



August 18, 2015

Proposed Resolution W-5057

Agenda ID: 14222

To: All Interested Persons

Enclosed is Proposed Resolution W-5057 of the Division of Water and Audits, which authorizes San Jose Water Company to recover \$9,566,814 or, an increase of 3.36% in annual metered revenue, for Lost Revenues due to Mandatory Conservation. Proposed Resolution W-5057 is scheduled to appear on the September 17, 2015 Commission Meeting Agenda (ID#14222).

The Commission may act on this resolution or it may postpone action until later. When the Commission acts on a proposed resolution, the Commission may adopt all or part of the proposed resolution, as written, or amend or modify the proposed resolution; or the Commission may set the proposed resolution aside and prepare a different resolution. Only when the Commission acts does the resolution become binding.

Interested persons may submit comments on Proposed Resolution W-5057 via email to Water.Division@cpuc.ca.gov on or before **September 8, 2015**. Please reference **"Proposed Resolution W-5057"** in the subject line.

Interested persons must also serve a copy of their comments on the utility on the same date that the comments are submitted to the Division of Water and Audits. If email is unavailable, please submit comments to:

California Public Utilities Commission
Division of Water and Audits
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Comments should focus on factual, legal, technical errors, or policy issues in the proposed resolution.

Persons interested in receiving comments submitted may contact the Division of Water and Audits at Water.Division@cpuc.ca.gov or (415) 703-1133.

/s/ RAMI S. KAHLON

Rami S. Kahlon, Director
Division of Water and Audits

Enclosures: Proposed Resolution W-5057
Certificate of Service
Service List

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

AGENDA ID #14222

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DIVISION OF WATER AND AUDITS
Water and Sewer Advisory Branch

RESOLUTION W-5057
September 17, 2015

RESOLUTION

(RES. W-5057), SAN JOSE WATER COMPANY (SJWC). ORDER
AUTHORIZING SURCHARGES TO RECOVER \$9,566,814 OR, AN
INCREASE OF 3.36% IN ANNUAL METERED REVENUE, FOR LOST
REVENUES DUE TO MANDATORY CONSERVATION.

By Advice Letter 468-W, filed March 26, 2015.

SUMMARY

This Resolution grants San Jose Water Company's (SJWC) request to recover in rates, \$9,566,814 by adding a surcharge of \$0.1798 per 100 cubic feet (ccf) to the Quantity Rates in each customer's bill to be recovered over twelve months. The increases requested are to recover lost revenues tracked in SJWC's Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account (MCRAMA) resulting from reduced water consumption by customers during the period of April 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.

BACKGROUND

On January 17, 2014, Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., proclaimed a Drought State of Emergency and directed state officials to take all necessary actions to prepare for these drought conditions.¹ On January 28th, 2014 the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD)² Board of Directors (Board) set a preliminary 2014 water reduction target equal to 10 percent of 2013 water use in Santa Clara County. On February 25, 2014, in response to the worsening water supply outlook for Santa Clara County, the SCVWD Board passed a resolution calling for mandatory measures to reach a water use reduction target equal to 20 percent of 2013 water use, through December 31, 2014.

¹ "Governor Brown Declares Drought State of Emergency": <http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18368>

² The SCVWD is responsible for managing the water supply in Santa Clara County. About 50% of the water supply for SJWC is obtained through a contract with the SCVWD.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

On February 27th, 2014 the Commission issued Resolution W-4976 adopting drought procedures for water conservation, rationing and service connection moratoria ("Drought Procedures") and required that all Class A and B water utilities that had an existing Tariff Rule 14.1 activate the Rule within 30 days of the Resolution effective date. The Drought Procedures, in addition to providing steps to be taken when a utility suffers from a water shortage, provided that a utility without a full revenue decoupling Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanism (WRAM) may request to add a memorandum account to track lost revenue associated with reduced sales as a result of activating Rule 14.1.

By AL 456-A, approved on March 31, 2014, the Commission authorized SJWC to establish (1) a Mandatory Conservation Memorandum Account (MCMA) to track the additional administrative costs, operating costs not otherwise recoverable through memoranda or balancing account and/or any other mechanism recognized by the Commission, and (2) a Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account (MCRAMA) to track the revenue impact of mandatory conservation.

By AL 468, filed on March 26, 2015, SJWC requested Commission authorization to recover an accumulated balance of \$9,566,814³ in the MCRAMA for the period April 1 through December 31, 2014. This is 3.36% of the annual metered revenues for the prior 12 months. The recovery would be through a surcharge of \$0.1798 per ccf to be applied to all potable water usage over a 12 month period. As a result, the bill for the average customer using 15 ccf per month will increase by \$1.42 per month, or approximately 3.47%.

