



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**07/03/20
11:41 AM

July 3, 2020

Agenda ID #18596
Quasi-Legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 17-06-024:

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Martha Guzman Aceves. 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 August 6, 2020 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 of record may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

/s/ ANNE E. SIMON

Anne E. Simon
Chief Administrative Law Judge

AES:avs

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES**
(Mailed 7/3/2020)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking
Evaluating the Commission's 2010
Water Action Plan Objective of
Achieving Consistency between Class
A Water Utilities' Low-Income Rate
Assistance Programs, Providing Rate
Assistance to All Low - Income
Customers of Investor-Owned Water
Utilities, and Affordability.

Rulemaking 17-06-024

DECISION AND ORDER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
DECISION AND ORDER.....	1
Summary	2
1. Background.....	3
1.1. Policy Background.....	3
1.2. Factual and Procedural Background.....	4
2. Issues Before the Commission	10
3. Coordination of Issues Between Statewide Water Legislation and Commission-Regulated Water Utilities	14
4. Party Comments.....	16
4.1. 2017 and 2018 Comments.....	17
4.2. Comments on the 2019 Workshops and Workshop Reports.....	33
4.2.1. Water Sales Forecasting Comments	34
4.2.2. WRAM Comments.....	37
4.2.3. Tier 1 Water Usage and Water Baselines Comments	39
4.2.4. Low-Income Water Program Name Comments.....	40
4.2.5. Low-Income Multi-Family Housing Pilots Comments.....	41
4.2.6. Reporting Mechanism Comments.....	43
4.2.7. Water Consolidation Timeline Comments.....	43
4.2.8. Utility Affiliate Transaction Rule Comments	45
4.2.9. Safe Drinking Water Loan Funds Comments.....	45
5. Water Sales Forecasting	45
5.1. Requiring Specific Factors in Future Sales Forecasts	46
5.1.1. Short Term Forecasting.....	46
5.2. Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms	47
5.2.1. Transitioning WRAM Utilities to Monterey-Style WRAM	48
5.2.2. GRC Decisions Subsequent to D.12-04-048 Have Not Resolved Whether to Continue Implementing the WRAM/MCBA Mechanism.....	52
5.2.3. The WRAM/MCBA Ratemaking Mechanism is Not Necessary to Achieve Conservation.....	54
5.2.4. Because the WRAM/MCBA Mechanism is Implemented Through a Balancing Account, There are Intergenerational Transfers of Costs	56
5.2.5. Transition to a Monterey-Style WRAM.....	56

5.2.6. For Utilities Without WRAM/MCBA Mechanisms, Accurate Forecasts of Water Sales in General Rate Cases Places Added Significance on the Reliability of the Adopted Forecasts 57

5.2.7 Lost Revenue Due to Reduced Sales During Droughts..... 58

5.2.8. Modifications are needed to the WRAM Process for it to Continue 59

6. Tier 1 Water Usage and Water Baselines 60

7. Consistent Terminology All Water Utilities Should Use for Low-Income Water Programs 61

8. Low-Income Multi-Family Housing Pilots..... 64

9. Reporting Mechanisms 65

10. Water Consolidation Timelines 68

10.1. Existing Guidance for Water Consolidation Timelines 68

10.2. Streamlining Requirements 70

10.3. Maintenance of At-Risk Timeline 76

10.3.1. Identification of Opportunities for Consolidation..... 79

11. Utility Affiliate Transaction Rules and Safe Drinking Water Loan Funds..... 79

12. Next Steps 80

12.1. Phase II Scoping Memo and Ruling Directing Covid-19 Related Reporting..... 80

12.2. Alignment with Statewide Programs and Processes 81

13. Conclusion 82

14. Comments on Proposed Decision 82

15. Assignment of Proceeding..... 83

Findings of Fact..... 83

Conclusions of Law 85

ORDER..... 87

Appendix A - Style Reference Tables

DECISION AND ORDER

Summary

This decision resolves Phase I issues in this proceeding. This decision evaluates the sales forecasting processes used by water utilities and concludes that, after years as a pilot program, the Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms have proven to be ineffective in achieving its primary goal of conservation. This decision therefore identifies other benefits the Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms provide that are better achieved through the Monterey-Style Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms and requires water utilities to propose Monterey-Style Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms in future general rate cases. This decision also:

- (1) directs water utilities to provide analysis in their next general rate case to determine the appropriate Tier 1 rate breakpoint that aligns with the baseline amount of water for basic human needs for each ratemaking area;
- (2) adopts consistent terminology for low-income rate assistance programs for all Commission-regulated water utilities and directs the creation of a low-income multi-family housing rate assistance pilot;
- (3) authorizes a pilot program that provides a discount to water users in low-income multi-family dwellings that do not pay their water bill directly through the utility; and
- (4) directs standardized reporting requirements to be followed by water utilities and provides direction with respect to specific information required to streamline consideration of consolidation requests.

This proceeding will remain open upon issuance of this decision to consider Phase II issues.

1. Background

1.1 Policy Background

In December 2005, the Commission adopted a Water Action Plan (Plan) setting forth its policy objectives for the regulation of investor-owned water utilities and highlighting the actions that the Commission anticipated or would consider taking in order to implement these objectives. The primary goal was two-fold: apply regulatory best practices from the energy utilities to the water utilities and to place water conservation at the top of the loading order as the best, lowest-cost supply.

Among the energy industry's best practices to be incorporated into the water industry was to assist low-income ratepayers struggling with payments for basic monthly water service. Similar to the Commission's practices in the telecommunications and energy industries, the Plan provides for the Commission to develop options to increase affordability of water service for these customers as well as provide specific emphasis on water conservation programs for low-income water customers.

In 2010, the Commission updated the Plan (2010 Update) in response to the severe drought conditions within the state. Among the action items added in the 2010 Update was to develop standardized tariff discounts and eligibility criteria for Class A water utilities' low-income rate assistance program.

Currently, there are nine Class A water utilities under the Commission's jurisdiction. They are: Liberty Utilities (Apple Valley Ranchos Water) Corp., California Water Service Company, California-American Water Company, Golden State Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company, Liberty Utilities

(Park Water) Corp., San Gabriel Valley Water Company, San Jose Water Company (SJWC), and Suburban Water Systems.¹

1.2. Factual and Procedural Background

On June 29, 2017, the Commission opened this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) to evaluate the Commission's objective of achieving consistency between Class A water utilities' low-income rate assistance programs, evaluate affordability, and providing rate assistance to all low-income customers of investor-owned water utilities.

Currently, each Class A water utility has an individualized low-income rate assistance program which was established on a case-by-case basis, as part of the utility's general rate case (GRC). There is no standardization among these programs.² Each program differs in its name, availability of monthly discounts, and recovery of costs. Therefore, one objective we set in this proceeding was to explore the feasibility of achieving consistency among low-income rate assistance program for of all the Class A water utilities and to examine whether allowing for greater pooling within utilities and across utilities could allow a more comprehensive low-income rate assistance program.³

¹ Liberty Utilities Company acquired Class A water utilities Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company and Park Water Company at the end of 2015 (Decision (D.)15-12-029) and continues to operate them as distinctly separate Class A water utilities.

² See, Appendix A of Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) adopted June 29, 2017 (Rulemaking (R.) 17-06-024).

³ We noted when we began this review that there were no rate-assistance programs for low-income ratepayers of most Class B, C, and D utilities. These small water utilities serve a total of about 50,000 customers, with many of these utilities serving very few customers. While estimating the number of low-income customers served is difficult in the aggregate for Class B, C, and D water utilities, we hope those utilities will use the best practices identified by participants in this proceeding to best serve low-income customers of those Class B, C, and D utilities.

The Commission specifically sought input from water utilities regarding: (1) establishing a uniform low-income rate assistance program name for investor-owned utilities; (2) effectiveness of current programs; (3) the design of the monthly discount to low-income customers; and (4) recovery of program costs, as well as other issues regarding implementation, consolidation of systems, and administration for smaller water utilities in addition to the jurisdiction issues.⁴

On July 27, 2017, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) noticed the first of five workshops to be held jointly with the State Water Resources Control Board (Board) on access and affordability of safe, clean, and reliable drinking water. These joint workshops were designed for the Board and the Commission to receive public input on how the current efforts could be strengthened and made more successful related to water utilities' low-income assistance programs, affordability, and consolidation efforts as a means of providing safe drinking water. The first two workshops were held on August 17, 2017, and November 13, 2017.

A Staff Report summarizes the input received during the two initial workshops⁵ and concluded that, as part of the effort to ensure the long-term sustainability of drinking water in California, consolidation has been and will

⁴ See, Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 241 ("Water corporation' includes every corporation or person owning, controlling, operating, or managing any water system for compensation within this State."), Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 261(a) ("Public utility' includes every ... water corporation ... where the service is performed for, or the commodity is delivered to, the public or any portion thereof."), *Indep. Energy Producers Ass'n, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 125 Cal. App. 4th 425, 442 (Cal. Ct. App. 2004) (citing *Allen v. R.R. Comm'n*, 179 Cal. 68, 85, 89, 175 P. 466 (Cal. 1918); *Associated Pipe Line Co. v. R.R. Comm'n* 176 Cal. 518, 523 (1917); *Frost v. R.R. Comm'n*, 197 Cal. 230, 236, 240 P. 26 (1925), *rev'd on other grounds*, 271 U.S. 583 (1926)) (there must be "a dedication to public use to transform [a] private business[] into a public utility.").

⁵ The Staff Report summarizing inputs from the two initial workshops was attached as Appendix B to the Scoping Memo issued on January 9, 2018, in this proceeding.

continue to be an important tool to address the many issues struggling water systems face. That Staff Report also finds that to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water for all of California, many tools will be needed, including consolidation and a stable funding source such as the Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Fund.⁶

Comments to the OIR were filed on August 16 and 21, 2017,⁷ and reply comments on September 7, 2017.⁸ On September 11, 2017, a prehearing conference (PHC) was held to determine parties, discuss the scope, the schedule, and other procedural matters. The assigned Commissioner issued the Scoping Memo and Ruling on January 9, 2018, and an Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling on July 9, 2018, to include two additional issues (Scoping Memo and Amended Scoping Memo, respectively). The Amended Scoping Memo also set the initial statutory deadline for this proceeding of January 8, 2020.

Comments on issues identified in the Scoping Memo and on the Staff Report on the two initial joint workshops were due February 23, 2018. Comments were filed by California-American Water Company, California Water

⁶ See, Stats. 2019, ch. 120 (An act to add Section 53082.6 to the Government Code, to amend Sections 39719, 100827, 116275, 116385, 116530, 116540, and 116686 of, and to add Chapter 4.6 (commencing with Section 116765) to Part 12 of Division 104 of, the Health and Safety Code, and to add Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 8390) to Division 4.1 of the Public Utilities Code, relating to drinking water, making an appropriation therefor, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.).

⁷ Opening Comments on the OIR were filed by California-American Water Company, California Water Association, Center for Accessible Technology, Consumer Federation of California Foundation, Golden State Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company, International Bottled Water Association and California Bottled Water Association, The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission, San Gabriel Valley Water Company, and Southern California Edison Company.

⁸ Reply Comments on the OIR were filed by California Water Association and Great Oaks Water Company.

Association, Center for Accessible Technology, Consumer Federation of California Foundation, Great Oaks Water Company, the Joint Advocates (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability, Community Water Center, and the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment and Security),⁹ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission (the Public Advocates), and San Gabriel Valley Water Company.

California Water Association, the Public Advocates, Great Oaks Water Company, the Joint Advocates (The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment and Security, National Resources Defense Council, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability, Center for Accessible Technology, and Community Water Center), and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) also filed comments on the two additional issues included in the Amended Scoping Memo. Reply comments to the Amended Scoping Memo were filed by the California Water Association.

On December 18 and 19, 2018, the assigned ALJ issued rulings to provide notice of a joint workshop with the Board on January 14, 2019, to (a) receive information and assess issues pertaining to water sales forecasting, rising drought risks, and water conservation and impacts to water costs for customers, especially low-income customers; (b) determine how an improved, reliable water forecasting can enhance affordable pricing for low-income customers; and (c) receive public input on how to strengthen water forecasting and make affordability more successful.

