



FILED
6-02-15
04:59 PM

BWM/ek4

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for Approval of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and Authorization to Recover All Present and Future Costs in Rates.

Application 12-04-019
(Filed April 23, 2012)

E-MAIL RULING ON COMMON OUTLINE

Dated June 2, 2015, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ BURTON W. MATTSON for
Gary Weatherford
Administrative Law Judge

A.12-04-019 BWM/ek4

From: Mattson, Burton

Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 2:01 PM

To: michael@rri.org; rmcglathlin@bhfs.com; norm@montereycfb.com; ronweitzman@redshift.com; JRBobMcK@gmail.com; nisakson@mbay.net; GeorgeTRiley@gmail.com; attys@wellingtonlaw.com; tfrutchev@ci.pg.ca.us; dave@laredolaw.net; rscg.carlos@gmail.com; ross@smwlaw.com; sarah.leeper@amwater.com; Reynolds, John; MFogelman@FriedmanSpring.com; jfarrow@mrwolfeassociates.com; LarrySilver@earthlink.net; dcarroll@downeybrand.com; jminton@pcl.org; ek@a-klaw.com; jgeever@surfrider.org; kstrong@gordonrees.com; lminky@bhfs.com; sdamron@surfrider.org; filings@a-klaw.com; don.evans8@gmail.com; jdriscoll@allenmatkins.com; ACerasuolo@amwater.com; david.sousa@amwater.com; kevin.tilden@amwater.com; robert.maclean@amwater.com; tim.miller@amwater.com; pfindley@rbf.com; ahowe@surfrider.org; jshoaf@bhfs.com; rdrake@bhfs.com; ffarina@cox.net; mckeej@co.monterey.ca.us; awhite@mcclw.org; ChardavoyneDE@co.monterey.ca.us; janetb@montereybay.com; engellj@comcast.net; lflowrey@nheh.com; lflowrey@nheh.com; jason@burnettforcarmel.com; iga@att.net; jheitzman@mcwd.org; directorshriner@gmail.com; keith@mrwpc.com; DStoldt@mpwmd.net; atersol@gmail.com; Catherine.Bowie@amwater.com; heidi@laredolaw.net; GeneralManager@mpccpb.org; Andrew.Homer@amwater.com; Nicholas.Subias@amwater.com; nina.suetake@amwater.com; rhm@landwater.com; Anna.Shimko@SedgwickLaw.com; Sigrid.Waggener@SedgwickLaw.com; rmuzzin@friedmanspring.com; EZigas@esassoc.com; BMooney@GordonRees.com; ldolqueist@manatt.com; VidhyaPrabhakaran@dwt.com; JMcTarnaghan@perkinscoie.com; jbrezack@brezack.com; blaising@braunlegal.com; red@eslawfirm.com; Richard.Svindland@amwater.com; ca.rates@amwater.com; Ungson, Chris; Koltz, Jonathan; Rauschmeier, Richard; Truong, Viet; Kotch, Andrew; Mattson, Burton; Weatherford, Gary; Reiger, J. Jason; Menda, Justin; Wong, Lester; Zelazo, Michael; Allen, Peter; Kumra, Ravi; Thomas, Sarah R.; St. Marie, Stephen; Rose, Suzie; Shia, Terence

Cc: ALJ_Support ID; ALJ Docket Office; ALJ Process

Subject: A.12-04-019 Email Ruling on Common Outline

DATE: June 2, 2015

TO: Service list for A.12-04-019

FROM: Burton W. Mattson for
Gary Weatherford

Administrative Law Judge

CC: ALJ_Support ID; ALJ Docket Office; ALJ Process Office

Subject: A.12-04-019 Email Ruling on Common Outline

On May 26, 2015, applicant, California American Water Company, served a common outline to be used for opening and reply briefs on policy and legal issues. The expectation was that the applicant and served parties could agree upon a common outline. (See Rulings dated January 23, 2015 and May 20, 2015.) Three parties, however, have brought to the Commission's attention that they do not agree with the common outline. (Marina Coast Water District, The Public Trust Alliance, Water Plus.)

The purpose of a common outline is to let all parties address all issues they believe necessary, and to do so in an orderly and organized way. It is appropriate for the outline to separately identify each topic any party states is important to address. A topic identified by a party as important should not be left to the "other issues" part of the common outline. Each topic in the common outline should not be stated from an advocacy prospective but should be stated in a neutral way, so that a party may address the topic in the affirmative, negative, or otherwise. Finally, while the common outline must separately state and include all important topics identified by parties, it is not necessary for each party to address each topic included in the common outline when the party later files its brief.

This ruling requires applicant to engage in further consultation with parties to develop a common outline, and to file and serve the parties' agreed upon common outline no later than June 5, 2015. Applicant is expected to do everything reasonably appropriate to separately state and include in the common outline each important topic identified by a party. Nonetheless, if a party still disagrees with what applicant files on June 5, 2015, that party shall file and serve a complete specific alternative proposed outline no later than June 8, 2015. If necessary and appropriate, a subsequent ruling shall specify the common outline parties shall use.

The Docket Office shall formally file this ruling.

Gary Weatherford
Administrative Law Judge