

170 FERC ¶ 61,041  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Neil Chatterjee, Chairman;  
Richard Glick and Bernard L. McNamee.

Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc.

Docket No. ER19-1946-000

ORDER ON COMPLIANCE

(Issued January 24, 2020)

1. On May 22, 2019, Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc. (South Carolina)<sup>1</sup> submitted proposed revisions to its Open Access Transmission Tariff (Tariff) in compliance with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A,<sup>2</sup> which amended the Commission's *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (LGIA) and *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP).<sup>3</sup> As discussed below, we find that South Carolina's filing partially complies with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. Accordingly, we accept South Carolina's compliance filing, effective May 22, 2019, and direct South Carolina to submit a further compliance filing within sixty (60) days of the date of this order.

---

<sup>1</sup> On April 30, 2019, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company filed a notice with the Commission changing its name to Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc. following Commission approval of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company becoming an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of Dominion Energy, Inc. *See Dominion Energy, Inc.*, 164 FERC ¶ 62,025 (2018).

<sup>2</sup> *Reform of Generator Interconnection Procedures and Agreements*, Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 (2018), *errata notice*, 167 FERC ¶ 61,123, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137, *errata notice*, 167 FERC ¶ 61,124, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 845-B, 168 FERC ¶ 61,092 (2019).

<sup>3</sup> The *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA establish the terms and conditions under which public utilities that own, control, or operate facilities for transmitting energy in interstate commerce must provide interconnection service to large generating facilities. Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 6.

## I. Background

2. On April 19, 2018, the Commission issued Order No. 845, which revised the Commission's *pro forma* LGIA and the *pro forma* LGIP to improve certainty for interconnection customers, promote more informed interconnection decisions, and enhance the interconnection process. The Commission stated that it expects that these reforms will provide interconnection customers better information and more options for obtaining interconnection service, and as a result, there will be fewer overall interconnection requests and fewer interconnection requests failing to reach commercial operation. The Commission also stated that it expects that, as a result of these reforms, transmission providers will be able to focus resources on those interconnection requests most likely to reach commercial operation.<sup>4</sup> In Order No. 845-A, the Commission generally upheld the reforms it required in Order No. 845 but granted certain requests for rehearing and clarification.

3. In Order No. 845, the Commission adopted 10 different reforms in three categories to improve the interconnection process. First, in order to improve certainty for interconnection customers, the Commission: (1) removed the limitation that interconnection customers may exercise the option to build the transmission provider's interconnection facilities<sup>5</sup> and stand-alone network upgrades<sup>6</sup> only in instances when the transmission provider cannot meet the dates proposed by the interconnection customer;<sup>7</sup> and (2) required that transmission providers establish interconnection dispute

---

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* P 2; Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 1.

<sup>5</sup> Transmission provider's interconnection facilities are "all facilities and equipment owned, controlled or operated by the Transmission Provider from the Point of Change of Ownership to the Point of Interconnection as identified in Appendix A to the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Agreement, including any modifications, additions or upgrades to such facilities and equipment. Transmission Provider's Interconnection Facilities are sole use facilities and shall not include Distribution Upgrades, Stand Alone Network Upgrades or Network Upgrades." *Pro forma* LGIA, art. 1 (Definitions).

<sup>6</sup> Stand alone network upgrades are "Network Upgrades that an Interconnection Customer may construct without affecting day-to-day operations of the Transmission System during their construction. Both the Transmission Provider and the Interconnection Customer must agree as to what constitutes Stand Alone Network Upgrades and identify them in Appendix A to the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Agreement." *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 85.

resolution procedures that allow a disputing party unilaterally to seek non-binding dispute resolution.<sup>8</sup>

4. Second, to promote more informed interconnection decisions, the Commission: (1) required transmission providers to outline and make public a method for determining contingent facilities;<sup>9</sup> (2) required transmission providers to list the specific study processes and assumptions for forming the network models used for interconnection studies; (3) revised the definition of “Generating Facility” to explicitly include electric storage resources; and (4) established reporting requirements for aggregate interconnection study performance.<sup>10</sup>

5. Third, the Commission adopted reforms to enhance the interconnection process by: (1) allowing interconnection customers to request a level of interconnection service that is lower than their generating facility capacity; (2) requiring transmission providers to allow for provisional interconnection agreements that provide for limited operation of a generating facility prior to completion of the full interconnection process; (3) requiring transmission providers to create a process for interconnection customers to use surplus interconnection service<sup>11</sup> at existing points of interconnection; and (4) requiring transmission providers to set forth a procedure to follow when assessing and, if necessary, studying an interconnection customer’s technology changes without affecting the interconnection customer’s queue position.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* P 3.

<sup>9</sup> Contingent facilities are “those unbuilt Interconnection Facilities and Network Upgrades upon which the Interconnection Request’s costs, timing, and study findings are dependent, and if delayed or not built, could cause a need for Re-Studies of the Interconnection Request or a reassessment of the Interconnection Facilities and/or Network Upgrades and/or costs and timing.” *Pro Forma* LGIP, § 1 (Definitions).

<sup>10</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 4.

<sup>11</sup> Order No. 845 added a definition for “Surplus Interconnection Service” to section 1 of the *pro forma* LGIP and article 1 of the *pro forma* LGIA, defining the term as “any unused portion of Interconnection Service established in a Large Generator Interconnection Agreement, such that if Surplus Interconnection Service is utilized the Interconnection Service limit at the Point of Interconnection would remain the same.” *Id.* P 459.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* P 5.

