

I believe that most of the comments made by Nick Rigas, the Coastal Conservation League, MeadWestvaco, SC Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Alliance, and the Solar Business Alliance are outside the charge given by the EAC to B&V and ORS. However, there are some selected comments which should be taken into consideration.

1. Nick Rigas asks a fair question about how much wind can be integrated into the existing system without major upgrades. Perhaps the Santee Cooper studies have examined this. In fact, the Dept. of Energy is helping fund a relatively new study to address that very issue in the Carolinas: <http://www.windpowerengineering.com/construction/projects/companies-collaborate-on-carolinas-offshore-wind-integration-case-study/>
2. As part of the Palmetto Wind project, Santee Cooper addressed viewshed concerns with an artist rendering of how future wind turbines would be seen from shore. I have attached their photo. Wind turbines placed beyond 5 miles of shore are not visible. I have attached a viewshed picture. It should be included in the report as a footnote. The Offshore Wind Task Force should also be mentioned in the report. Their information will not be available until summer of 2013, but a mention of the work being done is important.
3. 20% losses for off shore wind sound high to Cooperatives as well. Not sure where this number comes from.
4. Under "Solar", CCL suggests Boeing be included. Agree.
5. "Biomass" has a valid point that the expiration of the MACT is a potential price escalator for biomass plants.

Within its general comments, the Coastal Conservation League makes several substantive and positive suggestions as to what might be included in a "final report on renewable resource potential." The scope of the current B&V and ORS report does not address any of these suggestions beyond: 1) "Catalogue of viable renewable resources available in South Carolina" and 2) "The average cost range associated with developing these resources" and, therefore, have not served to frame public comment. The cooperatives suggest that EAC consider CCL's suggestion and recommend to PURC further areas for review at a later date.