

GW2/lil 7/6/2016



**FILED**  
7-06-16  
02:41 PM

**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)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING GRANTING IN PART, THE  
JOINT MOTION FOR RULING CONFIRMING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE**

On June 28, 2016, thirteen parties filed a joint motion for a ruling confirming the procedural schedule. Joint parties move for the requested ruling before July 13, 2016.

July 13, 2016 is the current deadline for written comments to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on its Staff Recommendation to modify the SWRCB's 2009 Cease and Desist Order (CDO). The Staff Recommendation includes a milestone for California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) action in Phase 2 of this proceeding. The milestone is that the Commission adopts a favorable Phase 2 decision by September 30, 2016. The current schedule contains a target date for Commission action by August 18, 2016. Joint parties would like a confirmation of that date, or information that the August 18, 2016 date is no longer viable so that joint parties can inform the SWRCB by July 13, 2016. Joint parties also seek clarification that the upcoming Public Participation Hearing scheduled for September 1, 2016 is not intended to extend the current schedule.

The motion is granted in part. The grant is to address the schedule as provided below, but not to state specific dates for Commission action. The motion is denied in all other respects.

The Commission notes that the parties did everything the parties believed necessary on a very tight schedule to meet the conditions in the April 25, 2016 Ruling (that conditionally granted the joint motion for a separate Phase 2), and the Commission is appreciative of that work. It is now up to the Judge and the assigned Commissioner to determine if the joint parties did or did not satisfactorily do so. It is premature, and would be prejudicial, to make that decision in a ruling before issuance of the Proposed Decision (PD).

Nonetheless, the Judge is working on meeting what the April 25, 2016 Ruling adopted as the "target date" for the item being on the Commission agenda at the August 18, 2016 voting meeting. That means the PD must be filed and served by July 19, 2016. Every attempt is being made to meet that deadline but that is a target date, and there is no commitment to do more than what is reasonably possible to meet that date. The workshop and public participation hearing scheduled for September 1, 2016 is not intended to extend the current procedural schedule.

If the PD is filed on or before July 19, 2016, the item will be on the Commission agenda at the voting meeting August 18, 2016. If the PD is filed on or before August 16, 2016, the item will be on the Commission agenda at the voting meeting September 15, 2016. If the PD is filed on or before August 30, 2016, the item will be on the Commission agenda at the voting meeting September 29, 2016. The Commission meeting dates in August and September are adequate to meet the September 30, 2016 deadline for Commission action on this item (with the September 30, 2016 date contained as a milestone condition in

the SWRCB's staff Recommended Decision to the SWRCB for an extension of the December 31, 2016 CDO date).

Even if a PD is issued timely, and a proposed or alternate decision is adopted at the Commission's August 18, September 15, or September 29, 2016 meeting, however, there is no guarantee what that decision will say. While every reasonable effort is being made for the Commission to be able to act one way or another by its September 29, 2016 voting meeting, it is also possible that the Commission will not be able to act by then.

It is hoped that this explanation of Commission process and procedures in the context of the current schedule is helpful to the Joint Parties.

**IT IS RULED** that the June 28, 2016 joint motion is granted to the extent the schedule is discussed and explained, and the motion is denied in all other respects.

Dated July 6, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

          /s/ RICHARD SMITH for  
          Gary Weatherford  
          Administrative Law Judge