Docket : A.25-01-001
Exhibit Number : Cal Adv-01
Commissioner : Darcie L. Houck
Admin. Law Judge : Minh LeQuang

Public Advocates : Mehboob Aslam

Witness :



PUBLIC ADVOCATES OFFICE



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS TABLES

Application 25-01-001 (San Gabriel Valley Water Company)

Los Angeles, California July 25, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<u>Pa</u>	ige
MEM	ORAN	DUM		1
EXEC	CUTIVI	E SUN	MMARY	2
A.	•		of SGVWC's Proposed Revenue Increases and Cal Advocates'	2
B.	Reven	ue and	d Rate Design	3
	1.	Reve	nues	3
	2.	Rate	Design	3
	3.	Custo	omer Assistance Program (CAP)	4
C.	Foreca	ast for	Plant in Service and Rate Base.	4
	1.	Previ	ously Funded Incomplete Projects	5
	2.	Pre-c	onstruction Projects	6
	3.	Use	of Unreasonable Cost Adders and Escalation Rates	6
	4.	Plant	Assets No Longer in Use	6
	5.	Early	Retirement of Useful Plant Assets	7
	6.	Inclu	sion of Construction Work In Progress (CWIP) in Rate Base	8
	7.	Unne	ccessary and Inadequately Supported Projects	9
		a.	New Administrative Building for General Office	9
		b.	Unreasonable Vehicle Replacement Budget	9
		c.	Inadequately Supported Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA) Upgrades Budget	
		d.	Unreasonable Meter Replacement Request	10
		e.	Inadequately supported Well Projects	10
		f.	Poorly supported Treatment Projects	10
		g.	Unreasonable Reservoir Projects	11
		h.	Inadequately Supported Structure and Improvements Projects	11
D.	Foreca	ast for	Expenses	11
	1.	Gene	ral Office O&M Expenses	11
	2.	Gene	ral Office A&G Expenses	12
	3.	Los A	Angeles Division O&M Expenses	12
	4.	Los A	Angeles Division A&G Expenses	13

	5.	Fontana Water Company Division O&M Expenses	13
	6.	Fontana Water Company Division A&G Expenses	14
	7.	New Positions in LA and FWC Divisions	14
E.	Cust	omer Service	15
F.	Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan		
G.	Balancing Accounts and Memorandum Accounts (BAMAs)		
H.	Wate	er Quality Assessment	18
I.	Special Requests		
List of	f Cal.	Advocates Reports and Witnesses	
Result	s of C	Operations Tables	
Staten	nent c	of Qualifications	

1	<u>MEMORANDUM</u>
2	The Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal
3	Advocates) has examined requests and data presented by San Gabriel Valley Water
4	Company (SGVWC) in Application (A.) 25-01-001 (Application). This testimony
5	provides the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) with
6	recommendations that represent the interests of ratepayers for safe and reliable service at
7	the lowest cost. This Executive Summary is prepared by Mehboob Aslam, and the
8	Results of Operations Tables are prepared by Mehboob Aslam and Anthony Andrade.
9	Mehboob Aslam is Cal Advocates' project lead for this proceeding. Victor Chan is the
10	oversight supervisor, and Michael Damasco is legal counsel.
11	Cal Advocates has made every effort to comprehensively review, analyze, and
12	provide the Commission with recommendations on each ratemaking and policy aspect of
13	the requests presented in the Application. The absence from Cal Advocates' testimony of
14	any particular issue does not constitute its endorsement or acceptance of the underlying
15	request, or of the methodology or policy position supporting the request.
16	

1	<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>			
2	In the instant GRC application, SGVWC requests an increase in rates in its Los			
3	Angeles County Division (LA division) by \$13,758,493 or 13.23% in the Test Year (TY)			
4	2026-2027, by \$4,535,740, or 3.75% in the Escalation Year 2027-2028, and by			
5	\$4,867,882, or 3.98% in the Escalation Year 2028-2029. In its Fontana Water Company			
6	Division (FWC division), San Gabriel is requesting \$12,335,163 or 12.72% in TY 2026-			
7	2027, \$4,368,089 or 3.87% in the Escalation Year 2027-2028, and \$4,467,928 or 3.88%			
8	in the Escalation Year 2028-2029. SGVWC identifies various reasons for this rate			
9	increase, including increasing rate base, administrative expenses, pension and benefits,			
10	purchased power, purchased water, and deprecation, etc. By comparison, Cal Advocates			
11	recommends significantly lower rate increases in LA division by \$508,168 or 0.49% in			
12	the Test Year 2026-2027, by \$2,320,591 or 2.13% in the Escalation 2027-2028, and by			
13	\$2,335,562 or 2.21% in the Escalation Year 2028-2029, and in FWC division by			
14	\$2,399,213 or 2.45% in the Test Year 2026-2027, by \$3,174,995 or 3.10% in the			
15	Escalation 2027-2028, and by \$2,806,394 or 2.75% in the Escalation Year 2028-2029.			
16	This Executive Summary provides an overview of Cal Advocates' rationale and its			
17	recommendations in support of its proposed adjustments.			
18 19	A. Comparison of SGVWC's Proposed Revenue Increases and Cal Advocates' Recommendations			
20	The following Table ES-1 compares SGVWC's proposed increases in			
21	revenue with Cal Advocates' recommendation for each of the three fiscal years			
22	covered in this proceeding (2025-2029). The difference in increased revenue			
23	reflects the differences between SGVWC's and Cal Advocates' proposed capital			
24	spending and expense budgets. The percentages shown reflect the resulting changes			
25	in average system rates for each division and year.			

Table ES-1: Proposed Increase in Revenue Comparison

	SGVWC (LA Di	C (LA Division) Cal Advocates (LA Division)		Division)
Year	Increased Revenue Percentage Change		Increased Revenue	Percentage Change
2026-2027	\$13,758,493	13.23%	\$508,168	0.49%
2027-2028	\$4,535,740	3.75%	\$2,320,591	2.13%
2028-2029 \$4,867,882 3.98% \$2,3		\$2,335,562	2.21%	
	SGVWC (FWC Division)		Cal Advocates (FWC Division	
Year	Increased Revenue	Percentage Change	Increased Revenue	Percentage Change
2026-2027	\$12,335,163	12.72%	\$2,399,213	2.45%
2027-2028	\$4,368,089	3.87%	\$3,174,995	3.10%
2028-2029	\$4,467,928	3.88%	\$2,806,394	2.75%

B. Revenue and Rate Design

1. Revenues

An accurate forecast of customers and water consumption is required to determine revenues at present rates and design reasonable water rates for TY 2026-2027 with revenue neutrality. For the number of customer forecasts, Cal Advocates recommends that the Commission should accept SGVWC's forecast as it is in line with the Commission's Revised Rate Case Plan (D.07-05-062) methodology. However, for the water consumption forecast, Cal Advocates recommends that the Commission should adopt Cal Advocates' estimates, which more accurately reflect recent water consumption trends such as drought and impact of COVID-19 pandemic, which are ignored by SGVWC. Please see Chapter 1 of Cal Advocates' Report on Sales & Revenues and Rate Design for more details.

