



Filing Receipt

Filing Date - 2024-08-22 01:48:27 PM

Control Number - 54617

Item Number - 127

Public Utility Commission of Texas

Docket No. 54617

SOAH Docket No. 473-24-13127

Central Records

22 August 2024

P.O. Box 13326

Austin, TX 78711-3326

Subject: Intervenor Reply To Initial Brief

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I. INTRODUCTION

On July 23, 2024, the administrative law judge (ALJ) ordered to submit all Reply To Initial Brief by August 23, 2024. Therefore, this reply to initial brief is timely filed.

II. Issues With TWU And PUC Initial Brief

Public Interest. How can higher rates, that put a burden on consumers, be considered just & reasonable and in the public interest? These concerns must be taken seriously.

Recommendations by TWU and PUC, to imposing TWU initial rates, will unjustly burden all of us customers with an outrageously high tariff (100% increase from today to tomorrow).

Intervenors do not stand a chance as Mr. Faulk stated in his Initial Brief 'customers without any water rate-making experience should not be given any weight in this proceeding.' Excuse me but isn't that PUC's job to protect consumers? We have had experience before in appealing rate increases, maybe not as much as ya'll, in which we negotiated a reasonable price rate.

This hike seems to be only in the interest to make money for TWU whether it is fair or not.

As to TWUs 10% argument. As I stated, a large population of our subdivisions are low income, retired, veterans, and or of Hispanic descent and have little or no idea what this STM is all about (hence the low intervenor participation). No money for legal representation, time, or stamina to go through this grueling intervenor process.

If the intervenor process would have been on a petition basis, I know for a fact, the participation rate would have reflected a greater number of customers from our subdivision.

As to TWUs claim that "Direct-to-Customers" be more effective tool. An STM with TWU initial rate would be devastating. Existing rates should remain to alleviate further strain and burden on us customers.

III. CONCLUSION

May I remind you, our subdivisions are struggling, as it is, to pay their bills now. I have stated before that conversations on our community website reflect all their concerns on this STM. I have been living in Southern Crossing for 22 years and seen how we all are struggling to survive. This STM is not in the public interest and should not go forward unless our current SHDI existing rates stay. We need PUC & OPEC to fight for the consumers to stop monopolies from taking over because they feel superior to small communities.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Constance Stover

Intervenor