

SECRETARY'S RECORD, NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of Happy Cab) APPLICATION NO. TR-190
Company d/b/a Checker Cab, Happy)
Cab Company d/b/a Yellow Cab)
Company, Happy Cab Company d/b/a)
Happy Cab Company, DonMark,) GRANTED
Inc., d/b/a Cornhusker Cab, and)
Valor Transportation, Omaha,)
seeking authority to establish)
rates for its Lancaster County)
operations.) ENTERED: MAY 22, 2012

APPEARANCES

For the Applicant:

Andy Pollock
Rembolt Ludtke LLP
1201 Lincoln Mall, Suite 102
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

For the Commission Staff:

Mark Breiner
300 The Atrium
1200 N Street
PO Box 94927
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

For the Protestants

Servant Cab, Inc. d/b/a Yellow
Cab and Capitol Cab

Jack Shultz
Harding & Shultz, P.C., L.L.O.
800 Lincoln Square
P.O. Box 82028
Lincoln, NE 68501

BY THE COMMISSION:

By application filed February 25, 2011, Happy Cab Company, Checker Cab and Yellow Cab Company, DonMark, Inc., d/b/a Cornhusker Cab, and Valor Transportation d/b/a Safeway Cabs of Omaha, Nebraska, seeking approval to establish rates for its services in Lancaster County, and between points in Lancaster County, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, points in Nebraska over irregular routes, as follows:

Description	Proposed Rates
I. Standard Fare:	
(A) First 1/6 mile	\$2.95
(B) Each add'l 1/11 mile	\$0.20
II. Senior Citizen Fare	

SECRETARY'S RECORD, NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

APPLICATION NO. TR-190

PAGE 2

(A) First 1/6 mile	\$2.95
(B) Each add'l 1/8 mile	\$0.21
III. Out-of-town Fare	
(A) Rate per mile	\$2.25
IV. Waiting time	
(A) Per each 86 seconds	\$0.60
V. Cab Hired by the hour	\$22/hour
VI. No Service Charge	\$7.50
VII. Time and Mileage Charge	Waiting time plus meter fare
VIII. Traffic Delay Waiting Time	Same as IV. Waiting time above
<u>Fuel Surcharge</u>	

When fuel price exceeds:

\$4.00/gallon	\$0.60
\$4.30/gallon	\$0.75
\$4.60/gallon	\$0.90
\$4.90/gallon	\$1.05

When fuel price exceeds \$5.20/gallon, the surcharge increases \$0.15 for every \$0.30 increase in the cost of fuel.

Notice of the application appeared in The Daily Record, Omaha, Nebraska, on March 7, 2012. A protest to the Application was timely filed by Servant Cab Company through its attorney of record, Jack Shultz. Notice of this hearing was sent by U.S. Mail on May 10, 2011 to the interested parties.

Evidence was received on this Application during the hearings on the Extension Applications held on April 9, 10, and 11, 2012, in the Nebraska Public Service Commission Hearing Room at 1200 N Street, Suite 300, Lincoln, Nebraska.

E V I D E N C E

Mr. Mark Mitchell testified for the Applicants. He stated that he is the president and the owner of Happy, Yellow and Checker Cab Company and that he has administrative and operation functions for all of the Applicants. Mr. Mitchell testified

that he is familiar with the rate filing made in this proceeding.

Mr. Mitchell testified that Exhibit 102 is the rate filing prepared by Happy Cab with assistance from Mr. Pollock. He also testified that Exhibit 10 is a Commission order approving the rates Happy Cab is currently utilizing. He testified that the rates Happy Cab is now proposing for its proposed Lancaster County operations are the same as those rates approved in the August 30, 2011 order marked as Exhibit 10 for its use in its Omaha operations. Mr. Mitchell identified Exhibit 9 as a Commission order approving Servant Cab's rates on July 26, 2011.