2. Rate Design

A well-constructed rate design aligns the costs of operating a water system equitably across all its customers and maintains revenue neutrality. SGVWC's rate design involves determining the revenue requirement, allocating revenue recovery between fixed

- and quantity charges (revenue allocation), finding tier breakpoints for metered services,
- 2 and establishing a tiered quantity rate structure for each tier breakpoint. Cal Advocates
- 3 recommends that the Commission should accept SGVWC's proposal by maintaining a
- 4 revenue split of 64.6%/35.4% between fixed and quantity charges for the LA division,
- 5 and the 70%/30% revenue split for the FWC division. However, Cal Advocates
- 6 recommends 8 Ccf (Centum Cubic Feet), 18 Ccf, and greater than 18 Ccf for Tier 1, Tier
- 7 2, and Tier 3 break points, respectively in LA division. Similarly, Cal Advocates
- 8 recommend 9 Ccf, 22 Ccf, and greater than 22 Ccf for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 break
- 9 points, respectively in FWC division. Cal Advocates' recommendations are based on the
- 10 current number of average household members, setting SGVWC's Standard Quantity
- Rates (SQR) as Tier 2 base, and setting Tier 1 rates at 89.99% of SQR, to promote
- affordability and conservation. Please see Chapter 2 of Cal Advocates' Report on Sales &
- 13 Revenues and Rate Design for more details.

25

3. Customer Assistance Program (CAP)

- SGVWC's CAP currently provides a fixed monthly discount of \$10.35 to eligible
- 16 customers in the LA and FWC divisions, applied directly to their monthly fixed charges.
- 17 SGWVC proposes increasing this discount to \$12.00 per month to maintain the same
- 18 effective discount in percentage terms. The non-CAP SGVWC customers in the LA and
- 19 FWC divisions pay monthly surcharges of \$0.3410/Ccf and \$0.3620/Ccf respectively.
- However, since Cal Advocates' recommendations result in a smaller overall increase in
- 21 the customers' average bill, using the same effective discount as proposed by SGVWC,
- 22 Cal Advocates recommends a CAP discount of \$10.53 for the LA Division and \$10.88
- for the FWC Division. Please see Chapter 2 of Cal Advocates' Report on Sales &
- 24 Revenues and Rate Design for more details.

C. Forecast for Plant in Service and Rate Base

- 26 Certain aspects of cost-based regulation may incentivize utilities to invest capital
- to an unnecessary degree, saddling ratepayers with unnecessary costs. In fact, utilities
- 28 calculate customer rates to produce utility net income that is directly proportional to

1 capital investment. A utility's entire profit that is included in rates is determined by a

2 calculation of its net capital investment, or rate base, multiplied by its authorized rate of

3 return. As a result, utilities with greater capital investment have more profit included in

4 rates. This dynamic and the potential for abuse is explored in Averch and Johnson's 1962

5 article "Behavior of the Firm Under Regulatory Constraint." 1 The potential for the

6 Averch-Johnson effect in utility rate setting, often referred to as "gold-plating," suggests

that without adequate review and oversight of utility proposals, ratepayers would be

harmed by excessive rates that reflect unnecessary utility spending and unreasonable

shareholder profit.

The Commission should consider several fundamental policy aspects when assessing the estimates for the plant and the rate base, including SGVWC's request for ratepayer funding of previously funded yet uncompleted capital projects, preconstruction projects that are not used and useful, unreasonable cost adders, plant assets no longer in use, early retirements of plant, Construction Work In Progress (CWIP) in ratebase that allows for profit on projects that are not used and useful, and unnecessary and unsupported plant requests. These are all examples that undermine the reasonableness of SGVWC's plant and rate base estimates.

1. Previously Funded Incomplete Projects

Ratepayers should never be required to pay twice for projects that have failed to provide benefits once. With "future-test-year" ratemaking, utilities fund projects with customer rates that may be delayed or cancelled altogether. Because customers have already paid once under the assumption that these projects would provide beneficial service, it is unreasonable to continue customer funding of these projects until the actual project benefits (i.e. in-service) can be demonstrated in a subsequent general rate case. Therefore, Cal Advocates recommends eight previously funded projects totaling \$23.95 million in the LA Division, and \$15.23 million in the FWC Division be removed. Please

¹ Averch, Harvey and Johnson, Leland L. "Behavior of the Firm Under Regulatory Constraint." The American Economic Review 52, no. 5 (1962): 1052-069. Accessed November 20, 2020. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1812181.

see Chapter 1 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.

2. Pre-construction Projects

SGVWC proposed to include in rate base pre-construction costs, such as planning, design, permitting, land acquisition, or an initial phase of construction work that will not result in a complete project during this rate case. Specifically, SGVWC requests \$1.0 million in the LA division and \$8.55 million in the FWC division for these types of multi-phase projects. The Commission should not require ratepayers to fund shareholder profit on projects that SGVWC itself acknowledges will not be providing service during this rate case cycle. If any of these proposed projects are completed or assumed to be completed during a future GRC periods, SGVWC may then seek recovery and inclusion in rate base at that time. Please see Chapter 2 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.

3. Use of Unreasonable Cost Adders and Escalation Rates

The Commission should not allow unreasonable adders and escalation rates. For example, SGVWC applies the following cost adders to its individual capital projects: 10% for contingency, 3% for inspections, and 4% for project management. SGVWC also uses various annual escalation rates ranging from 5% to 15%. Consistent with prior decisions (D.96-12-066, and D.24-03-0420), and because SGVWC's proposed costs do not meet the Commission's requirement that a utility must demonstrate the reasonableness of every dollar included in its revenue requirement and customer rates, the Commission should deny these adders and instead only allow a 3% escalation rate based on current Consumer Price Index (CPI). Please see Chapter 3 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.

4. Plant Assets No Longer in Use

Because utility's rate base is an accumulated investment built over time, Cal Advocates also reviewed the historic rate base to confirm whether previously authorized

- 1 capital projects are still used and useful. Upon review, Cal Advocates determined four
- 2 previously constructed projects are no longer used and useful. Cal Advocates
- 3 recommends removing \$1.42 million of remaining Net Book Value (NBV) for these
- 4 capital projects in LA division, and \$43,130 in FWC. Please see Chapter 12 of Cal
- 5 Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation,
- 6 and Rate Base for more details.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

7 In addition, SGVWC's 2023 purchase of two water rights in the amount of \$6.42

8 million in LA division were not cost-effective for the ratepayers. SGVWC's cost-benefit

analysis for this purchase is flawed and results in an unreasonably early break-even point.

Please see Chapter 12 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base,

Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.

5. Early Retirement of Useful Plant Assets

Early retirement of an asset can lead to an imbalance between the depreciation reserve and plant- in- service, which leads to ratepayers paying for assets that no longer exist. The Commission should make an adjustment to the recorded depreciation reserve to account for extraordinary early retirements. In the case of early retirement, only a portion of the asset's value has accumulated in the depreciation reserve, but standard ratemaking results in the full original cost being removed. Because the depreciation reserve is a deduction from rate base, removing the full amount from the depreciation reserve when only a portion has been added results in a negative subtraction or effectively an addition to rate base.

The Commission's standard practice for determination of straight-line remaining life depreciation accruals (SP U-4-W) recognizes this issue in what is termed "Extraordinary Obsolescence." SP U-4-W states "unexpected early retirement of *a major unit of property* may require some form of an adjustment." An adjustment for the assets that have been retired extraordinarily early is warranted. While the Commission does not define "*a major unit of property*", a utility's bookkeeping practices should not

7

² CPUC Standard Practice U-4-W p. 42.

allow it to earn an unfair return from a mathematical flaw. If a utility chooses to record its assets as multiple smaller amounts instead of recording them as larger projects, this does not change the necessity of fixing the imbalance created by early retirements.