NOTICE AND PROTESTS

SJWC mailed a copy of AL 468 to its AL 468 service list. A public notice of its rate increase request was also mailed to all customers in compliance with General Order 96-B, Water Industry Rule 3.1 and General Rule 4.2. Ninety-one protests were received, including a protest from the Commission's Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA).

³ The accumulated balance in the MCRAMA includes a required 20 basis points adjustment in SJWC's Return on Equity (ROE) as required by D. 91-10-042.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

1. *Protest by ORA*

ORA filed a protest to SJWC AL 468 on May 29, 2015. ORA states that: (1) DWA should reject the methodology that SJWC uses in AL 468; and (2) SJWC's MCRMA balance is less than the threshold for recovery through an AL filing.

a) DWA should reject the MCRAMA methodology that SJWC uses in AL 468

SJWC calculated the lost revenues due to drought conditions in its MCRAMA account balances by using the full Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanism/Modified Cost Balancing Account ("WRAM mechanism") instead of the Water Conservation Memorandum Account (WCMA) methodology authorized in Decision (D.) 90-08-055 and D. 91-10-042 ("WCMA Methodology").⁴ This was despite the fact that the Commission explicitly rejected SJWC's requested authorization of a full WRAM/MCBA methodology in D. 14-08-006⁵ and only allowed it to use its Monterey Style WRAM.⁶ Based on this, DWA should reject the methodology used by the utility in AL 468 and direct SJWC to remove all references to use of a full WRAM methodology from AL 468 and from its tariffs consistent with D. 14-08-006.

b) SJWC's MCRMA balance is less than the threshold for recovery through an AL

ORA reports that if the MCBA Methodology were used, the balance in the MCRAMA as of December 31, 2014 will be an under-collection of \$4,241,241 rather than \$9,566,814 claimed by SJWC. The corresponding surcharge will be \$0.0797 and not \$0.1798 per ccf. Since the MCRAMA balance is only 1.5% of SJWC's 2014 authorized revenue of \$267,926,000, it does not meet the 2% threshold for surcharge recovery. The Commission should direct SJWC to wait until the MCRAMA balance reaches the 2% threshold before requesting surcharge recovery. ORA points out that the Commission may approve SJWC's request for immediate recovery as it is within its discretion to do so.

⁴ The WCMA methodology first calculates foregone sales revenue on a per-customer basis, and secondly calculates avoided Water Supply costs associated with lower sales volumes. The same foregone volume of sales expressed in ccf that was used to calculate lost revenues in the first step is multiplied by the adopted Water Supply unit costs to arrive at the amount of avoided costs, which are applied as an offset to the amount of conservation-related lost revenue.

⁵ D. 14-08-006, p. 17

⁶ D.08-08-030 implemented two-tiered increasing block rates for residential customers and the Monterey-style WRAM that will track the difference between revenue SJWC receives for actual metered sales through the tiered volumetric rate and the revenue SJWC would have received through the uniform, single quantity rates if they had been in effect.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

ORA did not calculate the incremental costs that are attributable to increased water supply costs. Such costs may be eligible for recovery through SJWC's increased Water Supply Costs through its Incremental Cost Balancing Account (ICBA).

2. Protests by other interested parties

Ninety-one protests were received from other interested parties. Some issues raised by the protestants included:

- Utility did not properly serve or give notice of the advice letter.
- The relief requested in the advice letter would violate statute or Commission order, or is not authorized by statute or Commission order on which the utility relies.
- The relief requested in the advice letter requires consideration in a formal hearing, or is otherwise inappropriate for the advice letter process.
- The relief requested in the advice letter is unjust, unreasonable, or discretionary.
- A customer recommended a tiered surcharge rate structure.
- The surcharge should end when the under-collection balance has been collected.
- Excessive salaries drawn by the SJWC Board and Management should be reduced.
- Water waste in the system should be reduced.

3. San Jose Water Company's Responses To Protests

a) SJWC's response to ORA's protest

SJWC filed a response to ORA's protest on June 12, 2015. In its response, SJWC states that ORA's protest should be dismissed as it does not meet the allowable grounds for protest as required by General Order (GO) 96-B, General Rule 7.4.2. SJWC also responded to ORA's arguments.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

b) SJWC's currently used methodology for MCRAMA is appropriate

SJWC justified its methodology for computing its MCRAMA balances based on past Commission practices.

