



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED

09/26/25

01:00 PM

A2401001

September 26, 2025

Agenda ID #23773
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 24-01-001:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Douglas Long. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's **10/30/2025** Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Electronic copies of comments should also be sent to the Intervenor Compensation Program at icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE

Michelle Cooke

Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC: smt

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ LONG** (Mailed 9/26/2025)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of SAN JOSE WATER COMPANY (U168W) for an Order authorizing it to increase rates charged for water service by \$55,196,000 or 11.11% in 2025, by \$22,041,000 or 3.99% in 2026, and by \$25,809,000 or 4.49% in 2027.

Application 24-01-001

DECISION DENYING COMPENSATION TO WATER RATE ADVOCATES FOR TRANSPARENCY, EQUITY, AND SUSTAINABILITY

Intervenor: Water Rate Advocates for Transparency, Equity, and Sustainability	For contribution to Decision 24-12-077 accuracy, reliability, factual integrity and consistency.
Claimed: \$16,818.00	Awarded: \$0.00
Assigned Commissioner: Darcie L. Houck	Assigned ALJ: Douglas Long

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	The decision adopts rates allowing applicant opportunity to earn its required revenue per the corrected Settlement Agreement between Cal Advocates and San Jose Water Company (SJW) for Test Year 2025 and escalation years, 2026 and 2027. Specific figures are defined in Appendix A, Tables A-G, derived from the corrected settlement agreement, Appendix B. The decision denies 2 disputed issues, Special Requests 1 & 2. Finally, guidance to the Parties requires submission of a detailed exhibit with testimony listing projects approved by GRC 2024, Decision (D.) 24-12-077, and Appendix B that are deferred, discontinued, cancelled or added as new projects.
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of prehearing conference (PHC):	February 14, 2024	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	March 12, 2024	March 14, 2024
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b)) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):		
5. During the PHC with the ruling by Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Long granting party status (Transcript PHC, Feb 14, 2024; p. 2 & 7 https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M525/K574/525574170.PDF) to Patrick Kearns as a customer of the applicant and to dba Water Rate Advocates for Transparency, Equity and Sustainability (WRATES) members being represented by Kearns and “this unincorporated association, other than a partnership, functions as a community action group organized exclusively for education of water utility rate payers and consumers of water on conservation, assuring access to affordable rates for quality water and service especially securing access to water for low income residents and assuring public safety of high quality water who attested to be customers of San Jose Water Company (SJW), Kearns tendered a NOI to Claim compensation, WRATES attested to qualification per category 2. The notice did not receive a ruling but WRATES its representation was not denied that it qualified on the grounds the case of a group or organization, the economic interest of the Individual members of the group or organization is small in	PHC of February 14, 2024 Request for significant financial hardship was made in original NOI of March 12, 2024	On March 28, 2025, an ALJ’s Ruling was issued denying Water Rate Advocates for Transparency, Equity and Sustainability’s (WRATES) NOI in proceeding Application (A.) 24-01-001. On June 6, 2025, another ALJ’s Ruling was issued denying WRATES’ motion requesting reconsideration of the initial ruling rejecting its NOI in this proceeding.

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
comparison to the costs of effective participation in the proceeding. (§ 1802(h)). Failure of other parties to Respond to WRATES notice (Pub. Util. 1802 (g) Transcript issued documenting Patrick Kearns is was granted party status with Patrick Kearns as a customer representative of an association of Applicant's customers WRATES. WRATES determined this is in accord with the CPUC Intervenor Compensation guide, normally, an ALJ Ruling needs not be issued unless: the NOI has requested a finding of "significant financial hardship under §1802(g); (b) the NOI is deficient, or (C)the ALJ desires to provide guidance on specific issues of the NOI (p.12). WRATES determined that no ruling was required.		
6. Date of ALJ Ruling: (above)	February 14, 2024	March 28, 2025, and June 6, 2025.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	n/a	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		No. <i>See</i> Part I.C [1] CPUC's Additional Comments and Discussion on Part I.B(5-8).
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ruling issued in proceeding number:	Pending decision by CPUC based on §1802 (g); individual benefit to WRATESWRATES members is small compared to cost of effective legal representation	A.24-01-001
10. Date of ALJ ruling (c.f. above)	Pending. No ruling on request per NOI of March 12, 2024 has been issued to	March 28, 2025, and June 6, 2025.

