



Control Number: 28840



Item Number: 701

Addendum StartPage: 0

LLOYD GOSSELINK BLEVINS
ROCHELLE & TOWNSEND, P. C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

111 CONGRESS AVENUE, SUITE 1800
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701
TELEPHONE (512) 322-5800
TELECOPIER (512) 472-0532
www.lglawfirm.com

Mr. Porter's Direct Line: (512) 322-5876
Email: sporter@lglawfirm.com

RECEIVED
2004 SEP -3 AM 9:08
711 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS 78401
TELEPHONE (361) 654-3200
TELECOPIER (361) 654-3203
*BY APPOINTMENT ONLY

September 3, 2004

Honorable Katherine L. Smith
Honorable Paul D. Keeper
Administrative Law Judges
State Office of Administrative Hearings
300 West 15th Street, Room 504
Austin, Texas 78701


**Re: SOAH Docket No. 473-04-1033, PUC Docket No. 28840 -- Application
of AEP Texas Central Company for Authority to Change Rates --
Cities' Response to Order No. 20**

Dear ALJs Smith and Keeper:

In accordance with Order No. 20, please find attached a list, in numerical format, of evidence and record/brief discussions supporting Cities' position on the remanded issues. We hope this is helpful to your analysis.

Please be advised that a copy of this correspondence is being delivered to all parties of record.

Sincerely,


Steven A. Porter
Attorney for Cities

cc: Parties of Record

1. Affiliate Costs

- The discussion of this issue is found at Cities Exhibit No. 4 (Direct Testimony of Gerald Tucker): Pages 19-51, Exhibits GWT-11 through GWT-22.
- Specifically, the following excerpts from Mr. Tucker's testimony demonstrate the unreasonableness of TCC's request:
Page 31, line 1 through page 51, line 10.

Additional Information -

- Discussion at pages 45-64 of Cities' Initial Brief.
- Discussion at pages 35-38 of Cities' Reply Brief.
- Discussion at pages 31-36 of Cities' Exceptions.
- Discussion at pages 30-39 of Cities' Reply to Exceptions.

2. Distribution A&G Expense Adjustments

- The discussion of this issue is found at Cities Exhibit No. 6 (Direct Testimony of A.D. Patton): Pages 18-25, Exhibits ADP-5 through ADP-6.
- Specifically, the following excerpts from Dr. Patton's testimony demonstrate the unreasonableness of TCC's request:
Page 20, lines 14-21.
Page 22, line 3-8.
Page 23, line 3 through page 25, line 13.
- Insofar as Dr. Patton's recommendation is a disallowance of affiliate expense, it is also supported by Mr. Tucker's testimony discussed in section 1 above.
- Transcript volume 8, pages 1583-1585.

Additional Information -

- Discussion at pages 93-100 of Cities' Initial Brief.
- Discussion at pages 71-75 of Cities' Reply Brief.
- Discussion at pages 56-61 of Cities' Exceptions.
- Discussion at pages 62-66 of Cities' Reply to Exceptions.

3. Depreciation Expense

- Cities Exhibit No. 5 (Direct Testimony of Nancy Hughes)
- Transcript volume 8, pages 1515-1543
- Discussion at pages 100-108 of Cities' Initial Brief
- Discussion at pages 75-77 of Cities' Reply Brief
- Discussion at pages 62-65 of Cities' Exceptions
- Discussion at pages 67-70 of Cities' Reply to Exceptions

4. Net Salvage

- Cities Exhibit No. 5 (Direct Testimony of Nancy Hughes, pages 35-37)
- TCC Exhibit No. 85, page 13
- Discussion at pages 107-108 of Cities' Initial Brief
- Discussion at pages 64-65 of Cities' Exceptions

5. Special Meter Reading Fee

- Cities Exhibit No. 8 (Direct Testimony of Sarah Goodfriend, pages 9-10; 46-56; 71-73; 98-100; 106-107)