For SGVWC's most recent retirement transactions over the period 2020-2024, adjustments should be made for assets that were retired with more than 50% of their estimated useful life remaining. There are 863 such capital assets totaling \$1.67 million in rate base. This amount should be added to SGWC's depreciation reserves so that the negative impact of these early retirements is removed from the rate base. Please see Chapter 14 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.

6. Inclusion of Construction Work In Progress (CWIP) in Rate Base

Since regulated utilities operate as natural monopolies, the Commission must act as a substitute for competition and remove SGVWC's proposed CWIP from the rate base. By definition, these projects have yet to provide service and therefore should not result in ratepayers funding a profit on their costs while under construction. Please see Chapter 1 of Cal Advocates' Report on Construction Work In Progress and Balancing & Memorandum Accounts for more details.

Rather than allowing CWIP in rate base, SGVWC should be permitted to accumulate interest during construction (IDC). Based on Cal Advocates' discovery, SGVWC's actual short-term debt cost over 2021-2024 was \$777,494 while spending \$222,044,233 in capital expenditure. Thus, spreading this cost over the capital expenditure results in an IDC rate of 0.35%. Therefore, Cal Advocates recommends inclusion of an IDC amount in rate base based on 0.35% of SGVWC's authorized plant additions in this GRC. Please see Chapter 11 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.

 $[\]frac{3}{3}$ (\$777,494 / \$222,044,233) x 100 = 0.35%.

1	7. Unnecessary and Inadequately Supported Projects
2	The Commission should not allow the following plant addition in rates:
3 4	a. New Administrative Building for General Office
5	SGVWC requests a budget of \$38.5 million for a new administrative building to
6	replace the two existing buildings at its headquarters. SGVWC's proposed cost of \$1,203
7	per square-foot exceeds the typical average cost of construction for commercial real
8	estate throughout the USA and specifically in the Western USA, ranging from \$80-to-
9	\$850 per square-foot. Additionally, SGVWC's proposed new building is significantly
10	oversized for its current need. Furthermore, SGWVC failed to consider other more cost-
11	effective alternatives such as purchasing an existing building. Please see Chapter 1 of Cal
12	Advocates' Report on General Office Operations, Taxes, and Special Request #4 for
13	more details.
14	b. Unreasonable Vehicle Replacement Budget
15	SGVWC requests \$9.795 million to replace several vehicles in its LA division,
16	FWC division, and General Office. However, SGVWC's request is unreasonable as it is
17	based on California Department of General Services (DGS) vehicle replacement criteria
18	that are no longer applicable and are designed to cater to DGS' specific needs given its
19	scale of fleet. In addition, SGVWC's request includes an excessive number of Zero
20	Emission vehicles which contrasts with the minimum number of such vehicles under the
21	California Air Resources Board (CARB) requirements. Therefore, SGVWC's vehicle
22	replacement budget should be reduced by 32% to \$6.707 million. Please see Chapter 9 of
23	Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant,
24	Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.
25 26 27	c. Inadequately Supported Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA) Upgrades Budget
28	SGVWC requests a total budget of \$13.4 million over the 2025-2028 GRC cycle
29	to upgrade its existing SCADA infrastructure in LA and FWC divisions. However,

- 1 SGVWC's costs estimates are based on Association for the Advanced Cost Engineering
- 2 (AACE) Class 5 category estimates which are known as "concept screening" and
- 3 associated with the lowest levels of project definition and least amount of preparation
- 4 effort. Therefore, the Commission should not require ratepayers to fund SGVWC's
- 5 request for \$13.4 million for SCADA upgrades. Please see Chapter 1 of Cal Advocates'
- 6 Report on SCADA, New Position, Customer Service, Water Quality, Special Request #1,
- 7 and ESJ Action Plan for more details.

10

11

18

25

28

d. Unreasonable Meter Replacement Request

9 SGVWC requests \$1.8 million annually for the LA division, and \$2.3 million

annually for the FWC division for its meter replacement program. However, the

- requested budget reflects an accelerated meter replacement program that would violate
- the previously Commission-approved meter replacement program pursuant to D.17-06-
- 13 008. In addition, SGVWC's proposed budget would result in early retirement of meters
- which have not yet reached their useful life. Therefore, the Commission should allow
- 15 \$0.95 million annually for the LA division, and \$0.90 million annually for the FWC
- division. Please see Chapter 5 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic
- 17 Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.

e. Inadequately supported Well Projects

- 19 SGVWC requests a total of \$8.22 million for several capital projects involving
- well drilling, equipping, and rehabilitation. However, an analysis of supply does not
- 21 justify the need for at least three wells at Plants F10, F18, and F34. Therefore, the
- 22 Commission should allow \$0.80 million for well projects. Please see Chapter 6 of Cal
- 23 Advocates' Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation,
- 24 and Rate Base for more details.

f. Poorly supported Treatment Projects

26 SGVWC requests a total of \$31.90 million for several capital projects involving

water treatments, such as ion exchange, retrofitting existing plants, and new filtration and

solid handling. However, analysis refutes the need for at least three treatment projects at

1	Plants 1, 11, and B7. Therefore, the Commission should allow \$11.08 million for
2	treatment projects. Please see Chapter 7 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital Projects,
3	Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.
4	g. Unreasonable Reservoir Projects
5	SGWVC requests a total of \$40.56 million for water reservoir projects. However,
6	three projects at Plants 7, B15, and F20 were previously funded by ratepayers but remain
7	incomplete. Similarly, two projects, F10 and F59 are multi-phased projects which will
8	not be used and useful in the GRC cycle. Therefore, the Commission should allow \$11.1
9	million for reservoir projects. Please see Chapter 8 of Cal Advocates' Report on Capital
10	Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more details.
11 12	h. Inadequately Supported Structure and Improvements Projects
13	SGVWC requests a total of \$17.942 million for multiple structure and
14	improvements projects, such as LA division's allocation of new administrative building
15	at General Office, air conditioning system, pavement replacement, and solar systems.
16	However, as discussed earlier, the Commission should not require ratepayers to fund a
17	new office building. Therefore, the Commission should allow \$1.343 million for
18	structure and improvements projects. Please see Chapter 10 of Cal Advocates' Report on
19	Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base for more
20	details.
21	D. Forecast for Expenses
22	Although utility expenses do not contain a built-in profit percentage like utility's
23	authorized capital spending, overestimating expense budgets would produce revenues in
24	excess of operating costs, which also results in unreasonable customer rates and undue
25	utility profits. The following discussion addresses SGVWC's overstatement of expenses.
26	1. General Office O&M Expenses
27	SGVWC forecasts an Operation & Maintenance (O&M) expense budget of
28	\$164,910 in TY 2026-2027. O&M expenses include payroll, materials and supplies,

- outside services, utilities and rents, and miscellaneous expenses. Cal Advocates
- 2 recommend an O&M expense budget of \$164,520 in TY 2026-2027. The difference in
- 3 budget is due to the adjustment of salaries for the new positions in General Office.
- 4 SGVWC requests eight new positions and three re-requested positions from its last GRC.
- 5 However, SGVWC fails to adequately justify the need for three of these positions,
- 6 Surveyor, Planning Manager, and Procurement Supervisor. Therefore, the Commission
- should allow \$164,520 in TY 2026-2027. Please see Chapter 1 of Cal Advocates' Report
- 8 on General Office Operations, Taxes, and Special Request #4 for more details.