## II. South Carolina's Compliance Filing

6. South Carolina states that its compliance filing incorporates revisions to the LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA in Attachment M to South Carolina's Tariff as required by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A.<sup>13</sup> South Carolina states that it has modified its LGIP to add provisions that it developed including technological change procedure provisions, a definition of permissible technological advancement, provisions associated with the utilization of surplus interconnection service, and a methodology for identifying contingent facilities. South Carolina states that it also modified its LGIP to incorporate changes specifically mandated in the Appendix B Errata and provisions where the Commission requested that a transmission provider proposes time frames.<sup>14</sup>

7. South Carolina requests that the proposed revisions to its Tariff to comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A become effective on May 22, 2019.

## III. Notice and Responsive Pleadings

8. Notice of South Carolina's compliance filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 84 Fed. Reg. 24,770 (2019), with interventions and protests due on or before June 12, 2019. None was filed.

## IV. Discussion

9. As discussed below, we find that South Carolina's filing partially complies with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. Accordingly, we accept South Carolina's compliance filing effective May 22, 2019, and direct South Carolina to submit a further compliance filing within sixty (60) days of the date of this order.

### 1. Proposed Variations

10. As discussed further below, South Carolina has requested certain variations from the Commission's requirements in Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. The Commission explained in Order No. 845 that such variations would be reviewed under the same standard allowed by Order No. 2003.<sup>15</sup> In Order No. 2003, when adopting the *pro forma* LGIA and LGIP, the Commission permitted transmission providers to seek variations from the *pro forma* LGIA and/or LGIP if they were "consistent with or superior to" the

---

<sup>13</sup> Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc., Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER19-1946-000 (filed May 22, 2019) (Filing).

<sup>14</sup> Filing at 3-4.

<sup>15</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 43.

terms of the *pro forma* LGIA and LGIP.<sup>16</sup> The Commission also permitted transmission providers to justify a variation to the *pro forma* LGIA or LGIP based on regional reliability requirements and required transmission providers submitting such regional reliability variations to the Commission for approval to identify the proposed variations and explain why such variations are necessary.<sup>17</sup> We will evaluate South Carolina's proposed variations from the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A accordingly.

## 2. Interconnection Customer's Option to Build

11. In Order No. 845, the Commission revised articles 5.1, 5.1.3, and 5.1.4 of the *pro forma* LGIA to allow interconnection customers to unilaterally exercise the option to build for stand-alone network upgrades and the transmission provider's interconnection facilities, regardless of whether the transmission provider can complete construction of such facilities by the interconnection customer's proposed in-service date, initial synchronization date, or commercial operation date.<sup>18</sup> Prior to Order No. 845, this option to build was available to an interconnection customer only if the transmission provider did not agree to the interconnection customer's preferred construction timeline.<sup>19</sup> The Commission stated in Order No. 845 that this reform of the option to build will "benefit the interconnection process by providing interconnection customers more control and certainty during the design and construction phases of the interconnection process."<sup>20</sup>

12. In Order No. 845-A, the Commission granted rehearing and clarification of certain aspects of the revised option to build. Specifically, the Commission revised the definition of stand-alone network upgrade in the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA to: (1) state that, when there is a disagreement, the transmission provider must provide the interconnection customer a written technical explanation outlining why the transmission provider does not consider a specific network upgrade to be a stand-alone network

---

<sup>16</sup> *Standardization of Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures*, Order No. 2003, 104 FERC ¶ 61,103, at P 825 (2003), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2003-A, 106 FERC ¶ 61,220, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2003-B, 109 FERC ¶ 61,287 (2004), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2003-C, 111 FERC ¶ 61,401 (2005), *aff'd sub nom. Nat'l Ass'n of Regulatory Util. Comm'rs v. FERC*, 475 F.3d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 2007).

<sup>17</sup> Order No. 2003, 104 FERC ¶ 61,103 at P 826; Order No. 2003-A, 106 FERC ¶ 61,220 at P 45.

<sup>18</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at PP 85-87.

<sup>19</sup> Order No. 2003, 104 FERC ¶ 61,103 at P 353; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 5.1.3.

<sup>20</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 85.

upgrade;<sup>21</sup> and (2) clarify that the option to build does not apply to stand-alone network upgrades on affected systems.<sup>22</sup> The Commission also made revisions to article 5.2 of the *pro forma* LGIA to allow transmission providers to recover oversight costs related to the interconnection customer's option to build.<sup>23</sup> In addition, the Commission clarified that the revised option to build provisions apply to all public utility transmission providers, including those that reimburse the interconnection customer for network upgrades.<sup>24</sup>

**a. South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

13. South Carolina proposes revisions to its *pro forma* LGIA amending articles 5.1, 5.1.3, 5.1.4, and 5.2(12) to incorporate the *pro forma* LGIA revisions adopted by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A without modification. Additionally, South Carolina proposes revisions to its *pro forma* LGIP revising section 1 Definitions to incorporate the *pro forma* LGIP revisions adopted by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A without modification.<sup>25</sup>

**b. Commission Determination**

14. We find that South Carolina's proposed revisions regarding the option to build comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina adopts the Commission's *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA revisions without modification.

**3. Dispute Resolution**

15. In Order No. 845, the Commission revised the *pro forma* LGIP by adding new section 13.5.5, which establishes generator interconnection dispute resolution procedures that allow a disputing party to unilaterally seek non-binding dispute resolution.<sup>26</sup> The Commission established these new procedures because dispute resolution was previously unavailable when the parties did not mutually agree to pursue a binding arbitration under section 13.5 of the pre-Order No. 845 *pro forma* LGIP. The Commission further

---

<sup>21</sup> Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 68.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* P 61.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* P 75.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.* P 33.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* P 68.