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
	date.	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify): n/a	Similarly, the failure of the customer to identify a specific issue or anticipate all issues in the notice of intent or to precisely estimate potential compensation shall not preclude an award of reasonable compensation if a substantial contribution is made.	<i>See</i> Part I.C [2] CPUC's Additional Comments and Discussion on Part I.B(9-12).
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		No. <i>See</i> Part I.C [2] CPUC's Additional Comments and Discussion on Part I.B(9-12).
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.24-12-077	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 19, 2024	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	2/19/25	February 18, 2025
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	Intervenor cannot afford to hire experts or attorneys as it has no income as an association and the demographics of its members include individuals in the CAP (formerly WRAP) program, individuals on fixed income, retired individuals who are customers and members not able to pay for legal representation because of value disparity. WRATES approached	Noted

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	several attorney's firms to represent customers Pro Bono before the CPUC without success.	
	Several individuals volunteered on the chance that WRATES' claim for Intervenor compensation would be approved and this would support WRATES members in future proceedings.	Noted
[1]		<p>Based on the ALJ's Ruling in A.24-01-001, issued March 28, 2025, WRATES has failed to adequately show eligible customer status, as required by Pub. Util. Code §§ 1802(b)(1)(B).</p> <p>We affirm the findings made in the March 28, 2025 ruling that WRATES is ineligible to claim category 2 customer status, and this claim is denied.</p>
[2]		<p>Based on the ALJ's Ruling in A.24-01-001, issued March 28, 2025, WRATES has failed to adequately show eligible customer status and has not shown significant financial hardship as required by Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.</p> <p>Therefore, we find that WRATES is ineligible to claim intervenor compensation, and this claim is denied.</p>

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
--------------------------------------	---	-----------------

<p>WRATES maintains that it made substantial contributions in its procedural and clerical recommendations to the court helping maintain the schedule (chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgleclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M535/K530/535530336.PDF) and suggesting editorial corrections to errors in the record by the parties failing to submit uncorrupted PDA/a documents, misrepresentation of procedural facts. This helped prevent delays due to requests for hearings while maintaining an accurate record consistent with the facts, evidence and Rules of Practice and Procedures.</p> <p>A major discovery of a Rule based contribution was WRATES informing parties and the court that the primary document, (Public version) submitted by the applicant to support the reasonableness of capital improvement costs was tendered corrupted per Rule 1.9(d)3. This document was filed in error as well per Rule 1.9(d)4 as it was improperly removed from the URL and unavailable to the record after 2 months, making it out of compliance with Rule 1.9(d)4 as properly maintained until the final decision is made. This was brought to the courts attention in WRATES comments to the cSA. [chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgleclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/Pub</p>	<p>WRATES COMMENTS ON ALTERNATE PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER DARCIE HOUCK ADOPTING A SETTLEMENT AND RESOLVING TWO DISPUTED ISSUES IN A GENERAL RATE CASE FOR SAN JOSE WATER 4.4 p11/18;(chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgleclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M549/K797/549797759.PDF) presence of 5 different versions of the rate tier structures throughout the application; non-existence of the agreed upon tier structure in the Corrected Settlement Agreement (cSA); a 5th version in the Alternative Proposed decision. (chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgleclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M539/K999/539999969.PDF) p. 3 Exhibit F.</p> <p>The exhibit list had no documentation that exhibit SJWC-04 (Appendix 1-Capital improvement (Public)) version was updated to support this document used as proof that Capital project costs are reasonable was revised and</p>	<p>N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.</p>
--	---	--