⁹ Throughout this proceeding the Joint Advocates submitted comments in various combinations of parties; the specific signatories to each filing are identified herein with each comment.

On the same date as the workshop, January 14, 2019, a status conference was held to discuss the status of the proceeding, potential revisions to the proceeding scope, and the timeline for concluding the proceeding. On January 22, 2019, California Water Association and Eastern Municipal Water District submitted comments on the topics enumerated in the ruling setting the status conference.

Following the January 14, 2019, joint workshop, the Commission's Water Division staff prepared a Staff Report resulting from that workshop. On March 20, 2019, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling inviting comments on that Staff Report and noticed three additional workshops to be held in 2019. That Staff Report summarized the January 14, 2019, workshop presentations and concludes that as drought conditions are becoming the norm, water utility management of the drought impacts is critical. This third workshop highlighted the unique risks to small water systems and noted the successes larger water utilities had managing drought impacts in their service areas. That Staff Report finds that (a) additional collaboration will be needed to improve sales forecasting in a way that accounts for the reality of decreasing water supplies and use in California, and does not place all the financial risk on the customers; and (b) continuing communication between the Commission and the Board will be necessary to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water for all of California. The California Water Association filed comments on April 5, 2019, in response to that Staff Report.

On May 2, 2019, a fourth joint workshop was held focused on rate design and basic low-income water rates. Thereafter, the Commission's Water Division staff prepared another Staff Report resulting from that workshop on water rate design for a basic amount of water at a low quantity rate. On June 21, 2019, the

assigned ALJ issued a ruling modifying the procedural schedule and inviting comments on this latest Staff Report. This Staff Report noted that the workshop had identified a number of challenges in determining a basic quantity due to varying income and household size, and master-metered properties. Parties at the workshop agreed that basic quantities are an important factor for improving water affordability for low-income customers. Though disagreeing on rate design for low-income customers, parties did provide many rate design ideas and issues for our consideration. Parties also agreed any low-income program for multi-family properties should be designed to ensure eligible customers directly receive the benefit, but there was no agreement on how that could be achieved. Participants agreed that there was a tension between conservation pricing and affordability and offered different solutions to balance those considerations.

Comments were filed on July 10, 2019, by the California Water Association, the Center for Accessible Technology and Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security (Joint Comments), the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission, and Southern California Edison Company. Reply comments were filed on July 24, 2019, by the California Water Association, the Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability, Community Water Center, and Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security (Joint Reply Comments), and the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission.

On August 2, 2019, a fifth joint workshop was held focused on potential changes to enhance water affordability. This workshop consisted of three panels, the first focused on Low Income Rate Assistance (LIRA), the second addressed drought forecasting mechanisms, and the third discussed consolidation of small

water systems. Another staff report was prepared by the staff of the Water Division following this fifth workshop. On September 4, 2019, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling inviting comments on the latest staff report as well as the Public Review Draft, Achieving the Human Right to Water in California, an Assessment of the State's Community Water Systems, issued in August 2019, by the Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment, California Environment Protection Agency.

Comments were filed on September 16, 2019, by California Water Association, Center for Accessible Technology, Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission, and Southern California Edison Company. Reply comments were filed on September 23, 2019, by California Water Association and Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission.

On October 11, 2019, Rulemaking (R.) 17-06-024 was reassigned to ALJ Robert W. Haga. D.19-12-062 extended the statutory deadline in this proceeding from January 8, 2020, to July 8, 2020. On May 26, 2020, ALJ Camille Watts-Zagha was co-assigned to this proceeding.

On June 2, 2020, the assigned Commissioner and ALJ issued a Second Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling (Second Amended Scoping Memo) directing comments to consider potential Commission response to COVID-19. This Second Amended Scoping Memo added and initiated Phase II in this proceeding as we were already addressing many of the subjects impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic as part of this Rulemaking. The Second Amended Scoping Memo extends the statutory deadline for this proceeding to December 2, 2021.

2. Issues Before the Commission

The Commission launched this rulemaking to (1) better understand the differences between Class A water utilities' low-income rate programs;

(2) evaluate whether consistency between the Class A water utilities' low-income rate programs is feasible; (3) if so, how such consistency can be attained; (4) assess whether other water companies meet the definition of a public utility under the Commission's jurisdiction; and (5) examine issues concerning affordability of clean and safe drinking water for low-income and disadvantaged communities, including greater pooling and consolidation.

As part of this rulemaking the Commission sought to continue its efforts consistent with Cal. Water Code Section 106.3 (Stats. 2012, ch. 524) and the human right to water for all Californians to ensure that low-income customers and disadvantaged communities have safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes.

After reviewing comments filed in response to the OIR as well as input from the first two joint workshops, PHC statements, and discussion at the prehearing conference, the January 9, 2018, Scoping Memo provided greater focus on the issues to be considered. Specifically, the Scoping Memo described the issues to be addressed in the proceeding included an examination of low-income rate assistance programs for Class A and B water utilities to determine whether consistency among low-income rate assistance programs for all low-income water ratepayers can be established. Further, an examination of regionalization and consolidation (including voluntary and virtual) of at-risk water systems by regulated water utilities, in addition to forecasting and affordability issues. The Scoping Memo also called for consideration of whether other water companies qualify as public utilities under the Commission's jurisdiction for purposes of assessing a public purpose surcharge. The Scoping Memo sought input from parties and respondent Class A and B water utilities on the following issues in the first phase of the proceeding:

1. Consolidation of at-risk water systems by regulated water utilities:
 - a. How could the Commission work with the SWRCB and Class A and B water utilities to identify opportunities for consolidating small non-regulated systems within or adjacent to their service territories that are not able to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water? Should the Commission address consolidation outside of each utility's GRC?
 - b. In what ways can the Commission assist Class A and B utilities that provide unregulated affiliate and franchise services to serve as administrators for small water systems that need operations & maintenance support as proscribed by Senate Bill (SB) 552 (2016)?
2. Forecasting Water Sales:
 - a. How should the Commission address forecasts of sales in a manner that avoids regressive rates that adversely impact particularly low-income or moderate-income customers?
 - b. In D.16-12-026, adopted in R.11-11-008, the Commission addressed the importance of forecasting sales and therefore revenues. The Commission, in D.16-12-026, directed Class A and B water utilities to propose improved forecast methodologies in their GRC application[s]. However, given the significant length of time between Class A water utility GRC filings, and the potential for different forecasting methodologies proposals in individual GRCs, the Commission will examine how to improve water sales forecasting as part of this phase of the proceeding. What guidelines or mechanisms can the Commission put in place to improve or standardize water sales forecasting for Class A water utilities?
3. What regulatory changes should the Commission consider to lower rates and improve access to safe quality drinking water for disadvantaged communities?

4. What if any regulatory changes should the Commission consider that would ensure and/or improve the health and safety of regulated water systems?

In addition, the Scoping Memo set forth the following issues would be addressed in 2019 workshops and additional comments from parties:

1. Program Name;
2. Effectiveness of LIRA Programs;
3. Monthly Discounts;
4. Program Cost Recovery;
5. Commission Jurisdiction Over Other Water Companies; and
6. Implementation of Any Changes to Existing LIRA Programs.

After the Scoping Memo was issued, Governor Brown signed Assembly Bill (AB) 1668 and Senate Bill (SB) 606 in 2018, codifying various water management planning criteria.¹⁰ Specifically, Water Code Section 10609.4(a) established a 55 gallons per day per capita standard for indoor residential water use until January 1, 2025.¹¹ In addition, questions had been raised about municipal water company access to data needed to ensure discounts reach customers who need them. Therefore, the July 9, 2018, Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling added the following two issues for would be the focus of the 2018 portion of this proceeding:

1. How best to consider potential changes in rate design such that there is a basic amount of water that customers receive at a low quantity rate; and

¹⁰ Stats. 2018, Ch. 14 (SB 606 requires the State Water Resources and Control Board (Board) and Department of Water Resources to adopt water efficiency regulations, outlines requirements for urban water suppliers including urban drought risk assessments, and implements penalties for violations.) Stats. 2018, Ch. 15. (AB 1668 codified the Governor's May 2016 Making Water Conservation a California Way of Life Executive Order B-37-16.)

¹¹ Cal. Water Code § 10609.4(a) (after 2025 the standard is reduced to 52.5 gallons per day per capita until 2030 when it is further reduced to 50 gallons per day per capita).

2. Whether the ... Commission should adopt criteria to allow for sharing of low-income customer data by regulated investor-owned energy utilities with municipal water utilities.

The Second Amended Scoping Memo, issued on June 20, 2020, added and initiated Phase II in this proceeding to consider potential Commission response to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, this decision will not be addressing and resolving those Phase II issues.

3. Coordination of Issues Between Statewide Water Legislation and Commission-Regulated Water Utilities

The resolution of three of the scoped issues in particular will be guided by adopted or pending legislation, or regulatory processes of other California regulatory agencies.

State policy through AB 685 (Stats. 2012, Ch. 524) aims to ensure universal access to water. In furtherance of that goal, AB 401, the LIRA Act (Stats. 2018, Ch. 662) requires the Board to develop a plan for funding and implementation of a statewide low-income water rate assistance program and report to the legislature on the feasibility, financial stability, and desired structure of the program, including and recommendations for legislative action that may need to be taken. On February 25, 2020, the Board released its final recommendations to implement a statewide low-income water rate assistance program.¹² The Board recommends the creation of a statewide water rate assistance program funded through taxes on personal income, business income, and bottled water, as most

¹² See, AB 401 Final Report: Recommendations for Implementation of a Statewide Low-Income Water Rate Assistance Program, available at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/conservation_portal/assistance/docs/ab401_report.pdf

systems are not able to fund low-income assistance programs. For qualifying customers, the program recommended by the Board will support bill discounts, crisis assistance, and a tax credit for renters who pay for their water indirectly through rent. These bill discounts are modeled on the low-income assistance program for customers of Commission-regulated energy utilities, and the crisis assistance is modeled on the federal energy crisis program known as Low-Income Heating and Assistance Program (LIHEAP). The Board estimates the first-year cost for the Board recommended program, including administrative costs, at \$606 million.

In addition, in 2019, the Legislature adopted SB 200 (States. 2019, Ch. 120) which provides up to \$130 million annually for the next 10 years to provide safe drinking water to disadvantaged communities that currently do not have access to safe drinking water. The Board will administer the program and will prioritize solutions for those most impacted by unsafe and unaffordable drinking water.

As discussed above, conservation legislation was also adopted in 2018, codifying the Governor's May 2016 Making Water Conservation a California Way of Life Executive Order.¹³ In response, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the State Water Board developed new standards for: indoor residential water use; outdoor residential water use; commercial, industrial, and institutional (CII) water use for landscape irrigation with dedicated meters; water loss; and urban water suppliers annual water budgets. In addition, water suppliers will need to report on the implementation of new performance measures for CII water use.

¹³ AB 1668 and SB 606.

The conservation legislation also made important changes to existing urban and agricultural water management planning, and enhanced drought preparedness and water shortage contingency planning for both urban water suppliers, as well as small water systems and rural communities.

DWR is responsible for numerous studies and investigations over the next three years, the development of standards, guidelines and methodologies, performance measures, web-based tools and calculators, data and data platforms, reports and recommendations to the State Water Board for adoption of new regulations.

All of these standards and tools are intended to help water suppliers to forecast their supplies and demands with greater accuracy, which will then benefit revenue forecasts.

4. Party Comments

Initial comments responding to the rulemaking and responding to the Scoping Memo and Amended Scoping Memo illuminated the benefits of adopting a consistent terminology for low-income rate assistance programs across water utilities.

Those comments also identified the Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms (WRAMs) as one way we could further adapt our policies to changing conditions while still allowing utilities the ability to earn a reasonable rate of return and keep rates just and reasonable.

