

**RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS  
GAS SERVICES DIVISION**

**GAS UTILITIES  
INFORMATION BULLETIN**

**No. 696**



**RAILROAD COMMISSION  
OF TEXAS**

**Michael L. Williams, Chairman  
Charles R. Matthews, Commissioner  
Tony Garza, Commissioner**

**Steve Pitner  
Director  
Gas Services Division**

**March 25, 2002**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
SECTION 1 - NEW APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS FILED .....	2
SECTION 2 - APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS SET FOR HEARING .....	2
SECTION 3 - STATUS OF PENDING CASES .....	2
SECTION 4 - NOTICES OF DISMISSAL .....	2
SECTION 5 - ORDERS OF THE COMMISSION .....	3-4
SECTION 6 - MISCELLANEOUS .....	5-18

Final Order issued in Gas Utilities Docket No. 9173, Complaint of TXU Gas Distribution Against EPGT Texas Pipeline, L.P.

**SECTION 1  
NEW APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS FILED**

**DOCKET NO.** -- 9284  
**CAPTION** -- Appeal of TXU Gas Distribution concerning Ordinance No. 2002-01 of the City of Gatesville, TX, regarding notice requirements for gas utility rate increases.  
**DATE FILED** -- March 14, 2002  
**FILED BY** -- John Moeller  
**EXAMINER** --

**DOCKET NO.** -- 9285  
**CAPTION** -- Appeal of TXU Gas Distribution concerning Ordinance No. 2002-02 of the City of Gatesville, TX, regarding rate filing package requirements for gas utility rate increases.  
**DATE FILED** -- March 14, 2002  
**FILED BY** -- John E. Moeller  
**EXAMINER** --

**DOCKET NO.** -- 9286  
**CAPTION** -- Appeal of TXU Gas Distribution concerning Ordinance No. 3104 of the City of Longview, TX, regarding notice requirements for gas utility rate increases.  
**DATE FILED** -- March 15, 2002  
**FILED BY** -- John E. Moeller  
**EXAMINER** --

**DOCKET NO.** -- 9287  
**CAPTION** -- Appeal of TXU Gas Distribution concerning Ordinance No. 2002-073 of the City of Denton, TX, regarding notice requirements for gas utility rate increases.  
**DATE FILED** -- March 15, 2002  
**FILED BY** -- John E. Moeller  
**EXAMINER** --

**DOCKET NO.** -- 9288  
**CAPTION** -- Appeal of TXU Gas Distribution concerning Ordinance No. 3105 of the City of Longview, TX, regarding rate filing package requirements for gas utility rate increases.  
**DATE FILED** -- March 15, 2002  
**FILED BY** -- John E. Moeller  
**EXAMINER** --

**DOCKET NO.** -- 9289  
**CAPTION** -- General inquiry into rates filed by CoServ Gas for service to residential and commercial customers in and adjacent to unincorporated territory known as the Windmill Farms Subdivision Kaufman County, TX, also known as the Kaufman County Development District Number One.  
**DATE FILED** -- March 18, 2002  
**FILED BY** -- Don Leverty  
**EXAMINER** -- Mimi Winetroub

**DOCKET NO.** -- 9290  
**CAPTION** -- Application of Neches Gas Distribution Company for approval to abandon a lateral line located in Jefferson County, TX, and connected to Sabine Pipe Line LLC's 22 inch main.  
**DATE FILED** -- March 20, 2002  
**FILED BY** -- Sandra Buch  
**EXAMINER** -- Jackie Standard

**SECTION 2**  
**APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS SET FOR HEARING OR PREHEARING CONFERENCE**

None at this time.

**SECTION 3**  
**STATUS OF PENDING CASES**

None at this time.

**SECTION 4**  
**NOTICES OF DISMISSAL**

None at this time.

