

Control Number: 42867



Item Number: 76

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-14-5138 PUC DOCKET NO. 42857

73-14-5138
A2857

PECE/VED

BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE

FILING CLERK SSION PETITION OF NORTH AUSTIN § UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1. **§** § § NORTHTOWN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, TRAVIS COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT \$ \$ \$ \$ DISTRICT NO. 10 AND WELLS OF **BRANCH MUNICIPAL UTILITY** DISTRICT, FROM THE RATEMAKING ACTIONS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN § AND REQUEST FOR INTERIM RATES IN WILLIAMSON AND TRAVIS

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-14-\$138 PUC DOCKET NO. 42867

§

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

PETITION OF NORTH AUSTIN	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO.	Š	
1, NORTHTOWN MUNICIPAL	§	
UTILITY DISTRICT, AND WELLS	§	
BRANCH MUNICIPAL UTILITY	§	
DISTRICT FROM THE RATEMAKING	§	OF
ACTIONS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN	§	
AND REQUEST FOR INTERIM RATES	§	
IN WILLIAMSON AND TRAVIS	§	
COUNTIES	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

CITY OF AUSTIN'S REPLY TO PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO MOTION TO STRIKE PREFILED TESTIMONY OF PETITIONERS NORTH AUSTIN MUD NO. 1, NORTHTOWN MUD. TRAVIS COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT **DISTRICT NO. 10, AND WELLS BRANCH MUD**

TO THE HONORABLE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES:

COUNTIES

COMES NOW, the City of Austin ("Austin"), Respondent in the referenced consolidated administrative appeal of Austin's 2013 wholesale water and wastewater rates to Petitioners, by and through its attorneys, Webb & Webb, Attorneys at Law, and files this, its Reply to Petitioners' Response to Motion to Strike Prefiled Testimony of Petitioners North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1 ("North Austin"), Northtown Municipal Utility District ("Northtown"), Travis County Water Control and Improvement District No. 10 ("WCID No 10"), and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District ("Wells Branch"). In support thereof, Austin would respectfully state as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

- 1. On October 27, 2014, City of Austin ("Austin"), Respondent filed its Motion to Strike Prefiled Testimony of Petitioners North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control and Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District ("Motion to Strike").
- 2. On October 31, 2014, Petitioners filed their Response to City of Austin's Motion to Strike Prefiled Testimony of Petitioners North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control and Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District ("Response").
- 3. The City of Austin's Motion to Strike is anything but frivolous. Petitioners' counsel have all but admitted most of the facts upon which Austin based its Motion and yet assert that Austin has no right to object to deficiencies in Petitioners' filing. If anything, it is Petitioners who have made a frivolous claim for sanctions and attorneys fees.
- 4. A key element in Austin's Motion to Strike is the fact that the was no evidence that Petitioners satisfied the 3:00 p.m. filing deadline required by P.U.C. Proc. R. §§22.71(i) or the formal filing requirements of the Public Utility Commission ("PUC"). In Petitioners' Response they include an affidavit stating that they satisfied the deadline to the PUC. Petitioners' Response ignores some of the requirements of P.U.C. Proc. R. §22.74(a) and the standing practice in this case, thus far. Pleadings from the City of Austin have been served on Petitioners' counsel at the time that they have been filed with the PUC. This is the purpose of the certificate of service requirement of §22.74(d); to advise the PUC, the Administrative Law Judges, and the parties of the timeliness of a filing and the timeliness of service of the pleading to the parties. When a pleading is filed

with the PUC without a certificate of service, it fails to comply with clear filing requirements and it fails to inform the parties whether *any* of the filing requirements have been satisfied. For example, Petitioners' Response is completely silent with respect to Petitioners' failure to comply with P.U.C. Proc. R §22.72(e), pertaining to the obligation of a pleading to be signed by the attorney of record. Petitioners have not even attempted to correct this additional error. Under P.U.C §22.75(b) Petitioners' October 17, 2014 filing is only entitled to be considered "conditionally accepted for filing" because of its failure to comply with §22.72(e). *Arguably, Petitioners have yet to actually file their prefiled testimony*. Moreover, Petitioners' failure to follow P.UC. Proc. R §22.74(d) is certainly not "harmless" to the City of Austin if it would be required to pay Petitioners' attorneys for the costs of their attempt to comply with simple PUC filing requirements after the fact. Petitioners' nonconforming pleading is entitled to be stricken, in some forums. [See TRAP9.4(j)] Austin is entitled to object to the Petitioners' non-conforming pleading.

5. Petitioners statement at Paragraph 5 of their response cannot be taken seriously. The ALJ's did not have to state in any order a *time* deadline for a filing in this case--§22.71 imposes the time deadline. The ALJ's were clear about the applicability of PUC filing requirements to this base. Austin assumes that *all* PUC filing requirements would be enforced.

III. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE PREMISES CONSIDERED, the City of Austin respectfully requests that the Direct Testimony of David Malish, Direct Testimony of Thomas C. Arndt, Direct Testimony of Jay Joyce, and Petitioners' Exhibits 1-4, which was presumably filed on behalf of North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control and Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District be stricken in its entirety; that Petitioners' request for sanctions be denied it their entirety, and for such other and further relief that Austin may show itself entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

KAREN KENNARD, City Attorney

D. CLARK CORNWELL Assistant City Attorney

WEBB & WEBB

712 Southwest Tower 211 East Seventh Street Austin, Texas 78767

Tel: (512) 472-9990 Fax: (512) 472-3183

ATTORNEYS FOR CITY OF AUSTIN

By:

Stephen P. Webl State Bar No 21/33800

s.p.webb@webblaw.com

Gwendolyn Hill Webb State Bar No. 21026300 g.hill.webb@webbwebblaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been served via hand delivery, facsimile, electronic mail, overnight mail, US mail and/or Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested on all parties whose names appear on the mailing list below on this day of hand of hand when the served whose names appear on the mailing list below on this day of hand when the served whose names appear on the mailing list below on this

FOR THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

1701 N. Congress Avenue, 7th Floor PO Box 13326 Austin, Texas 78711-3326 Via Electronic Upload and Hand Delivery

FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES:

Honorable Pratibha J. Shenoy Administrative Law Judge

Honorable Beth Bierman Administrative Law Judge

State Office of Administrative Hearings 300 W. 15th Street, Suite 504 Austin, Texas 78701 Phone: 512-475-4993

Fax: 512-322-2061 Via Electronic Upload

FOR THE SOAH DOCKET CLERK:

Ms. Monica Luna, Docketing Clerk State Office of Administrative Hearings

300 W. 15th Street, Suite 504 Austin, Texas 78701

Phone: 512-475-4993 Fax: 512-322-2061 Via Electronic Upload

FOR PETITIONERS:

Mr. Randall B. Wilburn, Attorney at Law 3000 South IH 35, Suite 150 Austin, Texas 78704 Phone: 512-535-1661

Fax: 512-535-1678

rbw@randallwilburnlaw.com

Mr. John Carlton, Attorney at Law The Carlton Law Firm, PLLC 2705 Bee Cave Road, Suite 200 Austin, Texas 78746

Phone: 512-614-0901 Fax: 512-900-2855

john@carltonlawaustin.com

FOR THE PUC STAFF:

Mr. Hollis Henley, Attorney-Legal Division

Public Utility Commission of Texas

1701 N. Congress Avenue

PO Box 13326

Austin, Texas 78711-3326

Phone: 512-936-7230 Fax: 512-936-7268

Hollis.henley@puc.texas.gov