SJWC states that the MCRAMA (MCRAMA I) was initially established by Resolution 407-D, on August 23, 2009. MCRAMA I was operational from August 3, 2009 through May 1, 2010. After SCVWD lifted the call for mandatory conservation, SJWC filed for recovery of the MCRAMA I balance of \$5,740,078 on July 8, 2010 by AL 415A filed on June 3, 2010. The Commission approved the recovery of the MCRAMA I account balance through a volumetric based surcharge by Resolution W-4885 on December 15, 2011.

The MCRAMA was re-established when SCVWD again called for mandatory conservation in June 10, 2010 through AL 419-B (MCRAMA II), effective August 20, 2010. MCRAMA II tracked an over-collection of \$1,080,403 for August 20, 2010 through September 2010. In D. 14-08-006, the Commission adopted this recommendation, indicating agreement with MCRAMA II. Rates from that Decision, including a refund of the MCRAMA II balance, went onto effect on August 15, 2014.

SJWC's MCRAMA was again re-established effective March 20, 2015 via AL 456-A. That AL was not protested by ORA and DWA did not request any changes to the MCRAMA descriptions contained in SJWC's preliminary statement included with the filing.

SJWC states that the MCRAMA has undergone extensive reviews by DWA, DRA, ORA and the Commission over the last six years. Revising the Commission approved MCRAMA accounting procedures now would entail SJWC to retroactively create an entirely new memorandum account, going back to a prior period to make new calculations, and booking these prior period amounts to the new memorandum account. This would entail retroactive ratemaking which is inconsistent with Commission policy. Based on this, ORA's recommendation to move away from the MCRAMA and use the WCMA methodology should be disregarded.

c) SJWC's MCRAMA is substantially similar to Full Revenue Decoupling

ORA's main concern is that the MCRAMA uses revenue decoupling full WRAM/MCBA methodology to calculate lost revenues. Since such revenue decoupling has not been authorized, AL 468 should be rejected. However, the

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

Commission has previously addressed this issue in relation to SJWC's MCRAMA. In Resolution W-4885, the Commission noted that authorization of the MCRAMA would "provide SJWC the recovery the utility would have achieved if the Commission had authorized a full decoupling WRAM/MCBA rate-making mechanism for SJWC".⁷

The Commission went on to find that it was appropriate to SJWC to seek recovery of the MCRAMA balances and waive the requirements for seeking a petition to modify D.08-08-030.⁸

As provided by Resolution W-4885, there is Commission precedent to authorize MCRAMA amortization even though the accounting procedures are substantially similar to a full decoupling WRAM/MCBA. Thus, the Commission should disregard ORA's protest in total.

SJWC's responses to protests from other parties

SJWC provided DWA with its generic response to protests received from other parties on April 22, 2015.

In its responses, SJWC indicated that it had complied with all noticing requirements for AL 468; the relief requested by the AL-468 was in accordance with Commission adopted practices and procedures and was pursuant to Commission authorizations and did not require any formal hearings; and the tracking and subsequent recovery of lost revenue due to conservation was not unjust, unreasonable, or discriminatory. The remaining protests were not protests to the requests in the Advice Letter. Based on these, the protests should be dismissed.

As required by GO 96-B, General Rule 7.4.3, SJWC filed the response to the protests to AL 468 within 5 days of the end of the protests period and served the responses to each person who filed the protests.

DISCUSSION

SJWC seeks to recover the balances in the MCRAMA for reduced water consumption by customers that resulted from SJWC's implementation of mandatory water

⁷ Resolution W-4885, Findings and Conclusions 15

⁸ Resolution W-4885, Findings and Conclusions 18

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

measures during the period of April 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014. We authorize this recovery for the reasons discussed below.

Recovery of conservation related revenue losses

The Commission in D.90-08-055 and D.91-10-042 established the methodology for computing revenue losses resulting from mandatory and voluntary conservation programs. D.91-10-042, Ordering Paragraph 3, also authorized recovery of revenue losses resulting from implementation of these types of water conservation measures contingent upon the following:

1. Approval of the utility's water management program;
2. Reduction of the memorandum account balance pursuant to the risk reduction adjustment set-forth in D.91-10-042; and
3. Offset of the memorandum account balance, where applicable, by water rationing.

SJWC is required, per Section 10620 of the Water Code, to prepare an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) every five years and to submit this plan to the California Department of Water Resources. Class A and B water utilities also submit their UWMPs as part of their General Rate Cases (GRCs). SJWC submitted to the Commission its UWMP for its service area as part of its GRC adopted through D.14-08-006. The DWA reviewed SJWC's UWMP and determined that it meets the water management plan requirements established by D.90-08-055, which include: 1) clear and specific goals for reducing water usage; 2) multiple approaches for conserving water; 3) long-term water conservation programs (including incentive-based programs); 4) cost-effectiveness of the programs; and 5) method for measuring the effectiveness of the programs.