**SECTION 5  
ORDERS OF THE COMMISSION**

<b>RE: COMPLAINT OF TXU GAS</b>	‘	<b>GAS UTILITIES DOCKET</b>
<b>DISTRIBUTION AGAINST EPGT</b>	‘	
<b>TEXAS PIPELINE, L.P.</b>	‘	<b>NO. 9173</b>

**FINAL ORDER**

On September 12, 2000, TXU Gas Company, d/b/a TXU Gas Distribution, initiated this proceeding by filing its complaint against PG&E Texas Pipeline, L.P., now known as EPGT Texas Pipeline, L.P. “TXU” shall refer to TXU Gas Company, its predecessors in interest, and all divisions or operating units thereof. “EPGT” shall refer to EPGT Texas Pipeline, L.P. its predecessors in interest, and all divisions or operating units thereof. In June 2001 the Commission abated proceedings in this docket in light of preexisting litigation between TXU and EPGT in Travis County styled: Cause No. 99-10570; *EPGT Texas Pipeline, L.P. and El Paso Reata Energy, L.P. v. TXU Gas Company*; In the 250<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas (“Travis County Suit”). TXU and EPGT have reached a settlement of the issues involved in this docket and the Travis County Suit as provided in a Settlement Agreement dated December 28, 2001, as amended (“Settlement Agreement”). The Intervenor Cities by their stipulation and agreement support the settlement and the entry of this order. TXU, EPGT, and the Intervenor Cities are sometimes hereinafter referred to as the “Settling Parties.”

Pursuant to the parties’ agreement and request, the Commission takes official notice of: (a) the record in Gas Utilities Docket No. 500 (“GUD 500”) including but not limited to the Agreement of the Parties, dated as of December 26, 1977, with an attached Settlement Plan (“Settlement Plan”), pursuant to which the parties agreed to resolve GUD 500, among other proceedings, and the Final Order in GUD 500, issued on September 4, 1979, and all orders in subsequent proceedings to the extent they modified or interpreted the GUD 500 final order (“GUD 500 Final Order”); (b) the monthly filings by EPGT showing the calculation of its weighted average cost of gas (“WACOG”) under the agreed formula set forth in the GUD 500 Final Order; and (c) the audits conducted by the Commission of EPGT and EPGT’s customers.

Notice of Open Meeting to consider this Order was duly posted with the Secretary of State within the time period provided by law pursuant to TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN. Chapter 551, *et seq.* (Vernon 1994 & Supp. 2001). The Railroad Commission of Texas hereby adopts the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and orders as follows:

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Notice of this proceeding was given to TXU Gas Company, EPGT Texas Pipeline, L.P., and the Intervenor Cities.
2. In 1968, TXU’s predecessor, Lone Star Gas Company, and EPGT’s predecessor, Lo-Vaca Gathering Company, entered into a gas sales contract for the sale of gas by Lo-Vaca to Lone Star (“Contract”). In 1973, Lo-Vaca instituted GUD 500, seeking to modify the sales price under its sales contracts, including the Contract. EPGT and TXU (through their predecessors) reached a settlement that was joined by customers representing in excess of ninety-nine percent of Lo-Vaca’s 1975 sales volumes. The settlement was incorporated into the Settlement Plan. As part of the implementation of the Settlement Plan, the Commission entered the GUD 500 Final Order. Among other things, the GUD 500 Final Order approved the Settlement Plan and thereby modified the sales price under the Contract. The modified price was to be calculated based on a WACOG formula that was attached as an appendix to the GUD 500 Final Order.
3. Subsequent to the 1979 settlement and GUD 500 Final Order, the parties amended their Contract numerous times, modifying aspects of the charges and providing other contractual concessions thereunder.
4. The parties have stipulated that the Contract created obligations by EPGT to TXU that arose pursuant to GUD 500 and that, upon termination of the Contract in March of 1998, those obligations ceased. Thereafter, in 1999 TXU disputed certain charges under the Contract. Unable to resolve this dispute EPGT, in September of 1999, filed the Travis County Suit, seeking a declaratory judgment that it or its predecessor had complied with the GUD 500 WACOG formula in calculating and charging the contract price. TXU filed a counterclaim contending EPGT had breached the Contract and committed fraud by not complying with the agreed GUD 500 WACOG formula and other contractual agreements between the parties. EPGT contended that its charges under the Contract were strictly in accordance with the Settlement Plan, the Final Order in GUD 500, and the parties’ contractual agreements.