Mr. Mitchell then walked through a comparison of Exhibit 102 (Happy Cab proposed rates) and Exhibit 9 (Servant Cab approved rates). Mr. Mitchell testified, based on the Exhibits, that the rates in general consist of a drop charge, fuel surcharge, and per mile charge. Servant Cab's approved rates, according to Mr. Mitchell's testimony, include a drop charge of \$4.25, a fuel surcharge of \$1.20 (based on \$3.75-\$4 fuel price), and a per-mile charge of \$3.90. He testified that Happy Cab's proposed rates include a drop charge of \$2.95, no fuel surcharge, and a per-mile charge of \$2.20. Mr. Mitchell testified that these numbers showed Servant Cab's rate to be 78 percent higher than Happy Cab's proposed rate. Breaking these numbers down further, Mr. Mitchell testified that Servant Cab's fare is calculated by adding the drop rate of \$4.25, which includes the first 1/13th of a mile, the fuel surcharge, and 30 cents per each additional 1/13th of a mile (and that Happy Cab's per-mile charge is 20 cents per 1/11th of a mile). He testified that the approved waiting time was 70 cents per minute and the out-of-town rate per mile was \$3. He then pointed out that Happy Cab's wait time is 60 cents per 86 seconds, but testified that he did not include waiting time or out-of-town rates in his calculations.

Mr. Mitchell testified that he had run several scenarios to see how the two companies' rates compared to each other. Mr. Mitchell testified that Servant Cab's rates exceeded Happy Cab's rates by \$19.50 for a 10-mile trip, \$36.50 on a 20-mile trip, and \$53 on a 30-mile trip based on typical taxicab fare and not including rates for waiting time or out-of-town travel.

Mr. Mitchell then turned his attention to Exhibit 20, the prefiled testimony of John Davis. Mr. Mitchell testified that the rates now being proposed are the same rates currently being charged in Omaha because nothing in Happy Cab's financial picture has changed since August 30, 2011. He stated that the rates are based on revenues and expenses, allowing for a

reasonable rate of return, which would be around 8 to 10 percent.

Mr. Mitchell then talked about Exhibit 11, which is a confidential exhibit containing Happy Cab's financial information. Mr. Mitchell testified that the exhibit takes several things into account when talking about how the company's income is derived, including credit card fees, mechanical repair of the vehicles, licensing, et cetera. He also testified that Happy Cab uses projected numbers for insurance expenses, including policy expense, personal property, and general liability insurance expense. Mr. Mitchell stated that the projected numbers for Lincoln are the same as those currently used by Happy Cab in Omaha. He testified that there are some differences in variable and fixed expenses and that the projected percentages for Lincoln that were the same as Omaha includes the variable expenses, such as maintenance, repair, and insurance. Mr. Mitchell stated that fixed costs, as a percentage of the total cost, would be different in Lincoln than in Omaha, that even though the dollar value is higher in Omaha, he believes that these costs will be a higher percentage of Happy Cab's income in Lincoln, but that the cost will be fair.

Mr. Mitchell then testified about Exhibit 12, referenced on page 2 of Exhibit 20. Exhibit 12 is a confidential exhibit containing the profit and loss income statements of the Happy Cab companies for 2010 and 2011. Mr. Mitchell testified that the information contained in Exhibit 12 is consistent with the information the company provided during its rate proceeding that culminated with an order approving the rate on August 30, 2011. He testified that Happy Cab submitted Exhibit 12 for purposes of establishing the proposed rates and not for the purpose of showing fitness. Mr. Mitchell stated that he submitted a financial statement for each application and that he has applied for authority with the Commission before. On those previous applications for authority, Mr. Mitchell testified that he had never submitted business expenses and revenues, but that he had provided financial statements as required by the Commission.

Without delving into specific details of Exhibit 12, as it was received under seal, Mr. Mitchell testified in response to Mr. Shultz's question that the rate of return demonstrated in Exhibit 12 is within the 8 to 10 percent range. Mr. Davis testified that this would constitute a reasonable rate of return.