<sup>26</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 133; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 13.5.5.

explained that participation in the new non-binding dispute resolution process in *pro forma* LGIP section 13.5.5 does not preclude disputing parties from pursuing binding arbitration after the conclusion of the non-binding dispute resolution process if they seek a binding result.<sup>27</sup>

**a. South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

16. South Carolina's proposed revisions adopt the Commission's *pro forma* LGIP revisions for dispute resolution as required by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A without modification.<sup>28</sup>

**b. Commission Determination**

17. We find that South Carolina's proposed LGIP revisions regarding dispute resolution comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina adopts the Commission's *pro forma* revisions without modification.

**4. Identification and Definition of Contingent Facilities**

18. In Order No. 845, the Commission added a new definition to section 1 of the *pro forma* LGIP, providing that contingent facilities shall mean those unbuilt interconnection facilities and network upgrades upon which the interconnection request's costs, timing, and study findings are dependent, and if delayed or not built, could cause a need for restudies of the interconnection request or a reassessment of the interconnection facilities and/or network upgrades and/or costs and timing.<sup>29</sup> The Commission also added new section 3.8 to the *pro forma* LGIP, which requires transmission providers to include, within section 3.8, a method for identifying the contingent facilities that they will provide to the interconnection customer at the conclusion of the system impact study and include in the interconnection customer's generator interconnection agreement.<sup>30</sup> The Commission specified that the method must be sufficiently transparent to determine why a specific contingent facility was identified and how it relates to the interconnection request.<sup>31</sup> The Commission stated that this transparency will ensure that the method is

---

<sup>27</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 139.

<sup>28</sup> Filing at 12; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 13.5.5.

<sup>29</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 218; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 1 (Definitions).

<sup>30</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 199.

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 3.8.

applied on a non-discriminatory basis.<sup>32</sup> The Commission further required that transmission providers provide, upon the interconnection customer's request, the estimated network upgrade costs and estimated in-service completion date associated with each identified contingent facility when this information is readily available and not commercially sensitive.<sup>33</sup>

**a. South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

19. South Carolina proposes revisions to its LGIP to add a new section 3.8 for identifying contingent facilities. South Carolina proposes to identify contingent facilities through comparative modeling of its transmission system. South Carolina also proposes language that explains that interconnection modeling cases are created by modifying base cases to include the requested generating facility information to determine if any violations would occur on the transmission system as a result of the interconnection request. South Carolina proposes that contingent facilities are the facilities identified as part of South Carolina's expansion plans and part of higher-queued interconnection requests that must be constructed or upgraded to alleviate the identified violations. In addition, South Carolina proposes that the system impact study report will identify the name of the contingent facility, a description of the identified violations making the facility a contingent facility, a description of the scope of work necessary for each contingent facility (including the relevant interconnection facilities and/or network upgrades), and, upon request, the estimated costs of the interconnection facilities and/or network upgrades and the in-service completion time of each contingent facility. The LGIA will also set forth the contingent facilities in Appendix C.<sup>34</sup>

20. South Carolina also proposes language stating that changes in its expansion plans, or modifications, delays, or withdrawals of higher-queued interconnection requests, which impact the contingent facilities, could necessitate a restudy of the interconnection customer's interconnection request, and/or reassessment of their costs or timing. As a result of such reassessment, the interconnection customer could bear cost responsibility for the identified contingent facilities, in addition to its network upgrades or interconnection facilities costs.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 200.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.* P 199; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 3.8.

<sup>34</sup> Filing at 11-12; *see also* South Carolina OATT, attach. M, LGIP §§ 3.8.1 and 3.8.2 (Identification of Contingent Facilities).

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* at 12.



**b. Commission Determination**

21. We find that the revised provisions that identify and describe South Carolina's method for determining contingent facilities, as South Carolina proposes in its LGIP, partially comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. We find that South Carolina complies with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina has adopted the definition of contingent facilities and the language regarding the need for the transmission provider to include in LGIP section 3.8 a method for identification of contingent facilities without modification. Further, South Carolina's proposed Tariff revisions comply with the requirements related to providing estimated network upgrade costs and estimated in-service completion dates associated with contingent facilities to the interconnection customer.

22. However, as specified in Order No. 845, transmission providers must include, in section 3.8 of their LGIPs, a method for determining contingent facilities.<sup>36</sup> The Commission required that this method must provide sufficient transparency to determine why a specific contingent facility was identified and how it relates to the interconnection request.<sup>37</sup> The Commission also required that a transmission provider's method to identify contingent facilities be transparent enough to ensure that it will be applied on a non-discriminatory basis.<sup>38</sup> South Carolina's proposed Tariff revisions lack the requisite transparency required by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because the proposed Tariff revisions do not detail the specific thresholds or criteria that South Carolina will use as part of its method to identify contingent facilities.<sup>39</sup> Without this information, an interconnection customer will not understand how South Carolina will evaluate potential contingent facilities to determine their relationship to an individual interconnection request.<sup>40</sup> Further, including provisions regarding specific thresholds or criteria in South Carolina's LGIP will ensure South Carolina's technical screens or analyses will be applied to interconnection requests on a consistent, not unduly discriminatory or preferential basis. Accordingly, we direct South Carolina to file, within sixty (60) days

---

<sup>36</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 199.

<sup>37</sup> *Id.* P 200.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.*

<sup>39</sup> The Commission declined to implement a standard threshold or criteria, such as a specific distribution factor threshold, because different thresholds may be more appropriate for different queue types and geographical footprints. *Id.* P 220.

<sup>40</sup> *See pro forma* LGIP, § 3.8 ("The method shall be sufficiently transparent to determine why a specific Contingent Facility was identified.").

of the date of this order, a further compliance filing that includes the specific thresholds or criteria to achieve the level of transparency required by Order No. 845.

