

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Supreme Court

RECEIVED

JUN 30 2014

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

S.C. Supreme Court

PSC Docket No. 2014-153-S

Arch Enterprises, LLC.....Appellant,

v.


Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation, LLC d/b/a Alpine Utilities
and South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff.....Respondents.

AMENDED NOTICE OF APPEAL

Arch Enterprises, LLC (Arch) appeals two decisions of the South Carolina Public Service Commission (PSC). The first decision appealed is the PSC Directive and Order, dated May 1, 2014. The second decision appealed is the PSC Order Denying Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration, dated June 26, 2014.

The PSC issued a Directive, dated May 21, 2014, denying Arch's Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration. In its Notice of Appeal, filed on June 13, 2014, Arch sought to appeal the May 21 Directive believing it to be the PSC's final order on the matter. However, on June 26, 2014, the PSC issued its Order Denying Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration, which is now the PSC's final order on the matter. Accordingly, Arch hereby amends its Notice of Appeal so as to appeal the PSC's May 1 and June 26, 2014 Orders, copies of which are attached hereto.

Signature on following page



D. Reece Williams, III (S.C.Bar No. 6120)
Kathleen M. McDaniel (S.C.Bar No. 74826)
CALLISON TIGHE & ROBINSON, LLC
1812 Lincoln Street
P.O. Box 1390
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
Tel. (803) 404-6900
Fax. (803) 404-6901
reecewilliams@callisontighe.com
kathleenmcdaniel@callisontighe.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT
ARCH ENTERPRISES, LLC**

June 30, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina

Other Counsel of Record:

John M. S. Hoefler
WILLOUGHBY & HOEFER, P.A.
930 Richland Street
P.O. Box 8416
Columbia, SC 29202
Phone: 803-252-3300
Fax: 803-256-8062
Email: jhoefler@willoughbyhoefler.com

**ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT PALMETTO WASTEWATER
RECLAMATION, LLC D/B/A ALPINE UTILITIES**

Jeffrey M. Nelson
OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF
1401 Main Street, Suite 900
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone: 803-737-0823
Fax: 803-737-0895
jnelson@regstaff.sc.gov

**ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF
REGULATORY STAFF**

RECEIVED

JUN 30 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Supreme Court

S.C. Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PSC Docket No. 2014-153-S

Arch Enterprises, LLC.....Appellant,

v.

Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation, LLC d/b/a Alpine Utilities
and South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff.....Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE


I certify that I have served the Amended Notice of Appeal on the following by causing a copy to be mailed to the parties on June 30, 2014, at the addresses shown below:

**PALMETTO WASTEWATER
RECLAMATION, LLC D/B/A
ALPINE UTILITIES**
John M. S. Hoefler
Willoughby & Hoefler, P.A.
930 Richland Street
Columbia, SC 29201

**SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF
REGULATORY STAFF**
Jeffrey M. Nelson
1401 Main Street, Suite 900
Columbia, SC 29201

**SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION**
Jocelyn Boyd, Chief Clerk
P.O. Drawer 11649
Columbia, SC 29211

Signature on following page



D. Reece Williams, III (S.C.Bar No. 6120)
Kathleen M. McDaniel (S.C.Bar No. 74826)
CALLISON TIGHE & ROBINSON, LLC
Post Office Box 1390
Columbia, SC 29202-1390
Telephone: (803) 404-6900
Facsimile: (803) 404-6901

**ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT
ARCH ENTERPRISES, LLC**

June 30, 2014

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COMMISSION DIRECTIVE**

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	DATE	<u>May 01, 2014</u>
MOTOR CARRIER MATTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	DOCKET NO.	<u>2014-153-S</u>
UTILITIES MATTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ORDER NO.	<u>2014-400</u>

THIS DIRECTIVE SHALL SERVE AS THE COMMISSION'S ORDER ON THIS ISSUE.

SUBJECT:

DOCKET NO. 2014-153-S - Arch Enterprises, LLC d/b/a McDonalds, Complainant/Petitioner v. Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation, LLC d/b/a Alpine Utilities, Defendant/Respondent - Discuss with the Commission the Motion to Dismiss on an Expedited Basis Filed on Behalf of Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation, LLC d/b/a Alpine Utilities.

