

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of California
Water Service Company (U-60-W), a
Corporation, for Authority to Recover Costs
Associated with General Office Building
Renovation.

Application 12-06-016
(Filed June 29, 2012)

**MOTION TO ADOPT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES
AND CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY (U-60-W)
(SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ATTACHED)**

NIKI BAWA
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 703-2049
niki.bawa@cpuc.ca.gov

Staff Attorney for the
Division of Ratepayer Advocates

Dated: March 4, 2013

NATALIE D. WALES
California Water Service Company
1720 North First Street
San Jose, California 95112
Phone: (408) 367-8566
nwales@calwater.com

Regulatory Attorney for
California Water Service Company

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of California Water Service Company (U-60-W), a Corporation, for Authority to Recover Costs Associated with General Office Building Renovation.

Application 12-06-016
(Filed June 29, 2012)

**MOTION TO ADOPT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES
AND CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY (U-60-W)
(SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ATTACHED)**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Rule 12.1 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (“Rules”), the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (“DRA”) and California Water Service Company (“Cal Water”) (together, “the Parties”) submit this motion for approval of the attached proposed Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) resolving all issues raised by Cal Water in its *Application for Authority to Recover Costs Associated with General Office Building Renovation* filed on June 29, 2012 (“Application”).¹

The Parties to the Agreement have worked closely to reach mutually agreeable positions on the issues in dispute. For the reasons discussed below, the Parties believe that the Agreement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law, and in the public interest. The Agreement is the result of a collaborative effort, and

¹ The proposed Settlement Agreement is provided as **Attachment 1** to this Motion.

carefully balances the unique interests and needs of each Party, as well as the overall goal of furthering good public policy. The Parties strongly urge the Commission to grant this Motion and adopt the Agreement in its entirety, without modification. The Agreement is provided as Attachment 1 to this Motion.

In addition, in light of the all-party Settlement Agreement, the Parties request that the requirement for a 30-day period for public review and comment be waived pursuant to § 311(g)(3) of the California Public Utilities Code and Commission Rule 14.7(a).

II. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

As provided in the attached Agreement, the Parties agree to the following resolution of Cal Water's Application for cost recovery of the renovation of the General Office building housing the Information Technology ("IT"), Human Resources ("HR"), and Customer Service ("CS") departments for Project ID ("PID") 16992 (referenced generally as the "IT/HR Building"):

1. Reclassification of certain costs from capital to expense, reducing the total capital costs of the renovation from \$6,011,172 to \$5,734,400;
2. Implementation of a surcharge² to begin recovery of \$5,734,400 in capital costs until final rates from A.12-07-007, Cal Water's current General Rate Case ("GRC"), become effective; and
3. An adjustment to General Office capital costs in A.12-07-007 that reflects the reclassification of costs so that new rates adopted in A.12-07-007 include, for the purposes of this Application, \$5,734,400 in capital costs for the IT/HR Building renovation.

The surcharge that should be applied until new rates go into effect has been recalculated to reflect the total capital costs of \$5,734,400 adopted in the proposed Settlement Agreement, and are provided in Attachment 2. As reflected in Attachment 2,

² For metered customers, there will be a surcharge on the quantity rate (\$/ccf) that is uniform across all districts. For flat-rate customers, flat surcharges will be applied.

the amount of the surcharge varies according to the ratemaking area, as well as whether a customer is metered.³

III. BACKGROUND

In resolving Cal Water's 2009 general rate case, the Commission adopted a settlement agreement (between the same Parties in this case) that authorized Cal Water to file a separate application for cost recovery of the renovation of its IT/HR building after its completion.⁴ Cal Water completed the renovation in December 2011 at a cost of \$6,011,172 (PID 16992).

On June 29, 2012, Cal Water filed an "*Application for Authority to Recover Costs Associated with General Office Building Renovation*" and served the Prepared Direct Testimony of Thomas F. Smegal ("Smegal Testimony") on the service list in this proceeding. On August 6, 2012, DRA filed a Protest to the Application and identified several issues of concern.⁵ The Parties submitted a Joint Prehearing Conference Statement on October 29, 2012, in anticipation of the Prehearing Conference held on November 6, 2012. The Parties subsequently engaged in several confidential settlement discussions. Consistent with the seven-day advance-notice requirement of Rule 12.1(b), the Parties provided notice of an all-party settlement conference on January 30, 2013, and subsequently held the noticed settlement conference via conference call on February 6, 2013.

