

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Upstate Forever, South Carolina  
Native Plant Society, and South  
Carolina Wildlife Federation, Appellants,

v.

South Carolina Department of  
Health and Environmental  
Control and Greenville Water  
System, Respondents.

The Honorable John D. McLeod  
Administrative Law Court  
Trial Court Case No. 2009-AL-07-00226

---

## ORDER

---




Appellants appeal an order from the administrative law court (the ALC) affirming the decision of the Board of the Department of Health and Environmental (the Department) and granting Respondents' motion for summary judgment. Respondents have filed a motion to dismiss this appeal as moot because no justiciable controversy exists due to the completion of the project. Additionally, Respondents argue Appellants' sole issue on appeal, whether the Department has the authority to impose minimum stream flow requirements as a condition of its water quality certification permits, is a purely hypothetical question that does not fall within any of the mootness exceptions. However, Appellants argue this appeal is not moot because this court can provide effectual relief and a cognizable remedy. In support, Appellants argue the Department has the discretion to establish any limitations on certification permits, the ability to modify the conditions of the certification, and the authority to mandate protections for navigable waterways in South Carolina. Moreover, Appellants asserts that even if

this court determines the appeal is moot, the public importance exception applies because the consequences of a low flow stream are of global significance.

Generally, this Court "will not pass on moot and academic questions or make an adjudication where there remains no actual controversy." *Sloan v. Dep't of Transp.*, 379 S.C. 160, 167, 666 S.E.2d 236, 240 (2008). "A case becomes moot when judgment, if rendered, will have no practical legal effect upon [the] existing controversy." *Curtis v. State*, 345 S.C. 557, 567, 549 S.E.2d 591, 596 (2001). "This is true when some event occurs making it impossible for [the] reviewing Court to grant effectual relief." *Id.* at 567-68, 549 S.E.2d at 596. However, the public importance exception to mootness permits a court to consider moot issues if "the issue . . . present[s] a question of imperative and manifest urgency requiring the establishment of a rule for future guidance in matters of important public interest." *Sloan v. Friends of Hunley, Inc.*, 369 S.C. 20, 27, 630 S.E.2d 474, 478 (2006) (citation and quotation marks omitted).

After careful consideration of the parties' filings, we dismiss this appeal as moot. Furthermore, we find the public importance exception does not apply to this appeal. Moreover, because we dismiss this appeal, we need not address Trout Unlimited's motion to file an amicus curiae brief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
C.J.  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J.  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J.

Columbia, South Carolina

cc: Amy E. Armstrong, Esquire  
Eugene C. McCall, Jr., Esquire  
Randolph R. Lowell, Esquire  
Chad N. Johnston, Esquire  
Stephen Philip Hightower, Esquire  
David D. Armstrong, Esquire  
Frank S. Holleman III, Esquire  
Nicholas S. Torrey, Esquire

**FILED**  
5/25/12 