2. General Office A&G Expenses

SGVWC requests an Administrative & General (A&G) expense budget of \$26.67

- million in TY 2026-2027. A&G expenses include payroll, materials and supplies,
- transportation, insurance, pensions & benefits, outside services, regulatory commission
- expenses, utilities and rents, and miscellaneous expenses. Cal Advocates recommends a
- reduced A&G expense budget of \$24.96 million in TY 2026-2027. The difference in
- budget is due to Cal Advocate's recommendation to not fund all requested new positions
- and SGVWC's request for the Retiree Health Reimbursement Arrangement (HRA)
- program. Please see Chapter 1 of Cal Advocates' Report on General Office Operations,
- Taxes, and Special Request #4 for more details.

9

19

3. Los Angeles Division O&M Expenses

- 20 SGVWC forecasts an Operation & Maintenance (O&M) expense budget of \$48.65
- 21 million in TY 2026-2027. O&M expenses include payroll, costs for purchased water,
- 22 groundwater assessments, purchased power, postage, and conservation program support
- 23 expenses. Cal Advocates recommends a lower O&M expense budget of \$45.39 million in
- 24 TY 2026-2027. The difference is due to several adjustments: 1) increase SGVWC's
- Operating Safe Yield (OSY) from its Main San Gabriel Basin that would decrease the
- 26 water supply expenses by \$1.74 million, 2) increase SGVWC's leased water forecast
- 27 from the Main San Gabriel Basin that would reduce water supply expense by \$166,540,
- 28 3) decrease the cyclic storage water forecast from \$1,015 to \$902 per acre-foot that

- 1 would reduce water supply expenses by \$467,100, and 4) decrease conservation expense
- 2 forecast from \$800,000 to \$548,920. Please see Chapter 1 of Cal Advocates' Report on
- 3 Operations and Maintenance Expenses and Administrative and General Expenses for
- 4 more details.

20

4. Los Angeles Division A&G Expenses

6 SGVWC forecasts an Administrative & General (A&G) expense budget of \$4.82

- 7 million in TY 2026-2027. A&G expenses include payroll, costs for office supplies,
- 8 property insurance, regulatory expense, and Administrative Expense Transferred. The
- 9 Commission should adopt an A&G expense budget of \$4.25 million in TY 2026-2027.
- 10 The difference in budget is due to Cal Advocates' recommendation to decrease
- SGVWC's Regulatory Expense estimates by \$92,610. SGVWC's estimates are based on
- an unrealistic and unlikely scenario of future participation in nine Order Instituting
- 13 Investigation (OII) and Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) proceedings. In addition, Cal
- 14 Advocates recommends maintaining SGVWC's current estimates of \$3.745 million for
- 15 the Administrative Expenses Transferred despite Cal Advocates' proposed reduction in
- 16 SGVWC's capital budgets as the actual capitalized labor would not be reduced due to the
- 17 lower capital budget estimates for ratemaking purposes. Please see Chapter 2 of Cal
- 18 Advocates' Report on Operations and Maintenance Expenses and Administrative and
- 19 General Expenses for more details.

5. Fontana Water Company Division O&M Expenses

- SGVWC forecasts an Operation & Maintenance (O&M) expense budget of \$46.03
- 22 million TY 2026-2027. O&M expenses include payroll, costs for purchased water,
- 23 groundwater assessments, purchased power, postage, and conservation program support
- 24 expenses. The Commission should adopt an O&M expense budget of \$42.80 million in
- 25 TY 2026-2027. The difference in budget is due to adjustments to SGVWC's water supply
- estimates from Lytle Creek, Rialto, and No-Man's Land sources. SGVWC's water supply
- estimates from these sources are much lower and invariably shifts the water supply to
- other relatively expensive sources. However, SGVWC's estimates from these three

- sources do not reflect the five-year average, which provides a better basis for future
- 2 estimates and is much higher than SGVWC's current estimates. Therefore, using a more
- 3 reasonable five-year average water supply reduces a total of \$2.83 million in water
- 4 production cost. In addition, the difference is also attributed to a decrease in conservation
- 5 expense estimates by \$269,200. Please see Chapter 3 of Cal Advocates' Report on
- 6 Operations and Maintenance Expenses and Administrative and General Expenses for
- 7 more details.

23

6. Fontana Water Company Division A&G Expenses

- 9 SGVWC forecasts an Administrative & General (A&G) expense budget of \$3.56
- million in TY 2026-2027. A&G expenses include payroll, costs for office supplies,
- property insurance, regulatory expense, and Administrative Expense Transferred. The
- 12 Commission should adopt an A&G expense budget of \$3.32 million in TY 2026-2027.
- 13 The difference in budget is due to Cal Advocates' recommendation to decrease
- 14 SGVWC's Regulatory Expense estimates by \$60.7 thousand. SGVWC's estimates are
- based on an unrealistic and unlikely scenario of future participation in nine Order
- 16 Instituting Investigation (OII) and Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) proceedings. In
- addition, Cal Advocates recommends maintaining SGVWC's current estimates of \$4.89
- million for the Administrative Expenses Transferred despite Cal Advocates' proposed
- reduction in SGVWC's capital budgets as the actual capitalized labor would not be
- 20 reduced due to the lower capital budget estimates for the ratemaking purposes. Please see
- 21 Chapter 4 of Cal Advocates' Report on Operations and Maintenance Expenses and
- 22 Administrative and General Expenses for more details.

7. New Positions in LA and FWC Divisions

- 24 SGVWC requests eight new positions: two SCADA Technicians, two SCADA
- 25 electricians, one Facilities Maintenance Supervisor, one Water Resources Project
- 26 Manager, one Water Quality Specialist, and one Water Resources Analyst. These new
- positions add a total of \$1.32 million in salaries in the TY 2026-2027. The Commission
- 28 should deny SGVWC's funding request for these new positions. The four new positions

- are related to SGVWC's proposed SCADA upgrades, which the Commission should not
- 2 require ratepayers to fund in this general rate case. The remaining four positions of
- 3 Facilities Maintenance Supervisor, Water Resources Project Manager, Water Quality
- 4 Specialist, Water Resources Analyst are inadequately supported as to their need for
- 5 operations. Please see Chapter 2 of Cal Advocates' Report on SCADA, New Position,
- 6 Customer Service, Water Quality, Special Request #1, and ESJ Action Plan for more
- 7 details.

11

19

E. Customer Service

9 Commission's General Order (GO)103A sets several performance standards for

the public utilities. Cal Advocates discovery efforts reveal that SGWVC is currently

- deficient in meeting the GO 103A Telephone Performance standard that requires a
- regulated utility to maintain a 5% or lower call abandonment rate for customer service
- calls in its FWC division. Similarly, SGVWC's Emergency Response Plan is currently
- deficient regarding its readiness to provide safe and accessible drinking water in the event
- of a natural disaster or malevolent acts. Therefore, the Commission should order
- 16 SGVWC to remedy these deficiencies in a timely manner. Please see Chapter 3 of Cal
- 17 Advocates' Report on SCADA, New Position, Customer Service, Water Quality, Special
- 18 Request #1, and ESJ Action Plan for more details.

F. Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan

- The Commission's Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan serves as
- both a commitment for furthering principles of environmental and social justice, as well
- as an operating framework with which to integrate ESJ considerations throughout the
- agency's work. The Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan, established in
- 24 2019 and updated to Version 2.0 in 2022, sets out nine goals that address health, safety,
- 25 consumer protection, programming benefits and enforcement in all CPUC regulatory
- 26 jurisdictions and sectors. The ESJ Action Plan further identifies the ESJ communities as
- 27 those disadvantage communities which are defined as census tracts that score in the top
- 28 25% of CalEnviroScreen 3.0, along with the score within the highest 5% of

1 CalEnviroScreen 3.0's Pollution Burden but which do not receive an overall

2 CalEnviroScreen score⁴.

Cal Advocates' review of SGVWC's application found deficiencies in SGVWC's adherence to the nine ESJ Action Plan Goals. First, SGVWC did not meet GO-156's supplier diversity rules in year 2022 through 2024, which require a utility to allocate at least 1.5% of its total annual procurement to Disabled Veteran Enterprises (DVEs).

Additionally, SGWVC fails to address three (goals 6, 8, and 9) out of nine ESJ goals claiming that these three goals are the sole responsibility of the Commission. ⁵

However, all ESJ goals are the responsibility of utilities and the Commission, and the utilities have a shared responsibility toward fulfilling ESJ goals. Therefore, the

11 Commission should address SGVWC's incomplete testimony on its adherence to the ESJ

12 Action Plan compliance by affirming that utilities share a responsibility with the

13 Commission to advance all goals and principles as outlined in the ESJ Action Plan.

14 Please see Chapter 3 of Cal Advocates' Report on SCADA, New Position, Customer

Service, Water Quality, Special Request #1, and ESJ Action Plan for more details.

G. Balancing Accounts and Memorandum Accounts (BAMAs)

A Balancing Account (BA) tracks authorized expenses against recorded expenses. The difference, whether positive or negative results in ratepayer surcharges (utility recovery) and surcredits (utility refund). A Memorandum Account (MA) allows a utility to track costs arising from unforeseeable events of exceptional nature. Therefore, in the rare and necessary instances, BAMAs can provide a reasonable alternative ratemaking mechanism that benefits utilities and ratepayers. However, these surcharges are becoming a significant and unanticipated burden for customers, allowing the utility to circumvent the traditional ratemaking process. BAMAs reduce ratepayer transparency and a utility's incentive to responsibly manage its expenses.

⁴ Environmental & Social Justice Action Plan, Version 2.0 at 2.

⁵ SGVWC subsequently provides details for activities it has taken under Goals 8 and 9, but Goal 6 remains unaddressed.

The Commission has authorized SGVWC to track costs in 37 BAMAs across its 1 2 LA and FWC division. As of June 2024, there is a total overcollected balance of 3 \$19,723,215.6 In its last General Rate Case (GRC), A.22-01-003, SGVWC amortized 4 \$2.46 million from BAMAs in its LA division amounting to a \$0.2205 per Ccf surcharge 5 on a customer's bill for 36 months. Similarly, in its FWC division, SGVWC amortized 6 \$2.84 million amounting to a \$0.2104 per Ccf surcharge for 12 months. Although 7 SGVWC does not request to amortize any of its surcharge accounts in this GRC, the delay in the last GRC's decision has caused these accounts to be amortized outside the 8 9 traditional ratemaking cycle. As a result, BAMAs continue to impose significant bill 10 impacts on customers without being reflected in base rate increases, reducing 11 transparency for ratepayers. 12 After a careful evaluation of SGVWC's BAMAs, Cal Advocates recommends that 13 in the LA division, the Commission should deactivate the Catastrophic Event 14 Memorandum Account- Covid 19 (CEMA) and transfer the current balance of \$64,340 15 to LA division's Previously Authorized Balances Balancing Account (PABBA), close the 16 Water Conservation Memorandum Account (WCMA) and transfer the current balance of 17 \$40,360 to PABBA, and finally, order to amortize the PABBA balance of \$99,430. In 18 SGVWC's FWC division, the Commission should deactivate the CEMA and transfer the current balance of \$52,650 to the FWC division's PABBA, close the WCMA account and 19 20 transfer the current balance of \$29,520 to PABBA, amortize the FWC division's PABBA 21 balance of \$123,860, close the Payment Option Memorandum Account (POMA) without 22 amortizing its current balance of \$44,200 as SGVWC failed to request amortization 23 within the three year mandatory timeframe, close the Land Parcel # 215 and # 221 24 Memorandum Account, and limit the recovery to the actual costs of the land parcels and 25 partial interest costs, \$162,620 and \$386,000 for the land parcels # 215, and # 221 26 respectively, when these land parcels become used and useful in the future. Please see

⁶ Most of the overcollected amount is attributed to Facilities Fee Memorandum Account in FWC division and the Commission has earmarked the use of these funds for the Summit Water Treatment Plant in FWC division per D.22-12-006. Also see SGVWC Exhibit SG-12, Attachment A.

- 1 Chapter 2 of Cal Advocates' Report on Construction Work In Progress and Balancing &
- 2 Memorandum Accounts for more details.

H. Water Quality Assessment

- 4 SGVWC, through its Special Request # 1, requests that the Commission issue a
- 5 Finding of Fact that SGVWC's LA division and FWC division have operated in
- 6 compliance with all applicable safe drinking water quality standards since its last GRC
- 7 through the submission of the evidentiary record in this proceeding. However, the
- 8 Commission should note that while Cal Advocates makes every effort to examine all
- 9 aspects of a utility's General Rate Case application, including a utility's compliance with
- water quality standards, the Commission is not the primary regulatory entity responsible
- for regulating a water utilities' compliance with water quality regulations. Therefore, Cal
- 12 Advocates relies on the latest findings of Department of Drinking Water's (DDW)
- 13 Sanitary Surveys of SGVWC's water systems. Cal Advocates' review of DDW's the
- most recent Sanitary Survey of SGVWC's water systems reveals that while DDW did
- 15 find several deficiencies for SGVWC systems in both the LA and Fontana divisions,
- 16 SGVWC issued "reply letters" to DDW demonstrating evidence that the utility took
- 17 remedial actions to rectify each of the noted deficiencies. DDW has noted that SGVWC
- generally operates well-operated and well-managed water systems. Please see Chapter 3
- of Cal Advocates' Report on SCADA, New Position, Customer Service, Water Quality,
- 20 Special Request #1, and ESJ Action Plan for more details.

21 I. Special Requests

- SGVWC identifies six specific issues as Special Request (SR) in its instant GRC.
- 23 These are generally reasonable, with the following exceptions:
- 24 Special Request #3: The Commission should grant SGVWC's Special Request #3,
- 25 except as related to SGVWC's Payment Options Memorandum Account and amortization
- of PABBA accounts as discussed in Chapter 2 Cal Advocates' Report on Construction
- Work In Progress and Balancing & Memorandum Accounts.

- 1 **Special Request #4:** The Commission should not approve SGVWC's Post-retirement
- 2 Benefits Other than Pension (PBOP) program. SGVWC's PBOP program is also known
- 3 as Retiree Health Reimbursement Arrangement (HRA) program. Please see Chapter 1 of
- 4 Cal Advocates' Report on General Office Operations, Taxes and Special Request #4 for
- 5 more details.