<p>lishedDocs/Efile/G000/M539/K999/539999969.PDF] (9/5/24)</p> <p>WRATES made substantial contributions to the record with regards to the Commission's approval of required revenue for improving control system Cybersecurity performance and programs in 2025, 2026 and 2027 e-IT.</p> <p>WRATES made substantial contributions in contributing to evidence leading to the D.24-12-077's orders 6 and 7 in the final decision including orders 6. and 7. And Conclusions of Law # 4 keeping open the issue of the appropriate allowance for escalations in capital additions forecasts 8, 9, 10, 11.</p> <p>Order 6 requires that SJW must, in its next general rate case, serve a specific detailed exhibit with supporting testimony listing any projects approved as a part of this decision that it subsequently deferred or otherwise decided to no longer pursue during the rate case years 2025, 2026, and 2027. San Jose Water must specifically list</p>	<p>resubmitted uncorrupted as assured by applicants attorney it would be. The Confidential version had documentation of compliance with the assurances. WRATES was the only entity to document on the record that SJWC-04 was tendered and served as a corrupted, unreadable and unsearchable PDF file that was removed from the record before the final decision.</p> <p>WRATES submitted notice that the motion to approve and the SA, cSA misrepresented the motion and agreement to be an all-party settlement in spite of the Courts order to correct the error.</p> <p>Capital projects #5595, #6067, for Cybersecurity. Decision Appendix 2 (attachment 1) confirmation #551015430 APPENDIX 2: 2024 - 2026 GRC A.24-01-001 Capital Improvement Budget. CalAdvocates and San Jose Water Co agreed to disapprove all 8 Cybersecurity employees requested, while WRATES ardently advocated for improvement of SJWC</p>	
---	--	--

<p>and justify any new projects</p> <p>1. The final decision approves no new employees as requested in A.24-01-001 but awards ~\$500,000 dollars for Cybersecurity programs as requested by WRATES. There were no other advocates addressing Cybersecurity and control system improvements to reduce SJW cyber vulnerability.</p>	<p>inadequate attention to Cybersecurity as directed by The Biden Administration, Governor Newsom and California Dept. of Technology and Cal Cybersecurity Task Force and the Office of Cybersecurity (Cal-CSIC) Attachment 2</p> <p>WRATES REBUTTAL TO REPORTS OF OPERATIONS BY PUBLIC ADVOCATES OFFICE (Appendix no update on Appendix 1 CIP)</p> <p>A. Chapter 2 Pre-Construction Projects</p> <p>B. Chapter 7 Escalation Factor</p> <p>C. CHAPTER 8 PIPELINE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM p 9. WRATES strengthens Cal Advocates position using the specific history of pipeline main required revenue falling short of unreasonable proposed capital projects and double billing expenses for the same project is successive years citing specific examples like Villa Project in Los Gatos.</p> <p>D. WRATES participate in Settlement Discussions resulting in the successful reduction of the unreasonable \$540,000,000 requested to a more reasonable \$450,000,000 awarded. WRATES contributed to the discussions and agreed with</p>	
---	--	--

	a majority of issues in the settlement agreement but objected to several unreasonable compromises and consequently did not join the settlement agreement.	
2. From the beginning, WRATES testimony encouraged the addition of improved Cybersecurity and control system cyber security, both of which were resisted by PAO and SJWC. To the end where WRATES Comments on the Alternative Proposed Decision, WRATES continues to advocate for Cybersecurity funding while CalAdvocates opposes WRATES evidence as adequate to counter SJW and CalAdvocates abandonment of requests in their application.	<p>Opening testimony Joseph Weiss, 5/15/24 A2, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9 raised concerns regarding control Cybersecurity vulnerability of SJWC which is entirely unprepared. SJWC was invited to several presentations presented at national and regional conference venues to educated SJWC's VP of Cybersecurity regarding control system vulnerability and achieved having Cybersecurity funded by the Commission's decision.</p> <p>WRATES maintains that it submitted sufficient evidence to raise reasonable doubt that SJW allows unreasonable flaws in its Cybersecurity network system in deploying a new AMI network (Klobe testimony) and ALJ Long's requirement to resubmit a corrected Settlement Agreement due to errors in the original settlement's due to omission of Advice Letters 609 and 610. c.f. WRATES Comments on Alternate Proposed Decision. p.9 (adobe p. 11; §4.4.1.</p>	N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.
3. From the Application A1801004, WRATES has entered into evidence showings that SJW has failed to complete <u>> 80% of its funded Capital Projects. WRATES has used the specific model of SJW receiving required revenue for upgrading its infrastructure as in main pipelines.</u>	San Jose Water Co and CalAdvocates, Joint Parties, submitted a Joint Motion to approve a Joint Settlement Agreement. WRATES reported the error in the motion and the Settlement Agreement falsely claiming an all-party settlement.	N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.