SJWC applied the reduction of the memorandum account balance pursuant to the risk reduction adjustment of 20 basis points on equity in compliance with D.91-10-042.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

SJWC computed the revenue shortfall through its MCRAMA as follows:

1. SJWC first recognized the most recently adopted water sales revenue per D.14-08-006.
2. SJWC then recorded the actual water sale revenue collected adjusted for existing Revenue Adjustment Mechanism;
3. SJWC also recognized the most recently adopted variable expenses for purchased water, pump tax, and power;
4. SJWC then recorded the actual variable expenses;
5. The total net MCRAMA balance was then calculated to be (Step 1 minus Step 2) plus (Step 3 minus Step 4); and
6. SJWC then computed the 20 basis point reduction on equity required by D.91-10-042.

DWA reviewed SJWC's calculations and confirmed that it complied with the risk reduction adjustment adopted in D.90-08-055 and D.91-10-042. DWA recommends approval of SJWC's AL 468. We concur with DWA's recommendation.

Noticing of Resolution W-468 on the parties to D.08-08-030

As stated above, the rate-making treatment the Commission has authorized for SJWC in D.08-08-030, is a Monterey-style WRAM. Recovery under this rate-making treatment adjusts for the difference between uniform rates and the tiered rates the Commission adopted for SJWC in D.08-08-030. However, recovery of the balances in the MCRAMA as requested in AL 468 would supplement, for the period April 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014, the recovery authorized under SJWC's Monterey-style WRAM and essentially provide to SJWC the recovery the utility would have achieved if the Commission had authorized a full decoupling Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanism/Modified Cost Balancing Account (WRAM/MCBA) rate-making mechanism for SJWC during this period in its most recent conservation case.⁹

⁹ Both the MCRAMA and the balancing accounts under the full WRAM/MCBA account for lost revenues in a similar manner. Both mechanisms take the net difference between adopted water sales revenue and actual water sales revenue and compare this difference to the difference between adopted variable expenses and actual recorded

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

While the amortization of the MCRAMA here would be consistent with the requirements set forth in D.90-08-055 and D.91-10-042 for computing revenue losses resulting from mandatory and voluntary conservation programs, it would also effectively change the rate-making mechanism authorized in D.08-08-030. Ordinarily, the mechanism for seeking a change to a previous Commission decision is through a petition for a modification, as provided for by GO 96-B, General Rule 5.2.¹⁰

Under our rules in GO 96-B, we may waive the application of GO 96-B rules if we determine this is appropriate considering the circumstances in specific situations. GO 96-B, Rule 1.3, provides that “the Commission in a specific instance may authorize an exception to the operation of [GO 96-B] as appropriate.” In Resolution W-4885, we find that it was appropriate for SJWC to seek recovery of the balances in the MCRAMA and to waive the requirement for seeking a petition for modification of D.08-08-030 because we have previously granted authority in D.90-08-055 and D.91-10-042 to establish the method for computing revenue losses resulting from mandatory and voluntary conservation programs requested by SJWC here. Therefore, we waive the requirement that SJWC seek to have the recovery issue raised here addressed through a petition for modification of D.08-08-030, and grant the recovery requested in AL 468.

However, because the recovery authorized here will result in a modification to a previous Commission Decision, i. e., D. 08-08-030, the parties to D. 08-08-030 must be provided notice and an opportunity to be heard on this issue as is required by Public Utilities Code Section 1708¹¹ Accordingly, notice of this Resolution is being provided to the parties to D. 08-08-030, as provided for in the comments discussed below.

variable expenses to derive a net balance. In addition, this net balance in the recovery authorized here is reduced for SJWC by the equivalent of a 20 basis point reduction on its return on equity, as discussed above.

¹⁰ GO 96-B, General Rule 5.2, states that a utility must file a petition for modification if the utility requests modification of a decision issued in a formal proceeding or otherwise seeks relief that the Commission can grant only after holding an evidentiary hearing, or by decision rendered in a formal proceeding.

¹¹ Public Utilities Code Section 1708 states: “The Commission may at any time, upon notice to the parties, and with the opportunity to be heard as provided in the case of complaints, rescind, alter, or amend any order or decision made by it. Any order rescinding, altering, or amending a prior order or decision shall, when served upon the parties, have the same effect as an original order or decision.”

