there are 624 qualifying facilities that operate under PURPA in our region. You can see that South Carolina is – it's just a tiny little part, here, for South Carolina. North Carolina leads the way. And you can see that the orange – the kind of pinkish colors, those are photovoltaic; that's solar power. You can see that's the majority of what we're looking at. The pink is existing. The green is planned solar coming down the pipeline. And so you can see that South Carolina is – that's all we have is photovoltaic right now. So we're just getting started. You can see, from – if you look at the little arrow there, we're way behind North Carolina, Florida, and Georgia. North Carolina leads the way.

And you can see what we're measuring here is

1 the number of megawatts in capacity. And so you  
2 can see that North Carolina is far and away the  
3 biggest producer of photovoltaic in the region.  
4 You can see, out of the 624 facilities, 483 of  
5 those are operating in North Carolina and account  
6 for 2.6 gigawatts of that total 4.4 gigawatt  
7 capacity.

8 [Reference: Presentation Slide 37]

9 This slide shows the top 10 states with PURPA-  
10 qualifying-facility generating capacity. Again,  
11 this is from 2008 to 2017, again, measured in  
12 gigawatts on this horizontal axis here. And what  
13 you're seeing here in the lighter yellow color and  
14 then that kind of gold color, that's all solar.  
15 The light yellow is the nonqualifying facilities  
16 and the gold color is the PURPA-qualifying  
17 facilities. And, again, you can see that virtually  
18 everything in North Carolina is solar.

19 Texas is interesting; they're farther along.  
20 California's, as well. But the majority of their  
21 energy is generated through wind, on-land – on-  
22 shore wind.

23 So, you notice South Carolina does not even  
24 show up. Those are the top 10 states.

25 [Reference: Presentation Slide 38]

26 This slide shows the renewable energy demand  
27 and how much capacity exists in each state, again,  
28 in the Southeast. And, again, if you'll notice,  
29 North Carolina leading the way. Here's South  
30 Carolina. I put a little block around us, here.  
31 Over here, you see this axis is measuring percent.  
32 This is megawatt-hours.

1                   What this shows is the blue dot, the little  
2                   blue histogram there, shows how much energy  
3                   demand – an estimate of renewable energy demand  
4                   there is in the State of South Carolina. And you  
5                   can see right now there's not a lot, compared to  
6                   the other states.

7                   This report also shows how much we are – the  
8                   kind of orange dot, the orange little histogram  
9                   there – shows how much we are currently providing  
10                  in renewable energy in the State. And the 7  
11                  percent, that little gold block is 7 percent of the  
12                  blue block. So in other words, only 7 percent of  
13                  the demand, renewable energy demand in the State,  
14                  is being provided right now. So as you can see,  
15                  there's a lot of potential to develop here. We're  
16                  just beginning; we're taking baby steps to get  
17                  there. So, just 7 percent.

18                  [Reference: Presentation Slide 39]

19                  Then this shows the off-site renewables in the  
20                  Southeast. And you can, again, see this is  
21                  measured in megawatts, and so once again North  
22                  Carolina leading the way: 344 megawatts. Two  
23                  hundred ninety-eight [298] there, in Georgia.  
24                  Sixteen, in Florida. And we are at eight.

25                  So all eight megawatts in South Carolina are  
26                  coming from community solar programs.

27                  [Reference: Presentation Slide 40]

28                  And then, finally, talking about community  
29                  solar programs, what you see here is, by year, how  
30                  much community solar capacity exists in each state.  
31                  South Carolina is the purple section of each  
32                  histogram, and you notice we had nothing until

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

2016, and it's a very small amount of community solar capacity installed, but in 2017 – the last year for which they have the data published – South Carolina has really grown. I mean, look at the size. You know, we went from that purple blob to a much bigger purple blob. And so, in 2018, it's probably going to get even bigger, as well, as more and more community solar programs are installed.

So you can see, as I said, we're just getting started in this State. A lot of potential, a lot of capacity to come.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** That sort of correlates with Act 236, I guess, is when –

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yes.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – we started seeing the gains.

**MR. SCARBOROUGH:** Yeah. And some of the other states – again, North Carolina, you know, they were a little ahead of the game in terms of passing acts like 236, and then, of course, this Act 62, to get us there.

So that's a brief update on where we stand as a State.

**MS. BOYD:** Mr. Chairman – I'm over here now, briefly – so remember I told you I wanted to update you on a couple of other issues from the Advisory Committee meeting. One of the others is the IRPs. Remember we talked about that and – okay. So there've been some comments that have been filed that, basically, the intent of Act 62 for when electric utilities file their IRPs in compliance with those new sections, the intent is for those



1 filings to begin in 2020, not this year.

2 So I know we've got to return to that issue,  
3 revisit that issue. I just wanted to let you know  
4 what I was – what we were told on June 14th. Okay?

5 May I get the ELMO, Randy, please?

6 So, also, at that meeting, Dominion Energy's  
7 attorney, Chad Burgess, provided or reviewed this  
8 matrix that we're distributing to you now,  
9 regarding dockets that we've opened, and their  
10 feedback on order deadlines and just suggested  
11 procedural schedules, Mr. Chairman.