<p><u>SJW has presented a non-scientific demonstration of its need to replace 24 miles of main pipelines and service pipelines every year. SJW agreed that it had replaced only 70-75% of the pipelines funded in A.18-01-004 and A.21-01-003. The Commission</u></p>	<p>WRATES informed the ALJ that the settlement was not an all-party settlement. Despite everyone knowing that the motion and SA included SJW and CalAdvocates, the motion was accepted by the Docket Office. WRATES immediately informed the ALJ of the error and the ALJ ordered the Docket Office and the Joint Parties to correct the error. No action was taken and the misrepresentation as all-party persisted in the attached Joint Motion and SA published in the docket card's Proposed Decision and Alternate Proposed Decision. WRATES further alerted the Court to an error made in a ruling establishing the updated schedule for filing the SA on August 19 and Comments on August 30. This would have delayed the ALJ's schedule intended to have the SA filed on August 19, Comments on August 26 and Response on August 30. The ALJ issued a corrective ruling scheduling the proceeding as had been intended to conclude on August 30, 2024. Unfortunately, SJW erroneously filled a motion to strike portions of WRATES Comments to the SA. The motion was rejected by the Docket office for falsely claiming to be on behalf of CalAdvocates and SJW. Even though the Docket Office subsequently accepted the motion identical to the rejected motion, contrary to Rule 1.14 (c), The Court ruled in favor of the motion to strike. While these are the Rules WRATES alleged</p>	
---	--	--

	imposed on WRATES due process, the Commission agenized the Alternate Proposed decision and voted on December 19, 2024	
WRATES managed to make significant contributions to maintaining the accuracy and integrity of the record; WRATES maintained focus of the Rules of Practice and Procedure in a way because of its pedantic style required to understand the Rules as literally written. and maintain the schedule by editorial rigor pointing out several errors in submitted documents.	WRATES was served a corrupted document on March 1, 2024 with the Appendix 1 Capital Improvement Projects (Public). The document was placed on a Nossaman server. WRATES filed a motion to strike SJW's key evidence supporting it request for \$540,000,000 in Capital Improvement required revenue. Portions of the corrupted document were unreadable and, unsearchable. SJW assured the ALJ the document would be repaired and served again. The evidence in the exhibits ruled into evidence strongly suggests that the documents remained unsearchable, corrupted and improperly served again in non-PDF/a format. In addition, the exhibit list failed to support SJW assurance that the document (Public) had been revised and the Confidential submission was annotated as repaired. Given WRATES hardship in financially being able to hire an attorney, this hardship dramatically impacts the party and the consumers represented in a prejudicial way. Acknowledging the consequences WRATES financial hardship is gaining due process is anathema to the Commission's goal in promoting input from all quarters of stakeholders.	N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	No	N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.
c. If so, provide name of other parties: n/a		N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.
While Cal Advocates and WRATES shared the similar observations and the same facts in the record, CalAdvocates compromised their reasonable positions on required revenue for capital improvement by settling with SJWC's position that it is reasonable to award SJW \$450,000,000 in spite of SJW's inability to complete more than 75-80% of the capital projects funded in its self-acclaimed project completion record for A.18-01-004 (GRC 18), A.21-01-003 (GRC 21). <i>See</i> WRATES Comments to Alt Proposed Decision. CalAdvocates agreed with WRATES that SJW replacement rate while WRATES submitted scientifically based analysis that the replacement is not only unsupported but unreasonable and unsustainable. Report and Recommendation on Capital Improvement Projects A. SJWC's Replacement Rate is Unsupported p.8-2, 8-5. WRATES analysis (Attachment A.24-01-001 PAO rebuttal CIP pipeline feet replaced) extends the inadequacy of SJW replacement rouse pointing out that SJWC is abandoning its unsupported 24-mile replacement goal as demonstrably an unachievable failure. In Appendix 1 CIP exhibit SJW is proposing to substitute using Artificial Intelligence as its new methodology. WRATES demonstrates SJW's failure to achieve it 24-mile replacement using a table showing that 18-miles replacement is all that they have		N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
<p>replaced from 2018 through 2023. WRATES contributes substantially to the understandability of the record compared to CalAdvocates trying to make the same point by describing the failure using feet which obscures the point they are making. WRATES analysis had a significant impact on reducing the Proposed Decisions award for Capital improvement by 27%, a more reasonable amount based on prior performance and the supplementary positions taken by CalAdvocates and WRATES and ultimately the Decision's Orders and awards.</p> <p>While CalAdvocates did not object to WRATES demand</p>		