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

The recovery of the balances in SJWC's MCRAMA will provide the utility with additional financial resources to *safely* operate and maintain its operations for the benefit of its customers, employees, and members of the general public.

COMMENTS

Public Utilities Code Section 311(g) (1) generally requires that resolutions must be served on all parties and be subject to at least 30 days public review and comment prior to a vote of the Commission. On August 18, 2015, this Resolution was mailed for 30-day public review and comment to the utility and protestants, and to the parties on the service list for AL 468 and D. 08-08-030.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. On March 26, 2015, San Jose Water Company filed Advice Letter (AL) 468 to request amortization of its Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account. San Jose Water Company requested to recover in rates the amount of \$9,566,814 by adding a surcharge of \$0.1798 per 100 cubic feet to the Quantity Rates in each customer's bill to be recovered over twelve months.
2. On April 25, 2015, the Division of Water and Audits (DWA) suspended AL 468.
3. On May 15, 2015, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) requested and received an extension of the protest period for Advice Letter 468.
4. On May 29, 2015, ORA timely filed a late protest to AL 468.
5. On June 12, 2015, San Jose Water Company timely filed a response to ORA's protest to AL 468.
6. The Santa Clara Valley Water District (District) is responsible for managing the overall water supply in Santa Clara County. The District must rely on the actions of the water retailers, cities, and the county to enact and implement local ordinances and conservation measures.
7. On February 25, 2014 the District issued a request for a 20 percent mandatory water conservation of all water retailers in Santa Clara County.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

8. San Jose Water Company is a water retailer in Santa Clara County.
9. In Decision (D.) 08-08-030, the Commission authorized a “Monterey-style” Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanism for San Jose Water Company for rate-making purposes.
10. Commission Decisions 90-08-055 and 91-10-042 established the method for computing revenue losses resulting from mandatory and voluntary conservation programs.
11. Commission Decision 91-10-042, Ordering Paragraph 3, authorized recovery of revenue losses resulting from implementation of these types of water conservation measures contingent upon the following:
 - a. Approval of the utility’s water management program;
 - b. Reduction of the memorandum account balance pursuant to the risk reduction adjustment set-forth in Decision 91-10-042; and
 - c. Offset of the memorandum account balance, where applicable, by water rationing.
12. Division of Water and Audits finds that San Jose Water Company’s 2010 Urban Water Management Plan meets the water management program requirement established by Decision 91-10-042, Ordering Paragraph 3.
13. Division of Water and Audits reviewed San Jose Water Company’s revenue loss calculations and finds that they are in compliance with the risk reduction adjustment adopted in Decisions 90-08-055 and 91-10-042, including the second contingency established by Ordering Paragraph 3.
14. The Division of Water and Audits recommends approval of San Jose Water Company’s Advice Letter 468-W.
15. Recovery of the balance in the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account would supplement, for the period April 2014 through December 31, 2014, the recovery authorized under San Jose Water Company’s Monterey-style WRAM and provide the recovery that the utility would have achieved if the Commission had authorized a full decoupling Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanism/Modified Cost Balancing Account (WRAM/MCBA) rate-

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

- making mechanism for SJWC during this period in its most recent conservation rate case.
16. While the amortization of the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account here would be consistent with the requirements set forth in D.90-08-055 and D.91-10-042 for computing revenue losses resulting from mandatory and voluntary conservation programs, it would also effectively change the rate-making mechanism authorized in D.08-08-030.
 17. By Resolution 5885-W the Commission determined that it was appropriate for San Jose Water Company to seek recovery of the balances in the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account and to waive the requirement for seeking a petition for modification of D. 08-08-030.
 18. This resolution was circulated for public review and comment pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 311(g)(1).
 19. San Jose Water Company is permitted to transfer \$9,566,814 from its Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account to a balancing account for recovery.
 20. It is consistent with Standard Practice U-27-W for San Jose Water Company to assess a 12-month surcharge for recovery of the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account balance.
 21. The surcharge of \$0.1798 per 100 cubic feet added to the quantity rates over twelve months herein would allow San Jose Water Company to recover in rates the \$9,566,814 in lost revenues.
 22. Consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 792.5, San Jose Water Company shall track revenues collected under the surcharges authorized in this resolution in a balancing account and account for any over or under collection in its next General Rate Case.
 23. The following tariff schedules should be approved in a Tier 1 Advice Letter filing as attached to this Resolution: 1) Schedule No. 1, General Metered Service; 2) Schedule No. 1B, General Metered Service with Automatic Fire Sprinkler System; 3) Schedule No. 1C, General Metered Service for Mountain District; and 4) Schedule No. RW, Raw Water Metered Service.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. San Jose Water Company is permitted to transfer \$9,566,814 from its Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account to a balancing account for recovery. San Jose Water Company is authorized to earn interest on the balance in this balancing account at the 90-day commercial paper rate.
2. San Jose Water Company is authorized to implement a surcharge of \$0.1798 per 100 cubic feet added to the quantity rates over twelve months to recover in rates the \$9,566,814 in lost revenues.
3. San Jose Water Company is authorized to file a Tier 1 Advice Letter to make effective the following tariff schedules as attached to this Resolution five days after approval of this Resolution:
 - a. Schedule No. 1, General Metered Service;
 - b. Schedule No. 1B, General Metered Service with Automatic Fire Sprinkler System;
 - c. Schedule No. 1C, General Metered Service for Mountain District; and
 - d. Schedule No. RW, Raw Water Metered Service.
4. San Jose Water Company is authorized to cancel the corresponding tariffs for the presently effective rate schedules listed in Ordering Paragraph 3 above.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