³ The surcharge varies according to ratemaking area because the allocation of General Office costs to each ratemaking area is different.

⁴ D.10-12-017, Attachment C (Further Amended Settlement) at C-470 to C-471.

⁵ Protest of the Division of Ratepayer Advocates to the Application of California Water Service Company (August 6, 2012) at 2.

IV. THE AGREEMENT MEETS THE CRITERIA UNDER RULE 12.1(d)

The Parties have determined that the attached Agreement is in their best interests, in the public interest, and more cost-effective than undertaking the expense, delay, and uncertainty of further litigation. Rule 12.1(d) requires that a settlement be “reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest.” Taken as a whole, this Motion and the Agreement satisfy these standards for approving settlements.

Following the Prehearing Conference, Cal Water and DRA discussed areas of concern and reached a reasonable compromise on each issue. The Agreement being submitted with this Motion addresses all issues raised by the Application.

A. The Agreement Is In The Public Interest

The Commission has explained that a settlement which “commands broad support among participants fairly reflective of the affected interests” and “does not contain terms which contravene statutory provisions or prior Commission decisions” well serves the public interest. *Re San Diego Gas & Elec.*, D.92-12-019, 46 CPUC 2d 538, 552.

Together, the Parties fairly represent the affected interests: Cal Water provides water service to customers in districts throughout California, and DRA is statutorily mandated to represent all ratepayers in California. The primary public interest affected by this proceeding is the delivery of safe and reliable water service at rates that are reasonable, and affordable for low-income customers. As discussed in the Smegal Testimony, renovation of the IT/HR Building furthers this public interest by ensuring that the personnel in the IT/HR Building who provide technical, customer service, and human resources services to all Cal Water employees are able to do their work safely

and efficiently.⁶ These behind-the-scenes services are necessary to enable other Cal Water employees, such as the operational employees, engineers, and water quality personnel who are engaged in the physical operations of Cal Water's water systems, to maintain the safety and reliability of our water services with prudently-incurred costs.

In addition, Commission approval of the Agreement will provide speedy resolution of contested issues, which will avoid unnecessary litigation expenses, and will conserve Commission resources. The Commission has acknowledged that "[t]here is a strong public policy favoring the settlement of disputes to avoid costly and protracted litigation." *Re PG&E*, D.88-12-083, 30 CPUC 2d 189, 221.

B. The Agreement Is Reasonable in Light of the Whole Record

The proposed Agreement is supported by the following undisputed material facts and conclusions:

- Cal Water demonstrated a need for renovation of the IT/HR building in order to increase employee workspace capacity.
- The costs for renovating the IT/HR building, as adjusted by the terms of the Agreement, were reasonably and prudently incurred.
- The renovated building became used and useful at the end of 2011.
- The costs identified in the Agreement should be recovered from ratepayers through a surcharge until new rates adopted in A.12-07-007 become effective.
- For the purposes of resolving this Application, the revenue requirement adopted in A.12-07-007 should reflect capital costs for PID 16992 in the amount of \$5,734,400 for General Office.

⁶ See, e.g., Smegal Testimony at 2 (lines 3-9) and 4 (lines 2-11). Also note that Cal Water's IT Department oversees and maintains not just the company's computer networks, data storage, software applications and internet/intranet functionalities, but all aspects of the communications systems (landline services, cellular services, electronic and mobile communications, etc.).

1) The record demonstrates that the costs incurred for renovation of the GO building were reasonable and prudent.

DRA has propounded discovery on Cal Water regarding the justifications and cost support provided in the Application and testimony, and Cal Water has provided additional support as requested. DRA has carefully reviewed the company's costs for prudence and reasonableness, and has discussed the details of specific costs and cost categories with Cal Water in settlement negotiations. The Parties agree that, for the purposes of the Agreement and resolution of this Application, it is appropriate to reclassify certain costs, thus decreasing the agreed-upon total capital costs for PID 16992 to \$5,734,400. The Commission should find that the agreed-upon costs are reasonable and prudent.

