

Control Number: 33310



Item Number: 466

Addendum StartPage: 0



New York Connecticut Texas Washington, DC Kazakhstan London Bracewell & Giuliani LLP 111 Congress Avenue Suite 2300 Austin, Texas 78701-4061

512.472.7800 Office 512.472.9123 Fax

bgllp.com

April 10, 2007

The Hon. Thomas H. Walston
The Hon. Lilo D. Pomerleau
The Hon. Charles Homer
Administrative Law Judges
State Office of Administrative Hearings
300 West 15th Street
Austin, Texas 78701



Re:

SOAH Docket No. 473-07-0833, PUC Docket No. 33309 – Application of AEP Texas Central Company for Authority to Change Rates; SOAH Docket No. 473-07-0851, PUC Docket No. 33310 – Application of AEP Texas North Company for Authority to Change Rates

Dear Judges:

As discussed at the prehearing conference yesterday, I am attaching a proposed hearing schedule and list of hearing procedures for the referenced cases which have been agreed upon by all parties who attended the prehearing conference. The dates for the witnesses are dates certain. Consistent with Order No. 6, the schedule provides an assurance of at least 16 hearing days. Each intervenor witness on the list is designated by the party he or she is testifying for. All other named witnesses are company witnesses.

As you can also see, most or parts of the first three hearing dates include time for settlement discussions. If it is warranted, the parties have agreed that these discussions can be extended, which may push the hearing dates back.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters. Please let me know if you have any questions about this prior to the commencement of the hearing on Thursday.

Very truly yours,

I / I / U

Bracewell & Giuliani LL

Philip F. Ricketts

BRACEWELL &GIULIANI

The Hon. Thomas H. Walston The Hon. Lilo D. Pomerleau The Hon. Charles Homer April 10, 2007 Page 2

PFR/pm Enclosures 2

cc: All Parties

WITNESS SCHEDULE

Docket No. 33309 and Docket No. 33310

April 12	Preliminary matters; opening statements; Patton; settlement discussions
April 13	Ford, Hamlett; settlement discussions
April 16	Bennett, Flaherty, Gordon; settlement discussions
April 17	Hooper, Hamrock, Harper, Tuchow, Reyes, Jolley, Cooper, Hadaway
April 18	Haynes, McCoy, Jakubowski, Wilson
April 19	Pasternack, Bartsch, Henderson, Berny, Pollock (TIEC)
April 20	Moncrief, Jackson, Graves, Byrne
April 23	Selecky (Wal-Mart), Gorman (TIEC), Two Cities Witnesses
April 24	Three Cities Witnesses, Daniel (Commercial Customer Group)
April 25	Hughes (Cities), Biedrzycki (Texas ROSE/TLSC), Three OPC Witnesses
April 26	One OPC Witness, Three Staff Witnesses
April 27	Four Staff Witnesses
April 30	Hill (Cities), Al-Jabir (Navy), Patton, Hamlett, McCoy
May 1	Bennett, Gordon, Hooper, Pasternack
May 2	Jolley, Hadaway, Haynes, Joyce
May 3	Jakubowski, Wilson, Bartsch, Henderson
May 4	Berny, Moncrief, Jackson, Graves

PROPOSED JOINT HEARING AND POST-HEARING PROCEDURES FOR DOCKET NOS. 33309 AND 33310

- Pre-filed testimony from both dockets will be offered in evidence at the commencement
 of each witness' appearance on the witness stand. A separate record of pre-filed
 testimony and exhibits admitted in evidence will be maintained for each docket.
 Therefore, pre-filed testimony and exhibits should be separately numbered for each
 docket. Parties should have enough copies of pre-filed testimony and exhibits to ensure
 that two complete records (include copies for the appeal box) can be maintained.
- RFI responses will only be admissible in the docket in which the response was provided, unless a proper predicate is established to justify admission of the RFI response in the other company's docket.
- Parties will make reasonable efforts to indicate the docket to which a particular line of
 questioning or a particular exhibit relates (Dk. 33309, Dk. 33310, or both dockets). If the
 record is unclear as to which docket a particular section of testimony or a particular
 exhibit relates, it will be assumed that the testimony or exhibit in question relates to both
 dockets.
- Briefing procedures to be specified during or subsequent to hearing.
- A separate proposal for decision will be prepared in each docket and separate exceptions and replies to exceptions will be filed in each docket.
- A separate final order will be issued in each docket.