



Filing Receipt

Filing Date - 2024-03-05 01:43:42 PM

Control Number - 55338

Item Number - 51

**SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-24-07154
PUC DOCKET NO. 55338**

**PROCEEDING TO RESOLVE ISSUES IN §
DOCKET NO. 53719 RELATED TO §
TRANSPORTATION §
ELECTRIFICATION AND CHARGING §
INFRASTRUCTURE §**

**BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**



SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

WILLIAM B. ABBOTT

RATE REGULATION DIVISION

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS

MARCH 5, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.....	3
II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF TESTIMONY.....	4
III. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	6
IV. EV RIDERS.....	7
V. CONCLUSION	15

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment WBA-1	Curriculum Vitae
-------------------------	------------------

I. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. William B. Abbott, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by the Public Utility Commission of Texas (Commission) as the Director of the Tariff and Rate Analysis Section of the Rate Regulation Division.

Q. What are your principal responsibilities at the Commission?

A. In addition to the supervision and management of the Tariff and Rate Analysis Section, my principal area of responsibility involves performing analyses of issues such as utility cost allocation, rate design, and tariff filings. My specific responsibilities include: analyzing cost allocation studies, as well as revenue distribution and rate design issues, for regulated electric, water, and wastewater utilities; analyzing policy issues associated with the regulation of regulated utilities; reviewing tariffs of regulated utilities to determine compliance with Commission requirements; preparing and presenting testimony as an expert witness on rate and related issues in docketed proceedings before the Commission and the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH); and working on or leading teams in contested cases, rulemaking projects, reports, and research concerning rates, pricing, and other Commission-related issues.

Q. Please state your educational background and professional experience.

A. I earned Bachelor of Science degrees in Chemistry, Psychology, and Economics with a minor in Mathematics from the University of Houston. I earned a Master of Arts degree in Economics from George Mason University while successfully completing all non-dissertation requirements for a Ph.D., with field concentrations in Law and Economics as

1 well as Public Choice Economics. My field concentrations involved the study of the
2 dynamics and social welfare implications of behavior in non-commercial domains such as
3 the legal, political, legislative, and regulatory arenas. For several years as an undergraduate
4 and post-baccalaureate student, I was employed teaching introductory and organic
5 chemistry laboratory courses. As a graduate student, I taught several undergraduate lecture
6 courses including Law and Economics, Money and Banking, Introductory
7 Microeconomics, and Introductory Macroeconomics. After my graduate studies, and prior
8 to my employment at the Commission, I was engaged as a freelance consultant to perform
9 econometric analyses. In 2010, I was hired as a Rate Analyst at the Commission. In 2012,
10 I was promoted to my current position of Director, Tariff and Rate Analysis. I have
11 provided a summary of my educational background and professional regulatory experience
12 in Attachment WBA-1.

13 **Q. Have you previously testified before the Commission or SOAH?**

14 A. Yes. Attachment WBA-1 includes a listing of my previously filed written testimony.
15

16 **II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF TESTIMONY**

17 **Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental direct testimony in this case, PUC Docket**
18 **No. 55338 and SOAH Docket No. 473-24-07154, *Proceeding to Resolve Issues in Docket***
19 ***No. 53719 Related to Transportation Electrification and Charging Infrastructure?***

20 A. My testimony will supplement my previously filed direct testimony in Docket No. 53719
21 regarding Entergy Texas Inc.'s (ETI) proposals for two new riders, the Transportation
22 Electrification and Charging Infrastructure (TECI) rider, and the Transportation
23 Electrification and Charging Demand Adjustment (TECDA) rider, in light of the recently

1 enacted Chapter 42 of the Public Utility Regulatory Act (PURA). I continue to address the
2 following issues included in the Preliminary Order in Docket No. 53719:

3 67. Has Entergy proposed any rate riders? If so, should any of the proposed riders
4 be adopted? If so, what are the appropriate costs to be recovered through the
5 riders, and what are the appropriate terms and conditions of the riders?

6 68. Is it appropriate for an electric utility in a vertically integrated area to own
7 vehicle-charging facilities or other transportation electrification and charging
8 infrastructure, or should the ownership of such facilities be left to competitive
9 providers?

10 69. Should Entergy be allowed to own transportation electrification and charging
11 infrastructure—including vehicle-charging facilities—in the manner it has
12 proposed in its application, or should such ownership be wholly left to
13 customers or third parties?