LIST OF CAL ADVOCATES REPORTS AND WITNESSES

The following Table ES-2 identifies the various Cal Advocates reports and witnesses that provide analysis and recommendations relevant to the requests made by SGVWC in the current proceeding:

4 5

1

2

3

Table ES-2: Cal Advocates Reports and Witnesses

Cal Advocates Witness	Report Title
Andrew Sweeney	Report on Sales & Revenues and Rate Design
Meghan Tosney	Report on Capital Projects, Historic Rate Base, Utility Plant, Depreciation, and Rate Base
Andrew Rubang	Report on Construction Work In Progress and Balancing & Memorandum Accounts
Zaved Sarkar	Report on General Office Operations, Taxes, and Special Request #4
Anthony Andrade	Report on Operations and Maintenance Expenses and Administrative and General Expenses
Timothy Gee	Report on SCADA, New Position, Customer Service, Water Quality, Special Request #1, and ESJ Action Plan
Mehboob Aslam	Project Lead, Executive Summary & Results of Operations Tables

6

8

RESULTS OF OPERATIONS TABLES

7 In developing the following Results of Operations ("RO") Tables, Cal Advocates

utilized the RO Model provided by SGVWC. Cal Advocates' adjustments reflect the

9 recommendations presented in its testimony.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DIVISION RESULTS OF OPERATIONS TABLES

Los	Angeles County Division				
San Gabriel V	alley Water Company A.25-	01-001			
	Table 1-1				
Summary of Earni	ngs - Test Year 2026-2027 Pro	esent Rates			
Description				Cal Advocates	
Operating Revenues	103,967,802	104,647,652	(679,849)	-0.7%	
Operating Expenses:					
Purchased Water & Assessments	19,936,219	17,374,283	2,561,937	12.9%	
Purchased Power	8,052,415	8,052,415	0	0.0%	
Chemicals	4,239,830	4,254,449	(14,619)	-0.3%	
Payroll	6,746,315	6,249,257	497,058	7.4%	
Materials & Supplies	2,514,653	2,507,810	6,843	0.3%	
Transportation	1,246,999	1,246,999	0	0.0%	
Insurance	2,641,385	2,609,789	31,597	1.2%	
Pensions & Benefits	3,231,092	2,963,386	267,707	8.3%	
Uncollectibles	84,063	84,679	(616)	-0.7%	
Franchise Fees	921,658	928,412	(6,754)	-0.7%	
Regulatory Commission Expense	229,769	137,159	92,610	40.3%	
Outside Services	3,239,593	3,239,593	0	0.0%	
Utilities & Rents	2,300,157	2,300,157	0	0.0%	
Miscellaneous Expense	1,677,704	1,426,624	251,080	15.0%	
Administrative Expense Transferred	(3,745,304)	(3,745,305)	0	0.0%	
Operating Expenses Subtotal	53,316,550	49,629,708	3,686,842	6.9%	
Allocated Common Expenses	13,436,039	12,994,830	441,209	3.3%	
Total Operating Expenses	66,752,589	62,624,538	4,128,051	6.2%	
Depreciation	12,627,289	11,722,013	905,276	7.2%	
Ad Valorem Taxes	3,182,385	2,718,551	463,834	14.6%	
Payroll Taxes	1,253,630	1,193,232	60,398	4.8%	
Total Expenses before Income Taxes	83,815,893	78,258,334	5,557,559	6.6%	
Net Revenue Before Income Taxes	20,151,910	26,389,318	(6,237,408)	-31.0%	
State Income Tax	816,345	1,676,390	(860,045)	-105.4%	
Federal Income Tax	2,487,632		(1,562,741)	-62.8%	
Total Expenses	87,119,870	83,985,097	3,134,773	3.6%	
Net Operating Revenues	16,847,933	20,662,555	(3,814,622)	-22.6%	
Rate Base	337,749,338	268,897,404	68,851,933	20.4%	
Rate of Return	4.99%	7.68%	-2.70%		

Los Angeles County Division San Gabriel Valley Water Company A.25-01-001 Table 1-2 Summary of Earnings - Test Year 2026-2027 Proposed Rates Description SGVWC Cal Advocates SGVWC > Cal Advocates Operating Revenues 117,726,296 105,155,819 12,570,476 10.7% Operating Expenses: Purchased Water & Assessments 19,936,219 17,374,283 2,561,937 12.9% Purchased Power 0.0% 8,052,415 8,052,415 0 Chemicals 4,239,830 4,254,449 (14,619)-0.3% Payroll 7.4% 6,746,315 6,249,257 497,058 Materials & Supplies 0.3% 2,514,653 2,507,810 6,843 Transportation 0.0% 1,246,999 1,246,999 Insurance 1.2% 2,641,385 2,609,789 31,597 Pensions & Benefits 3,231,092 2,963,386 267,707 8.3% Uncollectibles 96,529 11.8% 85,139 11,390 Franchise Fees 11.8% 1,058,339 933,460 124,879 Regulatory Commission Expense 229,769 137,159 92,610 40.3% **Outside Services** 0.0% 3,239,593 3,239,593 0 Utilities & Rents 2,300,157 2,300,157 0 0.0% Miscellaneous Expense 251,080 15.0% 1,677,704 1,426,624 Administrative Expense Transferred 0.0% (3,745,304)(3,745,305)Operating Expenses Subtotal 53,465,697 7.2% 49,635,216 3,830,481 Allocated Common Expenses 13,436,039 12,994,830 441,209 3.3% **Total Operating Expenses** 66,901,736 62,630,047 4,271,690 6.4% Depreciation 905,276 7.2% 12,627,289 11,722,013 Ad Valorem Taxes 3,182,385 2,718,551 463,834 14.6% Payroll Taxes 1,253,630 1,193,232 60,398 4.8% Total Expenses before Income Taxes 83,965,040 78,263,843 6.8% 5,701,197 Net Revenue Before Income Taxes 33,761,256 26,891,977 6,869,279 20.3% State Income Tax 2,019,412 1,720,825 298,587 14.8% Federal Income Tax 5,345,595 4,155,931 1,189,663 22.3% Total Expenses 91,330,046 84,140,599 7,189,447 7.9% Net Operating Revenues 26,396,250 21,015,220 5,381,030 20.4% Rate Base 337,749,338 268,897,404 68,851,933 20.4% Rate of Return 7.82% 7.82% 0.00%

Los Angeles County Division San Gabriel Valley Water Company A.25-01-001 Table 1-3 Summary of Earnings - Escalation Year 2027-2028 Present Rates Description SGVWC SGVWC > Cal Advocates Cal Advocates Operating Revenues 117,730,752 104,119,851 13,610,901 11.6% Operating Expenses Purchased Water & Assessments 14.3% 19,922,165 17,069,020 2,853,145 Purchased Power 8,046,738 7,910,936 135,803 1.7% Chemicals 1.3% 4,320,307 4,262,040 58.268 Payroll 553,717 8.0% 6,964,163 6,410,446 Materials & Supplies 0.9% 2,585,041 2,561,711 23,330 Transportation 0.6% 1,281,904 1,273,801 8,103 Insurance 2,734,603 2,684,933 49,670 1.8% Pensions & Benefits 8.9% 3,335,428 3,039,821 295,607 Uncollectibles 12.8% 96,533 84,201 12,333 Franchise Fees 1,058,383 923,169 135,214 12.8% Regulatory Commission Expense 40.3% 229,769 137,159 92.610 **Outside Services** 0.6% 3,379,840 21,051 3,358,789 **Utilities & Rents** 0.6% 2,364,542 2,349,595 14,947 Miscellaneous Expense 1,724,665 1,457,287 267,378 15.5% Administrative Expense Transferred (3,850,140)0.6% (3,825,803)(24,337)Operating Expenses Subtotal 8.3% 54,193,943 49,697,104 4,496,839 Allocated Common Expenses 13,812,132 538,000 3.9% 13.274.132 **Total Operating Expenses** 68,006,075 62,971,236 5,034,839 7.4% Depreciation 13,603,948 12,221,026 1,382,922 10.2% Ad Valorem Taxes 3,395,164 2,785,763 17.9% 609,401 Payroll Taxes 5.4% 1,294,111 1,224,009 70,102 Total Expense before Income Taxes 86,299,298 79,202,034 7,097,264 8.2% Net Revenue Before Income Taxes 31,431,454 24,917,817 6,513,637 20.7% State Income Tax 1,768,592 1,574,602 193,990 11.0% Federal Income Tax 4,568,146 982,067 21.5% 3,586,079 Total Expenses 92,636,036 8,273,321 8.9% 84,362,715 Net Operating Revenues 21.3% 25,094,716 19,757,136 5,337,580 Rate Base 361,373,094 24.3% 273,405,838 87,967,256 Rate of Return 6.94% 7.23% -0.28%