In addition, parties highlighted the reality that drought is the new normal in California and that forecasts need to be more accurate so that WRAMs can be smaller, and that the Monterey-style WRAM would provide better incentives for parties to more accurately forecast sales while still providing the utility the ability to earn a reasonable rate of return. Accordingly, we sought specific input

on whether the Commission should require all utilities to use Monterey-Style WRAMs with Incremental Cost Balancing Account (ICBA), and whether such a transition should occur in the context of the utilities' next GRC.

4.1. 2017 and 2018 Comments

The 2017 and 2018 comments are summarized below.

California-American Water Company set forth two considerations it saw as important in discussing a statewide low-income water program. First, the statewide program should not result in a reduction to current assistance California-American Water Company provides its low-income customers. Second, the statewide program should avoid any increased obligation for funding of California-American Water Company's other customers. California-American Water Company also identified sales forecasting as an important issue for this rulemaking to explore as the "long-standing problem of forecasting future sales ... has been heightened by periods of drought and issues related to very substantial balances in the Water Revenue Mechanism Accounts." California-American Water Company supported a uniform name for all water utility low-income customer assistance programs and identified program structure targeting extremely low-income customers for assistance, data sharing with energy utilities, and marketing, as keys to program effectiveness. California-American Water Company also expressed support for the monthly discount being calculated as a percentage of the monthly bill and that the current \$1.21 per month surcharge to non-LIRA customers is reasonable and should not increase.

California-American Water Company expressed concern about the current process for obtaining authorization to acquire and consolidate smaller systems highlighting the importance of receiving authorization for consolidation during

the acquisition approval process. California-American Water Company also stated that it cannot provide operation and maintenance services on a temporary basis in the current environment (*see*, SB 552), noting in particular the affiliate transaction rules discourage such actions.

California-American Water Company asked the Commission to allow it and other water utilities to recalculate its sales forecast on an annual basis rather than the current six-year cycle (from start to finish) based on the current GRC process. California-American Water Company also stated that common sense drives the use of smaller triggers and more complete adjustments as such changes will provide greater precision and accuracy in forecasting as drought years become more prevalent. California-American Water Company urged the Commission to continue focusing on individual affordability while supporting needed investments to provide safe, clean water. California-American Water Company asked the Commission to continue to encourage acquisition and consolidation of systems that lack sufficient technical, managerial, or financial expertise, as well as addressing forecasting issues to improve price signals created by rates and authorizing reasonable rates of return to encourage prudent investment and acquisitions.

California-American Water Company asked that this Commission continue its support for water utility access to low-interest loans and grants where appropriate. Where California-American Water Company did not provide specific comment, it generally noted agreement with the comments of California Water Association on those matters.

California Water Association supported the goals of the OIR and stated the primary objective should be to balance the purpose of the benefits against the burdens to pay for and administer the programs. California Water Association

urged coordination with the Board and Legislature to achieve the goal of establishing a uniform program meeting the needs of low-income customers.

California Water Association recommended the Commission adopt the nomenclature of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Water Foundation and water utilities in other states – Customer Assistance Program, or CAP. They recommended this program name as it avoids any stigma that might come from using “low-income” and avoids using the word “rates,” which distracts from the underlying purpose of the program – assisting households that have trouble meeting essential living expenses, of which water is just one. California Water Association urged the Commission to refrain from creating verification protocols used by energy utilities given the relative lack of economies-of-scale of the water utilities.

California Water Association noted the ease of both the fixed dollar discount and percentage discount methods though both methods come with different drawbacks. California Water Association stated that a flat discount calculated by the same method (*e.g.*, 20 percent of the typical residential bill in the service area) would capture the benefits and be advantageous for both customers and utilities and would have minimal impact on conservation messaging and programming. However, California Water Association cautioned that customers will not care about the methodology, but will focus on whether the method changes their current bill, and noted that any change will result in some customers seeing a decrease in benefits and surcharges, and an increase for others.

California Water Association urged caution in applying uniform standards for surcharges in multi-district Class A water utilities but supported establishment of a statewide low-income water customer assistance program.

California Water Association did not support requiring Class B, C, and D water utilities to establish customer assistance programs. California Water Association noted the comments of other parties provided helpful information on existing low-income customer assistance programs, the challenges implementing these programs, and issues of concern. California Water Association supported workshops to explore and define the issues presented fully and carefully.

California Water Association urged the Commission to coordinate closely with the Board regarding the consolidation of systems that are not able to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water. California Water Association noted it supports consolidation as a means to assist communities that are not able to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water on their own, with proper incentives in place. California Water Association noted there have been more than 30 acquisitions of small systems by larger Commission-regulated water utilities over the past decade, and the Commission should focus its efforts in this areas on working to streamline the processes for physical and ratemaking consolidation, and ensuring proper incentives are provided for regulated water utilities to undertake such efforts. California Water Association noted the substantial risk that comes with acquiring troubled utility systems and the need for efficient and timely action by the Commission.

With respect to changes to water sales forecasting, California Water Association reiterated some of the recent history and changes to water sales forecasting and urged continuing the flexible alternative forecasting methodologies that take into account the impact of drought, conservation government mandated reductions, and economic developments. California Water Association urged the Commission remove restrictions on sales reconciliation mechanism implementation that tie to a drought period and allow

utilities to implement a modified sales reconciliation mechanism that captures more of the revenue differences between earlier forecasts and actual sales.

California Water Association called for the removal of the five percent trigger and the fifty percent adjustment limitation. California Water Association also called for folding the WRAM/Modified Cost Balancing Accounts (MCBA) recovery into base rates instead of surcharges. California Water Association argued these changes will send more accurate pricing conservation signals to customers, ameliorate intergenerational risk, help utilities avoid large WRAM/MCBA surcharges, and reduce confusion about cost-of-service ratemaking.

In addition, California Water Association argued there is no need to consider rate design changes to address the requirement for a basic amount of water at a low quantity rate as the concept is already part of existing water rate designs, and the issue should continue to be addressed in GRCs. California Water Association also expressed concern that adopting a single standard will have unintended consequences such as higher prices in upper tiers, greater fluctuations in revenue, larger WRAM balances, distorting price signals, and will miss many low-income individuals that live in multi-unit buildings that are not sub-metered.

California Water Association agreed with the privacy concerns expressed by Southern California Edison Company and thought the issue of sharing information with municipal utilities is best addressed by the Board in its rulemaking; to the extent it is pursued, the Commission should look to the framework it has already established for sharing such information with Commission-regulated water utilities.

Center for Accessible Technology supported the use of a uniform program name that is not LIRA, as it will help customers understand that the program is widely available, which is particularly useful for customers who move between jurisdictions. Center for Accessible Technology advocated structuring discounts to provide essential supplies of water at reduced rates, while allowing higher rates for water supplies that go beyond basic needs, essentially reinforcing an inverted block rate structure. Center for Accessible Technology argued other subsidy options might be less effective in supporting the two policy goals of affordability for essential supplies of water and establishment of rates that promote conservation. Center for Accessible Technology argued for the creation of broad cost recovery with pooled funding as the most equitable and fair cost recovery option. Center for Accessible Technology also supported efforts to promote consolidation of water systems to improve water quality and address affordability.

Center for Accessible Technology urged the Commission to focus the use of its rate design authority to support affordable access to necessary supplies of drinking water. Center for Accessible Technology stated the existing inverted tier block structure, in particular, can be used to ensure the affordability of the first allocation of water, which should be sufficient, at minimum, to satisfy a household's essential indoor usage needs. Center for Accessible Technology argued it would be appropriate for the Commission to consider more targeted use of its rate design authority as an independent mechanism to support affordability.

Consumer Federation of California Foundation urged the Commission to consider proper cost allocation, appropriate definitions, the broad jurisdiction of the Commission, and various components of the assistance programs. Consumer

Federation of California Foundation argued the Commission has broad authority to create a program to assist low-income water customers and that include other water companies not regulated by the Commission. Consumer Federation of California Foundation argued such companies can be required to participate either directly or through selective jurisdiction in any public assistance program the Commission creates.

Consumer Federation of California Foundation agreed that a common name should be adopted and suggested either the California Alternative Rates for Water (CARW) or Water Rate Assistance Program (WRAP) as appropriate program names. Consumer Federation of California Foundation suggested the effectiveness of assistance programs be measured through metrics that include participation rate, the improvement in water burden, and positive impacts on arrearage and disconnection rates.

Consumer Federation of California Foundation stated that ultimate effectiveness will need to be shown through the impact on water affordability. Consumer Federation of California Foundation offered a range of affordability thresholds between 1.5-3 percent of income, and that an effective program will have a water burden no greater than the agreed-upon target value.

Consumer Federation of California Foundation noted the ease of both the fixed dollar discount and percentage discount methods though both methods come with different drawbacks. Consumer Federation of California Foundation advocated for the adoption of some form of rate similar to the communications Lifeline program wherein a discounted rate would apply to a basic service volume and agreed that it is more practical to administer the percentage/proportional approach.

Consumer Federation of California Foundation supported the prospect of pooled low-income assistance funding, noting though that more information is needed to fully evaluate such a proposal. Consumer Federation of California Foundation agreed that any changes to the water sales forecasting process limit any annual rate increase to twice the demonstrated rate of median household income growth.

Golden State Water Company joined in the comments filed by California Water Association and added details about its low-income program and suggested that sales forecast changes be addressed in the “Balanced Rates” OIR and that the directions of D.16-12-026 be implemented before determining the need to revisit sales forecasting methodology in this proceeding.

Golden State Water Company expressed concern that a uniform program name may create potentially unmet customer expectations of a uniform level of assistance. Golden State Water Company stated that since the implementation of data sharing with the large Commission-regulated energy companies (D.11-05-020), its penetration rates have increased and that it believes its current program has been effective.

Golden State Water Company offered limited support for serving as administrators of small water systems that need operations and maintenance support, qualifying its support upon achieving no cost to the Class A water utilities’ stakeholders.

Great Oaks Water Company also joined in the comments filed by California Water Association and provided additional comments of its own. Great Oaks Water Company urged coordination with the activities of the Board under California Water Code § 189.5. Great Oaks Water Company argued the Commission and the Class A water utilities have long been leaders in ensuring

the human right to water, and industry-wide solutions should not be assumed, as company-specific customer assistance needs should be examined closely. Great Oaks Water Company stated that assessing whether other water companies meet the definition of a public utility is not difficult but should be decided on a case-by-case determination of whether the company is dedicated to public use.

Great Oaks Water Company agreed that “Customer Assistance Program” would be an appropriate uniform name for all companies to use. Great Oaks Water Company stated the current methodology it uses is highly effective in identifying and enrolling eligible customers and was made more effective through the coordination with the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) program enabled in D.11-02-020.

Great Oaks Water Company urged that whatever changes the Commission makes that simplicity in presenting the result to the customer should be an important component. Great Oaks Water Company argued that a flat dollar amount is most appropriate and easily administered by utilities and customers.

Great Oaks Water Company urged the Commission to closely coordinate with the Board with respect to the consolidation of systems that are not able to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water and be cognizant of the measurable risk undertaken by the acquiring company. Great Oaks Water Company also urged the Commission to evaluate the results of D.16-12-026 with respect to sales forecasting before making additional changes in this proceeding. Great Oaks Water Company reiterated that there is no “one size fits all” solution for reducing water use and that there are pros and cons to any sales forecasting methodology. Great Oaks Water Company urged the Commission to not adopt even more rigid rules simply to change the problems caused by the current set of

rigid rules. Great Oaks Water Company also argued that any low-income financial assistance program is unworkable unless the resident/tenant of a multi-family location receives a bill from the water company. Great Oaks Water Company urged the Commission to consider rate design issues in GRCs and not in rulemakings. Finally, Great Oaks Water Company argued D.11-05-020 already addressed the data-sharing issues, and the Commission should not spend time addressing data sharing with non-jurisdictional municipal utilities.