2) The record demonstrates that authorizing a surcharge for cost recovery until new rates become effective is reasonable and is in the public interest.

Because the renovated GO building was used and useful by the end of 2011, Cal Water should be authorized to begin recovering the costs reflected in the Agreement as soon as possible. The proposed surcharge levels in Cal Water's application have been recalculated based upon the agreed-upon capital costs, and are included as Attachment 2. It is therefore reasonable to allow Cal Water to file a Tier 1 advice letter within 30 days of a decision approving the Agreement in order to implement the surcharge in Attachment 2, which will remain in effect until new rates adopted in A.12-07-007 become effective.

3) The record demonstrates that including only capital costs of \$5,734,400 for PID 16992 in General Office in A.12-07-007 is reasonable and is in the public interest.

The Parties agree that it was reasonable for Cal Water to include its claimed costs for PID 16992 in the beginning plant balance for Application 12-07-007, and that,

as a result of the Agreement between the Parties, Cal Water should be required to decrease the costs for PID to \$5,734,400. The adjusted capital costs result in a revenue requirement impact of \$874,961.

C. The Agreement Does Not Contravene Any Rules Or Laws

The Parties are aware of no statutory provision or prior Commission decision that would be contravened or compromised by the Agreement. The issues resolved in the Agreement are within the scope of the proceeding and will produce just and reasonable rates.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROPOSED DECISION

Cal Water and DRA have entered into settlement agreements in two recent proceedings: (1) Cal Water's Petition to Modify D.06-11-053 in A.05-10-035; and (2) Cal Water's application re home insurance services in A.08-05-019. Modeled on the decision adopted in A.05-10-035, D.12-09-020, and the proposed decision issued on February 14, 2013 in A.08-05-019, both of which approve the proposed settlements, the Parties suggest the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and ordering paragraphs for this proceeding.

A. Proposed Findings of Fact

1. This application was filed by Cal Water consistent with D.10-12-017, Attachment C (Further Amended Settlement) at pages C-470 to C-471.
2. DRA protested this application.
3. On March 4, 2013, Cal Water and DRA filed a Joint Motion requesting approval of the proposed settlement agreement, attached hereto as Attachment A, which addressed proposals made in Cal Water's application and the issues raised by DRA in its responses.
4. All issues in this proceeding are encompassed by, and resolved in the settlement agreement.
5. The parties to the settlement agreement are all of the active parties in this proceeding.

6. The parties are fairly reflective of the affected interests.
7. No term of the settlement agreement contravenes statutory provisions or prior Commission decisions.
8. The settlement agreement, as clarified, is reasonable in light of the record, is consistent with law, and is in the public interest.

B. Proposed Conclusions of Law

1. The settlement agreement fully resolves and settles all disputed issues in this proceeding.
2. The settlement agreement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest.
3. The settlement agreement should be approved.
4. For the purposes of resolving Cal Water's application, it is reasonable for Cal Water to include capital costs of \$5,734,400 for Project ID 16992 in the rates that will be set in A.12-07-007.
5. Adoption of the settlement agreement has no precedential status for subsequent applications by Cal Water.
6. The requirement for a 30-day period for public review and comment should be waived, pursuant to § 311(g)(3) of the Public Utilities Code and Rule 14.7(a).
7. This proceeding should be closed.
8. This decision should be effective today so that the settlement agreement may be implemented expeditiously.

C. Proposed Ordering Paragraphs

1. The settlement agreement between the Division of Ratepayer Advocates and California Water Service Company, attached hereto as Appendix A, is approved.
2. Within 30 days of the Commission's final decision approving the settlement, California Water Service Company (U 60 W) will submit a Tier 1 advice letter requesting authority to impose a surcharge to begin recovering General Office capital costs of \$5,734,400 for Project ID 16992.
3. For the purposes of resolving Cal Water's application, the capital costs for Project ID 16992 that may be incorporated into the revenue requirement for General Office in Application 12-07-007 is \$5,734,400.
4. Application 12-06-016 is closed.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Parties believe that the Agreement and the testimony in this case convey sufficient information for the Commission to discharge its regulatory obligations with regard to the Application in this proceeding. Nevertheless, the Parties are prepared to offer additional support for the Agreement if needed.