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
	<p>That SJW failed to attend to improving its dangerous vulnerability to hacking as warned by WRATES control system experts testimony, it did object to the 8 employees requested by SJW in its application. It was WRATES' insistence, support during settlement discussions and expert testimony for Cybersecurity that ultimately supported inclusion of ~\$600,000 dollars for Cybersecurity programs and performance made an issue by Scoping Memo issue #9, "Whether there are any safety concerns"; as outlined in the Alternate Proposed Decision and Decision's list of proposed projects that are to be included in the accounting, reporting with testimony required by the Commission in its list of Orders. WRATES also submits its influence in requiring more of SJW as it proposed 330 projects. WRATES once again attempts to keep the record credible when it points out there are 448 projects listed. There have been 118 additional projects added to the Final Decisions list (Attachment 1) with some of the projects listed twice as will be highlighted in SJW accounting with the next GRC application and testimony.</p>	<p>N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.</p>

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: WRATES is learning the Intervenor Compensation process and procedures outlined in (§ 1801 and § 1806. WRATES conservative requests are well within the bounds of reasonable since it is not requesting compensation for all of the volunteer hours contributed by its members. The purpose of (§ 1801) is to provide compensation for reasonable advocate’s fees, reasonable expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs to public utility customers of participation or intervention in any proceeding of the commission. WRATES has introduced a world expert on Cybersecurity and control system Cybersecurity that was otherwise unavailable to the commission. Neither SJW nor CalAdvocates provided testimony, rebuttal or settlement terms to support improvements in SJW’s control system security. WRATES recruited Joseph Weiss with over 40 years experience qualifying him as a recognized engineering control system expert as receives over \$500 per hour for his consultations, presentations and educational programs. The expert has offered his expertise to the Commission at rates that are 60% of what he normally charges as he is trying to help SJW address its vulnerability and risk of foreign attack on Silicon Valley’s water and power infrastructure. Given Mr. Weiss’s professional teaching methods all parties have access to polished slide stacks, Zoom presentations detailing SJW’s lack of understanding of its vulnerability in spite of multiple warnings justifies the hours billed at the rate established for a national expert in Cybersecurity with Mr. Weiss’ experience. WRATES secured Mr. Weiss to contribute to substantially to SJW’s ability to avoid cyber hacking that puts not only its infrastructure at risk but the entire utility infrastructure throughout California through the exposure opened up through security gaps with communication through Nossaman’s incriminating response to WRATES allegations.</p>	<p>N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: WRATES contends that the number of hours contributed by the 15 active volunteers supporting Water Rate Advocates for Transparency, Equity and Sustainability representatives, expert and advocates without compensation is conservative and reasonable and hours worked are more than 80% of the hours claimed and are below the guidelines’ rates given the experience of Patrick Kearns with experience of Hospital Medicine and having developed the Hospitalist system for Santa Clara County Hospitalist Public Health approach used during the Covid-19 Pandemic.. WRATES recruited John Klobe, a customer service and Bryan Mekechuk, both incredible financial experts with over 30 years’ experience including elected and appointed public service. whose contributions to rates and</p>	<p>N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>hours worked are claimed at zero compensation for their contributions in elucidating the discrepancies and contradictions in the evidence submitted in Exhibit F of WRATES Comments on the corrected Settlement Agreement showing three different rate tier structures without definitive identification of which structure was the version the Joint Parties agreed to. claims individuals who have served on the grand Jury investigations for Santa Clara County, held public office, lectured at Stanford, Energy conferences in Houston as supported public service associations. If the Commission wishes to encourage the effective and efficient participation of all groups that have a stake in the regulation of public utilities, it works against its purpose to put customers at risk by not allowing them access to legal aid provided CalAdvocates when their staff refuses input from consumer representatives.