## 5. Transparency Regarding Study Models and Assumptions

23. In Order No. 845, the Commission revised section 2.3 of the *pro forma* LGIP to require transmission providers to maintain network models and underlying assumptions on either an Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS) site or a password-protected website. If the transmission provider posts this information on a password-protected website, a link to the information must be provided on its OASIS site. Revised *pro forma* LGIP section 2.3 also requires that “network models and underlying assumptions reasonably represent those used during the most recent interconnection study and be representative of current system conditions.” In addition, the Commission revised *pro forma* LGIP section 2.3 to allow transmission providers to require interconnection customers, OASIS site users, and password-protected website users to sign a confidentiality agreement before the release of commercially sensitive information or critical energy infrastructure information (CEII).<sup>41</sup>

24. In Order No. 845-A, the Commission reiterated that neither the Commission’s CEII regulations nor Order No. 845 precludes a transmission provider from taking necessary steps to protect information within its custody or control to ensure the safety and security of the electric grid.<sup>42</sup> The Commission also clarified that, to the extent any party would like to use the Commission’s CEII regulations as a model for evaluating entities that request network model information and assumptions (prior to signing a non-disclosure agreement), it may do so.<sup>43</sup> The Commission further clarified that the phrase “current system conditions” does not require transmission providers to maintain network models that reflect current real-time operating conditions of the transmission provider’s system. Instead, the network model information should reflect the system conditions currently used in interconnection studies.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 236; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 2.3.

<sup>42</sup> Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 84 (citing Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 241).

<sup>43</sup> *Id.* P 85 (citing 18 C.F.R. § 388.113(g)(5)(i)(2019)).

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* P 88.

a. **South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

25. South Carolina proposes revisions to section 2.3 of its LGIP to incorporate the language regarding study models and assumptions adopted by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A without modification.<sup>45</sup>

b. **Commission Determination**

26. We find that South Carolina's proposed LGIP revisions regarding study models and assumptions comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina adopts the *pro forma* LGIP provisions without modification.

6. **Definition of Generating Facility**

27. In Order No. 845, the Commission revised the definition of "Generating Facility" to include electric storage resources and to allow electric storage resources to interconnect pursuant to the Commission-jurisdictional large generator interconnection processes. Specifically, the Commission revised the definition of "Generating Facility" in the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA as follows:

Generating Facility shall mean Interconnection Customer's device for the production *and/or storage for later injection* of electricity identified in the Interconnection Request, but shall not include the Interconnection Customer's Interconnection Facilities.<sup>46</sup>

The Commission found that this definitional change will reduce a potential barrier to large electric storage resources with a generating facility capacity above 20 MW that wish to interconnect pursuant to the terms in the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Filing at 12; *see also* South Carolina OATT, attach. M, LGIP § 2.3 (Base Case Data).

<sup>46</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 275 (additions italicized); *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 1 (Definitions).

<sup>47</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 275.

a. **South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

28. South Carolina proposes revisions to section 1 of both its LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA to incorporate the Commission's revised definition of "Generating Facility" adopted by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A without modification.<sup>48</sup>

b. **Commission Determination**

29. We find that South Carolina's revisions regarding the definition of a "Generating Facility" comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina adopts the Commission's *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA provisions without modification.

7. **Interconnection Study Deadlines**

30. In Order No. 845, the Commission modified the *pro forma* LGIP to add sections 3.5.2 and 3.5.3, which require transmission providers to calculate and maintain on their OASIS sites or public websites summary statistics related to the timing of the transmission provider's processing of interconnection studies and to update those statistics on a quarterly basis. In these sections, the Commission included bracketed Tariff language to be completed by the transmission provider in accordance with the timelines established for the various studies in their LGIPs.<sup>49</sup> The Commission also revised the *pro forma* LGIP to add section 3.5.4 to require transmission providers to file informational reports with the Commission if a transmission provider exceeds its interconnection study deadlines for more than 25 percent of any study type for two consecutive calendar quarters.<sup>50</sup> In adopting these reporting requirements, the Commission found that the reporting requirements strike a reasonable balance between providing increased transparency and information to interconnection customers and not unduly burdening transmission providers.<sup>51</sup> In Order No. 845-A, the Commission revised

---

<sup>48</sup> Filing at 12-13; *see also* South Carolina OATT, attach. M, LGIP § 1 (Definitions) and app. 6, LGIA, art. 1 (Definitions).

<sup>49</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 305; *see also pro forma* LGIP, §§ 3.5.2 and 3.5.3.

<sup>50</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 305; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 3.5.4.

<sup>51</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 307.

*pro forma* LGIP section 3.5.3 to clarify that the data reporting and retention requirements begin in the first calendar quarter of 2020.<sup>52</sup>

**a. South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

31. South Carolina proposes to add new sections 3.5.2, 3.5.3, and 3.5.4 to its LGIP that incorporate the language adopted by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. Additionally, South Carolina proposes revisions that replace the bracketed placeholders in *pro forma* LGIP sections 3.5.2.1, 3.5.2.2, and 3.5.2.3 with timelines that align with the timelines already in its Tariff to complete the feasibility, system impact, and facilities studies, respectively.<sup>53</sup>

**b. Commission Determination**

32. We find that South Carolina's proposed LGIP revisions regarding interconnection studies deadlines comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. South Carolina's proposed revisions adopt the language provided in Order No. 845 without modification and replace the bracketed placeholders in *pro forma* LGIP sections 3.5.2.1, 3.5.2.2, and 3.5.2.3 with timelines that align with the timelines already in its Tariff.