Mr. Mitchell then testified to Exhibits 13 and 14. He stated that he did not put these exhibits together, but that he has had the opportunity to review them and that they were

provided to the Protestants in this case. He further stated that he believed the Protestants had an opportunity to look at these records in Mr. Kirby Young's deposition. Mr. Mitchell testified that Exhibit 13 contains national cab rates compiled by one passenger in November of 2011. This exhibit was compiled by the Washington Post in November of 2011 and lists the rates from 20 different cities for 1-mile, 3-mile, 5-mile, and 10-mile trips. He testified that Exhibit 13 lists Lincoln as the highest cab cost among the 20 cities ranked and that it listed the following rates: 1-mile = \$9.25; 3-mile = \$17; 5-mile = \$24.85; and 10-mile = \$44.85. Mr. Mitchell stated that these numbers appeared consistent with his calculations, though there is a slight variation due to fuel surcharge differentials.

Mr. Mitchell testified that Exhibit 14 is a document prepared by Nicole Canny in Senator Avery's office in reference to LB 889, a bill introduced by Senator Avery to deregulate taxicabs. He stated that the document contains a summary of cab rates, including the drop and per-mile rates and the cost to travel one mile, in Lincoln, Omaha, Madison (Wisconsin), Orlando (Florida), Des Moines (Iowa), and a number of other cities. Further, Mr. Mitchell testified that the document lists the cost to travel one mile at \$9.25 for Lincoln and \$5.15 for Omaha, and that most of the cities in the summary appear to be similar to Lincoln in population, except for Omaha, which is the largest city on the list.

Mr. Mitchell then testified that, if granted authority in Lincoln, Happy Cab would not seek approval for a lower rate than the company proposed in this application. He did state, however, that Happy Cab would seek a lower rate if it was required to charge the same rate as Servant Cab. Mr. Mitchell testified that it was not his goal to run Servant Cab out of business, rather, Happy Cab's goal is to operate a profitable business and take care of the need and necessity of the Lincoln market for improved cab service.

Mr. Mitchell identified Exhibit 15 as the taxi rate ordinances for Des Moines (Iowa), Wichita (Kansas), St. Paul (Minnesota), and Madison (Wisconsin), four relatively Midwestern cities. Mr. Mitchell testified that he did not compile these documents, but that he had a chance to review them fairly thoroughly. He stated that the ordinances do not establish fixed rates for any of those communities, but offer a range of acceptable rates and procedural rules for changing rates and operating taxicabs. Mr. Mitchell stated that the requirements of notice to the appropriate commission and posting the rates within the vehicle are essentially the same requirement that the Commission requires in Nebraska. Mr. Mitchell testified that

SECRETARY'S RECORD, NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

APPLICATION NO. TR-190

PAGE 6

Des Moines does list a maximum and minimum per-mile rate, but that these are the only fixed rates in any of the communities and that no communities mandate one single rate to be used in the particular community.

Mr. Mitchell testified that the taxicab companies in Des Moines operate with independent contractors and have a slightly lower rate than Happy Cab. He again testified that Happy Cab's rates are based on its costs of doing business as shown in Exhibit 12 and that the companies have operated with a reasonable rate of return (between 8 and 10 percent) under this model for 12 years, including a five-year period without a rate increase.