5. Approximately one year after the initiation of the Travis County Suit, TXU filed its Complaint in this docket. The Complaint asserted the same claims as TXU asserted in the Travis County Suit. EPGT contended that it had properly charged for gas in accordance with the agreed GUD 500 formula and the parties' contractual agreements. EPGT further maintained that the preexisting dispute between it and TXU was a contract dispute properly within the jurisdiction of the Travis County District Court. EPGT further has asserted in the Travis County Suit that it is entitled to rescind the various contractual concessions it has made under the Contract over the years and recoup the value of these concessions passed through to TXU.
6. In order to avoid the cost of prolonged litigation and the uncertainty brought about by such litigation and to bar future litigation related to these issues, TXU and EPGT, with the joinder of the Intervenor Cities, which are members of the Steering Committee of Cities served by TXU, have agreed to resolve all disputes between them by EPGT's payment of certain agreed sums to TXU as additional contractual concessions, a portion of which shall be passed through to TXU's residential and commercial sales customers as set forth in the Final Order in Gas Utilities Docket No. 8647 ("the Settlement Funds"). For the consideration paid in the Settlement Agreement and in light of the effect of such additional contractual concessions, the parties have also agreed to support the entry of this final order by the Commission that, *inter alia*, dismisses this proceeding with prejudice.
7. The Settling Parties have stipulated that the Settlement Funds paid hereunder resulted from contractual concessions between the parties and that no part of the Settlement Funds are the result of any GUD 500 WACOG calculation made by EPGT.
8. TXU and the Intervenor Cities have further agreed that the Settlement Funds should be handled in accordance with the provisions of this Commission's Final Order in 1998 in Gas Utilities Docket No. 8647 providing for allocation of refunds and credits received by TXU from its suppliers for the benefit of itself and its customers and that a portion of the additional payment shall be allocated to compensate TXU and the Intervenor Cities for their reasonable attorney's fees and litigation expenses incurred in the proceedings leading to this Settlement.
9. The Settling Parties have stipulated as to the reasonableness and adequacies of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law herein to support the entry of this order. The stipulations of the Settling Parties are set forth on Exhibit A of this order.
10. All parties to Gas Utilities Docket No. 9173 have waived hearing and the issuance of a proposal for decision and the opportunity for exceptions and replies.
11. The Settlement Funds provided by the Settlement Agreement represent a final and non-appealable negotiated amount.
12. The parties have stipulated that, after the entry of the GUD 500 Final Order, EPGT filed monthly with the Commission and TXU its calculation of the WACOG under the agreed GUD 500 formula.
13. The parties have stipulated that, since 1979 and through 1998, covering the period in question, the Commission regularly audited EPGT, which audits included costs incurred, and rates charged by EPGT under the GUD 500 Final Order.
14. The parties have stipulated that, during the Commission's review of the monthly WACOG filings and its audits of EPGT from 1979 through the audit concluded January 18, 2001, no instances were found in which EPGT failed to properly calculate and charge the WACOG price in compliance with the agreed GUD 500 formula.
15. The parties have stipulated that all charges by EPGT to TXU under the Contract and GUD 500, which charges were flowed-through by TXU to its customers, have been calculated in compliance with the GUD 500 Final Order and the Settlement Plan, and all revenues collected by EPGT from TXU are not subject to refund by EPGT.
16. It is reasonable and the intention of the Commission that this order will give preclusive effect to the findings to bar any future litigation of any kind whatsoever between TXU and EPGT with respect to, *inter alia*, the administration of the Contract and EPGT's charges to TXU, which charges were flowed-through by TXU to its customers.
17. This order is intended to preclude and limit positions and arguments on future proceedings regarding charges made by EPGT and the payment of such charges by TXU, which charges were flowed-through by TXU to its customers.
18. The Commission finds that it is reasonable to dismiss Gas Utilities Docket No. 9173 with prejudice.

