



K. Chad Burgess
Associate General Counsel

chad.burgess@scana.com

June 24, 2013

VIA U.S. FIRST-CLASS MAIL

The Honorable Daniel E. Shearouse
Clerk of Court
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

RECEIVED

JUN 26 2013

S.C. SUPREME COURT

RE: South Carolina Energy Users Committee v. The SC Public Service
Commission
Appellate Case No. 2013-000529

Dear Mr. Shearouse:

On March 14, 2013, the South Carolina Energy Users Committee ("SCEUC") filed a Notice of Appeal appealing the decisions of the Public Service Commission of South Carolina ("Commission"). On March 18, 2013, the Sierra Club also filed a Notice of Appeal appealing the Commission's decisions. As a result of these multiple Notices of Appeal, the Supreme Court of South Carolina by letter dated March 19, 2013, consolidated the appeals and amended the title of the case as follows:

South Carolina Energy Users Committee, Appellant/Respondent,

v.

The South Carolina Public Service Commission, South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, Office of Regulatory Staff, Sierra Club and Pamela Greenlaw, Defendants,

of whom Sierra Club, is Respondent/Appellant.

Upon review of the caption, it appears that the SCEUC and the Sierra Club should not be viewed as respondents in the other's appeal because the SCEUC and the Sierra Club are on the same side. While this case was pending before the Commission, both the SCEUC and the Sierra Club advocated against the relief requested by SCE&G. Although their issues on appeal may differ, the SCEUC and the Sierra Club are united in their opposition to the Commission orders on appeal. Styling them as both appellants and respondents would appear to give them the

(Continued . . .)

The Honorable Daniel E. Shearouse

June 24, 2013

Page 2

right to file two briefs — one as the appellant and one as the respondent. This would not only increase the Court's burden but would allow each of these parties to advocate their positions twice, to the prejudice of SCE&G.

For these reasons, SCE&G respectfully suggests that an appropriate caption would style both the SCEUC and the Sierra Club as appellants only, and SCE&G and the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff as respondents.

If a motion for this relief is necessary, I will appreciate your advice.

With a copy of this letter to Mr. Guild and Mr. Elliott, I take the liberty to suggest that they give the Court the benefit of their views on this matter.

Your consideration of this matter is much appreciated.

Very truly yours,



K. Chad Burgess

KCB/kms

cc: Scott A. Elliott, Esquire
Jocelyn G. Boyd, Esquire
Jeffrey M. Nelson, Esquire
Florence P. Belser, Esquire
Shannon Bowyer Hudson, Esquire
Courtney D. Edwards, Esquire
Robert Guild, Esquire
Pamela Greenlaw
(all via U.S. First-Class Mail)