14 In addition, I also address the following issues included in the Supplemental
15 Preliminary Order in this docket.

16 **TECI-1 Rider**

17 1. Do the proposed rates for the TECI-1 Rider comply with the requirements of
18 Chapter 42 of PURA?

19 4. Will the revenue collected by Entergy Texas under each agreement with a
20 participating person allow the utility to recover the costs of owning,
21 constructing, financing, operating, and maintaining the public electric vehicle
22 charging station from the person and not the utility's other customers under
23 PURA § 42.0103(p)(2)?

5. Do the rates comply with the requirements of PURA § 36.003?

TECDA-1 Rider

6. Do the proposed rates for the TECDA-1 rider comply with the requirements of Chapter 42 of PURA?

7. Do the proposed rates for the TECDA-1 rider comply with the requirements of PURA § 36.003?

The fact that I remain silent on certain issues associated with ETI's request, or any issues presented by any other party to this proceeding, does not imply any agreement on those issues.

Q. Was your testimony prepared by you or someone working under your direct supervision?

A. Yes.

III. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Q. What is your recommendation?

A. Based on my plain-language reading of PURA § 42.0103, I retract my previous recommendation that it is not appropriate for an electric utility in a vertically integrated area to own vehicle-charging facilities or other transportation electrification and charging infrastructure. PURA § 42.0103 appears to authorize such ownership under certain conditions. However, I still recommend that:

1. ETI's proposed TECDA Rider is unreasonably preferential and discriminatory, is inequitable and grants an unreasonable preference concerning rates to certain

persons in a classification, and should be rejected as it is not just and reasonable;
and,

2. ETI's proposed TECI Rider conflicts with PURA § 42.0101(d)(2), is unreasonably preferential and discriminatory, is inequitable, and should be rejected as it is not just and reasonable; and,

3. ETI should not be allowed to own transportation electrification and charging infrastructure—including vehicle-charging facilities—in the manner it has proposed in its application. Rather, if ETI is to own such infrastructure and facilities, it should establish an EV base rate class with standard EV rates established consistent with PURA Chapter 36, Commission rules, and standard ratemaking practice.

IV. EV RIDERS

Q. As an initial matter, is there any need to approve the riders ETI is proposing?

A. No. It is important to recognize at the outset that none of ETI's proposals in this proceeding are necessary for ETI to provide adequate and reasonable electric utility service to its customers, whether they currently own, or expect to own EVs, or EV charging stations. Nor are any of these proposals necessary for ETI to maintain its financial integrity. ETI's existing rates and tariffs are fully adequate to provide reasonable and adequate electric service to its customers. Any customer can, under ETI's existing tariff, elect to install an EV charger on their property and pay existing tariffed rates for electric service. If non-standard infrastructure is required to accommodate EV chargers on a customer's premises,

ETI's existing Additional Facilities Charge (AFC) rider is available to accommodate such installations.

Q. In light of the lack of necessity for ETI's proposed riders, under what standard should ETI's proposal be evaluated?

A. While ETI bears the burden of proof in this proceeding, the fact that ETI's proposed riders are unnecessary for ETI to fulfil its obligations to provide electric service warrants heightened scrutiny of the company's request. Furthermore, PURA's explicit support for limiting monopoly encroachment into the competitive market, discussed in my direct testimony in Docket No. 53719, along with the fact that there are competitive EV charging providers operating in Entergy's service territory, suggests to me that ETI's proposals should be rejected if there is even the slightest risk of inequity, discriminatory treatment, or unreasonableness.

Q. Did the proposal for decision in Docket No. 53719 reject ETI's proposed TECDA rider?

A. Yes.

Q. Does the adoption of PURA Chapter 42 change your recommendation regarding ETI's proposed TECDA rider?

A. No. My plain-language reading of PURA Chapter 42 does not indicate that anything like the TECDA rider is appropriate to encourage deployment of EV charging stations. As discussed in my direct testimony in Docket No. 53719, the rider would unreasonably shift significant costs to non-participating customers. Importantly, the rider is not based on cost causation, as it provides significant discounts from cost-based rates. Furthermore, the costs shifted to other customers as a result of the TECDA rider would likely far exceed the costs

1 of any relevant make-ready infrastructure, as the rate discount applies to rates that include
2 all of ETI's system costs – generation, transmission, and distribution. ETI's proposed
3 TECDA rider should be rejected again.