19. The Settling Parties have compromised and agreed to conclude these proceedings. Neither the Settling Parties nor the Commission, in approving, accepting and agreeing to this order, is deemed to have approved, accepted, agreed or consented to any principle of ratemaking or to any underlying data or to any data that may be asserted to underlie this order other than the matters specifically referred to herein. Neither the Settlement Agreement nor this order shall be deemed in any respect to constitute an admission by any party or the Commission that an allegation or contention made or contained in these proceedings is true or valid or untrue and invalid. It is recognized that a party's support for this order may differ from its position and testimony in other dockets and to the extent there is such a difference the Settling Parties are not waiving their position in other dockets. However, no future claim by EPGT or TXU shall be based upon any acts or admissions on or before the date of this order. Nothing herein shall preclude the Commission from or limit the Commission in any way in exercising its lawful authority over gas utility rates and services and in meeting its statutory duties to ensure compliance with the obligations under law of gas utilities.

20. For the reasons set forth in these findings of fact, the Commission finds that a resolution of Gas Utilities Docket No. 9173 consistent with the settlement is prudent and in the public interest.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Commission has jurisdiction to resolve the pending docket pursuant to Texas Utilities Code, §§101.001-124.002, by the entry of the proposed order.
2. It would not be in the parties' interest to have protracted litigation with uncertainty as to the remedies that might legally be available to resolve the dispute in the absence of an agreement.
3. It is in the public interest and in accordance with the Commission's Order in Gas Utilities Docket No. 8647 to facilitate customers of TXU receiving refunds and credits by way of the settlement.
4. It is reasonable to resolve this docket by approving the settlement by the entry of this Order pursuant to Texas Government Code, §2001.056.
5. This order precludes any future litigation of any kind between TXU and EPGT with respect to, *inter alia*, the administration of the Contract and charges made by EPGT at any time, and the resulting payments made by TXU, which payments were flowed-through by TXU to its customers.
6. Based upon the stipulation of the parties to this docket and the Settlement Agreement, the Commission renders this order which resolves all issues in this proceeding and is a final disposition of all disputes and potential disputes between TXU and EPGT arising from or related to EPGT's administration of the Contract and of the applicable rate provisions under the Settlement Plan and the Final Order in GUD 500, and the charges made by EPGT to TXU and resulting payments made by TXU and its customers.
7. It is hereby ordered that any provision or requirement contained in previous orders is superceded by this order to the extent that such provision or requirement is inconsistent with or in contradiction to this order and paragraph.
8. The Settling Parties have compromised and agreed to conclude these proceedings and the Settling Parties and the Commission in approving, accepting and agreeing to this order are not deemed to have approved, accepted or agreed or consented to any principle in ratemaking or any underlying data or to any data that may be asserted to underlie this order other than as the parties specifically referred to herein.
9. Neither the settlement nor this order shall be deemed in any respect to constitute an admission by any party or the Commission that any allegation made or contained in these proceedings is true and valid or untrue and invalid. It is recognized that a party's support for this order may differ from its position or testimony in other dockets. To the extent that there is such a difference, the Settling Parties and the Commission are not waiving their position in other dockets; however, no future claims by TXU or EPGT shall be based upon any action or omission during the period prior to the date of this order. Nothing herein shall preclude the Commission from or limit the Commission in any way in exercising its lawful authority over gas utility rates and services and in meeting its statutory duties to ensure compliance with the obligations under law of gas utilities.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED BY THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS:**

1. Upon receipt of the Settlement Funds, TXU shall administer such sums in accordance with the provisions of Gas Utilities Docket No. 8647.
2. All issues that have been raised or could have been raised in this proceeding are hereby resolved consistent with this order and the settlement.
3. TXU's Complaint and all issues raised by TXU therein are hereby dismissed with prejudice, and this proceeding is accordingly closed and final by virtue of the settlement and this final order.

**SIGNED** this 21st day of March, 2002.

**RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS**

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
**MICHAEL L. WILLIAMS**  
**CHAIRMAN**

**(did not sign)** \_\_\_\_\_  
**CHARLES R. MATTHEWS**  
**COMMISSIONER**

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
**TONY GARZA**  
**COMMISSIONER**

**ATTEST:**

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
**Secretary of the Commission**