International Bottled Water Association and California Bottled Water Association stated the Commission does not have jurisdiction over bottled water companies and therefore cannot impose public purpose or extraction fees on packaged bottled water products made by these businesses or bottled water end-users.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission noted the statutory directives to the Commission with respect to communication and energy utilities are detailed and comprehensive, which contrast with the general and brief direction applicable to water utilities low-income rate assistance.¹⁴ Nonetheless, the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission argued that Pub. Util. Code § 739.8 provides valuable guidance in the development and evaluation of potential changes to existing low-income water programs. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission stated the need to consider the differences in water needs caused by geography, climate, and the ability of the community to support the programs that are unique to water utilities.

¹⁴ Pub. Util. Code §§ 739.1-739.5, 739.9, and §§ 871 *et. seq.*, *cf.*, Pub. Util. Code § 739.8.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission agreed that a common name for low-income water programs should be adopted and recommended including the term “water” in the program name to help distinguish it from other Commission low-income programs. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also recommended specific guidance be provided with respect to any metrics adopted to measure the effectiveness of the program specifically recommending participation rate be calculated as a percentage of total residential customers. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also argued that participation rate on its own is not a meaningful measurement of effectiveness and that the Commission should evaluate and refine the reporting requirement to ensure it can evaluate the effectiveness based on the community being served.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recommended the Commission continue to evaluate consolidation and operator/administrator situations on a case-by-case basis. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recommended expanding the requirement for Class A water utilities to identify adjacent systems, and clarified that the requirement is to report more than just those that present opportunities for interconnection or acquisition in order to get a better picture of potentially vulnerable systems. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also recommended the Commission cross-check the adjacent system information provided by Class A water utilities with the Board’s data set that summarizes the compliance status of drinking water systems throughout the state as a starting point for identifying possible acquisition or consolidation candidates.

Further, the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recommended that forecasting of customer demand should proceed independent of affordability programs, and that throughout the process, the Commission should maintain a focus on overall bill impacts. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recognizes that forecast variance is inevitable in rate-of-return regulation, but that the impact on water utilities has been muted as the result of the WRAM decoupling mechanism in California. While the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recognized that large WRAM balances are not solely caused by a large variance in forecasted sales, it argued that by mitigating the consequences of inaccurate sales forecasts, WRAM and other decoupling mechanisms exacerbate the actual size of the variance. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also urges the Commission to instruct regulated water systems to provide in GRCs the historical data on service interruptions in order to create a repository of information from which longitudinal studies of safety and reliability performance could be conducted.

Finally, the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recommended the Commission provide (1) a starting point for determining the per capita amount for a low quantity rate to be utilized as part of each GRC process, (2) guidance regarding methods for determining the appropriate assumption for household size in each ratemaking area, (3) guidance regarding tier breakpoints, and (4) guidance regarding the percent difference in pricing between tiers. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also supported expanding data sharing between energy utilities and municipal water utilities to improve outreach and enrollment in low-income customer assistance programs, as long as it is done in compliance with Commission

decisions¹⁵ and state privacy requirements,¹⁶ and proper cybersecurity measures are in place. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission agreed that those requirements are met when a customer consents to the data sharing and the Commission can modify the CARE application to specifically allow customers to opt-in to data sharing when they apply to CARE.

San Gabriel Valley Water Company provided a summary of its low-income rate assistance program and proposed moving cost recovery from the individual utility to a broad, more diverse population across the entire state. San Gabriel Valley Water Company stated that based on its high participation rates, it serves a lower-income customer base in each of its divisions when compared to other water utilities regulated by the Commission, and a more traditional means of low-income assistance or statewide customer assistance program would provide many benefits such as (1) a “one-stop shop” for all utility low-income programs would simplify the process and encourage greater participation, (2) a reduction in confusion about multiple applications, (3) comprehensive, coordinated outreach, (4) mitigate abuses by customers and streamline administration for utilities, and (5) remove duplicate administrative structures across utilities. Therefore, San Gabriel Valley Water Company supported consolidating utility low-income rate assistance programs. San Gabriel Valley Water Company also supported a program where Class A and B water utilities would report to the Board all water purveyors within or adjacent to their service territories in order to identify high-cost, small-customer base water systems and purveyors unable to provide safe, reliable, and

¹⁵ *Citing*, D.11-07-056, D.11-05-020, and D.14-05-016.

¹⁶ *Citing*, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1798.24, 1798.82, and Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 8380.

affordable drinking water for possible acquisition. San Gabriel Valley Water Company argued that the Commission should grant exemptions to the non-tariffed products and services rules in specific cases to encourage Class A and B water utilities to serve as administrators for small water systems pursuant to SB 552. Finally, San Gabriel Valley Water Company supported the Commission re-examining its current rate design policies as long as it did so with the goal of encouraging conservation, while at the same time providing a sufficient amount of water to meet essential needs at an affordable rate, and enabling the utility to generate its revenue requirement without unduly burdening one class of customer to the benefit of another. Further, San Gabriel Valley Water Company agreed that authorizing Sales Reconciliation Mechanisms during drought periods will help mitigate the regressive nature of rates caused by amortizing high WRAM and Drought Lost Revenue Memorandum Account (DLRMA) balances.

Southern California Edison Company agreed a consistent naming convention would be beneficial to both utilities and customers. It uses the "CARE" name for its low-income program at its Catalina Water system to provide a consistent marketing message, name recognition, enrollment, and billing for customers across its electric, gas and water utilities on Catalina and recommends the CARE name would make sense for all other water utilities for those reasons. Southern California Edison Company acknowledged the various pros and cons to dollar-based and percentage-based discount methodologies, and noted that it currently utilizes a percentage discount on its water (and electric) rates and would need to consider how to shift customers to a flat dollar discount for its Catalina Water customers should such a change be required.

Southern California Edison Company stated that there is no one-size-fits-all answer when it comes to rate design and supported establishing guidelines for water utilities to consider when designing low-income rate assistance programs during each utilities' respective GRC proceedings. Further, Southern California Edison Company stated that it is important for each water utility to be given the flexibility to study its system and create a rate design, including establishing a Tier 1 amount reflective of the essential needs of customers in the system as part of a GRC.

Southern California Edison Company outlined a number of legal and policy hurdles in sharing customer data with municipal water systems and suggested a better approach would be to allow CARE customers to opt-in to data sharing when they apply to CARE and permit the sharing of their names and addresses with other utilities or municipalities to enroll them in assistance programs. Finally, Southern California Edison Company argued that this proceeding was not the best forum to consider data access issues for municipalities because the Commission has specifically rejected the question,¹⁷ and there is a process to overturn or reconsider Commission decisions.

The Joint Advocates (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability, Community Water Center, and Pacific Institute) cautioned against privatization of public utilities and urged that when consolidation or acquisition does occur that appropriate language outreach and meaningful community involvement should occur. The Joint Advocates urged the Commission to work with the Board to create guidelines on best practices for consolidations and urged the Commission to independently explore opportunities for extension of service to

¹⁷ *Citing*, D.14-05-016 at 35-36

residents currently served by domestic wells. The Joint Advocates encouraged coordination with the Board with respect to its information on systems that face affordability problems or challenged to meet the requirement to provide safe, reliable, and affordable drinking water.

In addition, the Joint Advocates encouraged the Commission to use the output of SB 244 commissions formed by cities, counties, and local agencies to identify disadvantaged communities within their jurisdiction and/or sphere of influence as a source to identify small rural communities that are struggling with failing water and wastewater services.

The Joint Advocates also called for moving to a system of consumption-based fixed rates, and if that isn't feasible, capping fixed charges at 30% of revenue, and pre-approving drought surcharges that could be enacted as soon as a drought begins, limited to the second tier of use and above. The Joint Advocates also sought additional indicators to measure affordability: First, the general system-level unaffordability metric would measure when the bill for meeting minimum indoor needs is unduly burdensome for median-income households in the service area; Second, the Low-Income System Unaffordability metric would measure when the bill for meeting minimum indoor needs is manageable for median-income households, but unduly burdensome for low-income households; and Third, the Household Unaffordability metric would measure when a household has difficulty paying their bill, regardless of whether it is affordable for others in their service area with higher incomes. They offer different strategies to address each of these measurements.

Additionally, the Joint Advocates (The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment and Security, National Resources Defense Council, Leadership Counsel for Justice

and Accountability, Center for Accessible Technology, and Community Water Center) urged the Commission to develop a program to make water affordable to low-income customers without sacrificing conservation goals. The Joint Advocates also urged caution before enshrining a 55 gallons per capita per day standard for essential indoor water use as low-income households tend to be low-volume users, and the average use in California is currently below that threshold.

They also encouraged the Commission when adopting any standard to consider special cases such as where some low-income households have higher-than-average water needs because of outdated appliances, unrepaired leaks, medical conditions, special work needs, or a large number of occupants. The Joint Advocates encouraged the Commission to expand the Energy Savings Assistance Program (ESAP) to water conservation and efficiency. Finally, the Joint Advocates found promise in sharing information with municipal water utilities, but sought safeguards to ensure personal information is not shared beyond the utilities serving a given customer before such sharing of information was allowed.

4.2. Comments on the 2019 Workshops and Workshop Reports

California Water Association, the Center for Accessible Technology and Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security (Joint Comments), the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission, and Southern California Edison Company submitted comments. Reply comments were filed on July 24, 2019, by the California Water Association, the Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability, Community Water Center, and Pacific

Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security (Joint Reply Comments), and the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission.

4.2.1. Water Sales Forecasting Comments

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission called for the Commission to require each Class A Water utility in its GRC application to use a Sales Forecasting Model that accounts for at least the following factors:

- The impact of proposed revenue allocation and rate design on sales and revenue collection;
- The impact of planned conservation programs;
- Changes in customer counts;
- Previous and upcoming changes to building codes requiring low flow fixtures and other water-saving measures, as well as any other relevant code changes;
- Local and statewide trends in consumption;
- Demographics, climate, population density, and historic trends, by ratemaking area; and
- Past sales (of more than one year).

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also called for ensuring that sales forecasting occur exclusively in GRCs, be done by ratemaking district, and include drought years when assessing historic data. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission sought to maintain transparency, accountability, and public participation opportunities for discussions of possible changes in sales forecasting process and procedures, and minimize rate changes outside of GRCs. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission encouraged the Commission to evaluate the accuracy of sales forecast models on an ongoing basis for continuous improvement. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also sought to have sales addressed by tier, and possibly link Tier 1 breakpoints

to projected essential use quantities or assumed indoor water usage. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission stated that rates per tier should be assessed, and not determined exclusively as a percentage of Standard Quantity Rates (SQRs). The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission encouraged the Commission to require water utilities to evaluate and measure the effectiveness of conservation programs. Further, the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission stated the Commission should update the rate case plan to provide relevant guidance for sales forecasting, particularly since the rate case plan was last modified in 2007 and has not been updated to account for changes to sales forecasting due to recent drought events, legislation declaring conservation as a way of life, and the addition of WRAMs.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission noted that it had recently recommended budget forecasts larger than those proposed by water utilities in GRCs in order to account for known and measurable cost increases that, in the utilities proposals, that would have resulted in rate increases via existing mechanisms that operate outside of GRCs. To increase the transparency of rate impacts, the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission argues the Commission should reduce the number of alternative ratemaking mechanisms like WRAM rather than creating new ones like SRM. Further, the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission argued utilities should not propose, and the Commission should not adopt sales forecasts with any particular rate outcome in mind. Instead of lowering noticed rate impacts with higher than reasonable sales forecasts and allowing new mechanisms to “stagger the impact on customers into smaller increments” as suggested by California Water Association, the Public Advocates Office of the

Public Utilities Commission suggested water utilities should propose accurate forecasts openly and transparently in GRCs. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission stated that customers should not be required to face the continued uncertainty of stealth rate increases that accompany the operation of existing – much less new – alternative rate mechanisms.