COMMISSION ACTION:

We have before us for consideration a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint of Arch Enterprises, LLC d/b/a McDonalds ("Arch") filed by Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation LLC d/b/a Alpine Utilities ("Alpine"). The Complaint requests two forms of relief. The first request was for an emergency order halting disconnection of sewer service. This request was discussed with the parties shortly after the complaint was filed, and, as was stated to them – and agreed to by Alpine – was actually moot upon the filing of the complaint requesting a hearing before the Commission, pursuant to Commission Regulation 103-538 (B). The second request for relief was that the Commission hold a hearing and determine that the past due amount owed to the utility by the complainant was \$9,560.00. This amount was derived by the Complainant attempting to apply a rate approved for Palmetto Utilities in its 2013 rate case. In addition, Arch points out that this rate is proposed for adoption by the Commission for the respondent utility in this case, Alpine. The Commission has neither held a hearing, nor ruled on the Alpine rate matter.

In its Motion to Dismiss, among other arguments, Alpine cites Commission Regulation 103-533, which states that a utility must charge its customers according to schedules filed in compliance with Title 58 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, which requires approval of such schedules by the Commission. The Regulation clearly states that the utility is prohibited from charging a customer in any manner inconsistent with its filed schedules, and prescribes remedies in the event that charges outside these schedules are billed to the utility's customers. In this case, Arch requests the imposition of rates approved only for another utility company. Alpine has no such approved rates. Further, Alpine notes that the case law in South Carolina prohibits a retroactive reduction of charges imposed under a previously approved rate, which is the remedy sought by Arch in this case. In other words, Alpine states, in so many words, that granting the rate relief requested by the Complainant in this case would be unlawful. I agree with this view of the law, find it sufficient to resolve the issue in the case, and move that the Arch Complaint be dismissed on this ground, while expressly declining to rule on Alpine's other arguments.

However, there is one other matter that must be addressed. The Complaint asserts that 30-day and 10-day disconnection notices under Commission Regulation 103-535.1 were served on Arch under the Palmetto Utilities, Inc. name. Copies of the notices are in fact attached to the Complaint, and Alpine does not dispute the fact that this occurred. We are not aware of any disconnection notices that have been issued under the actual service provider in this case, Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation LLC d/b/a Alpine Utilities. I believe that just as it is unlawful to charge a customer under a rate schedule approved only for a utility that does not serve the customer in question, it is also unlawful, and of no force and effect, for one utility to serve disconnection notices on the customer of a different utility. Unless the disconnection notices come from the actual utility serving the particular customer, the customer could appropriately consider the notices to be a mistake, and disregard them. Accordingly, I move that we

hold that the disconnection notices in the present case served by Palmetto Utilities were of no force and effect on Arch, since Arch was receiving service by Alpine.

PRESIDING: Hamilton

SESSION: Regular

TIME: 11:00 a.m.

	MOTION	YES	NO	OTHER
FLEMING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
HALL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
HAMILTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
HOWARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
MCGEE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
RANDALL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
WHITFIELD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

(SEAL)

RECORDED BY: J. Schmieding



BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2014-153-S - ORDER NO. 2014-452

JUNE 26, 2014

IN RE: Arch Enterprises, LLC d/b/a McDonalds,)	ORDER DENYING
Complainant/Petitioner v. Palmetto)	PETITION FOR
Wastewater Reclamation, LLC d/b/a Alpine)	REHEARING AND
Utilities, Defendant/Respondent)	RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (“Commission”) on the Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration filed by Arch Enterprises, LLC d/b/a McDonalds (“Arch”) in this complaint matter against Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation, LLC d/b/a Alpine Utilities (“Alpine”). The Petition is denied.

First, Arch complains that it received no notice that anything related to its complaint would be heard and decided by the Commission on May 1, 2014, or that dispositive action could result at the Commission’s scheduled public business meeting on that date. Significantly, Arch does not claim that it failed to receive notice of the meeting; nor does it claim that the Commission failed to list Arch’s docket on the meeting’s agenda. Instead, Arch finds fault with the sufficiency of the notice. Arch’s Petition quotes the specific language of the Agenda Item, which stated: “Discuss with the Commission the Motion to Dismiss on an expedited basis filed on behalf of Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation, d/b/a Alpine Utilities.” However, it does not quote the statement at the beginning of the full agenda, where the following introductory language appears: “Commission Action on the Following Items:”. In our view, the language of the

agenda item itself was sufficient notice to Arch that a dispositive motion was up for consideration. Moreover, the agenda item language and the introductory “Commission Action” language taken together provided clear notice that the Motion to Dismiss would be discussed by the Commission, and that the Commission could act on the motion at the time of the meeting.

