ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 2018 March 16 10:51 AM - SCPSC - 2017-228-S - Page 1 of 3

Easterling, Deborah

275106

From: Easterling, Deborah
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2018 10:08 AM
To: 'Francee Levin'
Subject: RE: awful decision re Palmetto Utilities, docket #2017-228-5
Attachments: 2017-228-S.pdf; Order 2018-155.pdf

Dear Ms. Levin,

I have attached the Commission Directive and Order regarding the Commission's decision in Docket No. 2017-228-S.

You and/or other residents of the neighborhood may want to talk to the Office of Regulatory Staff, or with your own counsel.

Sincerely,

Deborah Easterling
Executive Assistant
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
803-896-5133
Sign up for Meeting Agenda Alerts: Text PSCAGENDAS to 39492

From: Francee Levin [m
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 2:59 AM
To: Easterling, Deborah <Deborah.Easterling@psc.sc.gov>
Subject: Re: awful decision re Palmetto Utilities, docket #2017-228-5

Is it true that this is a unanimous decision? Is there anything we can do? Our entire neighborhood is disgusted.

Francee Levin

On 3/12/2018 8:36 AM, Easterling, Deborah wrote:

> Dear Francee Levin,
>
> This is to acknowledge receipt of your Letter of Protest/Comments to the Public Service Commission of South Carolina. Your Letter of Protest/Comments will be placed in the Protest File of the Docket listed below and on the Commission's Website at www.psc.sc.gov.
>
> • Docket No. 2017-228-S - Application of Palmetto Utilities, Incorporated for Adjustment of Rates and Charges for Customers in the Palmetto Utilities and Palmetto of Richland County Service Areas
>
> A Protestant is an individual objecting on the ground of private or public interest to the approval of an Application, Petition, Motion or other matters which the Commission may have under consideration. A Protestant may offer sworn testimony but cannot cross-examine witnesses offered by other parties.
>
> According to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, filing a Protest does not make you a Party of Record. A Protestant desiring to become an Intervenor (i.e., a Party of Record) in a proceeding

before the Commission may file a Petition for Intervention within the time prescribed by the Commission.

You can follow this Docket and other daily filings made at the Commission by subscribing to the Commission's Email Subscriptions at this link: https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Email; or you can also follow Docket No. 2017-228-S at this link: https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Dockets/Detail/116386.

If we may be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Deborah Easterling
Executive Assistant
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
803-896-5133
Sign up for Meeting Agenda Alerts: Text PSCAGENDAS to 39492

-----Original Message-----
From: Francee Levin [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, March 10, 2018 12:38 AM
To: PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>
Subject: awful decision re Palmetto Utilities, docket #2017-228-5

I'm a senior, [redacted] y limited income, plus I have cardiomyopathy, so I have major health issues. Palmetto Utilities has been charging exorbitant rates since I moved to Summit Townes in 2006. The rate now is ridiculous. I'm paying $36.50 a month, which is almost twice my water bill! And I'm paying out of city rates there. Yet, you're considering allow Palmetto Utilities to almost double their rates for no reason whatsoever. They are a terrible company with awful customer service. And though I send in payments a week before the due date, they usually tack on late charges as well.

What is going on at the Public Service Commission? Your mission seems to be to take advantage of the public. Haven't you done enough with SCANA/SCE&G? I was protesting the unnecessary nuclear reactors back in 2009. I've done the math, and I personally have paid over $3700 to date for those disastrous nuclear reactors, something I can ill afford, and yet it continues. And now you're allowing Palmetto Utilities to go down that same road. I think you owe us an explanation, and you also need to rein in these people and start PROTECTING the public, instead of bilking us.

Francee Levin

[redacted] 9229

[redacted]

ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 2018 March 16 10:51 AM - SCPSC - 2017-228-S - Page 2 of 3

Action Item 7

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COMMISSION DIRECTIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER	☐	DATE	**February 21, 2018**
MOTOR CARRIER MATTER	☐	DOCKET NO.	**2017-228-S**
UTILITIES MATTER	☑	ORDER NO.	

SUBJECT:

DOCKET NO. 2017-228-S - Application of Palmetto Utilities, Incorporated for Adjustment of Rates and Charges for Customers in the Palmetto Utilities and Palmetto of Richland County Service Areas - Staff Presents for Commission Consideration Palmetto Utilities, Incorporated's Application for Adjustment of Rates and Charges for Customers in the Palmetto Utilities and Palmetto of Richland County Service Areas.

COMMISSION ACTION:

In Docket No. 2017-228-WS, Palmetto Utilities sought a rate increase in its original Application which would have resulted in a $68.05 flat-rate monthly charge for sewer service. The Commission held its hearing on the merits in this docket on January 17, 2018. I have reviewed the evidence presented and the arguments of the parties. After adopting certain accounting adjustments to more accurately reflect the allowable expenses incurred by the company, I move that the Commission approve a flat-rate monthly charge for sewer service of approximately $52.10. This would provide the company with additional revenue of $4,515,286, resulting in a 15 percent operating margin, which is within the range recommended by the Office of Regulatory Staff.

I would note that the utility has made significant improvements to the system, which will benefit its entire customer base by increasing capacity and reducing or preventing adverse environmental effects. These improvements will have a positive impact on the service area and aid in accommodating projected growth in the area.

It is also important to note that this rate represents a substantially smaller rate increase than that initially requested by the utility. Service to the customers in the flat-rate portion of the company's service area costs $36.50 per month under existing rates. The new rate requested by the company was $68.05 per month – a net increase of $31.55. That was what the company had requested. This proposed rate in this motion represents a net increase of $15.60, less than half of what was initially requested.

I understand that some customers, because of their low water consumption, will experience somewhat higher charges for sewer service on a flat-rate basis than on the basis of the volume of water they use. However, there is an insufficient evidentiary record upon which to base a preference for volumetric rates over flat rates, particularly where, as here, the volume of water that a customer uses does not necessarily correlate directly with the volume of sewage that a customer causes to be treated and disposed, and where the sewer provider is not the water provider Additionally, adopting flat rates for the entire service area of the company will result in certain cost savings which will ultimately benefit the customers. On balance, I am persuaded that adopting a flat rate of approximately $52.10 is just and reasonable.

ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 2018 March 16 10:51 AM - SCPSC - 2017-228-S - Page 3 of 3
ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 2018 February 22 9:44 AM - SCPSC - 2017-228-S - Page 1 of 2