**SECTION 6**  
**MISCELLANEOUS**

**STEVE PITNER, GAS SERVICES DIVISION DIRECTOR**

**1. OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR**

**A. Publications**

1. Texas Utilities Code Titles 3 and 4. Special Rules of Practice and Procedure and Substantive Rules - \$15.00
2. a. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2001 – Now available via the Commission’s website at:  
<http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/tablecontents01.html>
  - a. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2000 - \$17.00 (includes statistical data for 1999)
  - b. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1999 - \$9.00 (includes statistical data for 1998)
  - c. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1998 - \$7.00 (includes statistical data for 1997)
3. January 2000 Pipeline Safety Rules - \$24.00, includes: 49 CFR 191 & 192 and 16 TAC Sections 7.70-7.74 (gas) 49 CFR 193 (LNG); 49 CFR 195 and 16 TAC Sections 7.80-7.87 (hazardous liquids); 49 CFR 40 and 199 (drug testing).
4. Distribution and/or Gas Transmission Review forms for Adequacy of Operation, Maintenance and Emergency Manual - To obtain a copy of review forms at no charge, send a request with a self addressed envelope (10" x 13" preferably) with \$0.98 postage.
5. Six MCF Monthly Residential Gas Bill Analysis for Twenty-five Texas Cities - \$2.00

Anyone who wishes to obtain a copy of any of the publications or maps listed in Section A should contact the Gas Services Division, P. O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78711-2967, (512) 463-7167.

**B. Interest Rate on Customer Deposits**

We have been advised by the Public Utility Commission that the interest rate to be applied to customer deposits in calendar year 2002 is 6.00%. All gas utilities should use this rate.

**2. PIPELINE SAFETY SECTION**

- A. Austin Headquarters - William B. Travis Building  
1701 North Congress, (78701)  
PO Box 12967  
Austin, Texas 78711-2967 Telephone (512) 463-7058

Mary L. McDaniel, P.E., Assistant Director  
William (Bill) Dase, Jr., P.E., Engineer  
Terry Pardo, P.E., Engineer  
K. David Born, Field Operations Manager  
William (Bill) Meyer, Compliance Manager  
Lee Thying, P.E., Engineer  
Kendall Smith, Program Administrator  
Maurice Curd, Program Administrator

Amarillo Region 1 - 7102 IH-40 West, Bldg. C., Amarillo, Texas 79106 Telephone (806) 468-7486

Scott Williamson, Engineering Specialist  
Alan Mann, Engineering Assistant

Midland Region 2 - Petroleum Building, 214 West Texas, Suite 803, Midland, Texas 79701 Telephone (915) 570-5884

Glenn Taylor, Area Supervisor (Midland/Amarillo)  
Larry Felio, P.E., Engineer  
Keith Smith, Engineering Assistant  
Tim Murray, Engineering Specialist (Abilene)

Kilgore Region 3 - 619 Henderson Boulevard, Kilgore, Texas 75662 Telephone (903) 984-8581

Bob Oldham, Engineering Specialist  
James Alexander, Engineering Specialist  
Jerry Hill, Engineering Specialist

Austin Region 4 - 1701 North Congress, P. O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78711 Telephone (512) 463-7050

Johnny Burgess, Engineering Specialist  
Mark Arguelles, Program Administrator

Houston Region 5 -1706 Seamist Drive, Ste 501, Houston, Texas 77008-3135 Telephone (713) 869-8425

Danny Nichols, Area Supervisor  
Jerry Hoff, Engineering Specialist  
Jim Arnold, Engineering Specialist  
Randy Vaughn, Engineering Assistant  
Gregory Johnson, Engineering Assistant  
Frank Henderson, Engineering Assistant

Dallas Region 6 -1546 Rowlett Rd., Suite 107, Garland, Texas 75043 Telephone (972) 240-5757

Jody Kerl, P.E., Area Supervisor (Dallas/Kilgore)  
M. Kathryn Williams-Guzman, Engineering Specialist  
San Sein, Engineering Assistant

Corpus Christi Region 7 -10320 IH-37, P.O. Box 10307, Corpus Christi, Texas 78460-0307 Telephone (361) 242-3117

Don Gault, Area Supervisor  
Steven Schmidt, Engineering Specialist  
Steven Rios, Engineering Assistant  
Jesse Cantu, Jr., Engineering Assistant

**B. Monthly Summary (January)**

No. of distribution safety evaluations - 106  
No. of transmission safety evaluations - 69  
No. of liquid safety evaluations - 11  
No. of leak/calls - 48  
No. of accident investigations - 11  
No. of special investigations - 19

**C. Reporting of Pipeline Accidents**1) **NATURAL GAS**

Accidents on intrastate gas systems involving \$5,000 property damage, a fatality or injuries, gas ignition, or that are judged significant must be reported by telephone within two hours, and the written report filed within thirty (30) days. Call the 24-hour emergency phone number (512)463-6788 to report an accident. For your convenience this priority phone line is used only to report emergencies.