L	os Angeles County Division			
San Gabrie	l Valley Water Company A.25-	01-001		
	Table 1-4			
Summary of Earning	s - Escalation Year 2027-2028	Proposed Rates		
Description	SGVWC	Cal Advocates	SGVWC > Cal Ad	lvocates
Operating Revenues	122,266,492	106,440,442	15,826,050	12.9%
Operating Expenses				
Purchased Water & Assessments	19,922,165	17,069,020	2,853,145	14.3%
Purchased Power	8,046,738	7,910,936	135,803	1.7%
Chemicals	4,320,307	4,262,040	58,268	1.3%
Payroll	6,964,163	6,410,446	553,717	8.0%
Materials & Supplies	2,585,041	2,561,711	23,330	0.9%
Transportation	1,281,904	1,273,801	8,103	0.6%
Insurance	2,734,603	2,684,933	49,670	1.8%
Pensions & Benefits	3,335,428	3,039,821	295,607	8.9%
Uncollectibles	100,643	86,303	14,340	14.2%
Franchise Fees	1,103,442	946,222	157,220	14.2%
Regulatory Commission Expense	229,769	137,159	92,610	40.3%
Outside Services	3,379,840	3,358,789	21,051	0.6%
Utilities & Rents	2,364,542	2,349,595	14,947	0.6%
Miscellaneous Expense	1,724,665	1,457,287	267,378	15.5%
Administrative Expense Transferred	(3,850,140)	(3,825,803)	(24,337)	0.6%
Operating Expenses Subtotal	54,243,113	49,722,260	4,520,852	8.3%
Allocated Common Expenses	13,812,132	13,274,132	538,000	3.9%
Total Operating Expenses	68,055,244	62,996,392	5,058,852	7.4%
Depreciation	13,603,948	12,221,026	1,382,922	10.2%
Ad Valorem Taxes	3,395,164	2,785,763	609,401	17.9%
Payroll Taxes	1,294,111		70,102	5.4%
Total Expense before Income Taxes	86,348,467		7,121,277	8.2%
Net Revenue Before Income Taxes	35,918,025	27,213,252	8,704,773	24.2%
State Income Tax	2,165,205	1,777,519	387,686	17.9%
Federal Income Tax	5,510,326	4,068,121	1,442,205	26.2%
Total Expenses	94,023,998		8,951,169	9.5%
Net Operating Revenues	28,242,494	21,367,613	6,874,881	24.3%
Rate Base	361,373,094	273,405,838	87,967,256	24.3%
Rate of Return	7.82%	7.82%	0.00%	

FONTAN WATER COMPNAY DIVISION RESULTS OF OPERATIONS TABLES

	ana Water Company Division			
San Gabriel	l Valley Water Company A.25-	01-001		
	T-bl- 4 F			
Cumma wu of Fow	Table 1-5	noont Dates		
-	nings - Test Year 2026-2027 Pro		CC)////C > Cal A	ducactac
Description On antion Description	SGVWC	Cal Advocates	SGVWC > Cal Ac	
Operating Revenues	97,013,293	97,875,040	(861,747)	-0.9%
Operating Expenses				
Purchased Water & Assessments	25,335,472	22,504,613	2,830,859	11.2%
Purchased Power	7,509,694	7,509,694	0	0.0%
Chemicals	758,625	762,232	(3,607)	-0.5%
Payroll	6,728,482	6,584,402	144,080	2.1%
Materials & Supplies	1,793,927	1,793,927	0	0.0%
Transportation	1,383,513	1,383,513	0	0.0%
Insurance	2,686,990	2,674,274	12,716	0.5%
Pensions & Benefits	3,239,856	3,155,562	84,294	2.6%
Uncollectibles	140,012	141,267	(1,255)	-0.9%
Franchise Fees	651,163	656,999	(5,836)	-0.9%
Regulatory Commission Expense	227,613	166,925	60,688	26.7%
Outside Services	2,628,878	2,628,878	0	0.0%
Utilities & Rents	187,360	187,360	0	0.0%
Miscellaneous Expense	1,103,980	834,781	269,199	24.4%
Administrative Expense Transferred	(4,885,109)	(4,885,109)	(0)	0.0%
Operating Expenses Subtotal	49,490,456	46,099,316	3,391,140	6.9%
Allocated Common Expenses	13,275,768	12,839,822	435,946	3.3%
Total Operating Expenses	62,766,224	58,939,138	3,827,086	6.1%
Depreciation	11,996,453	11,379,455	616,998	5.1%
Ad Valorem Taxes	3,068,841	2,724,681	344,160	11.2%
Payroll Taxes	1,231,843		21,803	1.8%
Total Expenses before Income Taxes	79,063,362		4,810,047	6.1%
Net Revenue Before Income Taxes	17,949,931	23,621,725	(5,671,794)	-31.6%
State Income Tax	451,760	1,208,384	(756,624)	-167.5%
Federal Income Tax	2,269,419	3,617,785	(1,348,366)	-59.4%
Total Expenses	81,784,541	79,079,483	2,705,058	3.3%
Net Operating Revenues	15,228,752	18,795,557	(3,566,805)	-23.4%
Rate Base	304,681,575	261,857,308	42,824,266	14.1%
Rate of Return	5.00%	7.18%	-2.18%	

Fontana Water Company Division San Gabriel Valley Water Company A.25-01-001 Table 1-6 Summary of Earnings - Test Year 2026-2027 Proposed Rates Description SGVWC Cal Advocates SGVWC > Cal Advocates Operating Revenues 109,348,456 100,274,253 9,074,203 8.3% Operating Expenses Purchased Water & Assessments 25,335,472 2,830,859 11.2% 22,504,613 Purchased Power 0.0% 7,509,694 7,509,694 Chemicals -0.5% 762,232 (3,607)758,625 Payroll 144,080 2.1% 6,728,482 6,584,402 Materials & Supplies 0 0.0% 1,793,927 1,793,927 0.0% Transportation 1,383,513 1,383,513 0 Insurance 2,674,274 12,716 0.5% 2,686,990 Pensions & Benefits 3,239,856 3,155,562 84,294 2.6% Uncollectibles 8.4% 13,213 157,973 144,760 Franchise Fees 734,694 673,246 61,449 8.4% Regulatory Commission Expense 60,688 26.7% 227,613 166,925 **Outside Services** 0.0% 2,628,878 2,628,878 0 **Utilities & Rents** 0.0% 187,360 187,360 Miscellaneous Expense 24.4% 1,103,980 834,781 269,199 Administrative Expense Transferred (4,885,109)(4,885,109)0.0% Operating Expenses Subtotal 7.0% 49,591,948 46,119,057 3,472,892 Allocated Common Expenses 13,275,768 435,946 3.3% 12,839,822 Total Operating Expenses 62,867,716 58,958,879 3,908,838 6.2% Depreciation 11,996,453 11,379,455 616.998 5.1% Ad Valorem Taxes 3,068,841 2,724,681 344,160 11.2% Payroll Taxes 1,231,843 1.8% 1,210,040 21,803 Total Expenses before Income Taxes 79,164,854 6.2% 74,273,055 4,891,799 Net Revenue Before Income Taxes 30,183,603 26,001,198 4,182,404 13.9% State Income Tax 1,533,217 1,418,730 114,487 7.5% Federal Income Tax 14.9% 4,838,490 4,117,474 721,016 Total Expenses 5,727,302 6.7% 85,536,561 79,809,258 Net Operating Revenues 23,811,896 20,464,995 3,346,901 14.1% Rate Base 14.1% 304,681,575 261,857,308 42,824,266 Rate of Return 7.82% 7.82% 0.00%