</p> <p>WRATES experts, advocates and representatives, clerical staff contributed the maximum number of volunteer hours in preparing testimony, responses, identifying cyber corruption of SJW's evidence, failure to correct essential documents whose corruption in its public versions contributed to the applicants burden of proof that lead to the 27% capital required revenue award awarded, editing and correcting clerical errors in several pleadings, and yet is submitting the minimum hours claimed for compensation</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue: 72 hours of total hours with 19.87 hours requested for compensation. For expert work and 8 hours for drafting and preparing arguments, analyzing projects charged and not completed, settlement discussions and editing the volumes of fillings, rulings and research to identify and contribute to the orders that,</p> <p>“8. It is reasonable to require San Jose Water to justify and explain any and differences in its actual capital expenditures in 2025, 2026 and 2027 in its next general rate case caused by the deferral of any approved projects and/or the substitution of projects not otherwise considered in this proceeding. 9. It is reasonable to require San Jose Water to include testimony that clearly demonstrates that it has adopted and embedded in its operations some overall formal system for designing and managing its capital expenditures or some other industry standard and professionally recognized and documented system of cost engineering management form of best practices. 10. It is reasonable to require San Jose Water to include a reconciliation of completed, deferred and alternative capital projects in the next general rate case.” WRATES is taking into account that the hours it spent are in excess of professionals due its inexperience, diligence in identifying clerical, factual, technical and cyber-corruption of applicant's pleadings, was working without legal advice to streamline its research and is not charging for countless volunteer hours. WRATES discounted its hours worked by ~80% in its submitted claimed hours for compensation. WRATES must defer to the Court and the commission to decide if the</p>	<p>N/A. As per the findings in Part I.C [1] and [2], WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full.</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>adjustments are reasonable based on its experience in considering other intervenor awards.</p> <p>Improve Cybersecurity of untested networks being deployed without any beta testing of the deployed AMI network vulnerability released without beta testing 5.6 hours volunteered.</p> <p>Staff work volunteer uncompensated 96 hours</p> <p>Orders for SJWC to account for completed, deleted, delayed, reprioritized capital project as in Order 8, 9 and 10 of D.24-12-077</p> <p>Decision listing 448 capital projects with duplicates to be reported on in the Next GRC as increased from 330 projects to 448 listed (attachment) 5 hours Conclusion of Law # 4 re issue of escalation remaining open including determination of reduction in Capital Improvement Projects reduced from 540,000,000 to 450,000,000 and design of capital improvement schedule 32 hours volunteer plus 18 hours requested compensation.</p>	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Joseph Weiss	2024	19.87	361	IT Project Engineer V	7,168	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
John Klobe	2024	volunteer	200	Advocate not otherwise classified	-	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Patrick Kearns	2024	18	208	Health Scientist III Med	3,743	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Bryan Mekechuk	2024	volunteer	286	Cost Accountant IV Hi	-	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$10,911						Subtotal: \$0.00		
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Ann Chung	2024	volunteer		Advocate not otherwise classified	0	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Patricia Blevins	2024	volunteer		Advocate not otherwise classified	0	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00						Subtotal: \$0.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Patrick Kearns	2025	7	59	Program Coordinator/Rep	416	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$416						Subtotal: \$0.00		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.	Communication, Supplies, travel	Zoom subscription, Office supplies, site visits			84	\$0.00 [1]		
2.	conferences	Refreshment, Food, drink, , preparation material, organization, site			100	100	\$0.00 [1]	
Subtotal: \$184						Subtotal: \$0.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$11,512						TOTAL AWARD: \$0.00		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors’ records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR ²		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation		
n/a								