Referring to page 4 of Exhibit 20 (Mr. Davis's prefiled testimony) under the heading "Proposed Rates, Policy Basis," Mr. Pollock asked Mr. Mitchell to comment on the Commission looking into whether it should require a uniform rate to be charged by taxicab companies operating in Lincoln or whether it will allow companies to charge different rates. In other words, Mr. Pollock said the question becomes whether Happy Cab will be required to charge Servant Cab rates or whether two sets of rates would be allowed by the Commission. Mr. Mitchell testified that Happy Cab wants to charge rates that allow for a reasonable rate of return, reasonable profits for the drivers, and reasonable, and affordable rates for the customers. He further stated that he believed the proposed rates are both reasonable and affordable.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the proposed rates are based on what the Commission approved in 2011 and was asked whether there were other reasons to support the proposed rate as just and reasonable (other than prior Commission approval). Mr. Mitchell testified that, in addition to the Commission's approval of Happy Cab's rates for Omaha, the company proposed the same rates for Lincoln due to the challenging and time consuming nature of recalibrating meters, which must be inspected and sealed, when taxicabs are transferred between Lincoln and Omaha, for instance, during special events such as Husker football games.

Mr. Mitchell then testified that Happy Cab would have concerns if it were required to charge the same rates as Servant Cab. He stated that Servant Cab's rates are well over 70 percent higher than Happy Cab's and that he believes the rates are unreasonably high. Mr. Mitchell further testified in response to an article in the Lincoln Journal Star (entered as Exhibit 23) that credited Mark Breiner with saying that the Commission wants to keep rates the same to prevent confusion and fraud. He testified that people in Lincoln were smart enough to

not be confused by multiple rates. He also stated that having the rates posted in each vehicle would prevent confusion and would not lead to fraud because the taxi meters are inspected and sealed. Mr. Mitchell testified that drivers are not allowed to deviate from the rates posted and used in the meters under Commission regulations. He testified that the same rule requiring rates to be posted applies to Servant Cab, though he was unsure whether Servant Cab actually posts its rates and he has no control over their actions.

Mr. Mitchell testified that requiring Happy Cab to charge the same rates as Servant Cab would cause its rates to be unreasonably high in relation to its finances and would result in a rate that is not just or reasonable. He testified that, in his opinion, the customer would be the one who loses out under this arrangement and that based on earlier testimony, the customers already believe the rates are too high.

Mr. Mitchell testified that, if required to charge the same rates as Servant Cab, Happy Cab would have to address major issues with setting meters and renegotiate its contracts with all its drivers or consider increasing its rates in Omaha to match those in Lincoln. He further testified that he would expect many consumer complaints if rates were almost doubled in Omaha and that the company would receive a windfall from doing so, resulting in damaged relations with the customers and community. Mr. Mitchell clarified that both the drivers and the company would receive a windfall based on the costs submitted in Exhibit 12.

In summary on the question of rates, Mr. Mitchell testified that other cities the size of Lincoln had minimum and maximum rates, and that he thinks that is fair. He testified that Happy Cab's [independent contractor] model has worked well and been tested at both the state and federal levels, that it is a balanced and fair relationship between the company and the drivers, that it is according to law, and that the drivers do pretty well. Mr. Mitchell summarized the company's goals as getting a reasonable rate of return, making sure the drivers receive reasonable revenue from the work they do, and making sure that customers and the community receive reasonable and affordable rates.

The Commissioners noted that the Lincoln Journal Star was not actually quoting Mr. Breiner in the article, and that the issue of multiple rates in a given location had not been prejudged or determined by the Commission at this time.

SECRETARY'S RECORD, NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

APPLICATION NO. TR-190

PAGE 8

Mr. Mitchell testified, in response to a question from Commissioner Schram, that the rates of Safeway Cab, before it was acquired by Happy Cab, were the same as Happy Cab's rates in Omaha. Further, he stated that Safeway Cab had once applied for a rate increase, that Happy Cab had opposed it, and that ultimately the rate was unchanged.

On cross-examination, Mr. Shultz questioned Mr. Mitchell extensively on his rate calculations in comparing the rates of Servant Cab and Happy Cab from Exhibits 9 and 10. Mr. Shultz tried to show that there is not as large of a gap between Servant Cab's rates and the Omaha rates as that calculated by Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell testified that about 20 percent of Happy Cab's business in Omaha comes from business travelers, though he was unsure how the percentage of business travelers compares to the total population of Omaha. He stated that the bulk of those business travelers come through the airport and that the company then transports those travelers from their hotels to other locations.