Further, the written Motion and accompanying materials all plainly state Alpine’s request that the Commission expedite review of the Motion. Moreover, the Motion specifically requests “that the Commission rule on this motion...without hearing or oral argument” and that the “Motion be considered on an expedited basis without oral argument so that PWR (Alpine) may have the opportunity to be promptly relieved from the requirement” that it refrain from disconnection of Petitioner’s premises. See Motion at 2, 9-10. The lack of notice allegation is clearly without merit.

Arch also states that the Commission’s ruling dismissing the Complaint was issued without any opportunity for the Complainant to be heard on the matter in advance of the ruling. This allegation is also without merit. Again, the Motion to Dismiss filed by Alpine specifically requested that the “Motion be considered on an expedited basis without oral argument” Commission Regulation 103-829 (A) specifically states that responses to written motions are due within 10 days after service of such motions. Arch did not meet this deadline, and failed to file a response to the Motion to Dismiss. Accordingly, it did not avail itself of its right to respond to the Motion, so it cannot now legitimately complain that it did not have an opportunity to be heard on the matter.

Further, since Arch failed to file a response to the Motion, the Motion to Dismiss the Complaint in this matter was unopposed, based on the Commission's record.

In addition, as Arch states in its present Petition, Regulation 103-829 (B) gives the Commission the discretion to hear oral argument and response on prefiled motions in advance of the hearing on the merits of the case, or at the merits hearing. Because the Company's Motion to Dismiss was unopposed, based upon a review of the record, the question of holding oral arguments was moot, either in advance of the hearing or at the time of a scheduled hearing on the merits. Further, under Commission Regulation 103-803, waiver of the provisions allowing oral arguments was appropriate due to the non-contested nature of the Motion to Dismiss, and, under the circumstances of this case, was not contrary to the public interest. This Commission may dismiss complaints without hearing when the complainant fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a claim upon which relief could be granted by this Commission. This Commission may waive the provisions allowing oral arguments in granting the Company's request for dismissal, which it did in this instance. It is not contrary to the public interest to forego oral argument or hearing when relief cannot be granted in any event based on the face of the Petitioner's pleadings. This procedure is consistent with that used by other State tribunals.

Arch also alleges that the Commission erred in concluding that its request for a reduction in previously charged rates would amount to prohibited retroactive rate making. Alpine cites Commission Regulation 103-533, which states that a utility must charge its customers according to schedules filed in compliance with Title 58 of the South Carolina

Code of Laws, which requires approval of such schedules by the Commission. The Regulation clearly states that the utility is prohibited from charging a customer in any manner inconsistent with its filed schedules, and prescribes remedies in the event that charges outside these schedules are billed to the utility's customers. In this case, Arch requests the imposition of rates approved only for another utility company, and in a retroactive manner. Alpine's approved rates are its own; it does not offer the rates sought by Arch. Further, the case law in South Carolina prohibits a retroactive reduction of charges imposed under a previously approved rate. See South Carolina Elec. and Gas Co. v. Public Service Commission, 275 S.C. 487, 272 S.E.2d 793 (1980).

Essentially, we dismissed the complaint because it failed to state facts sufficient to constitute a claim upon which relief could be granted by this Commission. This was because the complaint requested rates that either had only been approved for another wastewater utility or rates that, if put into effect, would constitute retroactive ratemaking. The relief sought by the Complainant was unavailable as a matter of law. Dismissal was therefore reasonable. Oral argument could not have affected this outcome.

In conclusion, our dismissal of the Arch Complaint was proper and consistent with the law, and was based on settled regulatory principles. Further, since the complaint was properly dismissed, the scheduled hearing was properly cancelled by the Standing Hearing Officer's Directive of May 6, 2014.

Accordingly, Arch's Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration is denied.


This Order shall remain in full force and effect until further order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:



G. O'Neal Hamilton, Chairman

ATTEST:



Nikiya Hall, Vice Chairman

(SEAL)