California Water Association called for the Commission to require each Class A Water utility in its GRC application to use a Sales Forecasting Model that accounts for at least the following factors:

- The impact of proposed revenue allocation and rate design on sales and revenue collection;
- The impact of planned conservation programs;
- Changes in customer counts;
- Previous and upcoming changes to building codes requiring low flow fixtures and other water saving measures, as well as any other relevant code changes;
- Local and statewide trends in consumption;
- Demographics, climate, population density, and historic trends, by ratemaking area; and
- Past sales (of more than one year).

The Joint Advocates (Center for Accessible Technology, Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability, Community Water Center, and Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security) called for consideration of short-term sales forecasting (on a 3-5 year time horizon) and long-term demand forecasting (on a time horizon of approximately 30 years) as distinct issues. The Joint Advocates claimed that there has been a historic tendency to overestimate future demand in long-term demand forecasting because of a failure to incorporate the effect of water efficiency standards and codes. The Joint Advocates stated that to account for efficiency improvements,

forecasters should consider the various end uses of water by examining the stock and efficiency of appliances as well as behavioral aspects of water use, such as shower duration and frequency. They noted this approach is described in detail in the Water Research Foundation's 2018 report, Integrating Water Efficiency into Long-Term Demand Forecasting.

Southern California Edison Company called for the Commission to provide flexibility to water utilities to develop water sales forecasts based on individual water system characteristics, forecast period, data availability, and purpose of the forecast. Southern California Edison Company stated that multiple mechanisms are available for implementation that would improve the accuracy of sales forecasts and evaluate the potential for future drought when forecasting water sales. Southern California Edison Company noted that one option for improving the accuracy of a sales forecast is to shorten the forecast period. Southern California Edison Company also noted that an annual drought forecast approach is reasonable as predicting environmental and water conditions three years into the future is increasingly difficult. Southern California Edison Company claimed such an approach also supports utilities producing sales forecasts on an annual basis.

4.2.2. WRAM Comments

California Water Association argues that it is procedurally improper to seek to modify several final Commission Decisions in this proceeding, and that the WRAM/MCBA does not relate to the scope of this low-income proceeding. California Water Association strongly objects to reverting full WRAM/MCBA utilities to a Monterey Style WRAM/ICBA ratemaking mechanism. California Water Association contends that the Monterey Style WRAM does not fulfill the purpose of the full WRAM as it is a rate design tool and does not decouple sales

from revenues. California Water Association explains that financial stability is supported by the existence of WRAM, and that it allows utilities to implement conservation rates.

However, California Water Association opines that if the Commission decided to revert existing WRAM/MCBA utilities to Monterey-Style WRAM/ICBA, that should occur in the context of each utility's GRC as each utility faces different circumstances. Accordingly, California Water Association recommends a showing that such specific circumstances warrant such a transition.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission contended there should be a clear change in policy and existing WRAM/MCBA utilities should be converted to Monterey-Style WRAM/ICBA. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission also supported implementation of this proposed change in each utility GRC. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission argued that use of the Monterey-Style WRAM is superior as sales risk is not with ratepayers but with the utility. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission further stated that a full WRAM/MCBA does not account for other impacts on sales such as economic cycles and weather, which should be considered a general business risk.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission explained that because some fixed costs are included in the quantity revenues, that by providing total recovery of all quantity sales, WRAM is providing revenue recovery of estimated fixed costs, not actual. Consequently, when the estimated fixed cost portion of quantity rates does not occur, WRAM still provides recovery of these costs.

Southern California Edison Company recommended that changes in water decoupling programs should be on a case-by-case basis. Southern California Edison Company stated that implementing a change to a Monterey-Style WRAM may balance the benefits and risks of implementing a conservation rate design more equitably among stakeholders. Southern California Edison Company noted that WRAM is similar to energy sales programs and permits investment in infrastructure and conservation-related programs.

4.2.3. Tier 1 Water Usage and Water Baselines Comments

California Water Association recommends that the first tier in water usage would be set at a baseline rate for affordability and conservation purposes. However, California Water Association does not support setting a standard rate that would apply to all utilities noting that every utility, and even utility districts, is different with different use characteristics and average customer usage. California Water Association opposes setting this first-tier rate to reflect only variable costs, and no fixed costs, as this shifts all fixed cost recovery to higher tiers and other customers. California Water Association would not request utilities to develop rates based on the household size as gathering and verifying household size and data and enforcing household size rules would be extremely difficult and contentious.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission agreed with California Water Association regarding not setting the first-tier usage at a standard amount, which is a position also advocated by Southern California Edison Company. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission argued that the Commission should require utilities to provide analysis in their GRCs to determine the baseline amount that would be Tier 1 usage for a particular service area. The Public Advocates Office of the Public

Utilities Commission argued that Tier 1 rates should consider not only variable costs but also whether an amount of fixed costs should also be included. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission opined that limiting the number of large households in higher tiers will help to provide essential usage to these customers.

Center for Accessible Technology supported a calculation of Essential Indoor Usage (EIU) based on household size and average usage in a water utility service area. The EIU would determine baseline amounts of water and would vary among utility service areas due to variances in local climates, demographics, and other factors. The baseline would always exceed a specified amount as an absolute baseline. Center for Accessible Technology recognizes that fixed costs may need to be included in Tier 1 rates; however the critical issue is providing a minimal amount of water necessary for human consumption. Center for Accessible Technology also believed that despite setting a Tier 1 consumption and rate, the rate design should provide an opportunity for individual customers to request variances.

4.2.4. Low-Income Water Program Name Comments

California Water Association recommends adopting “Customer Assistance Program” or CAP, as the standardized name for low-income water programs offered by Class A water utilities. This is in line with program names and recommendations from US EPA, Water Research Foundation and other states, and avoids the stigma of including term “low-income” which may deter customer adoption.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission does not suggest a specific name but agrees the name selected should be non-stigmatizing.

Southern California Edison Company recommends using the CARE acronym in order to align with energy utilities as it is synonymous with low-income assistance. Southern California Edison Company currently uses the CARE name for its water program on Catalina Island.

Center for Accessible Technology supports a uniform, non-stigmatizing name and notes that “LIRA” is bureaucratic and has no direct meaning to customers.

4.2.5. Low-Income Multi-Family Housing Pilots Comments

Center for Accessible Technology supports providing benefits to low-income tenants who do not directly pay a water bill through a pilot program.¹⁸ They did not suggest specific recommendations for implementation, but did discuss some of the options that had been considered in the State Water Resources Control Board’s draft AB 401 report to deliver credit to these tenants, including delivering a credit through energy bills, the state’s CalFresh program and an income tax credit.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission supported waiting until the outcome of the AB 401 process before deciding how to assist low-income water users that do not pay their bill directly.¹⁹ However, in the meantime, they recommended implementing several requirements to protect this population. These included: requiring water utilities to provide notification to tenants who do not directly pay their water bill if/when their bill is in default and service may be terminated, requiring water utilities to provide tenants, in the

¹⁸ Center for Accessible Technology Comments dated September 16, 2019 (Center for Accessible Technology 2019 Comments) at 10-11.

¹⁹ Public Advocates Comments dated September 16, 2019 at 8-9.

event their landlord is in default of a water bill, the opportunity to pay the bill directly and then deduct that amount from rent, and allowing multi-family housing units to qualify for LIRA programs if the housing is owned by a non-profit and are for the explicit purpose of providing affordable housing to low-income residents.

California Water Association supported allowing small-scale pilot programs to provide discounts to master metered low-income tenants but opposes any requirement that the benefits be passed on to low-income master metered tenants.²⁰ They believed this requirement would be difficult to enforce and did not wish to be involved in landlord-tenant relationships. They suggested that CalFresh would be the best currently existing option to distribute benefits to tenants in multi-family dwellings, and any pilot program should be designed so that the benefit is delivered through CalFresh.

Southern California Edison Company opposed a requirement that benefits be passed on to low-income master metered tenants.²¹ Instead, they recommended existing water low-income programs incorporate some tenant-level communications. This could include actions such as an approval or rejection letter issued directly to the tenant for enrollment in the program and a monthly listing of tenants receiving the discount to owners/operators.

California Water Association expressed concern that the Public Advocates' recommendations were administratively unworkable and not likely to achieve the desired result.²² California Water Association opposed requiring the notification of low-income water users who do not directly pay their water bill if

²⁰ California Water Association Comments dated September 16, 2019 at 21-23.

²¹ Southern California Edison Company Comments dated September 16, 2019, at 7.

²² California Water Association Reply Comments dated September 26, 2019 at 3-6.

it is in default and argued that since the utility does not bill these users directly, a water utility does not know who they are or how to locate them. They similarly opposed requiring water utilities to provide tenants the opportunity to pay the bill directly and then deduct that amount from rent as they believe it is infeasible and landlord-tenant disputes are outside of the jurisdiction of the Commission. Lastly, California Water Association argued allowing multi-family owned by non-profits and designated to provide affordable housing to low-income residents is better aligned with a pilot program approach than a greater Commission-wide requirement. California Water Association also opposed Southern California Edison Company's tenant enrollment approval/rejection proposal as infeasible and creating new privacy issues.

4.2.6. Reporting Mechanism Comments

California Water Association argued current reporting mechanisms are enough. Currently, Class A utilities regularly report on their low-income programs; those programs are reviewed as part of the utility's GRC; and Low Income Oversight Board (LIOB) includes a water utility representative.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission suggested requiring water utilities with a low-income program to provide an evaluation of their respective program in their annual report and adopt a requirement that the final decision in each utility's GRC provide an ordering paragraph that details the required low-income program metrics for that utility to report in its annual report.

4.2.7. Water Consolidation Timeline Comments

California Water Association argued its expedited timeline should be adopted because the current schedule guidelines are often ignored. California Water Association said that if the Commission wants to update D.99-10-064's

water system acquisition framework, such updates should be reasonable and facilitate speedy resolution of applications and advice letters. California Water Association stated the scoping memo rulings in recent acquisition proceedings already included these requirements, adding, for example, reply briefs, the opportunity for comments and other more recent Commission procedures. California Water Association claimed the overall framework set out in D.99-10-064 still helps facilitate efficient and cost-effective consolidation of at-risk water systems and therefore does not require substantial overhauling.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission suggested that the Commission not adopt a specific timeline like the one suggested by California Water Association because an expedited advice letter process already exists for small, distressed systems. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission said water utilities put auxiliary requests in their consolidation applications which often leads to them taking longer; therefore, the Commission should not be following a more restrictive schedule when processing these applications.

Center for Accessible Technology stated the Commission should not adopt California Water Association's timeline, especially since California Water Association objected to limiting the scope of requests in acquisition applications as proposed by the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission. If a request raises new or more complex issues, an appropriate schedule should be set based on the issues raised.

4.2.8. Utility Affiliate Transaction Rule Comments

California Water Association stated current utility transaction rules are sufficient, and water utilities need the flexibility to use the administration framework that best addresses the issues the system is facing.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission urged the Commission should maintain current ratepayer protections that require all incremental costs associated with providing non-tariffed (*i.e.* administrator) services to be allocated to unregulated operations and not reduce the portion of non-tariffed revenues that are credited to ratepayers.

4.2.9. Safe Drinking Water Loan Funds Comments

California Water Association recommended speedy approval of safe drinking water fund loan authorization requests and greater assistance from Commission staff in working with Board staff in the application and implementation process.

5. Water Sales Forecasting

All parties agreed that California's rising drought risks created new challenges for sales forecasting and water efficiency. However, the alternative solutions presented offered varying levels of specificity and little agreement among the parties.²³ California Water Association proposed no substantive change from the current method and advocated against any uniform requirements. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission provided the most persuasive approach, setting forth specific factors water utilities should use in their individual sales forecasts. Southern California Edison

²³ California Water Association at 11-12, The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission at 1-3, SCE at 2-4.

Company sought to move the sales forecast to an annual process, similar to the electric Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) with annual updates, or include the possibility for multiple forecasts to be approved in the GRC process with the water utility selecting the drought or non-drought option each year depending on more recent forecasts.