The Parties note that they have entered into this Agreement on the basis that it shall not be construed as an admission or a concession by them regarding any fact or matter of law in dispute in this proceeding. Furthermore, as contemplated by Rule 12.5, the Parties do not intend that the Commission's adoption of this Agreement be construed as any statement of precedent or policy of any kind for or against any of them, in the current or in any future proceedings.

Respectfully Submitted,

// s //

// s //

NIKI BAWA
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 703-2049
niki.bawa@cpuc.ca.gov

Staff Attorney for the
Division of Ratepayer Advocates

NATALIE D. WALES
California Water Service Company
1720 North First Street
San Jose, California 95112
Phone: (408) 367-8566
nwales@calwater.com

Regulatory Attorney for
California Water Service Company

Dated: March 4, 2013

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of California Water Service Company (U-60-W), a Corporation, for Authority to Recover Costs Associated with General Office Building Renovation.

Application 12-06-016
(Filed June 29, 2012)

**SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES AND
CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY (U-60-W)
RESOLVING ALL ISSUES**

FRANCIS S. FERRARO
1720 North First Street
San Jose, California 95112
Phone: (408) 367-8225
sferraro@calwater.com

Vice President, Regulatory Matters &
Corporate Relations
California Water Service Company

JOE COMO
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 703-2381
joc@cpuc.ca.gov

Acting Director
Division of Ratepayer Advocates

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of California Water Service Company (U-60-W), a Corporation, for Authority to Recover Costs Associated with General Office Building Renovation.

Application 12-06-016
(Filed June 29, 2012)

**SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES AND
CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY (U-60-W)
RESOLVING ALL ISSUES**

I. RECITALS

WHEREAS, on June 29, 2012, California Water Service Company (“Cal Water”) filed an application seeking cost recovery for an expansion and renovation of one of four buildings on its General Office campus;

WHEREAS, on August 6, 2012, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (“DRA”) filed its Protest to the Application identifying several issues of concern for further investigation;

WHEREAS, Cal Water submitted pre-filed expert witness testimony supporting Cal Water’s requested cost recovery in the Application;

WHEREAS, DRA issued four sets of extensive data requests and conducted two separate visits to Cal Water’s General Office Campus to thoroughly examine the issues raised by the Application and test the validity of Cal Water’s statements and conclusions, and Cal Water responded to each of those data requests and visits with responsive information;

WHEREAS, a Pre-Hearing Conference in this proceeding took place on November 6, 2012, at 2:00 p.m. at the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) building in San Francisco;

WHEREAS, DRA and Cal Water (collectively, “the Parties”) engaged in substantive settlement discussions starting shortly after the first Pre-Hearing Conference and leading up until the execution of this agreement;

WHEREAS, the Parties have arrived at an agreement resolving all issues raised by the Application. The Settlement is reasonable in light of the whole record, is

consistent with the law of the State of California, and is in the public interest.

II. **GENERAL**

- A. Pursuant to Article 12 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure (“Rules”) of the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”), DRA and Cal Water have agreed on the terms of this Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) which they now submit for approval.
- B. As described in greater detail below, this Agreement provides for the following resolution of this proceeding:
 - 1. Reclassification of certain costs from capital to expense;
 - 2. Implementation of a surcharge¹ that will recover the remaining adjusted building renovation costs per this Agreement and will continue until final rates from A.12-07-007, when Cal Water’s current General Rate Case (“GRC”), become effective;
 - 3. An adjustment to General Office capital costs in A.12-07-007 that reflects the reclassification of costs in this Agreement; and
 - 4. An agreement to reconsider in A.12-07-007 including a portion of the reclassified costs in rates under specific circumstances.
- C. Since this Agreement represents a compromise by them, the Parties have entered into each stipulation contained in the Agreement on the basis that its approval by the Commission not be construed as an admission or concession by any Party regarding any fact or matter of law in dispute in this proceeding. Furthermore, the Parties intend that the approval of this Agreement by the Commission not be construed as a precedent or statement of policy of any kind for or against any Party in any current or future proceeding. (Rule 12.5.)
- D. The Parties agree, without further consideration, to execute and/or cause to be executed, any other documents and to take any other action as may be necessary, to effectively consummate this Agreement. The Parties shall take no action in opposition to this Agreement.
- E. The Parties agree that no signatory to the Agreement assumes any personal liability as a result of their agreement. All rights and remedies of the Parties are limited to those available before the Commission. The provisions of this Agreement are not severable. If any part of the Agreement is disapproved or modified, the remaining provisions of the Agreement shall be void, with the Parties returning to their positions in this proceeding as if the Agreement were never reached.
- F. The Parties acknowledge that, unless expressly and specifically stated otherwise herein, the California Public Utilities Code, Commission regulations, orders, rulings, and/or decisions shall govern the interpretation and enforcement of this Agreement.
- G. A duplicate set of this Agreement requiring signature shall issue and may be executed in counterparts, and when each party has signed and delivered at least one such counterpart, each counterpart shall be deemed an original, and taken together shall