Fontana Water Company Division San Gabriel Valley Water Company A.25-01-001 Table 1-7 Summary of Earnings - Escalation Year 2027-2028 Present Rates Description SGVWC Cal Advocates SGVWC > Cal Advocates Operating Revenues 110,023,875 99,077,511 10,946,364 9.9% Operating Expenses Purchased Water & Assessments 3,428,118 13.4% 25,497,740 22,069,622 Purchased Power 7,557,792 7,364,540 193,252 2.6% Chemicals 2.1% 778,525 762,224 16,300 Payroll 148,124 2.1% 6,917,357 6,769,233 0 0.0% Materials & Supplies 1,836,571 1,836,571 0.0% Transportation 1,416,400 1,416,400 Insurance 2,770,478 2,757,367 13.111 0.5% Pensions & Benefits 86,661 2.6% 3,330,802 3,244,141 Uncollectibles 15,939 10.0% 158,956 143,017 Franchise Fees 739,268 74,127 10.0% 665,142 Regulatory Commission Expense 60,688 26.7% 227,613 166,925 **Outside Services** 0.0% 2,731,591 2,731,591 **Utilities & Rents** 191,813 191,813 0 0.0% Miscellaneous Expense 1,130,223 854,624 275.599 24.4% Administrative Expense Transferred 0.0% (5,001,233)(5,001,232)Operating Expenses Subtotal 8.6% 50,283,896 45,971,977 4,311,919 Allocated Common Expenses 13.145.038 446,309 3.3% 13.591.346 **Total Operating Expenses** 63,875,242 59,117,015 4,758,227 7.4% Depreciation 12,904,439 11,925,341 979,098 7.6% Ad Valorem Taxes 3,197,898 2,720,829 477,070 14.9% Payroll Taxes 1,266,422 1,244,007 22,415 1.8% Total Expense before Income Taxes 81,244,001 75,007,191 6,236,810 7.7% Net Revenue Before Income Taxes 28,779,874 24,070,320 16.4% 4,709,554 State Income Tax 1,392,540 1,281,454 111,086 8.0% Federal Income Tax 4,298,933 3,554,090 744,843 17.3% 8.2% Total Expenses 86,935,474 79,842,735 7,092,739 Net Operating Revenues 16.7% 23,088,401 19,234,776 3,853,625 Rate Base 334,315,047 17.9% 274,383,802 59,931,246 Rate of Return 6.91% 7.01% -0.10%

Fontana Water Company Division San Gabriel Valley Water Company A.25-01-001 Table 1-8 Summary of Earnings - Escalation Year 2027-2028 Proposed Rates Description **SGVWC** Cal Advocates SGVWC > Cal Advocates Operating Revenues 114,391,964 102,252,507 12,139,457 10.6% Operating Expenses Purchased Water & Assessments 25,497,740 22,069,622 3,428,118 13.4% Purchased Power 2.6% 7,557,792 193,252 7,364,540 Chemicals 2.1% 778,525 762,224 16,300 Payroll 6,769,233 148,124 2.1% 6,917,357 Materials & Supplies 1.836.571 1.836.571 0.0% Transportation 1,416,400 1,416,400 0.0% Insurance 0.5% 2,770,478 2,757,367 13.111 Pensions & Benefits 3,330,802 3,244,141 86,661 2.6% Uncollectibles 17,676 10.7% 165,316 147,640 Franchise Fees 768,848 686,642 82,206 10.7% Regulatory Commission Expense 60,688 26.7% 227,613 166,925 **Outside Services** 2,731,591 2,731,591 0.0% Utilities & Rents 191,813 191,813 0 0.0% Miscellaneous Expense 1,130,223 854,624 275,599 24.4% Administrative Expense Transferred (5,001,233)(5,001,232)0.0% (0)Operating Expenses Subtotal 50,319,836 45,998,101 4,321,735 8.6% Allocated Common Expenses 13,145,038 446,309 3.3% 13,591,346 **Total Operating Expenses** 63,911,182 59,143,138 4,768,044 7.5% Depreciation 7.6% 12,904,439 11,925,341 979,098 Ad Valorem Taxes 3,197,898 2,720,829 477,070 14.9% Payroll Taxes 1.8% 1,266,422 1,244,007 22,415 Total Expense before Income Taxes 7.7% 81,279,941 75,033,315 6,246,626 Net Revenue Before Income Taxes 17.8% 33.112.023 27.219.192 5.892.831 State Income Tax 1,775,502 1,559,814 215,688 12.1% Federal Income Tax 5,208,684 4,215,353 993,331 19.1% Total Expenses 88,264,128 80,808,482 7,455,645 8.4% Net Operating Revenues 21,444,025 17.9% 26,127,837 4,683,812 Rate Base 334,315,047 274,383,802 59,931,246 17.9% Rate of Return 7.82% 7.82% 0.00%

1		STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
2		MEHBOOB ASLAM
3 4 5	Q.1 A.1	Please state your name and business address. My name is Mehboob Aslam. My business address is 320 West 4th Street, Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA 90013.
6	Q. 2	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
7 8	A. 2	I am employed by the California Public Utilities Commission as a Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst (PURA)-V.
9	Q. 3	Please briefly describe your educational background and work experience.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 23 24	A. 3	I graduated from the University of Engineering & Technology, Lahore, Pakistan, with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Mechanical Engineering, and also graduated from Western Kentucky University with a Master of Science Degree in Business Administration with an emphasis in Accounting and Finance. I have been employed by the CPUC since 2001. From 2001 through 2002, I was a member of the Consumer Protection and Safety Division, where I was responsible for energy utilities' operating practices to enforce the rules and regulations relating to the safe use of the plant and workforce. I performed engineering reviews and conducted incident investigations for both gas and electric utilities. I have also helped resolve customers' complaints. From 2002 through the present, I have been working for the Public Advocates Office in its Water Branch, mostly dealing with Class-A water utilities. I have performed evaluations of public utility plants and properties, regulation of utility tariffs and rates, studies of the cost of service, and studies of the utility's operating practices to enforce the rules and regulations relating to ratemaking. I have presented my findings and recommendations as an expert witness at public hearings before the Commission. I have also been actively involved with a few of Commission's OIR/OII proceedings.
27	Q. 4	What is your area of responsibility in this proceeding?
28 29	A. 4	I am a project coordinator in the GSWC Sutter Pointe GRC proceeding and responsible for Executive Summary and Results of Operations Tables.
30	Q. 5	Does this conclude your prepared testimony?
2 1	۸ 5	Ves it does