5.1. Requiring Specific Factors in Future Sales Forecasts

We have long recognized that sales forecasting is specific to each water utility and the areas they serve; however, in adopting the initial Water Action Plan in 2005, we determined that there were some uniform best practices that should be adopted to govern how all water utilities approach and work within the regulatory framework in California. After reviewing the comments and the record in this case, we are persuaded that additional guidance is needed to ensure water utilities incorporate the rising drought risk in California.

5.1.1. Short Term Forecasting

Specifically, we agree with the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission that drought year data should be included in forecasting. Further, certain factors should be included in the sales forecasting model presented by a water utility in its GRC or equivalent. While water utilities may still choose their preferred water sales forecasting model, the following factors should be incorporated into the model they choose:

1. Impact of revenue collection and rate design on sales and revenue collection.
2. Impact of planned conservation programs.
3. Changes in customer counts.
4. Previous and upcoming changes to building codes requiring low flow fixtures and other water-saving measures, as well as any other relevant code changes.

5. Local and statewide trends in consumption, demographics, climate population density and historic trends by ratemaking area.
6. Past Sales Trends.

Thus, in any future GRC submitted after the effective date of this decision, a water utility applicant must discuss how these specific factors impact the sales forecast presented in the application.

5.2. Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms

The issue of adapting the sales forecast over time and matching as closely as possible the revenue generated by rates to the costs approved for the year is made more difficult as we consider the impacts of drought risks in each service area. Parties identified the WRAMs as one way we could further adapt our policies to changing conditions while still allowing utilities the ability to earn a reasonable rate of return and keep rates just and reasonable.²⁴ Southern California Edison Company's proposal to allow utilities to update sales forecasts yearly was an approach we considered, but we reject it at this time as it is more cumbersome than our preferred alternative.

In order to achieve a goal of this proceeding to improve water sales forecasting, we agree with the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission that water utilities that currently use a WRAM²⁵ should propose a

²⁴ Pub. Util. Code § 451. Cal-Am 2017 Comments at 3, California Water Association 2018 2018 Comments at 7-9, The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission 2018 Comments at 7-8, San Gabriel Valley Water Company 2017 Comments at 8. *See also*, The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission Sept. 2019 Comments at 5, California Water Association Sept. 2019 Comments at 13-16, SCE Sept. 2019 Comments at 3-5.

²⁵ Cal-Am, California Water Service Company, Golden State Water Company, Liberty Utilities (Park Water) Corporation, and Liberty Utilities (Apple Valley Ranchos Water) Corporation. *See*, D.08-08-032, D.08-06-022, D.08-08-030, D.08-09-026, D.08-11-023, D09-05-005, D.09-07-021 and D.10-06-038.

Monterrey-Style WRAM in their next GRC. As discussed below, we find that the problems identified in the current WRAM/MCBA process are minimized in a Monterrey-Style WRAM without reducing the benefits we seek to achieve through the use of the WRAM process.

5.2.1. Transitioning WRAM Utilities to Monterey-Style WRAM

The WRAM and MCBA were first implemented in 2008 and were developed as part of a pilot program to promote water conservation. The Commission adopted these mechanisms as part of conservation rate design pilot programs. The goals of the WRAM/MCBA are to sever the relationship between sales and revenue to remove any disincentive for the utility to implement conservation rates and programs; ensure cost savings are passed on to ratepayers; and reduce overall water consumption.

The revenue and rate impacts of WRAM/MCBA amounts are implemented through balancing accounts. When actual sales are less than forecasted sales used in establishing a revenue requirement, the revenue shortfall, less offsetting marginal expenses, is surcharged to customers in addition to their regular tariffed rates. However, these balances rarely provide a positive balance (over-collected) but instead have been negative (under-collected).²⁶ Consequently, ratepayers experience not only the rate increase attributable to GRC rate changes, including increases in attrition years, but also a subsequent rate increase due to amortizing negative WRAM balances. It is unlikely that the average customer understands how this regulatory mechanism

²⁶ D.12-04-048 at 13.

works, consequently, customers experience frustrating multiple rate increases due to GRC test year, attrition year, WRAM/MCBA, and other offsets.²⁷

The Commission adopted settlements between the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (currently the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission) and various Class A water utilities in D.08-06-002, D.08-08-030, D.08-08-032, D.08-09-026, D.08-11-023, D.09-05-005, D.09-07-021, and D.10-06-038. These settlements included conservation rate design and adoption of WRAM as a means of promoting conservation by decoupling sales from revenues. As explained in D.08-08-030, the Commission, while citing to the 2005 Water Action Plan, found that water utilities had a financial disincentive to conserve water. The Commission then concluded that to advance the goals of conservation, the Commission would need to remove that disincentive.²⁸ These decisions adopted WRAM mechanisms for California Water Service Company, California-American Water Company, Golden State Water Company, Liberty Utilities (Park Water) Corp., and Liberty Utilities (Apple Valley Ranchos Water) Corp. These five utilities are commonly called the “WRAM utilities.” In addition, the Commission adopted a settlement between the precursor to the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission and San Jose Water Company, which is essentially the Monterey-Style WRAM.²⁹

This Monterey-Style WRAM adjusts for the revenue effect of metered tiered rates compared to the revenue SJWC would have received from single flat quantity rates if single flat rates had been in effect. The Monterey-Style WRAM, a regulatory mechanism initiated in the Monterey District of California-

²⁷ California Water Association 2018 Phase I Comments at 7-9.

²⁸ D.08-08-030 at 28.

²⁹ D.08-08-030 at 22.

American Water Company,³⁰ recognizes that with higher rate tiers there is an unstable revenue effect on Monterey-Style utilities due to small changes in water usage.

When initiating the WRAM, the Commission recognized that quantity revenues would be offset by variable costs of water supply.³¹ Consequently, the Commission adopted an offset to WRAM through the MCBA, which reflects costs such as purchased water, purchased power, pump taxes, chemicals, and similar costs which vary according to the amount of water sold.³² As implemented by the non-WRAM utilities, the Monterey Style WRAM amounts are also offset by variable costs which are accounted for in the ICBA.³³

Subsequently, in D.12-04-048, the Commission addressed the amortization of WRAM accounts, including determining the amounts and periods over which WRAM would be recovered. In D.12-04-048, the Commission also found that the WRAM/MCBA is part of pilot programs to promote water conservation. In addition, the Commission found that there was uncertainty over the success of adopting WRAM/MCBA programs and therefore ordered each affected utility in its next GRC to provide testimony that at a minimum addressing various options:

Option 1: Should the Commission adopt a Monterey-Style WRAM rather than the existing full WRAM?

Option 2: Should the Commission adopt a mechanism that bands the level of recovery, or refund, of account

³⁰ D.96-12-005; *see also*, D.00-03-053.

³¹ D.08-08-030 at 15.

³² D.08-06-002, Appendix A, Section VIII at 7. (*See also*, D.08-08-030 at 26.)

³³ D.08-06-002, FoFs 4, 8-10. While the WRAM/MCBA is called a “pilot,” there is no indication this program included goals, metrics, or other standards usually found in a pilot program.

balances based on the relative size of the account balance?

Option 3: Should the Commission place WRAM surcharges only on higher tiered volumes of usage, thereby benefiting customers who have usage only in Tier 1 or have reduced their usage in the higher tier levels?

Option 4: Should the Commission eliminate the WRAM mechanism?

Option 5: Should the Commission move all customer classes to increasing block rate-design and extend the WRAM mechanism to these classes?³⁴

A review of subsequent GRC filings shows that while utilities included testimony addressing WRAM/MCBA options as ordered in D.12-04-048, the proceedings were resolved by settlements that did not specifically adjudicate the questions raised in D.12-04-048. Consequently, the policy to continue the use of WRAM/MCBA has not been adjudicated, and the use of WRAM/MCBA continued for the five WRAM utilities.

While the Commission concluded that the WRAM mechanism should be maintained in D.16-12-026 (in R.11-11-008), the Commission noted the uncertainty of sales forecasts, the need for conservation, and that WRAM provided a means to support sustainability and attract investment during a current drought period and beyond.³⁵ The Commission also ordered that if utilities proposed adjusting the fixed cost portion of revenues in rates, WRAM utilities also submit alternative proposals to reduce reliance on the WRAM/MCBA balances and surcharges.³⁶

³⁴ D12-04-048, OP 4.

³⁵ D.16-12-026 at 41.

³⁶ D.16-12-026 at OP 13.

As noted above, the September 4, 2019, assigned ALJ Ruling included a summary of the August 2, 2019, Workshop, where parties raised the issue of the WRAM during the discussion of mechanisms to improve sales forecasts during droughts. The scope of this proceeding includes consideration of “how to improve water sales forecasting.” Thus, based on the discussion at the workshop on ways to improve water sales forecasting, the ruling specifically called for party input on whether the Commission should change all utilities to use Monterey-Style WRAMs with ICBA, and whether such a transition should occur in the context of the utilities’ next GRC.³⁷ Therefore, consideration of changes to the WRAM/MCBA is and has always been within the scope of this proceeding as part of our review of how to improve water sales forecasting.

**5.2.2. GRC Decisions Subsequent to
D.12-04-048 Have Not Resolved
Whether to Continue Implementing the
WRAM/MCBA Mechanism**

While the Commission has chosen not to change the existing WRAM mechanisms, it also did not endorse the continuation of the “pilot” program in an adjudicated proceeding or rulemaking. This is the first time the Commission has taken input to consider the foundational issue of whether WRAM/MCBA should continue, and if so, in what form it should continue. In addition, we note that there is no indication in the proceedings since D.12-04-048 that parties quantified the risk attributable to having a WRAM or not having a full WRAM, and no party presented any such quantification. Furthermore, there is no legal basis upon which WRAM/MCBA is required or necessary in water utility regulation. Thus, it has become clear during the course of this proceeding that

³⁷ Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Inviting Comments on Water Division Staff Report and Responses to Additional Questions, September 4, 2019, at 3.

review of the WRAM/MCBA is an important component of our consideration of ways to improve water sales forecasting.

The continuation of WRAM/MCBA as a regulatory tool to encourage conservation, yet account for the differences between forecasted sales and actual sales, engenders other negative consequences. One that is often heard in public participation hearings is the phrase, “I continue to conserve but my bill continues to increase.”³⁸ One explanation is that the WRAM balancing account under-collections are surcharged through the quantity rates. Thus, the declining use of water through the WRAM mechanism results in shortfalls in revenue, which includes a portion of fixed costs that must be then surcharged to customers for recovery. As this shortfall in revenue is then surcharged to customers in the quantity rates, the quantity rate increases, and customers conserve further by using even less water at these higher rates, and the WRAM under-collection increases.

In 2012, the Commission observed, in reference to WRAM balances, that “After the WRAM/MCBA mechanisms were first adopted in 2008, there have primarily been under-collections, and these under-collections are often quite substantial.”³⁹ Subsequently, the WRAM balances have continued to be significantly large and under-collected. Although some of these under-collected balances reflect droughts in 2014, 2015, and 2016, a review of WRAM utility balancing accounts over the past years rarely indicates an over-collected balance.

³⁸ See, e.g., D.16-12-026 at 36.

³⁹ D.12-04-048 at 3.

5.2.3. The WRAM/MCBA Ratemaking Mechanism is Not Necessary to Achieve Conservation

While the WRAM/MCBA mechanism adjusts for differences between sales forecasts and actual sales, it is less certain that WRAM is necessary to promote conservation. Conservation is not done by the utility but instead is accomplished by the customers. The utility does not save water or use less water, but instead, the utility through its rates, especially tiered rates that increase the cost per unit of quantity, provides a signal to customers that increased usage will result in increased costs per unit consumed. This basic supply and demand message based on cost is further enhanced by consistent messages to customers to conserve a precious resource, as well as conservation programs such as low-flow showerheads, toilets, sod removal programs and other conservation messages, executive orders, Board orders, and new laws. While both the utilities and the customers should take pride in their conservation accomplishments, it is the customers that have made the choices to use less water encouraged by tiered rates or state executive orders, Board orders, and state statute.