4 **Q. Why is ETI's proposed TECI rider unreasonable?**

5 A. As discussed in my direct testimony in Docket No. 53719, the proposed TECI rider suffers
6 from many problems. The rider is unduly preferential for the customers who would take
7 service from it, as it effectively offers those customers a personalized payment plan for
8 turnkey EV charging equipment similar or identical to that which they could obtain from a
9 competitive provider, but with ETI's other customers bearing the cost of providing this
10 financing to participating customers, and bearing the risk of nonpayment, while ETI
11 collects the profits. Despite being clothed in the garb of an electric service, service under
12 the rider would effectively put ETI in the position of a financial lender. There is no need
13 for such a rider when EV charger service could be provided as a standard rate class with
14 standard rates, as with ETI's lighting services. The TECI rider on its face indicates that it
15 would fail to collect the fully-embedded costs of providing service under the rider – it
16 indicates that customers will be charged only based on the transportation electrification
17 infrastructure and an "agreed-upon" amount associated with operations and maintenance
18 expense. There are system overhead and indirect costs, as well as administrative costs,
19 associated with service under the TECI rider that ETI would fail to collect from the
20 participating customers.

21 Additionally, the TECI rider is significantly underspecified, amounting to little
22 more than an assertion that ETI will collect a portion of the appropriate costs from the
23 appropriate customers. Such lack of specificity is unreasonable for something as

1 standardizable as EV charger service. Standard ratemaking practice involves setting
2 numerical rates for standard electric service, not simply establishing tariffs that state they
3 will collect the right costs from the right customers. This lack of specificity and
4 standardized rates would deeply impair the Commission's and the court's ability to
5 evaluate the appropriateness of what is being charged under the TECI rider, and thus impair
6 the Commission's ability to ensure that all rates are just and reasonable.

7 **Q. How would the underspecified nature of the TECI rider impair the Commission's**
8 **ability to ensure that all rates are just and reasonable?**

9 A. Rates include many costs that must be allocated among customer classes because they are
10 not clearly directly attributable to an individual customer. In addition to certain system
11 infrastructure costs, there are operations and maintenance costs, items such as
12 administrative and general payroll costs, and general and intangible plant costs, among
13 others, that must be allocated among customers to establish sufficiently just and reasonable
14 rates. ETI's investment in EV charger infrastructure costs is but a fraction of costs caused
15 by EV charger customers. Failing to appropriately collect all types of costs from customers
16 under the TECI rider would lead to unreasonably inequitable and preferential treatment for
17 the TECI customers. Ensuring that the proper costs are being recovered from TECI
18 customers, and not being unreasonably shifted onto other customers, would be an
19 incredibly burdensome task given the customer-specific application under the rider and the
20 potentially numerous EV charger installations that might be at issue. Electric utility base
21 rate cases are to be processed under statutorily mandated timelines and involve significant
22 review simply to establish reasonable base rates.

1 Additionally, in recent years a growing number of incremental cost recovery riders
2 must be reconciled in each base rate case, including potentially eight to ten distribution
3 cost recovery factor (DCRF) reconciliations,¹ several transmission cost recovery factor
4 (TCRF) reconciliations,² and generation cost recovery riders (GCRR),³ as well as recently
5 established resiliency-related riders and regulatory assets.⁴ While it may be theoretically
6 possible to seek discovery on, and review the reasonableness of each and every outstanding
7 TECI EV charger installation on ETT's system in every rate case, it is unreasonable to
8 burden the Commission and the court with such a task when the rider is unnecessary and
9 where more reasonable alternatives, such as a standard EV charger rate class with standard
10 rates, exist.

11 **Q. Are there other concerns with the lack of specificity under the TECI rider?**

12 A. Yes. The lack of published numerical rates under the TECI rider may impede the
13 deployment of EV charging stations. Tariffed numerical rates provide transparency and
14 predictability for customers, who need only consult the public tariff to get a sense of what
15 they likely would pay for service. The TECI rider envisions customers contacting ETI and
16 negotiating various terms and prices. Such an approach may be burdensome for some
17 customers, is not transparent, and may discourage adoption.

¹ 16 TAC § 25.243.

