

## South Carolina Resource Study

Comments provided by David Odell, Solar Business Alliance

### Section 1.0, bottom of page 1-3

It is important to understand that there are no “technical challenges” for implementing solar within the derived constrained potential levels. Isn’t that what is meant by constrained potential – i.e. no upgrades to the existing electrical system to handle intermittency, and using today’s technologies and infrastructure. These solar technologies exist today.

### Section 2.1, bottom of page 2-2

SCE&G’s 2.6 MW in North Charleston is now online and the current combined capacity should reflect this addition. It’s significant enough in the solar footprint of SC to amend this report.

### Section 4.1, page 4-5

These numbers from Table A-3 are based on a 2004 study. In just the last 5 years solar PV parking canopies have dramatically become viable solutions for solar PV systems. The Urban percentages for solar PV development potential can easily be doubled and most likely tripled to include solar PV parking canopies. MW-sized canopy systems are becoming common-place in other parts of the country.

### Section 4.1, bottom of page 4-5

7 Acres per MW AC is extremely conservative. Perhaps 6 acres is more accurate. In the southeast, current technologies and recent pricing are pushing PV installations towards solutions that consist of crystalline modules in a fixed or single axis tracker mounting solution. The technologies that increase land requirements such as dual-axis tracking and lower efficient thin-film modules are rarely employed on large scale projects in the Carolinas and surrounding states.

### Section 4.3, page 4-8

The real potential list of financial incentives to facilitate solar PV Development can be much longer. Various municipalities/states/countries have utilized many other means; property tax abatement, feed in tariffs, renewable portfolio standards, etc...

### Section 4.4, page 4-9

“Studies have shown” – I think it’s important to denote that the two studies being referenced are simulated modelings and are specific to the state of Wisconsin (2010) and Texas (2006). Also the Wisconsin study author is “Myers”.

### Section 4.4, last sentence page 4-9

“...the gap between the cost of solar compared the cost of electricity in the state.” I think I know what it’s trying to say, but it’s not what’s written.