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission in its reply comments argued that the annual change in average consumption per metered connection for Class A water utilities with full decoupling WRAM is very similar to the same consumption by Class A water utilities without a full decoupling WRAM. In support of this contention, the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission provided a graph showing that the annual change in

average consumption per metered connection is almost the same during the last eight years for both WRAM and Non-WRAM utilities.⁴⁰

Similarly, a review of reported annual consumption from the State Water Resources Control Board shows that over time utilities with a WRAM/MCBA conserve water at about the same rate, or even less, than water utilities without a WRAM. As shown in Table A, Water Savings Percentages, derived from public information available from the State Water Resources Control Board, during the period between 2015 and 2019, the cumulative water savings for the five WRAM utilities varied between 17 and 24%. During the same period, 2015-2019, the cumulative water savings for the four utilities with Monterey-Style WRAMs varied between 19% and 26%. That is, the water savings, or conservation, by utilities without WRAMs actually exceeded the conservation for those utilities with WRAMs.

In addition, as shown in Table A, the conservation exhibited by Class B utilities that have neither WRAM/MCBA mechanisms, nor Monterey-Style WRAMs for this period between 2015 and 2019 is between 19% and 32%, which exceeds WRAM and non-WRAM utilities. While individual water utility characteristics might explain some of these differences, it appears customer conservation is accomplished independently of whether a utility does or does not maintain a WRAM/MCBA mechanism.

These factors lead us to believe that it is not necessary for a utility to have a full WRAM/MCBA mechanism in order that their customers conserve water. Instead, it appears that over the years since WRAM/MCBA mechanisms were adopted, including drought years in 2014, 2015, and 2016, customers have

⁴⁰ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission Sept. 2019 Reply Comments at 7.

heeded the continuing message that water is a precious resource that should not be wasted.

5.2.4. Because the WRAM/MCBA Mechanism is Implemented Through a Balancing Account, there are Intergenerational Transfers of Costs

When WRAM balances, which have been significant and under-collected, are recovered through the WRAM/MCBA mechanism, the recovery payments may be made by a different group of ratepayers than those incurring the costs. Some customers may have moved and been replaced by others or may be new customers. In addition, usage patterns may have changed. These effects in the WRAM/MCBA mechanism implementation mean that different customer groups will be paying for the costs generated by an earlier customer group.⁴¹ While such intergenerational transfers may not be significant over long periods of time, we seek to minimize such transfers when possible in order to keep rates just and reasonable. We therefore find that the WRAM/MCBA mechanism is not the best means to minimize intergenerational transfers of costs when compared to an alternative available to the utilities and the Commission.

5.2.5. Transition to a Monterey-Style WRAM

In view of the foregoing, we believe that it is an appropriate time to move to eliminate the full WRAM/MCBA mechanism. However, to account for the consequences of inaccurate forecasts, it is reasonable that these former WRAM utilities be provided an opportunity to establish Monterey-Style WRAMs offset by ICBAAs.

In ordering this transition, we are aware that an immediate transition is unreasonable as current rates for WRAM utilities are based on adopted forecasts,

⁴¹ D.16-12-026 at 37.

which anticipate that corrections between forecasted and actual sales will be resolved through WRAM balances. To establish reasonable new rates based on forecasts that do not include this assumption, a new sales forecast should be developed and applied to rates, including a tiered rate structure for each utility.

Because the WRAM/MCBA mechanism has been used for over 10 years by the five WRAM utilities, and as there are many individual associated factors such as accounting, billing, and other related issues for these WRAM utilities, we agree with California Water Association that such a change should not be implemented immediately. Further, as noted, each WRAM utility may face different circumstances in the implementation of this major change. Therefore, as California Water Association recommends, we are ordering this transformation from WRAM/MCBA to Monterey-Style WRAM/ICBA to occur in the context of each WRAM utility's GRC. This means, our adoption of this significant policy change will not be implemented immediately but rather in the context of each GRC for each of the five WRAM utilities.

5.2.6. For Utilities Without WRAM/MCBA Mechanisms, Accurate Forecasts of Water Sales in General Rate Cases Places Added Significance on the Reliability of the Adopted Forecasts

The Commission has stated, "Forecasted sales drive rates as they determine how authorized revenue (based on determination of costs, return on equity, and other factors) are to be recovered through quantity rates."⁴² As discussed elsewhere in this decision, both utilities and their customers rely on forecasts that are as accurate as possible. Without a WRAM/MCBA mechanism, the forecast determines how all rates, both service charge and quantity rates, are

⁴² D.16-12-026 at 18.

established for the future. It will be incumbent upon the parties in each GRC to determine that the recommended forecasts are as accurate as possible. The consequences of inaccuracy can be significant to both the water utility and the customer. The WRAM/MCBA mechanism removes most of those consequences from the water utility and removes most of the risk from customers, by adding a means to adjust future rates to meet the approved revenue requirement. The earlier settlements reached in GRCs for California-American Water Company, California Water Service Company, Golden State Water Company, Liberty Utilities (Park Water) Corp., and Liberty Utilities (Apple Valley Ranchos Water) Corp. which established WRAMs for these utilities allude to the transfer of risk, but there is no evidence that this change was ever given a value to be included in determining the cost of equity for any utility. We believe this is true because, as pointed out by California-American Water Company, we cannot quantify that risk as it does not exist in a vacuum but as one element within many risks, such as the economy or weather.⁴³ Consequently, while we are ordering the utilities with WRAMs to transition to Monterey Style WRAMs, we cannot also conclude that there is a measurable change in the perceived risk component.

5.2.7. Lost Revenue Due to Reduced Sales During Droughts

During the Governor declared drought emergencies, the Commission has adopted appropriate measures which allowed utilities without a WRAM/MCBA to track lost revenues due to reductions in water use due to both voluntary and mandatory customer reductions. As described in Resolution W-4976 adopted February 27, 2014, these measures provide that a utility without a WRAM/MCBA was authorized to establish a Lost Revenue Memorandum

⁴³ D.08-08-030 at 28-29.

Account to track revenue shortfalls.⁴⁴ All non-WRAM utilities availed themselves of the opportunity to establish such accounts and thus were able to recover lost revenues caused as a result of the declared drought emergencies. If, in the future, there are Governor declared droughts, we expect that water utilities that no longer have WRAM/MCBA for tracking lost drought revenues will be provided an opportunity to establish similar lost revenue memorandum accounts during the time of declared drought.⁴⁵

5.2.8. Modifications are needed to the WRAM Process for it to Continue

We conclude that the primary reasons for adopting the WRAM/MCBA mechanism, to remove the financial disincentive on the part of the utility and to promote the conservation of water, are no longer applicable. Furthermore, our experience has been that employing the WRAM/MCBA mechanism has certain negative effects on customers and that there should be a fundamental change in policy regarding this subject. At the same time, we have identified some benefit to the WRAM/MCBA process with respect to decoupling sales from revenues and that the Monterey-Style WRAM captures the identified benefits without the negative effects on customers of a traditional WRAM. Consequently, we believe there is good reason for transitioning WRAM utilities away from this mechanism and that a policy change eliminating WRAM/MCBA is a reasonable outcome.

As discussed herein, such a change should not occur immediately as we are cognizant that this transition has many implications. In the next GRCs for each of the five utilities with a WRAM/MCBA, the utilities shall transition to Monterey-Style WRAMs. While we are ordering these transitions in the next

⁴⁴ See, Resolution W-4976, adopted February 27, 2014 at 11.

⁴⁵ D.16-12-026 at 35.

GRCs for WRAM utilities, we are also providing an opportunity for these five utilities to establish Monterey-Style WRAMs upon the end of the existing WRAM/MCBA mechanisms. Allowing Monterey-Style WRAMs for these five utilities recognizes that increased rate tiers will reduce sales that would otherwise occur at a single quantity rate.

6. Tier 1 Water Usage and Water Baselines

Adoption of any baseline amount to provide a minimal amount of water at an affordable rate, which can be defined as the Tier 1 usage and rate, requires utilities to develop and propose a methodology to determine this amount and rate. The difficulty, as explained by California Water Association, is determining the number of residents in any household, is a matter of privacy and other potential concerns. The development of the proposed methodology should include determining a minimal amount of water per person, such as a calculation of an EIU or other methodology that reflects the necessary water for basic human needs. Application of this methodology to develop the Tier 1 usage and rates should include the local demographics of the water utility service area. We will not adopt a specific method that does or does not include a portion of fixed costs in the Tier 1 rates as the consequent effects would be shifting these costs totally to those customers using water above the Tier 1 usage.

While it would be difficult to determine the actual household size, we are concerned about the affordability of water rates on large households. Therefore, we expect the utilities in proposing an adopted water rate design will minimize the number of households requiring greater water usage by setting breakpoints between tiers above Tier 1 that minimize the percentage of households in these higher tiers.

While we will not require a specific methodology, we direct the investor owned utilities to provide analysis in their next GRC to determine the appropriate Tier 1 breakpoint that aligns with the baseline amount of water for basic human needs for each ratemaking area. This analysis for establishing a baseline should consider and not be set below both the EIU of 600 cubic feet per household per month, as stated in the Affordability Rulemaking (R.18-07-006) and the average winter use in each ratemaking district. At 600 cubic feet per household per month, households water usage baseline will be roughly 4,488 gallons per month.⁴⁶

In comparison to Cal. Water Code § 10609.4(a) which established a 55 gallons per day per capita standard for indoor residential water use, this baseline water usage covers up to a 3-person household.

Person(s) Per Household	Calculation	Monthly Baseline Usage	EIU Baseline (R.18-07-006)
1	1*30*55	1,650 gallons of water	4,488 gallons of water
2	2*30*55	3,300 gallons of water	4,488 gallons of water
3	3*30*55	4,950 gallons of water	4,488 gallons of water

7. Consistent Terminology All Water Utilities Should Use for Low-Income Water Programs

As part of this rulemaking, we also evaluated and took input on ways to standardize, coordinate, and evaluate the different low-income water programs implemented by water utilities. Much of that input was incorporated by the Board as part of its AB 401 recommendations. We also evaluated and took input

⁴⁶ 1 cubic foot of water = 7.48 US gallons of water.

on the value of a uniform name for the program discount offered to customers qualifying for assistance on the basis of their income. Currently, each Commission-regulated Class A water utility utilizes a name of its own design for its low-income program.⁴⁷

Commenters were generally indifferent to the new name,⁴⁸ though some preferred to be allowed to retain the existing name of their program. For example, Southern California Edison Company proposed to continue its current title CARE for its water assistance program on Catalina Island and recommended that the value of the familiarity of the CARE acronym outweighs any concern that the acronym is particular to energy, not water.⁴⁹

One concern raised was that a uniform name suggests a uniform program structure, as is the case for the statewide assistance programs administered by Commission-regulated energy companies (CARE) and telephone companies (LifeLine).⁵⁰ However, we have previously determined that while the structure of the program discount varies, the criteria for qualification in the program, and the method of qualification, is uniform among the Commission-regulated water utilities and the Commission-regulated energy utilities.⁵¹ Thus, a single, straight-

⁴⁷ While the structure of the discount across Class A water utilities also varies, we have deferred consideration of consistency of the structure of those programs.

⁴⁸ California Water Association 2019 Comments at 20. Great Oaks Water Company 2017 Comments at 8. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission 2017 Comments at 17. SCE 2017 Comments at 3-4. Golden State Water Company 2017 Comments at 4. Consumer Federation of California 2017 Comments at 4-5.

⁴⁹ SCE 2019 Comments at 6.

⁵⁰ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission 2017 Comments at 17, Center for Accessible Technology 2017 Comments at 2.

⁵¹ See OIR at 6 (“The eligibility requirement is the only consistent aspect of the Class A water utilities’ low-income rate assistance programs.”).

forward name will aid outreach to consumers and statewide coordination in the delivery of assistance to low-income consumers.⁵²

California Water Association recommends the Commission require regulated water utilities use the name “Customer Assistance Program, or CAP,” for their low-income water programs in California. California Water Association states that this name is also used by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the Water Research Foundation, and water utilities in other states.⁵³

We agree and adopt the Customer Assistance Program (CAP) as the name to be used for all Commission-regulated water utilities for their low-income water assistance programs. On the theory that it is best to align with an existing program name specific to water, we choose the name Customer Assistance Program pending alignment of the assistance programs themselves.

