



**FILED**  
11-17-16  
01:32 PM

GW2/ek4 11/17/2016

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for an Order Authorizing the Collection and Remittance of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District User Fee.

Application 10-01-012  
(Filed January 5, 2010)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD**

This ruling is issued to supplement the record with additional information to provide an informed basis to consider the motion that was jointly filed on October 25, 2016, by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates and California-American Water Company (collectively "the Parties"). The motion requests issuance of a Commission order authorizing Cal-Am to resume collecting the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District User Fee (User Fee) on behalf of the District and remitting the proceeds to the District.<sup>1</sup> The parties describe the motion as an "all-party" motion.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The District User Fee is the subject of the California Supreme Court's opinion and order in *Monterey Peninsula Water Management Dist. v. Public Utilities Com.* (2016) 62 Cal.4th 693 2016 Cal. LEXIS 45.

<sup>2</sup> While the Sierra Club has not been an active party since 2012, it advised the moving parties that it supports the instant motion. All other active parties in the proceeding jointly sponsor the instant motion.

Pursuant to the directions below, the parties are directed to provide responsive information relating to each of the three issues identified below in order to supplement the record as a basis for a ruling on the instant motion:

**1. Protection of Customers that Omit Payment of the District Fee**

The parties' proposal is silent on what happens if a Cal-Am water customer pays everything except the District User Fee. It would be unreasonable for a customer to face disconnection, however, merely due to failure to pay the District User Fee. To correct this deficiency, this customer protection needs to be made explicit in the proposal and in Cal-Am's tariffs.

**2. Provision of a Proposed Tariff Sheet**

The parties' proposal should be supplemented with the provision of a proposed tariff sheet that reflects all of the relevant elements outlined in the proposal.

**3. Financial Impacts of the District User Fee**

Although there may be financial impacts to Cal-Am by having the District funded by the User Fee on the Cal-Am customer's bill, the proposal does not specify what the impacts are. The record should be augmented to identify and quantify any such financial impacts from the District User Fee in order to assist

in determining the revenue requirement impacts in the currently pending Cal-Am General Rate Case (A.16-07-002).

**IT IS RULED that** the parties sponsoring the motion filed October 25, 2016 (*i.e.*, Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates and California-American Water Company) are directed to jointly provide responsive information relating to the issues identified above to supplement the record as a basis for a ruling on the motion. The responsive information shall be filed and served by December 2, 2016.

Dated November 17, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ GARY WEATHERFORD

Gary Weatherford  
Administrative Law Judge