**8. Requesting Interconnection Service below Generating Facility Capacity**

33. In Order No. 845, the Commission modified sections 3.1, 6.3, 7.3, 8.2, and Appendix 1 of the *pro forma* LGIP to allow interconnection customers to request interconnection service that is lower than the proposed generating facility's capacity,<sup>54</sup> recognizing the need for proper control technologies and flexibility for transmission providers to propose penalties to ensure that the generating facility does not inject energy above the requested level of service.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 107.

<sup>53</sup> Filing at 13; *see also* South Carolina OATT, attach. M, LGIP §§ 3.5.2 (Study Statistics), 3.5.3, and 3.5.4.

<sup>54</sup> The term generating facility capacity is defined as "the net capacity of the Generating Facility and the aggregate net capacity of the Generating Facility where it includes multiple energy production devices." *Pro forma* LGIA, art. 1.

<sup>55</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 367; *see also pro forma* LGIP, §§ 3.1, 6.3, 7.3, and 8.2, and *pro forma* LGIP, app. 1.

34. The Commission required, in *pro forma* LGIP revised section 3.1, that transmission providers have a process in place to consider requests for interconnection service below the generating facility capacity. The Commission stipulated that such requests should be studied at the level of interconnection service requested for purposes of determining interconnection facilities, network upgrades, and associated costs, but that such requests may be subject to other studies at the full generating facility capacity to ensure safety and reliability of the system.<sup>56</sup> In addition, *pro forma* LGIP revised section 3.1 states that the interconnection customer is responsible for all study costs and interconnection facility and/or network upgrade costs required for safety and reliability. The Commission also required in *pro forma* LGIP revised section 3.1 that any necessary control technologies and/or protection systems be memorialized in the LGIA.

35. The Commission required, in *pro forma* LGIP revised sections 6.3, 7.3, and 8.2, that the feasibility, system impact, and facilities studies be performed at the level of interconnection service that the interconnection customer requests, unless the transmission provider is otherwise required to study the full generating facility capacity due to safety and reliability concerns. The Commission stated that, if the transmission provider determines that additional network upgrades are necessary based on these studies, it must specify which additional network upgrade costs are based on which studies and provide a detailed explanation of why the additional network upgrades are necessary.<sup>57</sup>

36. Finally, the Commission revised sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 of the *pro forma* LGIP to allow an interconnection customer to reduce the size of its interconnection request either prior to returning to the transmission provider an executed system impact study agreement or an executed facilities study agreement.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at PP 383-384.

<sup>57</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 384. The Commission clarified that, if the transmission provider determines, based on good utility practice and related engineering considerations and after accounting for the proposed control technology, that studies at the full generating facility capacity are necessary to ensure safety and reliability of the transmission system when an interconnection customer requests interconnection service that is lower than full generating facility capacity, then it must provide a detailed explanation for such a determination in writing to the interconnection customer. *Id.*

<sup>58</sup> *Id.* P 406; see also *pro forma* LGIP §§ 4.4.1 and 4.4.2.

**a. South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

37. South Carolina proposes revisions to its LGIP that adopt the Commission's proposed reforms to sections 3.1, 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 6.3, 7.3, and 8.2 and Appendix 1 to incorporate the language set forth in Order Nos. 845 and 845-A without modification.<sup>59</sup> However, South Carolina's proposed Tariff revisions do not fully incorporate the *pro forma* LGIP language adopted by Order No. 845.<sup>60</sup> Order No. 845 adopted the following language as the second sentence of the final paragraph in *pro forma* LGIP section 3.1:

These requests for Interconnection Service shall be studied at the level of Interconnection Service requested for purposes of Interconnection Facilities, Network Upgrades, and associated costs, but may be subject to other studies at the full Generating Facility Capacity to ensure safety and reliability of the system, with the study costs borne by the Interconnection Customer.<sup>61</sup>

**b. Commission Determination**

38. We find that South Carolina's proposed LGIP revisions that allow an interconnection customer to request interconnection service below its full generating facility capacity partially comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina incorporates most of the *pro forma* LGIP language without modification. However, as discussed above, South Carolina's revisions to section 3.1 of its LGIP omit some of the *pro forma* LGIP language required by Order No. 845.<sup>62</sup> Accordingly, we direct South Carolina to file, within sixty (60) days of the date of this order, a further compliance filing that incorporates the *pro forma* revisions to section 3.1 of its LGIP, as required by Order No. 845.

---

<sup>59</sup> Filing at 12-13.

<sup>60</sup> See Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 117.

<sup>61</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 347; see also *id.* P 367. The italics indicate language adopted by Order No. 845 that South Carolina's Tariff revisions failed to include. We recognize, however, that the *pro forma* LGIP that was available on the Commission's website failed to include that language.

<sup>62</sup> *Id.* PP 347, 367, and app. B.

## 9. Provisional Interconnection Service

39. In Order No. 845, the Commission required transmission providers to allow all interconnection customers to request provisional interconnection service.<sup>63</sup> The Commission explained that interconnection customers may seek provisional interconnection service when available studies or additional studies, as necessary, indicate that there is a level of interconnection service that can occur to accommodate an interconnection request without the construction of any additional interconnection facilities and/or network upgrades, and the interconnection customer wishes to make use of that level of interconnection service while the facilities required for its full interconnection request are completed.<sup>64</sup> To implement this service, the Commission revised the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA to add a definition for “Provisional Interconnection Service”<sup>65</sup> and for a “Provisional Large Generator Interconnection Agreement.”<sup>66</sup>

40. In addition, the Commission added *pro forma* LGIA article 5.9.2, which details the terms for provisional interconnection service.<sup>67</sup> The Commission also explained that transmission providers have the discretion to determine the frequency for updating provisional interconnection studies to account for changes to the transmission system to reassess system capacity available for provisional interconnection service, and included bracketed tariff language to be completed by the transmission provider to specify the frequency at which they perform such studies in their *pro forma* LGIA.<sup>68</sup> The Commission stated that interconnection customers are responsible for the costs for performing these provisional interconnection studies.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> *Id.* P 438.

