Special Agenda Item 1

COMMISSION DIRECTIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	☐	DATE	**September 6, 2006**
MOTOR CARRIER MATTERS	☐	DOCKET NO.	**2006-97-WS** **2006-107-WS** **2006-92-WS**
UTILITIES MATTERS	☒		

SUBJECT:

DOCKET NO. 2006-97-WS - Application of Tega Cay Water Service, Incorporated for Adjustment of Rates and Charges and Modifications to Certain Terms and Conditions for the Provision of Water and Sewer Service

- AND -

DOCKET NO. 2006-107-WS - Application of United Utility Companies, Incorporated for Adjustment of Rates and Charges and Modification to Certain Terms and Conditions for the Provision of Water and Sewer Service

DOCKET NO. 2006-92-WS – Application of Carolina Water Service, Incorporated for Adjustment of Rates and Charges for the Provision of Water and Sewer Service

Discuss these Matters with the Commission.

COMMISSION ACTION:

In regards to Docket No. 2006-107-WS, I move that the Commission adopt the attached questions and pose them to the Parties immediately following this Meeting.

PRESIDING Hamilton

	MOTION	YES	NO	OTHER
CLYBURN	☐	☒	☐	
FLEMING	☐	☒	☐	
HAMILTON	☐	☒	☐	
HOWARD	☐	☒	☐	
MITCHELL	XX	☐	☐	
MOSELEY	☐	☒	☐	
WRIGHT	☐	☒	☐	

APPROVED	☐
APPROVED STC 30 DAYS	☐
ACCEPTED FOR FILING	☐
DENIED	☐
AMENDED	☐
TRANSFERRED	☐
SUSPENDED	☐
CANCELED	☐
SET FOR HEARING	☐
ADVISED	☐
CARRIED OVER	☐
RECORDED BY	Schmieding

Session: Special

Time of Session 12:30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, as the parties prepare to present their settlement agreement to the Commission on Friday, I would like to alert them to some issues that I believe will be important to the Commission in considering this settlement. Therefore, I would move that the Commission request that the parties present testimony and introduce evidence to would address the following issues.

1. Does United Utilities maintain records of reported backups in its sewer systems? How many complaints of sewer backups were received within the test year, and how were they resolved?

2. Please elaborate on the efforts by United Utilities to prevent sewer backups. What measures does CWS employ to prevent sewer problems, and how they compare to applicable industry standards?

3. Explain why the Commission should find that flat-rate sewerage billing is just and reasonable. Absent any issues with regard to metering, why do the parties believe that a flat rate billing scheme is superior to one based upon individual usage?

4. Has UUC received any complaints from its customers of being billed for water and/or sewerage service arrearages incurred by previous residents? How have any such complaints been resolved?

5. Has UUC received any customer complaints pertaining to its collection practices? Is UUC aware of allegations that its agents or employees placed orange tags on the mailboxes of certain customers in Spartanburg County whom they believed to be delinquent in paying UUC's bills? What, if any, measures have been taken to ensure that UUC agents and employees engage in fair and lawful collection practices?

6. Please explain UUC's position with regard to its obligation to file with the Commission a notice of any violation of PSC or DHEC rules pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 103-514. Would a finding by DHEC that ammonia-nitrogen discharge limits had been exceeded trigger the obligation by UUC to file a notice with the Commission? Please elaborate.

7. Regarding UUC's compliance with DHEC standards, Dawn Hipp's prefiled testimony offers some general statements regarding compliance with DHEC standards and general housekeeping at the UUC systems. Several questions arise regarding that testimony in light of the site reports attached as DMH4 to her testimony. It would be helpful for the parties to explain the scope of her evaluation and conclusions since not all sites were selected for testing and several

systems that underwent a compliance inspection were found to be unsatisfactory by DHEC.