Mr. Mitchell testified that he understood Exhibit 14 to represent cab rates in cities of similar population. Mr. Mitchell said he would be surprised to learn that Lincoln had the lowest airport transportation of the cities on the list, but that he hasn't seen volume statistics for the other airports.

Mr. Mitchell testified that he did not know whether Exhibits 13 or 14 contained information from any cab companies with employee drivers and that he had never dealt with any of the regulatory agencies in the cities listed in Exhibit 15. Mr. Mitchell then testified that the price of fuel had risen between 2005 and 2011, that independent contractor drivers are required to purchase their own fuel, and that Happy Cab did not increase its rates in that time period. He then stated he wasn't sure exactly what the fuel prices were in 2005, but he knew prices went up and down all the time.

Mr. Mitchell then reiterated that he did not believe passengers would be confused by different rates because they could see the posted rates in the vehicle. He testified that an airport traveler paying one rate for a ride from the airport and then a different rate to go back to the airport would not be confused, but would question why the rates were different. He compared this situation to other industries with differing rates, such as hotels, limousines, or rental car companies.

Commissioner Schram questioned Mr. Mitchell about taxicab service in the cities listed in Exhibits 14 and 15, particularly Des Moines. Mr. Mitchell testified that there are different tariffed rates in the City of Des Moines for taxi service and that there is currently one company operating in that city. He was unsure as to how many companies operated in the other cities.

In response to a question from Commissioner Landis, Mr. Mitchell testified that he thinks Servant Cab's rates are high compared to other cities across the country, but that he doesn't know enough about their business model to know whether that is the reason for the rates being at that level.

On redirect, Mr. Mitchell testified that Happy Cab is seeking authority not just in Lincoln, but in all of Lancaster County. He testified that Happy Cab charges \$2.25 per mile for out of town trips and that Servant Cab charges \$3.00 per mile. Mr. Mitchell then testified that for a 1-mile trip, in the city limits, Happy Cab would charge \$5.15, while Servant Cab would charge \$9.40. Mr. Mitchell then testified that he expects over 95 percent of Happy Cab's trips [in Lancaster County] to be within the city limits of Lincoln. Mr. Mitchell then testified that Happy Cab's rates are published on its website and that travelers could check there or text or email Happy Cab to find out the rates in advance. He stated that customers could ask a driver what the rates are before that customer gets in the cab, and that he doesn't know whether Servant Cab has its rates published on the Internet. Mr. Mitchell reiterated that Happy Cab's rates are on file with the Commission.

In closing, Mr. Pollock renewed Happy Cabs motion to compel financial information from Servant Cab. Mr. Pollock acknowledged that such records would be moot if Happy Cab was denied authority or allowed to charge the rates it applied for, but that he thought the Commission should review both companies' financials before making a decision to charge them the same rate. He then reviewed each exhibit received into evidence and offered those that had not yet been received.

Kirby Young testified that his company uses an employee based model for employment. This model raises his costs as he experiences numerous costs that are not experienced by the Applicants. For example, Servant Cabs paid the following expenses that were not incurred by the Omaha taxi companies: Medicare, \$19,046; Social Security, \$81,439; Federal Unemployment Tax, \$42,244; State Unemployment Tax, \$21,222; Vacation Pay, \$37,031; Workers Compensation Insurance, \$55,4623. This is a total amount of \$218,446. These costs are the cause

of the disparity in the rates as currently charged in Lincoln and Omaha.

Mr. Young criticized the comparison information that was placed before the Commission regarding taxi rates in other locations. In almost every instance the city cited is either substantially larger or is part of a population area that is much larger than Lincoln. The airport usage numbers are also skewed due to these factors. He therefore believes that the comparisons listed in the exhibits are unfair and are not informative or useful in this application.

