

From: [Claunch, Chuck <Chuck.Claunch@duke-energy.com>](mailto:Chuck.Claunch@duke-energy.com)
To: [Danny Varat DannyVarat@scstatehouse.gov](mailto:DannyVarat@scstatehouse.gov)
Date: 4/10/2018 8:30:16 AM
Subject: RE: Senator Davis proviso Sec. 72, PSC - Rule 24

Thank you Danny. I'll hold off bothering him. Appreciate the heads up. Chuck

From: Danny Varat [<mailto:DannyVarat@scstatehouse.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 8:29 AM
To: Claunch, Chuck
Subject: Re: Senator Davis proviso Sec. 72, PSC - Rule 24

***** Exercise caution. This is an EXTERNAL email. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.**

Chuck, thanks. I don't think he'll be free before session, but I'll make sure that he and I discuss this today.

DV

From: Claunch, Chuck <Chuck.Claunch@duke-energy.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 8:19 AM
To: Danny Varat
Subject: Senator Davis proviso Sec. 72, PSC - Rule 24

Good morning Danny,

I wanted to give you a heads up that I'm planning to text the Lt. Governor this morning to see if he would have a minute to discuss Duke Energy's concerns with S.890 and Senator Davis' proviso.

We believe the proviso clearly seeks special treatment for one type of utility contract, thereby amending and restricting the statutory provisions that authorize the Commission to oversee utility contracts to ensure they are just and reasonable and don't result in unnecessary costs being passed on to customers.

I've attached our Rule 24 statement and another copy of our position paper on S.890, which we believe passes unnecessary costs to consumers.

I would appreciate any help or advice you may have.

Thank you, Chuck

From: Claunch, Chuck
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 4:31 PM
To: Danny Varat (dannyvarat@scstatehouse.gov)
Subject: Duke Energy position paper - S.890 - PURPA Federal Mandate

Hi Danny,

The attached 2-page paper was shared with bill sponsor Davis who then convened a meeting with Southern Current, Cypress Creek and Duke Energy several weeks ago. Both solar developers have multiple projects proposed for the Duke Energy grid in South Carolina. Cypress Creek even has solar farms already constructed and operating on the Duke grid in North Carolina. All 3 companies know each other well. In fact, there are about 2,500 megawatts of solar projects (more capacity than a 2-unit nuclear station) currently connected to the Duke grid in North Carolina. There are many lessons-learned (from NC) that South Carolina consumers can benefit from. That is why Duke Energy opposes S.890 as currently drafted.

Please let me know if you have any questions after you review that attached paper.

Thank you, Chuck

C: 803-370-2339