12 [Document distributed]

13 And so what I was going to ask the Commission,  
14 to, kind of like the dialogue, the exchange I had  
15 with Judge Ervin earlier about wrapping up these  
16 issues, any further comments that you all might  
17 consider, regarding any other procedural issues,  
18 any other interpretations – not regarding the  
19 substance of the bill, but maybe perhaps  
20 suggestions as to the order by which the  
21 Commission – if it's not specifically stated in the  
22 statute, recommendations as to orders to which you  
23 kind of take up these issues in Act 62, that  
24 perhaps they can use this as a guide. They can  
25 either mark that up, file it with us, "Here is the  
26 Entity XYZ's proposed schedule."

27 I would just recommend that you consider  
28 asking the public, asking any stakeholders, to file  
29 by X date any other procedural comments or  
30 recommendations regarding the order in which you  
31 take up issues, by a date certain.

32 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** So – and this is in

1 addition to – we just had a motion on comments.

2 **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

3 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Can we –

4 **MS. BOYD:** Incorporate into that?

5 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – incorporate all of that  
6 together so we've just got a – I don't know how  
7 that works on how much volume of stuff we get at  
8 one time, or –

9 **MS. BOYD:** And it's possible that I'm  
10 repeating myself. I had not provided you with that  
11 matrix before now. And what I can do, as part of  
12 our notice to the public for the advisory meeting,  
13 is include this as an attachment, too, and ask them  
14 if they have any – if they differ or want to  
15 provide a different schedule.

16 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Yeah, I think that would be  
17 good, and have these dates that we've asked for  
18 comments sort of consolidated, so we've got – not  
19 having them coming in at so many different times.

20 **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

21 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** That's just me. I don't  
22 know.

23 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Mr. Chairman.

24 **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Commissioner Belser.

25 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** When are you talking  
26 about having the Advisory Committee or sending  
27 something out? What are you talking about on a  
28 date for them? Because it seems that this matrix  
29 ought to be addressed in the comments that might be  
30 due – that would be due on next Friday.

31 **MS. BOYD:** July 5th?

32 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Yes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**MS. BOYD:** I think we could schedule an advisory meeting as early as the 12th.

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I'm just saying, I don't think that the Advisory Committee meeting is going to happen in time to have comments on the dates that we've asked for on the 5th.

**MS. BOYD:** Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Was this document – this proposed prefiled testimony deadlines and hearing dates, was that provided to you at the Advisory Committee meeting?

**MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** So everybody had a copy then?

**MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir. And I asked – I did ask if the participants would consider just marking that up and filing it with us. I just think we need a –

**COMMISSIONER ERVIN:** Right. Need a deadline.

**MS. BOYD:** I think we do, so that we can keep moving.

So, you're right. We have the Advisory Committee meeting, Mr. Chairman, and then remember I'm going to use as an outline the different sections of Act 62, right, for them to talk about any other issues. And as Judge Ervin just mentioned, the participants already have a copy of this, so I think it might – there's probably enough time. They've had enough time.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay, to add that? Let me ask –

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Mr. Chairman?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Yes, sir, Commissioner Williams.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Ms. Boyd, when you say “enough time” you’re referencing they’ve had this material, the parties have had this material, long enough to be able to provide some level of commentary by the 5th?

**MS. BOYD:** I think so.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Okay. I want to clarify a couple of things, too. At the Advisory Committee – and I don’t want to put words in your mouth, but I feel as if I’m hearing you say that it was a consensus that the parties believe the IRP date is 2020.

**MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Okay. So –

**MS. BOYD:** That’s right.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** – all parties involved believe that the IRP date is 2020.

**MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir. And I want to say there’s a filing. I’ll find it before we leave. I think they filed something, too, stating that.

**VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Okay. Well, I’ll ask my colleagues, if our Chief Clerk believes that the parties have had this material long enough to be able to provide some level of commentary by the 5th, would it not make sense to make that the deadline? I think that was Commissioner Belser’s motion earlier on. Do you have any comments on that, Commissioner Belser?

**COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I think the motion that was for the 5th had to do with the -176 docket and

1 the individual dockets for the utilities related to  
2 avoided costs and avoided-cost methodologies, the  
3 form contracts, those dockets. And I think,  
4 looking at this matrix, that appears to be column  
5 one, the standard offer, avoided cost, et cetera,  
6 what Dominion has noted as Docket 2019-184-E, which  
7 is, I think, the docket specific to Dominion on  
8 those.

9 So, to the extent that – I don't know that the  
10 comments on the 5th need to incorporate all of  
11 these, the entire matrix, just the first column  
12 with regard to those dockets. Ms. Boyd, does that  
13 sound correct? You were looking at something else.  
14 I'm sorry. That's okay.

15 **MS. BOYD:** No, I was – there are letters  
16 regarding the IRPs to be filed by 2020.

17 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** Okay. We've got you  
18 doing something and I'm asking you something.  
19 That's okay.

20 **MS. BOYD:** I got caught. I'm sorry,  
21 Commissioner Belser.