Mr. Young said that while there are periods of high demand time such as football Saturdays and other special events, most other times demand for services in Lincoln is not high. The Lincoln Municipal Airport is not utilized nearly as much as Eppley Airfield, and the services provided to the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services have dropped substantially in the past year. These business factors have led to a decrease in business for Servant Cab in the last year.

Mr. Young cited a 2010 Texas RioGrande Legal Aid study which showed that independent contract taxi drivers in Austin, Texas, made an average of \$2.75 per hour, with long hour working days, no vacation pay, and no benefits being provided in the process. This amount is much lower than the minimum wage. Another study of similar drivers in Portland, Oregon, found that those drivers earned an average of \$6.22 per hour.

A number of people testified during the public testimony section of the hearing regarding the rates that are currently charged in Lincoln as well as the proposed rates in this application. Essentially every person who testified regarding the rates said that the rates currently charged by Servant Cab were too high, much higher than other locations that they have experienced, and that the rates make travel too expensive. Other testimony involved the reasonableness of the rates as employed by the Applicants, and requested that the Commission allow the use of those rates in the Lincoln area.

O P I N I O N A N D F I N D I N G S

The Applicants received authority to operate in Lancaster County as set forth in its Order of May 22, 2012. This Application was made in order to establish rates for the new operations of the Applicants.

The rates as proposed in this Application are the same rates as currently approved for the Applicants use in their

Omaha, Nebraska, area operations. The Commission found in an Order August 30, 2011, that the rates as then proposed by the Applicants' were reasonable and approved for use in the Omaha area. There are several issues that the Commission will address in its determination of the proposed rates.

The Commission first points to §75-123. In this section, the Commission is obligated to consider that the lowest rate published or charged by any common carrier for substantially the same kind of service, whether in this state or another state, shall, when introduced into evidence, be accepted as prima facie evidence of a reasonable rate for the services inquired into. In this matter, the Applicants, subject to the rates approved in TR-180, are requesting that it be allowed to have those same tariff fares in its new operations in Lancaster County. Under this statute, the Commission finds that the proposed rates are reasonable and should be approved.

The Commission has found, in TR-185, that the rates charged by Servant Cab were reasonable. This finding is not binding on the rates charged by another entity such as is found in this case. While the higher rate charged by Servant Cab may be due to the costs it incurs as set forth above, it is not incumbent on the Commission to order that another carrier use these higher rates if that carrier is able to operate in a different manner and thus not need that particular tariff.

Indeed, the imposition of the higher rate could result in undue profits being permitted to the Applicants at the expense of the farepaying public. In light of the testimony that the Commission heard in the hearing on this matter, the farepaying public is asking for the relief that could be provided by the Applicants in this Application.

Nebraska Revised Statute §75-126 addresses the issue of unjust discrimination and practices in the rate area. The section reads as follows:

75-126. Unjust discrimination and practices prohibited; exceptions.

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no common carrier shall:

(a) Charge, demand, collect, or receive from any person a greater or lesser compensation for any services rendered than it charges, demands, collects, or receives from any other person for doing a like or contemporaneous service unless required under section 86-465;

(b) Make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person;

(c) Subject any type of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice, delay, or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever;

(d) Charge or receive any greater compensation in the aggregate for the transportation of a like kind of property or passengers for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route, except as the Commission may prescribe in special cases to prevent manifest injuries, except that no manifest injustice shall be imposed upon any person at intermediate points. This section shall not prevent the commission from making group or emergency rates;

(e) Demand, charge, or collect, by any device whatsoever, a lesser or greater compensation for any service rendered than that filed with or prescribed by the commission; or

(f) Change any rate, schedule, or classification in any manner whatsoever before application has been made to the commission and permission granted for that purpose, except as otherwise provided in section 86-155.