¹ For metered customers, there will be a surcharge on the quantity rate (\$/ccf) that is uniform across all districts. For flat-rate customers, flat surcharges will be applied.

constitute one and the same agreement, which shall be binding and effective as to all parties.

III. RECLASSIFICATION OF COSTS

- A. This Agreement addresses the costs in Project ID number (“PID”) 16992, the project for the renovation of the GO building housing some or all of the Information Technology, Human Resources, and Customer Service departments of Cal Water (“IT/HR Building Renovation”).
- B. The following capital costs originally included in PID 16992 will be reclassified in 2013 as follows:

Description	Amount	Reclassification Category
Asbestos Removal	\$ 11,250.00	to Cost of Removal
Interest Adjustment	\$ 64,617.00	to Expense
Other Costs	\$ 200,905.00	to Expense
Total	\$ 276,772.00	

- C. As a result of this Agreement, the following costs (referred to as the “agreed-upon costs”) may be recovered for the IT/HR Building Renovation:²

Project ID 16992	\$ 6,011,172.00
Reclassified Costs	\$ (276,772.00)
	\$ 5,734,400.00

IV. RECOVERY OF REMAINING COSTS

A. Surcharge until new rates become effective

1. The agreed-upon costs of \$5,734,400.00 for the IT/HR Building Renovation will be recovered through a surcharge on customer bills until new rates adopted in A.12-07-007 become effective.
2. The surcharge for metered customers will be on the quantity charge, and will be the same for all districts.
3. The surcharge for flat-rate customers will be a flat charge calculated for each district with flat-rate customers.
4. Upon implementation of the final rates adopted in A.12-07-007, the surcharge for the IT/HR Building Renovation will end.

² Details of the costs that make up PID 16992 are contained in Attachment 14 (Cost Breakdown) of Appendix F (Prepared Direct Testimony of Thomas F. Smegal) to the Application.

B. Incorporation of this Agreement into A.12-07-007

The agreed-upon costs for the IT/HR Building Renovation will be reflected in the new rates adopted in A.12-07-007.

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT

- A. Within 30 days of a Commission decision approving this Agreement, Cal Water shall file a Tier 1 advice letter to implement surcharges to begin recovery of the agreed-upon costs, and modify its tariffs, consistent with this Agreement.
- B. In testimony submitted in A.12-07-007 after execution of this Agreement, the Parties will acknowledge and support the terms of this Agreement to the extent that it impacts A.12-07-007.
- C. In any subsequent formal filings in A.12-07-007 (such as in a proposed settlement agreement), the Parties will include and reflect the impact of this Agreement, as appropriate, in any recommendations and proposed rate calculations.
- D. By signing below, each signatory represents and warrants that he/she is authorized to sign this Settlement Agreement and thereby binds each Party to the terms of this Settlement Agreement.