This resolution is effective today.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was duly introduced, passed, and adopted at a conference of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California held on September 17, 2015; the following Commissioners voting favorably thereon:

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN
Executive Director

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

APPENDIX A

Schedule No. 1

GENERAL METERED SERVICE (Continued)

6. To offset the July 2013 increase in Purchased Water from the Santa Clara Valley Water District, beginning August 15, 2014, as required by Section 7925 of the Public Utilities Code, an increase in purchased water costs of \$58.00 /acre-foot, relative to the purchase water costs adopted by D.14-08-006, and associated revenue increase of \$0.0739 per 100 cu. ft., are being tracked in a reserve account.
7. To offset the July 2013 increase in Ground Water Charges from the Santa Clara Valley Water District, beginning August 15, 2014, as required by Section 792.5 of the Public Utilities Code, an increase in ground water charges of \$58.00 /acre-foot, relative to the ground water charges adopted by D.14-08-006, and associated revenue increase of \$0.0623 per 100 cu.ft., are being tracked in a reserve account.
8. To offset the July 2014 increase in Purchased Water from the Santa Clara Valley Water District, beginning August 15, 2014, as required by Section 792.5 of the Public Utilities Code, an increase in purchased water costs of \$67.00 /acre-foot, relative to the purchase water costs adopted by D.14-08-006, and associated revenue increase of \$0.0853 per 100 cu. ft., are being tracked in a reserve account.
9. To offset the July 2014 increase in Ground Water Charges from the Santa Clara Valley Water District, beginning August 15, 2014, as required by Section 792.5 of the Public Utilities Code, an increase in ground water charges of \$67.00 /acre-foot, relative to the ground water charges adopted by D.14-08-006, and associated revenue increase of \$0.0719 per 100 cu.ft., are being tracked in a reserve account.
10. To amortize the under-collection in Balancing Accounts, a surcharge of \$0.0492 per 100 cu.ft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.
11. To amortize the over-collection in Memorandum Accounts, a surcredit of \$0.25 per service connection per month is to be added for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.
12. To amortize the under-collection in the 2013 GRC Interim Rates Memorandum Account, a surcharge of \$0.2888 per 100 cu.ft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 36 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 465-B.
13. To amortize the under-collection in the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account, a surcharge of \$0.1798 per 100 cu.ft. is to be added to the Quantity Rate shown for a 12-month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 468.

(N)
|
(N)

(cont.)

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

APPENDIX A (Cont.)

Schedule No. 1B

GENERAL METERED SERVICE WITH AUTOMATIC FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM (Continued)

11. To amortize the under-collection in Balancing Accounts, a surcharge of \$0.0492 per 100 cu.ft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.

12. To amortize the over-collection in Memorandum Accounts, a surcredit of \$0.25 per service connection per month is to be added for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.

13. To amortize the under-collection in the 2013 GRC Interim Rates Memorandum Account, a surcharge of \$0.2888 per 100 cu.ft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 36 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 465-B.

14. To amortize the under-collection in the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account, a surcharge of of \$0.1798 per 100 cu.ft. is to be added to the Quantity Rate shown for a 12-month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 468.

(N)
|
(N)

(cont.)

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

APPENDIX A (Cont.)