2) **HAZARDOUS LIQUIDS**

Accidents on intrastate hazardous liquid pipelines reportable under 49 CFR Sections 195.50 and 195.52 and 16 TAC Section 7.84(a) must be reported by telephone within two hours and the required written report filed within thirty (30) days. Call the 24-hour emergency phone number (512)463-6788 to report an accident. For your convenience this priority phone line is used only to report emergencies.

**Rules and Regulations:** None at this time.

**3. AUDIT SECTION****A. Maintains headquarters and three district offices as follows:**

Headquarters - William B. Travis Building

1701 North Congress, P. O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78701

Ed Abrahamson, Assistant Director

Telephone (512) 463-7022

Dallas District- 1546 Rowlett Rd., Suite 107, Garland, Texas 75043

Stephen Cooper, Auditor

Josh Settle, Auditor

Telephone (972) 240-5757;

Fax (972)303-1897

Austin District- P. O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78711-2967

Telephone (512) 463-7022

Houston District- 1706 Seamist Drive. Suite 501, Houston, Texas 77008-3135

Mark Brock, Supervising Auditor

Dale Francis, Auditor

Margie Stoney, Auditor

Konata Uzoma, Auditor

Lekisha Churchwell, Auditor

Larry Alcorn, Auditor

Telephone (713) 869-8425;

Fax (713)869-3219

**B. Gas Utility Tax, Annual Reports and Audit Reports**

Questions relating to gas utility tax, annual reports and audit reports, call Shannon L. Miller at (512) 463-7022.

**C. Available Information**

Copies of company annual reports (1994 to present), as well as information relating to any of the above, A through C, are available for review at the William B. Travis Building, Gas Services Division, 9th Floor, 1701 North Congress. All requests for copies must be made in writing and should be addressed to the Audit Section. Copies will be provided for a fee, depending on the volume of copy work desired, allow a minimum of five days for completion of requests. Inquiries regarding copies should be directed to the Audit Section at (512) 463-7022, or Fax your request to (512) 475-3180.

**4. REGULATORY ANALYSIS AND POLICY****A.** Maintains the following office to assist you:

Headquarters - William B. Travis Building  
1701 North Congress, P.O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78711  
Karl Nalepa, Assistant Director

Telephone (512) 463-7164

**B. Gas Utilities Information Bulletin**

Published on the Commission's web site at: <http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/rap/rapbls.html>.

**C. Proposals For Decision**

Published on the Commission's web site at: <http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/rap/pfds.html>.

**D. Tariff Filings**

Questions pertaining to the filing of tariffs and/or quality of service rules should be directed to Kathy Arroyo, or Sandra Soto at (512) 463-7164.

**E. Curtailements**

Curtailement questions should be referred to Sandra Soto at (512) 463-7164. Curtailement reports made Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., should be made to (512) 463-7164. Curtailement reports made during hours other than those specified above and holidays, should be made to (512) 463-6788, (512) 896-3863 (digital pager), (512) 892-1772 or (512) 280-5949.

**F. Compliance Filings**

Questions regarding gas utilities docket compliance filing requirements should be referred to Jackie Standard at (512) 463-7164.

**G. Complaints and Inquiries**

All complaints and inquiries relating to the gas utility industry should be directed to the Regulatory Analysis and Policy section at (512) 463-7164.

**5. HEARINGS AND LEGAL ANALYSIS****A. Miscellaneous**

Anyone wishing to obtain copies of appendices to Orders appearing in Section 5 of this Bulletin should contact the Legal Division at (512) 463-7017.

**B. Status of Pending Cases**

The status of all pending cases listed in Section 3 of this Bulletin is for informational purposes only and is complete up to the time of printing of this Bulletin. For a more accurate status of pending cases, please call the Legal Division at (512) 463-7017.