<sup>64</sup> *Id.* P 441.

<sup>65</sup> *Pro forma* LGIP, § 1 (Definitions); *pro forma* LGIA, art. 1 (Definitions).

<sup>66</sup> *Pro forma* LGIP, § 1 (Definitions); *pro forma* LGIA, art. 1 (Definitions). The Commission declined, however, to adopt a separate *pro forma* provisional large generator interconnection agreement. Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 444.

<sup>67</sup> *Id.* P 438; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 5.9.2.

<sup>68</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 448.

<sup>69</sup> *Id.*



**a. South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

41. South Carolina proposes revisions to adopt the Commission's *pro forma* definitions related to provisional interconnection service and *pro forma* language in its LGIA article 5.9.2 without modification. South Carolina proposes to fill in the bracketed section of article 5.9.2 to state that it will study and update the maximum permissible output of a generating facility subject to a provisional LGIA on an annual basis.<sup>70</sup>

**b. Commission Determination**

42. We find that South Carolina's proposed LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA revisions regarding provisional interconnection service comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina proposes to adopt the Commission's *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA provisions without modification, except to fill in the bracketed section in *pro forma* LGIA article 5.9.2 to state that it will study and update the maximum permissible output of the generating facility subject to a provisional LGIA on an annual basis.

**10. Surplus Interconnection Service**

43. In Order No. 845, the Commission adopted *pro forma* LGIP sections 1, 3.3, and 3.3.1 and *pro forma* LGIA article 1 to establish surplus interconnection service, which the Commission defined as any unneeded portion of interconnection service established in an LGIA such that if the surplus interconnection service is utilized the total amount of interconnection service at the point of interconnection would remain the same.<sup>71</sup> Surplus interconnection service enables a new interconnection customer to utilize the unused portion of an existing interconnection customer's interconnection service within specific parameters.<sup>72</sup> The Commission required transmission providers to revise their tariffs to include the new definition of surplus interconnection service in their *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA, and provide in the *pro forma* LGIP an expedited interconnection process outside of the interconnection queue for surplus interconnection service.<sup>73</sup> That expedited process must allow affiliates of the existing interconnection customer to use

---

<sup>70</sup> Filing at 12-14.

<sup>71</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 467; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 1 (Definitions); *pro forma* LGIA, art. 1 (Definitions).

<sup>72</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 467; Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 119.

<sup>73</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 467; *see also pro forma* LGIP, §§ 3.3 and 3.3.1.

surplus interconnection service for another interconnecting generating facility and allow for the transfer of surplus interconnection service that the existing interconnection customer or one of its affiliates does not intend to use.<sup>74</sup> The transmission provider must perform reactive power, short circuit/fault duty, and stability analyses studies as well as steady-state (thermal/voltage) analyses as necessary to ensure evaluation of all required reliability conditions to provide surplus interconnection service and ensure the reliable use of surplus interconnection service.<sup>75</sup> The original interconnection customer must be able to stipulate the amount of surplus interconnection service that is available, designate when that service is available, and describe any other conditions under which surplus interconnection service at the point of interconnection may be used.<sup>76</sup> When the original interconnection customer, the surplus interconnection service customer, and the transmission provider enter into agreements for surplus interconnection service, they must be filed by the transmission provider with the Commission, because any surplus interconnection service agreement will be an agreement under the transmission provider's open access transmission tariff.<sup>77</sup>

**a. South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

44. South Carolina proposes new provisions that include: (1) a definition for surplus interconnection service to its LGIP and the *pro forma* LGIA; and (2) new LGIP section 3.3, which addresses the process for utilizing surplus interconnection service. In addition, South Carolina notes that it includes a new definition of "Surplus Interconnection Service Customer," although that was not specifically required by Order No. 845. South Carolina states that its proposed definition of "Surplus Interconnection Service Customer" is based on the definition of "Interconnection Customer" in the *pro forma* LGIP and intends to add clarity to the provisions associated with surplus interconnection service.<sup>78</sup>

45. New LGIP section 3.3.1 states that the original interconnection customer may elect to offer surplus interconnection service to affiliates or non-affiliates and provides a process for evaluating the surplus interconnection service that is separate and apart from the traditional interconnection queue.

---

<sup>74</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 483; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 3.3.

<sup>75</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at PP 455, 467.

<sup>76</sup> *Id.* P 481.

<sup>77</sup> *Id.* P 499.

<sup>78</sup> Filing at 10.

46. New LGIP section 3.3.2 provides the terms and conditions associated with the surplus interconnection service agreement. More specifically, this section provides that the original interconnection customer, the surplus interconnection service customer, and South Carolina enter into a surplus interconnection service agreement, which must reflect: (i) term of operation; (ii) interconnection service limit; (iii) mode of operation for energy production; and (iv) roles and responsibilities of the parties for maintaining the operation of the generating facility within the parameters of the surplus interconnection service agreement. LGIP section 3.3.2 also states that South Carolina shall file the surplus interconnection service agreement with the Commission and that, if the surplus interconnection service customer disputes an issue in that agreement, South Carolina must file the unexecuted agreement if requested to do so by the surplus interconnection service customer.