Schedule No. 1 C

GENERAL METERED SERVICE Mountain District (Continued)

10. To offset the July 2014 increase in Purchased Water from the Santa Clara Valley Water District, beginning August 15, 2014, as required by Section 792.5 of the Public Utilities Code, an increase in purchased water costs of \$67.00 /acre-foot, relative to the purchase water costs adopted by D.14-08-006, and associated revenue increase of \$0.0853per100 cu.ft., are being tracked in a reserve account.
11. To offset the July 2014 increase in Ground Water Charges from the Santa Clara Valley Water District, beginning August 15, 2014, as required by Section 792.5 of the Public Utilities Code, an increase in ground water charges of \$67.00 /acre-foot, relative to the ground water charges adopted by D.14-08-006, and associated revenue increase of \$0.0719per100 cu.ft., are being tracked in a reserve account.
12. To amortize the under-collection in Balancing Accounts, a surcharge of \$0.0492 per 100 cu.ft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.
13. To amortize the over-collection in Memorandum Accounts, a sur-credit of \$0.25 per service connection per month is to be added for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.
14. To amortize the under-collection in the 2013 GRC Interim Rates Memorandum Account, a surcharge of \$0.2888 per 100 cuft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 36 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 465-8.
15. To amortize the over-collection of the Schedule 1C elevation charge within the 2013 GRC Interim Rates Memorandum Account, a one-time refund of \$105.03 per service connection will be added to the bills of all non-mutual customers beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 465-8.

(cont.)

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

APPENDIX A (Cont.)

Schedule No. 1 C

GENERAL METERED SERVICE Mountain District (Continued)

16. To amortize the over-collection of the Schedule 1C service charges collected from the Mutual Water Companies within the 2013 GRC Interim Rates Memorandum Account, a one-time refund is to be added to the bills of the Mutual Water Companies listed below beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 465-B as follows:

<u>Mutual:</u>	<u>One-time</u>
Brush & Old Well Mutual Water	\$12,253
Oakmont Mutual Water Co.	\$10,848
Stagecoach Mutual Water Co.	\$2,355
Summit West Mutual Water Co.	\$68,380
Ridge Mutual Water Co.	\$32,621
Villa Del Monte Mutual Water Co.	\$49,273
Big Redwood Park Water & Improvement	\$24,486
Mountain Summit Mutual Water Co	\$1,876

17. To amortize the under-collection in the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account, a surcharge of of \$0.1798 per 100 cu.ft. is to be added to the Quantity Rate shown for a 12-month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 468.

(N)
|
(N)

(cont.)

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Resolution W-5057
DWA

September 17, 2015

APPENDIX A (cont.)

Schedule No. RW

RAW WATER METERED SERVICE (Continued)

11. To amortize the under-collection in Balancing Accounts, a surcharge of \$0.0492 per 100 cu.ft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.
12. To amortize the over-collection in Memorandum Accounts, a surcredit of \$0.25 per service connection per month is to be added for a 12 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 463-A.
13. To amortize the under-collection in the 2013 GRC Interim Rates Memorandum Account, a surcharge of \$0.2888 per 100 cu.ft is to be added to the Quantity rate shown for a 36 month period beginning with the effective date of Advice Letter 465-B.
14. To amortize the under-collection in the Mandatory Conservation Revenue Adjustment Memorandum Account, a surcharge of \$0.1798 per 100 cu.ft. is to be added to the Quantity Rate shown for a 12-month period beginning with the effective date of this advice letter 468.

(N)
|
(N)