² 16 TAC § 25.239.

³ 16 TAC § 25.248.

⁴ 16 TAC § 25.62.

1 **Q. Would ETI's offsetting of net monthly payments under the TECI rider against ETI's**
2 **overall revenue requirement ensure just and reasonable cost recovery?**

3 A. No, not at all. Such assertions merely beg the question. If ETI is collecting less under the
4 TECI rider than the full costs to provide service under the rider, including all overhead and
5 indirect costs, then the offsetting revenues will still leave other customers unreasonably
6 paying for rider TECI costs.

7 **Q. Would adoption of ETI's proposed EV riders conflict with portions of PURA Chapter**
8 **42?**

9 A. Based on my plain-language reading of the statute, yes. As discussed in my direct
10 testimony in Docket No. 53719, both of ETI's proposals would unreasonably subsidize EV
11 charging service, and thereby undermine competition. PURA § 42.0101(a) finds an interest
12 in encouraging competitive private sector investment in EV charging station deployment.
13 ETI's TECI rider proposal would unduly subsidize EV charging stations deployed under
14 ETI's program, potentially stifling the provision of such charging stations by competitive
15 providers, who cannot socialize overhead or indirect costs and the financial risk of
16 providing customer payment plans among captive ratepayers as ETI would be able to do
17 under its proposal.⁵ Private companies seeking to provide EV chargers in ETI's service
18 territory may not even make any attempt to do so, knowing that they would either be
19 competing with ETI's subsidized service to ETI's affiliates or established installers, or that
20 they would be forced to do business with ETI through the TECI program. On these same
21 grounds, ETI's proposed TECI rider also conflicts with PURA § 42.0101(d)(1)'s stated

⁵ Direct Testimony of William B. Abbott, Rate Regulation Division, Public Utility Commission of Texas, November 2, 2022 at 9-10 (Duplicate) (Aug. 24, 2023).

goal of implementing competitively neutral policies, and PURA § 42.0101(d)(2)'s stated goal of competitively neutral tariffs.

Q. Would the TECI rider conflict with the intent behind PURA § 42.0103(c)?

A. Based on my plain-language reading, yes it would. PURA § 42.0103(c) appears to me to be concerned with ensuring that a utility does not offer preferential treatment to one of its own affiliates, by requiring that the same tariff apply to affiliates as to regular customers. The significantly underspecified nature of the proposed TECI rider leaves almost all of the relevant cost recovery aspects to the discretion of ETI on a case-by-case basis, especially terms such as the “agreed-upon” amount of O&M costs. This would open the door for ETI to provide potentially highly preferential service under TECI to one of its affiliates, while still claiming to be adhering to the letter of the law. Again, the TECI rider simply leaves far too much important detail unspecified to allow for any realistically meaningful review to ensure that unreasonably preferential treatment is not occurring.

Q. Does the existence of the Additional Facilities Charge rate schedule provide support for the TECI rider?

A. No. The AFC rate schedule is necessary because most electric utility service is standardized into specific rates for specific customer classes, and there may occasionally be a need for some type of non-standard equipment or infrastructure buildout to suit the unique needs of certain customers. Because of the potentially wide range of unique circumstances that might require nonstandard infrastructure buildout, and the wide range of potential costs associated with them, the AFC rate schedule cannot be highly specific. Additional non-standard facilities are presumably fairly rare for mass market customers; however, EV chargers may become very common over time. In contrast to AFC service,

EV charging service is much more standardizable. It is akin to ETI's lighting service rate schedules, including Area Lighting Service (ALS), as noted by the Company.⁶

Q. Does the existence of ETI's ALS rate schedule provide support for the proposed TECI rider?

A. No. The proposed TECI rider is far less standardized and specified than the ALS rate schedule. The ALS rate schedule is a standard base rate schedule that includes specific numerical rates for standardized lighting service. The TECI rider is not so specified. ETI's lighting rates include a wide range of standard lighting installations of different wattages – sodium vapor lights, LED lights, along with various wood, metal or fiberglass poles of different sizes. As with lighting service, there may be numerous different standard EV charging station configurations available. A standard EV charger rate class, with costs assigned and allocated to it in the same manner that costs are assigned and allocated to other rate classes, could be established with standardized EV charger options and numerical rates, just as is done with lighting rate classes for all the electric utilities in Texas. Such a rate class and rates would obviate the need for the TECI rider while providing transparent pricing that would encourage the deployment of utility-owned EV chargers. Therefore, the TECI rider should not be approved when a standard rate class offering would serve in a much more reasonable and appropriate manner. If a customer wishing to install an EV charger needs non-standard service for some reason, rider AFC would suffice for any non-standard EV charger costs.