47. Finally, newly proposed LGIP section 3.3.3 addresses the termination of surplus interconnection service and incorporates the limited conditions under which surplus interconnection service may be permitted to continue for up to one year following the retirement and permanent cessation of commercial operation of the original interconnection customer's generating facility. Specifically, LGIP section 3.3.3 provides that existing surplus interconnection service may continue for up to one year after the original interconnection customer's interconnection service terminates if: (1) the surplus interconnection service customer makes a written request to South Carolina to extend the surplus interconnection service; (2) the surplus interconnection service customer's generation facility was studied by South Carolina for sole operation at the point of interconnection at the time of interconnection of the surplus interconnection service customer; and (3) the original interconnection customer (whose interconnection service is now terminating) has agreed in writing that the surplus interconnection service customer may continue to operate at, or up to, the current surplus interconnection service limit.

**b. Commission Determination**

48. We find that the revisions regarding surplus interconnection service as proposed comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because South Carolina adopts the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA revisions for surplus interconnection service as required by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A without modification. We also find that South Carolina's proposed process for evaluating and transferring surplus interconnection service complies with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. The process provides that South Carolina will evaluate surplus interconnection service requests outside of the non-surplus interconnection queue. Additionally, as required by Order Nos. 845 and 845-A, South Carolina's proposed process requires that the transmission provider, original interconnection customer, and surplus interconnection service customer file a surplus interconnection service agreement with the Commission that includes the terms and conditions of surplus interconnection service.

## 11. Material Modifications and Incorporation of Advanced Technologies

49. In Order No. 845, the Commission modified section 4.4.2(c) of the *pro forma* LGIP to allow an interconnection customer to incorporate certain technological advancements to its interconnection request, prior to the execution of the interconnection facilities study agreement,<sup>79</sup> without risking the loss of its queue position. The Commission required transmission providers to develop and include in their LGIPs a definition of permissible technological advancements that will create a category of technological changes that, by definition, do not constitute a material modification and, therefore, will not result in the loss of queue position. In addition, the Commission modified section 4.4.6 of the *pro forma* LGIP to require transmission providers to insert a technological change procedure that includes the requisite information and process that the transmission provider will follow to assess whether an interconnection customer's proposed technological advancement is a material modification.<sup>80</sup>

50. The Commission required that the technological change procedure specify what technological advancements can be incorporated at various stages of the interconnection process and clearly identify which requirements apply to the interconnection customer and which apply to the transmission provider.<sup>81</sup> Additionally, the technological change procedure must state that, if the interconnection customer seeks to incorporate technological advancements into its proposed generating facility, it should submit a technological advancement request, and the procedure must specify the information that the interconnection customer must submit as part of that request.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> While the Commission clarified that interconnection customers may submit a technological advancement request up until execution of the facilities study agreement, the Commission stated that it will permit transmission providers to propose rules limiting the submission of technological advancement requests to a single point in the study process (prior to the execution of a facilities study agreement), to the extent the transmission provider believes it appropriate. Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 536.

<sup>80</sup> *Id.* P 518; *see also pro forma* LGIP, § 4.4.6.

<sup>81</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 519.

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*

51. The Commission also required that the technological change procedure specify the conditions under which a study will or will not be necessary to determine whether a proposed technological advancement is a material modification.<sup>83</sup> The Commission explained that the technological change procedure must also state that, if a study is necessary to evaluate whether a particular technological advancement is a material modification, the transmission provider shall clearly indicate to the interconnection customer the types of information and/or study inputs that the interconnection customer must provide to the transmission provider, including, for example, study scenarios, modeling data, and any other assumptions.<sup>84</sup> In addition, the Commission required that the technological change procedure explain how the transmission provider will evaluate the technological advancement request to determine whether it is a material modification.<sup>85</sup>

52. Further, the Commission required that the technological change procedure outline a time frame of no more than thirty (30) days after the interconnection customer submits a formal technological advancement request for the transmission provider to perform and complete any necessary additional studies.<sup>86</sup> The Commission also found that, if the transmission provider determines that additional studies are necessary to evaluate whether a technological advancement is a material modification, the interconnection customer must tender a deposit, and the transmission provider must specify the amount of the deposit in the transmission provider's technological change procedure.<sup>87</sup> In addition, the Commission explained that, if the transmission provider cannot accommodate a proposed technological advancement without triggering the material modification provision of the *pro forma* LGIP, the transmission provider must provide an explanation to the interconnection customer regarding why the technological advancement is a material modification.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> *Id.*; Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 155.

<sup>84</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 521.

<sup>85</sup> *Id.*

<sup>86</sup> *Id.* P 535; Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 155.

<sup>87</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 534. The Commission set the default deposit amount to \$10,000, but stated that a transmission provider may propose a reasonable alternative deposit amount in its compliance filing and include a justification supporting this alternative amount. *Id.*

<sup>88</sup> *Id.* P 522.

53. In Order No. 845-A, the Commission clarified that: (1) when studies are necessary, the interconnection customer's technological change request must demonstrate that the proposed incorporation of the technological change will result in electrical performance that is equal to or better than the electrical performance expected prior to the technological change and will not cause any reliability concerns; (2) if the interconnection customer cannot demonstrate in its technological change request that the proposed technological change would result in equal or better electrical performance, the change will be assessed pursuant to the existing material modification provisions in the *pro forma* LGIP; (3) information regarding electrical performance submitted by the interconnection customer is an input into the technological change study, and this factor alone is not determinative of whether a proposed technological change is a material modification; and (4) the determination of whether a proposed technological change (that the transmission provider does not otherwise include in its definition of permissible technological advancements) is a material modification should include an analysis of whether the proposed technological change materially impacts the timing and costs of lower-queued interconnection customers.<sup>89</sup>

a. **South Carolina's Compliance Filing**

54. South Carolina proposes revisions to its LGIP that incorporate a definition of permissible technological advancement to section 1 of its LGIP and a new section 4.4.6 to the LGIP.