END OF APPENDIX A

**SAN JOSE WATER COMPANY
ADVICE LETTER NO. 468
SERVICE LIST**

Anthony Gliozzo
1643 Dry Creek Rd
San Jose, CA 95125

Evangeline Rodriquez
509 Deer Ct
San Jose, CA 95123

Lamberto Diaz Cardenas
225 Shoshone Dr
San Jose, CA 95127

Anonymous
1088 East Campbell Ave,
Campbell, CA 95008

Joan Kilgore
3494 New Jersey Ave
San Jose, CA 95124

Malika Khan
1632 El Dorado Ave
San Jose, CA 95126-1527

Mark Macdonald
974 Wallace Drive
San Jose, CA 95120

O.D. Mitchell
14684 Bronson Ave.
San Jose, CA 95124-3555

Brenda A. Castro
3649 Lindenwood Drive
San Jose, CA 95117

Romeo & Emma Papas
287 Pala Ave
San Jose, CA 95127

Steve Moore
955 Salerno Drive
Campbell, CA 95008

Julian Escobedo
1877 Lanai Ave
San Jose, CA 95122

James Lee
12092 Candy Lane
Saratoga, CA 95196

Rao S. Ravuri
1528 Calle De Aida
San Jose, CA 95118

G. Carl Benson
5140 Rafton Drive
San Jose, 95124

Anoush Babayan
7038 Calcaterra Dr.
San Jose, CA 95120

Rameshwar Singh
631 Rocking Horse Court
San Jose, CA 95123

Diana Anderson,
14971 Quito Road
Saratoga, CA 95070

Helen Garza
50 Beverly Blvd
San Jose, CA 95116

Teresa Avila
21 S Claremont Ave
San Jose, CA 95127

Teresa Y. Calderon
112 N Cragmont Ave
San Jose, CA 95127

Tony Tully
ORA – Water Branch
tony.tully@cpuc.ca.gov

Lisa Bilir
Office of Ratepayer
Advocates
Lisa.Bilir@cpuc.ca.gov

Danilo Sanchez
Office of Ratepayer
Advocates
danilo.sanchez@cpuc.ca.gov

Regulatory Affairs
San Jose Water Company
110 West Taylor Street
San Jose, CA 95156
RegulatoryAffairs@sjwater.com

tinashih66@yahoo.com

dawnsat@aol.com

llopez2196@aol.com

marco.nelissen@gmail.com

ckl@cklconstruction.com

mariakuok@yahoo.com

wallygardner@att.net

subraji@att.net

root.j@comcast.net

loriakutch@gmail.com

edleaders@yahoo.com

micheng@yahoo.com

teresa.fernando@pillsburylaw.com

dinesh.joshi@yahoo.com

rbentscool@yahoo.com wmaguire@gmail.com peterlee@conservice.com
sl951@yahoo.com aghazi1@yahoo.com CHarak@nclc.org
ayse_yesilyurt@yahoo.com asokan_ramdas@yahoo.com LDolqueist@manatt.com
charphy19320@yahoo.com lesley14@sbcglobal.net TJRyan@sgvwater.com
danpet8@sbcglobal.net stanmail@yahoo.com TKim@rwglaw.com
donwolf20@comcast.net davcin19@yahoo.com bill@jbsenergy.com
fgbuchanan@yahoo.com howard.p.wong@gmail.com bkelly@swwc.com
jeff_w_brown@yahoo.com Jedkeller@verizon.net bloehr@greatoakswater.com
tvlagtjoe@aol.com jeffbarr2@yahoo.com broeder@greatoakswater.com
55cccw@gmail.com mbrading@yahoo.com charles.forst@360.net
kipp7284@comcast.net nikymissagh@gmail.com chris@cuwcc.org
psam1304@gmail.com ray_mirizzi@yahoo.com cmailloux@turn.org
rrcross@gmail.com wlhudson49@gmail.com dadellosa@sgvwater.com
lisenka06@yahoo.com valeriemaldo@yahoo.com danielle.burt@bingham.com
dale@dalewarner.com jenny_suwan@yahoo.com dave.stephenson@amwater.com
jjm.jjm@gmail.com jwong_wm@yahoo.com davidmorse9@gmail.com
rogerwangabc@hotmail.com romypapasin@yahoo.com debbie@ejcw.org
daphena@gmail.com aistena@gmail.com debershoff@fulbright.com
2stevetu@gmail.com erikrmz@sbcglobal.net dhilla@consumercal.org
baynes@mac.com inkydot@comcast.net doug@parkwater.com
mishra_anurag@yahoo.com theshulls@sbcglobal.net dsb@cpuc.ca.gov
ddcc@rs6.risingnet.net jzavala@fcai.fujitsu.com ed.jackson@parkwater.com
esumintac@yahoo.com vibhutio@gmail.com edeleon@gswater.com
Paul_s_liu@yahoo.com jerryr@seanet.com
ryan@geisswerks.com michelle.mar@gmail.com

gilleman@valenciawater.com

jadarneylane@gswater.com

jeff@jbsenergy.com

jhawks@calwaterassn.com

jkiddoo@swidlaw.com

john.greive@lightyear.net

kendall.macVey@bbklaw.com

kswitzer@gswater.com

leigh@parkwater.com

llk@cpuc.ca.gov

lmcghee@calwater.com

lweiss@manatt.com

marcel@turn.org

mcv@cpuc.ca.gov

mlane@nossaman.com

mlm@cpuc.ca.gov

mlwhitehead@sgvwater.com

mmattes@nossaman.com

monica.na@amwater.com

mpo@cpuc.ca.gov

mvander@pcl.org

nancitran@gswater.com

nsuetake@turn.org

owein@nclc.org

palle_jensen@sjwater.com

phh@cpuc.ca.gov

pschmiege@schmiegelaw.com

pucservice@dralegal.org

rkmoore@gswater.com

robert.maclean@amwater.com

sarah.leeper@amwater.com

sferraro@calwater.com

tguster@greatoakswater.com

tsmegal@calwater.com