Signed:

/ s /

/ s /

FRANCIS S. FERRARO
 1720 North First Street
 San Jose, California 95112
 Phone: (408) 367-8225
sferraro@calwater.com
 Vice President, Regulatory Matters &
 Corporate Relations
 California Water Service Company

JOE COMO
 California Public Utilities Commission
 505 Van Ness Avenue
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Phone: (415) 703-2381
joc@cpuc.ca.gov
 Acting Director
 Division of Ratepayer Advocates

Dated: March 1, 2013

Dated: March 1, 2013

**General Office
IT/HR Building Renovation
PID 16992**

REVENUE REQUIREMENT

A1) IT Building Remodel			
A2) ACCOUNT 3710		TOTAL COST	TOTAL COST
ACCOUNT 3720		\$5,236,099	\$5,236,099
TOTAL CAPITAL COST AT CLOSING		\$498,301	\$498,301
		\$5,734,400	\$5,734,400
A3)			\$5,734,400
A4) BEGINNING YEAR PLANT			\$5,734,400
B1) ACCOUNT 3710		PLANT	
B2) ACCOUNT 3720		3.09%	\$161,795
B5) TOTAL ANNUAL DEPRECIATION EXPENSE		6.39%	\$31,841
			\$193,636
C) RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT \$ IN THOUSANDS			\$5,734,400
D) RATE OF RETURN PROPOSED IN SETTLEMENT (A.11-05-001)			7.94%
E) REVENUE REQUIREMENT FOR RATE BASE ADJUSTMENT (C * D)			\$455,311
F) NET TO GROSS MULTIPLIER (APPENDIX E)			1.3671
G) GROSS REVENUE REQUIREMENT (E * F)			\$622,441
H) EXPENSE CHANGES			
H1	ANNUAL DEPRECIATION	\$193,636.0	
H2	AD VALOREM TAX RATE (APPENDIX F)	0.01222	
H3	AD VALOREM TAXES (A4 * H3)	\$70,101.9	
H4	NET TO GROSS EXCL INCOME TAXES	1.00000	
I) (H1 + H3) * H4		\$263,737.9	\$263,738
J) REVENUE INCREASE REQUESTED (G + I)			\$886,179

**NET TO GROSS MULTIPLIER
(NEW CPUC STAFF APPROVED METHOD)**

		2011	WP7-C16
			NORMAL W/0 INCOME TAXES
1	UNCOLLECTIBLES	0.00000%	0.00000%
2	1 - UNCOLLECTIBLES (100% - LINE 1)	100.00000%	100.00000%
	FRANCHISE TAX RATE	0.00000%	0.00000%
3	LOCAL FRANCHISE (% * LINE 2)	0.00000%	0.00000%
	BUSINESS LICENSE RATE	0.00000%	0.00000%
4	BUSINESS LICENSE (% * LINE 2)	0.00000%	0.00000%
5	SUBTOTAL (LINE 1 + LINE 3 + LINE 4)	0.00000%	0.00000%
6	1 - SUBTOTAL (100% - LINE 5)	100.00000%	100.00000%
7	CCFT (LINE 6 * 8.84%)	8.84000%	
8	AMERICAN JOB CREATION ACT (N/A TO GO)	0.00000%	
8	FIT (LINE 6 * 35 %)	31.90600%	
9	TOTAL TAXES PAID (LINE 5 + LINE 7 + LINE 8)	40.74600%	0.00000%
10	NET AFTER TAXES (1 - LINE 9)	59.25400%	100.00000%
	NET-TO-GROSS MULTIPLIER (1 / LINE 10)	1.68765	1.00000

ADOPTED
RATIO'S

DEBT	46.62%	Without income Taxes	1.00000	0.46620
EQUITY	53.38%	With income Taxes	1.68765	0.90087
TOTAL	100.00%			1.36707
		Adj. Net to Gross		

Attachment 2

	Requested Revenue	Percent Increase	Surcharge per ccf	Surcharge flat
BK	\$ 134,044	0.21%	0.004	0.170
BAY	\$ 87,846	0.14%	0.008	-
BG	\$ 49,085	0.13%	0.008	-
CH	\$ 48,560	0.24%	0.004	0.120
DIX	\$ 4,987	0.21%	0.007	-
ELA	\$ 54,073	0.16%	0.007	-
HR	\$ 44,798	0.16%	0.005	-
KC	\$ 5,600	0.20%	0.007	-
LIV	\$ 30,711	0.15%	0.006	-
LAS	\$ 36,836	0.14%	0.006	-
MRL	\$ 6,825	0.21%	0.006	0.126
ORO	\$ 9,012	0.22%	0.006	0.088
PV	\$ 52,323	0.12%	0.005	-
SLN	\$ 53,023	0.21%	0.007	-
SEL	\$ 10,237	0.24%	0.004	0.137
STK	\$ 68,509	0.20%	0.005	-
VIS	\$ 60,985	0.24%	0.004	-
WLK	\$ 20,737	0.11%	0.005	-
WIL	\$ 4,287	0.20%	0.005	0.167
AV-LKH/LVY	\$ 961	0.11%	0.006	-
AV-LAN	\$ 1,566	0.11%	0.005	-
AV-FMT	\$ 623	0.11%	0.017	-
SO-BAY	\$ 72,447	0.13%	0.004	-
KRV	\$ 10,850	0.20%	0.024	-
R.V. - LUC	\$ 3,762	0.21%	0.028	-
R.V. - COS	\$ 875	0.20%	0.106	-
R.V. - UNI	\$ 1,225	0.20%	0.024	-