55. South Carolina proposes the following definition of Permissible Technological Advancement in LGIP section 1:

**Permissible Technological Advancement** shall mean a change to technology of Generating Facility equipment that does not: (i) result in the transmission provider determining that the change is a material modification; (ii) require increasing the amount of originally requested interconnection service; or (iii) violate applicable reliability standards or otherwise cause reliability concerns. A Permissible Technological Advancement may include changes in the types of turbines, inverters, plant supervisory controls, or other advancements, provided they do not change generation technology, fuel type, or electrical characteristics such as facility ratings, impedances, efficiencies, capabilities, or performance of the generating facility equipment under

---

<sup>89</sup> Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 155.

steady state and/or dynamic conditions. A Permissible Technological Advancement does not constitute a material modification.

56. In addition, proposed LGIP section 4.4.6 sets forth the technological change procedures. Among other things, this section specifies that an interconnection customer may propose a technological advancement for a generating facility it has in the interconnecting queue at any time prior to the execution of the interconnection facilities study agreement and provides the specific information that the interconnection customer must include with its technological advancement request. In addition, LGIP section 4.4.6 states that if, after review of the request, South Carolina is able to easily assess and determine that the proposed technological advancement will not change study outcomes, or otherwise change the generating facility's effect on South Carolina's transmission system, the request will be accepted and the change will be considered a permissible technological advancement. If South Carolina is not able to easily assess the proposed changes and determines that further studies are necessary, the interconnection customer must, within five (5) days of being informed that further studies are necessary, provide a study deposit of \$10,000, and any additional information that South Carolina may request to complete the studies. South Carolina proposes to complete the necessary studies within thirty (30) calendar days (or as otherwise agreed upon with the interconnection customer) of receiving the study deposit and additional information and will provide a report to the interconnection customer. The report will consider material impacts to the South Carolina transmission system with regard to short circuit capability limits, steady-state thermal and voltage limits, or dynamic system stability and whether the proposed technological advancement materially impacts the timing and costs of lower-queued interconnection customers. Proposed LGIP section 4.4.6 also states that the study report provided to the interconnection customer will contain sufficient information to explain why South Carolina determined that the proposed technological advancement is either a material modification or a permissible technological advancement.<sup>90</sup>

57. With respect to the requirement that the transmission provider complete the studies within thirty (30) days after the interconnection customer submits a completed technological advancement request, South Carolina notes that section 4.4.6 includes the thirty (30) day deadline and adds language permitting the deadline to be extended if the interconnection customer agrees to such an extension. South Carolina asserts that this inclusion of this type of language is consistent with other provisions in the *pro forma* LGIP and LGIA.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> *Id.*

<sup>91</sup> *Id.*

**b. Commission Determination**

58. We find that South Carolina's proposed LGIP revisions to incorporate a definition of a permissible technological advancement and a technological change procedure partially comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 845 and 845-A. Specifically, we find that South Carolina's proposed definition of a permissible technological advancement meets the Commission's requirement to provide a category of technological change that does not constitute a material modification. We also find that South Carolina's provision permitting extension of the thirty (30) day deadline is compliant with Order Nos. 845 and 845-A because the extension requires agreement between South Carolina and the interconnection customer and extending the study period may increase the likelihood that the proposed technological advancement is allowed without triggering the material modification provisions of the LGIP.

59. With regard to the deadline for completion of a technological advancement request, Order No. 845 provides that the determination of whether a change is a material modification must be made within thirty (30) days of the initial request.<sup>92</sup> However, South Carolina's revised LGIP provides that the study will be completed within thirty (30) days of receipt of the deposit and any additional information needed to complete the study, which may be more than thirty (30) days after South Carolina receives the initial technological advancement request. Accordingly, we direct South Carolina to file, within sixty (60) days of the date of this order, a further compliance filing that revises its proposed technological change procedure to provide that the South Carolina will determine whether or not a technological advancement is a material modification within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the initial request.

**12. Other Issues**

60. On June 14, 2019, in Docket No. ER19-2139-000, South Carolina submitted a filing seeking, among other things, to administratively cancel its previous eTariff database, "Fifth Revised Volume No. 5," and establish a new eTariff database, "OATT and Service Agreements," to reflect the company changing its name from South Carolina Electric & Gas Company to Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc. and to make a correction in Attachment H. In that filing, South Carolina requested the Commission to administratively transfer the remaining contents of its previous database into its "OATT and Service Agreements" database. With respect to any tariff record versions under its existing eTariff database "Fifth Revised Volume No. 5" that have a pending status, South Carolina committed to make a compliance filing in the docket in which the tariff records were proposed to place those tariff records under the new eTariff database "OATT and

---

<sup>92</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 535; Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 155.



Service Agreements” upon the receipt of an order accepting such tariff records by the Commission.<sup>93</sup>

61. Consistent with South Carolina’s commitment made in Docket No. ER19-2139-000, we direct South Carolina to file to transfer its tariff records filed in this proceeding, into its new, Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc.’s eTariff database “OATT and Service Agreements” within sixty (60) days of the date of this order.

The Commission orders:

(A) South Carolina’s compliance filing is hereby accepted, effective May 22, 2019, subject to a further compliance filing, as discussed in the body of this order.

(B) South Carolina is hereby directed to submit a compliance filing within sixty (60) days of the date of this order, as discussed in the body of this order.

(C) South Carolina is hereby directed to submit its tariff records into its new eTariff database within sixty (60) days of the date of this order, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

( S E A L )

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,  
Deputy Secretary.

---

<sup>93</sup> Dominion Energy South Carolina, Compliance Filing – Name Change, Correction to Attachment H, and Baseline Open Access Transmission Tariff, Docket No. ER19-2139-000 (filed June 14, 2019).