⁶ Rebuttal Testimony of Samantha F. Hill (Duplicate) at 14 (Aug. 24, 2023).

V. CONCLUSION

Q. Please summarize your recommendation.

A. The Commission should reject ETI's proposed TECDA and TECI riders as not just and reasonable. The TECDA rider is unreasonably preferential and discriminatory, is inequitable and grants an unreasonable preference concerning rates to certain persons in a classification and is unnecessary. The TECI rider is unreasonably preferential and discriminatory, is inequitable, appears to conflict with portions of PURA, and is unnecessary as EV charger service could be offered as a standard base rate service with numerical Commission-approved rates as with ETI's lighting service.

Q. Does this complete your direct testimony?

A. Yes.

William B. Abbott
Public Utility Commission of Texas
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701

REGULATORY EXPERIENCE:

Public Utility Commission of Texas, Rate Regulation Division

June 2010 - Present

Director, Tariff and Rate Analysis Section as of May 1, 2012

Responsible for activities related to utility cost allocation, cost unbundling, rate design, and incentive regulation in areas subject to rate regulation. Key activities include managing staff engaged in rulemaking projects, contested cases, and tariff reviews. Perform in a technical capacity similar to that of a senior economic analyst including: analysis of economic issues and cost studies; review of rate requests and specific tariffs; and participation as an expert witness in major regulatory proceedings. Maintain contact with representatives of industry and consumers, other state agencies, and other Commission staff members, and advise the Division Director regarding the status of current projects and economic perspectives on utility regulatory issues.

EDUCATION:

2008	George Mason University <i>Master of Arts: Economics</i> (All requirements for Ph.D. completed, except for dissertation)
2004	University of Houston <i>Bachelor of Science: Economics</i> <i>Minor in Mathematics</i>
2003	University of Houston <i>Bachelor of Science: Psychology</i>
2002	University of Houston <i>Bachelor of Science: Chemistry</i>

List of Testimony Filed at the Public Utility Commission of Texas:

Docket No. 53625 – *Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorization and Related Relief for the Acquisition of Generation Facilities* – November 22, 2022.

Docket No. 53719 – *Application of Entergy Texas Inc. for Authority to Change Rates* – November 2, 2022.

Docket No. 53601 – *Application of Oncor Electric Delivery Company LLC for Authority to Change Rates* – September 16, 2022.

Docket No. 52195 – *Application of El Paso Electric Company to Change Rates* – October 29, 2021.

Docket No. 51802 – *Application of Southwestern Public Service Company for Authority to Change Rates* – August 20 and September 14, 2021.

Docket No. 51484 – *Compliance Filing of AEP Texas Inc. for Rider TC-2 Refund – Refund of Transition Charges-2* – August 6, 2021.

Docket No. 51239 – *Application of Carroll Water Company, Inc. for Authority to Change Rates* – May 14, 2021.

Docket No. 51547 – *Joint Report and Application of Texas-New Mexico Power Company, NM Green Holdings, Inc. and Avangrid, Inc. for Regulatory Approvals Under PURA §§ 14.101, 39.262, and 39.915* – March 2, 2021.

Docket No. 50714 – *Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. to Amend its Distribution Cost Recovery Factor* – May 27, 2020.

Docket No. 49189 – *Application of the City of Austin DBA Austin Water for Authority to Change Water and Wastewater Rates* – November 15, 2019.

Docket No. 49421 – *Application of CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC for Authority to Change Rates* – June 12 and 19, 2019.

Docket No. 48181 – *Application of El Paso Electric Company to Expand Solar Generation Capacity and Change Rates for the Community Solar Pilot Program* – October 24, 2018.

Docket No. 48401 – *Application of Texas-New Mexico Power Company for Authority to Change Rates* – August 20 and 28, 2018.

Docket No. 48371 – *Entergy Texas, Inc.'s Statement of Intent and Application for Authority to Change Rates* - August 16, 2018.