(2) This section shall not prohibit any common carrier from, and a common carrier shall not be subject to any fine, penalty, or forfeiture for, performing services free or at reduced rates to:

(a) The United States, the State of Nebraska, or any governmental subdivision thereof;

(b) The employees, both present and retired, of such common carrier;

(c) Any person when the object is to provide relief in case of any disaster;

(d) Any person who transports property for charitable purposes;

(e) Ministers and others giving their entire time to religious or charitable work; or

(f) Any person who is legally blind or visually handicapped.

The Commission is of the opinion and finds that the different rate as proposed by the Applicants does not violate

§75-126. That section refers to a "common carrier" in its prohibitions set out in the section. It does not require that all rates be the same for different carriers in different situations as the Applicants and the Protestant are in this matter.

The Commission is of the opinion that each carrier, with its respective business models, should be placed in a position to run its business according to its needs.

An examination of the taxi ordinances provided in this matter show that the jurisdictions cited have a minimum and maximum rate that the carriers can use. It is qualified that the carrier must use a rate that is between these rates and that the rate must be on file with the governing jurisdiction. There is no requirement that there be one, single rate used by all carriers in a given location. It appears from the evidence offered that, in at least these jurisdictions, different rates are allowed in the same area.

The Commission is also of the opinion that there will not be substantial confusion on the part of the general public. Several individuals testified that this is a common circumstance in many areas of commerce, and that the taxi situation should be no different.

The public testimony is such that fairness to the general public is also very important. The competition, both in service and in rates, may help to reduce the fares paid by the public while improving the service at the same time.

The Commission will hereby overrule the Motion to Compel the Review of Financial Information that Mr. Pollock renewed at the close of the hearing. The basis for the Motion was the importance of the Commission reviewing the financial records in the case that the Commission found that this Application should be denied. Inasmuch as the Commission has found the Application should be approved, the Motion has become moot and is therefore overruled.

Upon consideration of the Application, the evidence adduced and being fully advised in the premises, the Commission is of the opinion and finds that the Application should be granted effective May 25, 2012.

SECRETARY'S RECORD, NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

APPLICATION NO. TR-190

PAGE 14

O R D E R

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Nebraska Public Service Commission that the Application to establish rates for services in Lancaster County filed by the Happy Cab Companies, DonMark, Inc., d/b/a Cornhusker Cab Company, and Valor Transportation and Checker Cab be approved, effective May 25, 2012, as follows:

Description	Rates
I. Standard Fare	
A. First 1/6 mile (Initial Drop Charge)	\$2.95
B. Ea. Add'l 1/11 mile	\$0.20
II. Senior Citizen Fare:	
A. First 1/6 mile (Initial Drop Charge)	\$2.95
B. Ea. Add'l 1/8 mile	\$0.21
III. Out-of-town Fare:	
A. Rate per mile	\$2.25
IV. Waiting Time:	
A. Per each 86 seconds	\$0.60
V. Flat Rates Between Eppley Airfield and Hotels/Motels based on standard fare.	
VI. Cab Hired by the Hour	\$22/hour
VII. No Service Charge	\$7.50
VIII. Time and Mileage Charge	Waiting time plus meter fare
IX. Traffic Delay Waiting Time	Same as IV. Above

Fuel Surcharge

When fuel price exceeds:

\$4.00/gallon	\$0.60
\$4.30/gallon	\$0.75
\$4.60/gallon	\$0.90
\$4.90/gallon	\$1.05

When fuel price exceeds \$5.20/gallon, the surcharge increases \$0.15 for every \$0.30 increase in the cost of fuel.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fuel surcharge as approved by this order shall not be applicable to vehicles powered by compressed natural gas, and that the Applicants' meters will be programmed so that the fuel surcharge cannot and will not be charged on said vehicles.

APPLICATION NO. TR-190

PAGE 15

MADE AND ENTERED at Lincoln, Nebraska, this 22nd day of May, 2012.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS CONCURRING:



//s// Rod Johnson
//s// Frank Landis

Chairman



ATTEST:



Deputy Director