



Control Number: 42866



Item Number: 146

Addendum StartPage: 0

**SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-14-5144.WS
PUC DOCKET NO. 42866**

PETITION OF TRAVIS COUNTY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 12 APPEALING CHANGE OF WHOLESALE WATER RATES IMPLEMENTED BY WEST TRAVIS COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITY AGENCY; CITY OF BEE CAVE, TEXAS; HAYS COUNTY, TEXAS; AND WEST TRAVIS COUNTY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 5	§ § § § § § § § § §	<div style="text-align: right; font-size: small; margin-bottom: 10px;">2015 MAY -1 PM 4:50 FILED FILING CLERK</div> BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
--	--	---

**SOAH ORDER NO. 17
SETTING OUT POST-HEARING SCHEDULE AND BRIEFING OUTLINE**

The hearing on the merits of this case concluded on April 23, 2015. Initial closing briefs are due by June 26, 2015, and replies are due by August 3, 2015. The parties should expect the Administrative Law Judge to issue a Proposal for Decision by October 2, 2015.

The parties shall use the following agreed outline for their briefs: .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. PARTIES

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

IV. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROTESTED RATES

V. JURISDICTION

VI. THE REQUIRED PUBLIC INTEREST DETERMINATION AND ITS SCOPE

A. The Requirement for an Initial Public-Interest Determination

B. Public-Interest Considerations In This Case

C. Cost of Service Analysis Is Not Relevant To Determining Whether Rates Adversely
Affect The Public Interest (P.U.C. Subst. R. 24.133(b))

**VII. DOES THE PROTESTED RATE EVIDENCE WTCPUA'S ABUSE OF MONOPOLY
POWER? (P.U.C. Subst. R. 24.133(a)(3))**

146

A. Is the WTCPUA a Monopoly?

B. Disparate Bargaining Power of the Parties (P.U.C. SUBST. R. 24.133(a)(3)(A))

1. What Are TCMUD 12's Alternative Means, Alternative Costs and Problems of Obtaining Alternative Wholesale Water Services?
2. Are There Other Disparate Bargaining Power Factors?
3. Conclusion: If there was disparate bargaining power, does the protested rate evidence WTCPUA'S abuse of monopoly power?


C. Methodology for Computation of Revenue Requirement and Rate (P.U.C. SUBST. R. 24.133(a)(3)(C))

1. Did WTCPUA change the methodology for the computation of the revenue requirement?
2. Did WTCPUA change the methodology for the computation of the rate?
3. Conclusion: If there was a change in the methodology for the computation of the revenue requirement or rate, does the Protested Rate evidence WTCPUA's abuse of monopoly power?

VIII. TRANSCRIPTION COSTS

IX. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER

SIGNED May 1, 2015



**WILLIAM G. NEWCHURCH
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**