22 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** So, I think the concern  
23 about the July 5th date are these schedules that  
24 have been proposed by the various parties with  
25 regard to the six-month deadline. And that's what  
26 needs to be addressed by the 5th.

27 **MS. BOYD:** That is right.

28 **COMMISSIONER BELSER:** I think that's what  
29 needs to be addressed by the 5th. It doesn't have  
30 to be every docket that's been opened, but the ones  
31 that are dealing with the avoided costs, the  
32 contract, the standard offerings, those things

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

where we have that specific deadline.

**MS. BOYD:** Right. The deadline for the avoided-cost dockets, you're right, there's a six-month deadline. However, I was – I said – I thought – I think perhaps we're just talking about procedural issues, right, as –

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Correct.

**MS. BOYD:** – it relates to all the other dockets. And that's why I feel as though – and one other thing that was said, one person said, during the Advisory Committee meeting, "Jocelyn, you know, there's a certain order that that particular entity would like to see these issues in Act 62 addressed, because one kind of helps build the other," if that makes sense. And that was one of the reasons to start with the avoided-cost issue, because they kind of build on each other. So if they already know that and that's the thinking for others, then I think July 5th for the avoided-cost issue, that you addressed earlier today, and any of the others that are in Act 62, I think they'll be prepared to file that. And then we can schedule an advisory meeting on July 12th.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Because you're just asking for comments on this.

**MS. BOYD:** That's it.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** We're not making a decision or anything final. And we see what we get.

So we're asking for comments for that, by the 5th, and then we're not making any final decisions based on right then. We're just trying to get everybody's thoughts –

1                   **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

2                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** – on procedural matters.

3                   **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir. And if I may say, those  
4 who participated did a great job. This is my page  
5 of notes [indicating], and everybody commented. I  
6 just – I asked for them to please consider filing  
7 that document, either marked up, or something  
8 similar to this document, so that we could have  
9 something concrete to view each stakeholder's  
10 position on scheduling, due dates, whatever.

11                   **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** I think that's what  
12 Commissioner Williams was asking for. Is that  
13 right, Commissioner Williams?

14                   **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** That's exactly right,  
15 Commissioner Whitfield. And I think – is it  
16 appropriate to have a motion?

17                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** [Nodding head.]

18                   **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Mr. Chairman, I move  
19 that we set a July 5th deadline for comments from  
20 all parties regarding the community solar issues,  
21 voluntary renewable energy program, review of  
22 interconnection standards, review of NEM and NEM  
23 methodology, and the IRP. Any and all comments  
24 from all parties on those issues, I move that we  
25 set a July 5th deadline.

26                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** And that's for procedural.

27                   **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** For procedural  
28 matters.

29                   **MS. BOYD:** Yes.

30                   **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Did I get all the  
31 information?

32                   **MR. MELCHERS:** I think you missed one.

1                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** You may have missed one.

2                   **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Which one?

3                   **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Did you get the avoided-  
4 cost one?

5                   **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** I thought that was  
6 already made by Commissioner Belser. But I will,  
7 just for clarity: Also, standard offers, avoided  
8 costs, et cetera. All the issues on – is this –  
9 this hasn't been admitted, I mean [indicating].

10                  **MS. BOYD:** No, sir. But I will file it with  
11 the docket today. That's not a problem.

12                  **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** Okay.

13                  **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

14                  **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** All right. If you  
15 would, that would be helpful.

16                  **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

17                  **VICE CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS:** That's my motion. So  
18 moved.

19                  **CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay. You've heard  
20 Commissioner Williams' motion. Questions and  
21 comments, is everybody clear on what's being asked  
22 for?

23                  **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Just one comment, Mr.  
24 Chairman. I think Ms. Boyd did say that the other  
25 companies could take this sheet and mark it up, as  
26 she said. Is that correct, Ms. Boyd?

27                  **MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

28                  **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** Okay.

29                  **MS. BOYD:** Yes, Commissioner Whitfield, that's  
30 what I mentioned at the meeting.

31                  **COMMISSIONER WHITFIELD:** That might help speed  
32 them along, too.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Okay. Any other questions or comments?

[No response]

If not, all in favor, please say "aye"?

**COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All opposed, "no"?

[No response]

The motion carries. Thank you.

**MS. BOYD:** All right. Mr. Chairman, so, the only other thing I would say publicly is we're going to – I'm going to schedule that advisory meeting for Friday July 12th. All right?

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** Thank you. Okay. Does that conclude?

**MS. BOYD:** Yes, sir.

**CHAIRMAN RANDALL:** All right. I was just watching Mr. Melchers write with a light saber, it looked like, so I got distracted for a second.

[Laughter]

Anything else to come before us today?

[No response]

If not, we are adjourned. Thank you.

[WHEREUPON, at 3:22 p.m., the hearing in the above-entitled matter was adjourned.]

---



Date: 7/5/19

Jo Elizabeth M. Wheat, CVR-CM/M-GNSC  
Court Reporter ~ Public Service Commission of South Carolina  
803.896.5100 ~ [Jo.Wheat@psc.sc.gov](mailto:Jo.Wheat@psc.sc.gov)