Docket No. 48233 – *Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company to Implement a Base Rate Decrease in Compliance With Docket No. 46449* – July 19 and October 16, 2018.

Docket No. 45979 – *Review of the Rate Case Expenses Incurred by Sharyland Utilities, L.P. in Docket No. 45414* – June 27, 2018.

Docket No. 47527 – *Application of Southwestern Public Service Company for Authority to Change Rates* – May 2 and 22, 2018.

Docket No. 46602 – *Appeal of AEP Texas Central Company From an Order of the City of McAllen Regarding Complaint of L&F Distributors* – October 10, 2017.

Docket No. 46936 – *Application of Southwestern Public Service Company for Approval of Transactions with ESI Energy, LLC and Invenergy Wind Development North America, LLC, to Amend a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for Wind Generation Projects and Associated Facilities in Hale County, Texas and Roosevelt County, New Mexico, and for Related Approvals* – October 9, 2017.

Docket No. 46831 – *Application of El Paso Electric Company to Change Rates* – June 30, July 21, and November 2, 2017.

Docket No. 46449 – *Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Authority to Change Rates* – May 2 and 19, 2017.

Docket No. 45414 – *Review of the Rates of Sharyland Utilities, L.P., Establishment of Rates for Sharyland Distribution & Transmission Services, L.L.C., and Request for Grant of a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity and Transfer of Certificate Rights* – March 7 and 16, 2017.

Docket No. 44941 – *Application El Paso Electric Company to Change Rates* – January 15 and April 22, 2016.

Docket No. 45084 – *Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Approval of a Transmission Cost Recovery Factor* – November 24, 2015.

Docket No. 44620 – *Application of Sharyland Utilities, L.P. to Revise its TCRF Class Allocation Factors and Request for Good Cause Exception From P.U.C. Subst. R. 25.193(c)* – August 21 and September 8, 2015.

Docket No. 44677 – *Application of El Paso Electric Company for Approval to Revise its Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor and Request to Establish Revised Cost Cap* – July 31 and August 7, 2015.

Docket No. 44060 – *Application of Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. to Amend a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for a 138-kV Transmission Line in Denton County* – June 15, 2015.

Docket No. 43695 – *Application of Southwestern Public Service Company for Authority to Change Rates* – June 8, 2015.

Docket No. 42370 – *Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Rate Case Expenses Severed From PUC Docket No. 40443* – December 12, 2014.

Docket No. 43111 – *Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Approval of a Distribution Cost Recovery Factor* – November 5, 2014.

Docket No. 42448 – *Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Approval of a Transmission Cost Recovery Factor* – July 31, 2014.

Docket No. 42449 – *Application of El Paso Electric Company for Approval to Revise its Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor and Request to Establish Revised Cost Caps* – July 10, 2014.

Docket No. 42042 – *Application of Southwestern Public Service Company for Approval of a Transmission Cost Recovery Factor* – May 1, 2014.

Docket No. 41791 – *Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Authority to Change Rates and to Reconcile Fuel Costs* – January 17 and April 4, 2014.

Docket No. 41474 – *Application of Sharyland Utilities, L.P. to Establish Retail Delivery Rates, Approve Tariff for Retail Delivery Service, and Adjust Wholesale Transmission Rate* – October 28, 2013.

Docket No. 41430 – *Joint Report and Application of Sharyland Utilities, LP, Sharyland Distribution & Transmission Services, LLC, and Southwestern Public Service Company for Approval of Purchase and Sale of Facilities, for Regulatory Accounting Treatment of Gain on Sale, and for Transfer of Certification Rights* – August 9, 2013.

Docket No. 40627 – *Petition by Homeowners United for Rate Fairness to Review Austin Rate Ordinance No. 20120607-055* – February 14, 2013.

Docket No. 40443 – *Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Authority to Change Rates and Reconcile Fuel Costs* – December 17, 2012.

Docket No. 39896 – *Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Authority to Change Rates and Reconcile Fuel Costs* – April 3, 2012.

Docket No. 39375 – *Oncor Electric Delivery Company LLC's Application for 2012 Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor* – August 9, 2011.

Docket No. 39366 – *Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Authority to Redetermine Rates for the Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor Tariff and Request to Establish a Revised Energy Efficiency Goal and Cost Caps* – July 26, 2011.

Docket No. 39363 – *Application of CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC for Approval of an Adjustment to its Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor* – July 22, 2011.