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:³

Attachment or Comment #	Intervenor Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	San Jose Water Appendix B - Settlement Agreement
3	Appendix A - Adopted Quantities
4	D2412077 (A2401001) DECISION ADOPTING A SETTLEMENT AND RESOLVING TWO DISPUTED etc...
	c.f. https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=551128522
5	Motion to file late https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=549797758
6	WRATES COMMENTS ON ALTERNATE PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER DARCIE HOUCK https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=549797759
7	WRATES RESPONSE TO “SAN JOSE WATER COMPANY’S MOTION TO STRIKE chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M540/K720/540720468.PDF
8	IN LIMINE MOTION TO EXCLUDE IN THEIR ENTIRETY APPENDIX 1 CIP
8	chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M534/K344/534344010.PDF
9	NOTICE OF INTENT TO CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
9	https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=527510318
10	WRATES REBUTTAL TO REPORTS OF OPERATIONS BY PUBLIC ADVOCATES OFFICE
10	chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/Publish

³ Attachments are not included in the final decision.

	edDocs/SupDoc/A2401001/7504/532702614.pdf
11	OPENING TESTIMONY OF PATRICK KEARNS chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/SupDoc/A2401001/7382/531638859.pdf
12	OPENING DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH WEISS chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/SupDoc/A2401001/7382/531577283.pdf
13	OPENING TESTIMONY OF JOHN KLOBE chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/SupDoc/A2401001/7382/531623727.pdf
14	A2401001 - SJWC Reply to WRATE Motion chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M534/K344/534344085.PDF
15	Ruling correcting schedule error alert by WRATES to Jun 19 schedule chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M535/K530/535530336.PDF
16	RULING ON MOTION TO STRIKE TESTIMONY chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M534/K105/534105510.PDF
17	Response filed by SAN JOSE WATER COMPANY on 06/17/2024 https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=534344085

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1]	The claim is denied in its entirety as WRATES has not demonstrated a “customer” status pursuant to Section 1802(b)(1) and has not shown significant financial hardship pursuant to Section 1802(h). As WRATES is not eligible to claim intervenor compensation, this decision does not address other aspects of WRATES claim, such as substantial contributions (Section 1802(j)), duplication of effort, and reasonableness of costs (Section 1801).
[2] Hourly Rates	Because WRATES intervenor compensation claim is denied in full for the reasons noted in Part I.C., we do not assess the reasonableness of the requested hourly rates.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

**Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff
or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))**

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Water Rate Advocates for Transparency, Equity, and Sustainability has not demonstrated customer status and significant financial hardship.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim does not satisfy all the requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812 and must be denied.

ORDER

1. The intervenor compensation claim filed by Water Rate Advocates for Transparency, Equity, and Sustainability is denied.
2. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.
3. Application 24-01-001 is closed.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at Sacramento, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2412077		
Proceeding(s):	A2401001		
Author:	ALJ Douglas Long		
Payer(s):	N/A		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Water Rate Advocates for Transparency, Equity, and Sustainability	2/18/25	\$16,818	\$0.00	N/A	Failure to demonstrate customer status and significant financial hardship. <i>See</i> Part I.C - Additional Comments [1] and [2].

Hourly Fee Information⁴

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Joseph	Weiss	IT Project Engineer V	\$361	2024	N/A
John	Klobe	Volunteer (Advocate - Not otherwise classified)	\$200	2024	N/A
Patrick	Kearns	Health Scientist III Med	\$208	2024	N/A
Patrick	Kearns	Health Scientist III Med	\$59	2025	N/A
Bryan	Mekechuk	Volunteer (Cost Accountant IV Hi)	\$286	2024	N/A
Ann	Chung	Volunteer (Advocate - Not otherwise classified)	\$0.00	2024	N/A
Patricia	Blevins	Volunteer (Advocate - Not otherwise classified)	\$0.00	2024	N/A

(END OF APPENDIX)

⁴ Table completed by the Commission.