Attachment 2

Metered Customers						
District	Metered		Current Bill	New Bill	% Increase	
	Surcharge Per Ccf	Typical Ccf				
Bakersfield	\$ 0.0042	21	\$ 45.85	\$ 45.94	0.19%	
Bayshore	\$ 0.0077	12	\$ 60.02	\$ 60.11	0.15%	
Bear Gulch	\$ 0.0079	23	\$ 121.55	\$ 121.73	0.15%	
Chico	\$ 0.0039	20	\$ 32.61	\$ 32.69	0.24%	
Dixon	\$ 0.0072	13	\$ 45.71	\$ 45.80	0.21%	
East Los Angeles	\$ 0.0065	13	\$ 54.80	\$ 54.88	0.15%	
Hermosa Redondo	\$ 0.0054	11	\$ 45.49	\$ 45.55	0.13%	
King City	\$ 0.0067	13	\$ 44.28	\$ 44.37	0.20%	
Livermore	\$ 0.0059	15	\$ 59.45	\$ 59.54	0.15%	
Los Altos Sub.	\$ 0.0058	19	\$ 72.28	\$ 72.39	0.15%	
Marysville	\$ 0.0060	10	\$ 34.16	\$ 34.22	0.18%	
Oroville	\$ 0.0060	12	\$ 51.66	\$ 51.73	0.14%	
Palos Verdes	\$ 0.0053	24	\$ 96.77	\$ 96.90	0.13%	
Salinas	\$ 0.0070	11	\$ 37.80	\$ 37.88	0.20%	
Selma	\$ 0.0036	23	\$ 41.35	\$ 41.43	0.20%	
Stockton	\$ 0.0052	12	\$ 35.47	\$ 35.53	0.18%	
Visalia	\$ 0.0036	24	\$ 34.66	\$ 34.75	0.25%	
Westlake	\$ 0.0050	30	\$ 133.01	\$ 133.16	0.11%	
Willows	\$ 0.0055	15	\$ 55.32	\$ 55.40	0.15%	
L.Hughes/Leona Val.	\$ 0.0059	32	\$ 145.39	\$ 145.58	0.13%	
Lancaster	\$ 0.0049	38	\$ 123.69	\$ 123.88	0.15%	
Fremont	\$ 0.0171	10	\$ 66.02	\$ 66.19	0.26%	
Dominguez	\$ 0.0041	12	\$ 41.79	\$ 41.84	0.12%	
Kern River Valley	\$ 0.0244	7	\$ 75.34	\$ 75.51	0.23%	
Lucerne	\$ 0.0284	4	\$ 54.94	\$ 55.05	0.21%	
Coast Springs	\$ 0.1060	2	\$ 101.98	\$ 102.19	0.21%	
Armstrong/Hawkins	\$ 0.0239	6	\$ 91.74	\$ 91.88	0.16%	
Flat Service Customers						
District	Flat		Current Bill	New Bill	% Increase	
	Surcharge					
Bakersfield	\$ 0.1702		\$ 68.87	\$ 69.04	0.25%	
Chico	\$ 0.1204		\$ 53.93	\$ 54.05	0.22%	
Marysville	\$ 0.1262		\$ 72.37	\$ 72.50	0.17%	
Oroville	\$ 0.0878		\$ 85.23	\$ 85.32	0.10%	
Selma	\$ 0.1367		\$ 54.00	\$ 54.14	0.25%	
Willows	\$ 0.1671		\$ 74.79	\$ 74.96	0.22%	