We have coordinated closely with the State Water Resources Control Board AB 401 proceeding during this rulemaking and agree with parties that broader changes made to either the funding or the structure of the assistance will happen through the statewide process. Thus, while specific changes to individual water utilities may occur as part of their regular GRC process, broader standardization of funding and assistance may be considered in the future. However, we need not wait to move forward on adopting a uniform program name. We hereby require all water utilities to adopt this new name in their next GRC.

By adopting this phased approach to the uniform name, we minimize the costs passed on to ratepayers of changing a program name in the middle of a

⁵² California Water Association 2017 Comments at 5.

⁵³ California Water Association 2017 Comments at 6.

GRC cycle. Therefore, a water utility that has a pending or to be filed rate case before the Commission should adopt the Customer Assistance Program name for its low-income water assistance program when implementing the Commission's decision in that case.

Water utilities with low-income programs shall describe their programs in filings and public outreach with the name "Customer Assistance Program."

Water utilities may use the CAP acronym where appropriate.

8. Low-Income Multi-Family Housing Pilots

We agree with the Center for Accessible Technology and California Water Association that small-scale pilot programs offer a good opportunity to test delivering benefits to low-income renters in multi-family buildings that do not pay a water bill directly.

We acknowledge the Public Advocates' position on waiting on legislation, as the AB 401 process could be very lengthy. In the meantime, while we are waiting to see whether there will be a state-funded, statewide low-income rate assistance program, small pilots could provide some immediate relief to struggling tenants and allow us to gather information on better serving those tenants.

We believe California-American Water Company's Advice Letter 1221 for establishing a tariff that provided a discount to low-income multi-family renters provides a good starting point for a pilot. This was also discussed in the August 2, 2019, workshop.⁵⁴

Accordingly, we direct California-American Water Company to file a Tier 3 advice letter, within 60-days of the issuance of this decision, outlining a

⁵⁴ Staff Report at 3

pilot program that provides a discount to water users in low-income multi-family dwellings that do not pay their water bill directly through the utility. All other Class A water utilities interested in a similar pilot program should file a Tier 3 advice letter that includes at least the same level of detail.

The Advice Letter must outline and address the following:

- Locations and size of pilots
- How the utility will identify the tenants who meet the income eligibility (200% of federal poverty level)?
- How the utility will provide the program benefit directly to the users who do not receive water bills?
- Proposed evaluation plan including program audit provisions. The pilots should be evaluated after no later than two years
- How to address tenant turnover in the program administration
- Proposed budget including all administrative and audit costs
- Provisions for how the pilot program is to be funded

Lastly, we agree with the Public Advocates that multi-family housing units should qualify for LIRA programs if the housing is owned by a non-profit and are for the explicit purpose of providing affordable housing to low-income residents. We direct Class A water utilities with existing LIRA programs to update their eligibility to reflect this change.

9. Reporting Mechanisms

We agree with parties that GRCs are the appropriate proceedings to consider low-income programs and affordability issues within their systems, as well as each utility's ability to achieve Water Action Plan item 6 (balancing conservation, affordability, and investment.) That said, as GRCs occur approximately every three to five years, the data submitted in Annual Reports

provide timely updates and information to gauge and track the progress, if any, toward our goals.⁵⁵ We realize that, currently, the reporting requirements can be found in various decisions, and parties could not point to a single location summarizing the reporting requirements. To achieve our goal during the GRCs, to use both the data from Annual Reports and the Minimum Data Requirements to develop the comprehensive assessment of progress toward meeting our statutory requirements and goals, we find that it would be helpful to reiterate the current reporting requirements as discussed and summarized below.

Specifically, D.11-05-004 ordered Class A water utilities to begin including Conservation Data Reports and Low-Income Data Reports in their Annual Reports. Further, the Low-Income Data Reports were to include the average bill impact of surcharges resulting from the amortization of WRAM/MCBAs on participating low-income program customers. Further, D.14-10-047 required multi-district utilities to include in their next GRC filings a district-based rate review to assess whether high-cost and affordability problems exist in any of its districts.⁵⁶ In addition, D.12-04-048, ordering paragraph (OP) 4 set forth a number of requirements for water utilities to provide options related to WRAM during their GRC, which are superseded by this decision to transition to Monterey-Style WRAMs for all water utilities using a WRAM.

D.16-12-026 was intended to spawn a number of trials and evaluations of how to improve the balance of conservation, investment, and affordability through a variety of means. OPs 9 and 10 directed proposals for Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), and these directives have appeared most often in

⁵⁵ D.11-05-004 is the most recent update to data requirements of the Annual Reports.

⁵⁶ D.14-10-047, OPs 1, 2.

subsequent GRC applications. However, it does not appear that the requirements of OP 8 to evaluate the results of AMI pilots have been fully completed. Similarly, evidence that OPs 11-14 directing more attention and creative approaches to rate design cannot be consistently identified.

Finally, in the Amended Scoping Memo initiating Phase II of this proceeding, we initiated a reporting requirement to better track the impact the COVID-19 pandemic is having on water customers and water utilities for the past few months to at least the middle of 2021.

For ease of reference, we summarize here all of the requirements, and indicate whether they are confirming prior requirements or expanding on prior requirements:

- Annual reporting requirements from D.11-05-004.
- To each Annual Report, attach Minimum Data Requests submitted in the prior-year period as part of 1) GRC filing, 2) applications for acquisitions (or expansion based on new requirements in this decision).
- Compliance, and associated data and analysis with orders from D.14-10-047 and D.16-12-026.
- Inclusion of disconnection and payment behaviors required in this proceeding beginning in June, 2020 through June, 2021.

Taken together, these existing requirements, if faithfully followed and enforced, will provide the needed foundational data, and allow analysis by which progress toward affordability for low-income and all customers can be evaluated.

Finally, we commit to providing in each utility's GRC an OP that details the required low-income program metrics and data for that utility to report in its annual report.

10. Water Consolidation Timelines

Through this Rulemaking, we have attempted to comprehensively evaluate the connections between consolidation, safety, and affordability by examining issues concerning affordability of clean, safe drinking water for low-income and disadvantaged communities, including greater pooling and consolidation.

Consolidation has been and continues to be a tool to remedy systems failing water quality health and safety standards. Consolidation may also be a means to improve affordability, by leveraging greater economies of scale and scope, and by importing best, or better, practices related to operating a water utility, as well as designing rates to allow recovery of reasonable expenses. It is incumbent upon this Commission to ensure the process to achieve consolidation is as effective and efficient as possible. Accordingly, we incorporate the multiple perspectives of the parties and workshop participants to make minor adjustments to ensure an effective and efficient consolidation timeline.

10.1. Existing Guidance for Water Consolidation Timelines

Simply from an expediency angle, the answer to the Scoping Memo's question 1a asking whether the Commission should consider consolidations outside of GRCs is an unequivocal yes. No party argued that we should limit such consideration to GRCs. Commission-regulated utilities should continue to file standalone applications and advice letters relating to acquisitions, as necessary.

The current Commission consolidation guidance is old but not outdated. D.99-10-064 adopted an agreement between California Water Association, the

Commission's Water Division,⁵⁷ and several Commission-regulated water utilities that were not opposed by the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission or others.⁵⁸ The agreement lays out a 245-day schedule for completing consolidation applications generally, and 100 days for at-risk systems.⁵⁹ The agreement also noted that Commission approval is not a requirement for a private utility to acquire a public system, but only for the approval of the long-term financing involved in the acquisition, if different than current approval⁶⁰ and to set rates for the acquired system.⁶¹ The agreement builds upon prior guidelines from D.92-03-093.

The State of California has pending legislation, AB 1751, the Consolidation for Safe Drinking Water Act of 2019, that would establish criteria, procedures, and timelines for deciding water utility requests to acquire water systems that may be different from D.99-10-064, although according to California Water Association the schedule of AB 1751 is intended to mirror D.99-10-064.⁶² Thus, for our purposes, the legislation, as proposed, should have little impact on our consolidation timelines. While we may revisit this issue again in Phase II, as the

⁵⁷ The Ratepayer Representation Branch (RRB) within the Commission's Water Division filed the joint motion for settlement with California Water Association. This branch no longer exists.

⁵⁸ D.99-10-064 at 3.

⁵⁹ The aspirational schedule was agreed to by the parties more than twenty years ago. D.99-10-064 at 6. Also *see* Section 3 in Appendix D to D.99-10-065 defining an inadequately operated and maintained small water utility as "any operation serving under 2,000 customers that is subject to an outstanding order of the Department of Health Services to implement improvement."

⁶⁰ D.99-10-064 at 6.

⁶¹ D.99-10-064 at 11, CoL 5, OP 2.

⁶² California Water Association 2019 Reply Comments at 5.

legislation is still pending, we will move forward now with affirming the Commission's current consolidation timelines in this decision.

The Commission also established consolidation guidelines in D.14-10-047 that contain important rationale for consolidation to mitigate affordability issues. Although that decision pertained exclusively to consolidation within companies, its requirements for examining cost and affordability considerations district-by-district are consistent with our overall acquisition and consolidation consideration and timelines.

10.2. Streamlining Requirements

We take further steps here based on parties' proposed modifications designed to streamline consideration of the applications for consolidation. Both California Water Association and the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission⁶³ recommended the practice in GRCs and cost of capital filings⁶⁴ of Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) also apply to applications for mergers and acquisitions, although they differ on which data should be included. As California Water Association identified, several Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recommendations were already contained within the D.99-10-064. The only reason to include these here was for ease of reference.

The current agreed-upon data elements approved by D.99-10-064 and affirmed in the instant proceeding by both the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission and California Water Association are:

⁶³ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission July 2019 Comments at 4, California Water Association July 2019 Comments at 10.

⁶⁴ D.07-05-062, Appendix A, Attachments 1-2.

- A copy of the purchase agreement;⁶⁵
- A copy of any appraisals conducted in the past five years;⁶⁶
- A forecast of the results of operation for (1) the acquiring utility, (2) the acquired utility, and (3) the combined operation;⁶⁷
- A list of all assets funded by the state or federal government and other contributions;⁶⁸
- Assets funded by contributions;⁶⁹ and
- Indication of compliance orders for failures to meet drinking water standards⁷⁰

Both the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission and California Water Association proposed additional items to be submitted with the application that we adopt. We agree that if all of the documents required for an acquisition are filed as requested, and there is no controversy over the statements or facts then there should be an acceleration in processing the application or advice letter. These nonduplicative items proposed by both California Water

⁶⁵ Required to ensure compliance with Pub. Util. Code Sections 851 – 854.

⁶⁶ Section 2.05 to Appendix A of D.99-10-064 requires just one appraisal. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission proposed specifying that this requirement be limited to any appraisal in connection with the sale. We are not persuaded to make such a change in this proceeding.

⁶⁷ Section 2.04 to Appendix A of D.99-10-064.

⁶⁸ Section 2.06 to Appendix A of D.99-10-064.

⁶⁹ Section 2.07 to Appendix A of D.99-10-064.

⁷⁰ Implicit in Sections 3.01 and 3.02 to Appendix A of D.99-10-064. In Reply Comments dated July 24, 2019 at 5, California Water Association recommends this indication be included as well

Association (1-2, 4-5)⁷¹ and the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission (all items except 9, 10)⁷² are approved and listed below:

1. Estimate the potential monthly incremental cost impact on existing and acquired customers following the actual results of the Buyer's most recently authorized tariffs.
 - a. If a Buyer has pending request before the Commission to change rates, it must also calculate the above using data as proposed in its pending request.
2. If the Buyer has a present intention to increase the acquired system's rates to a certain level, please state the basis for the targeted rate and period of time for such targeted rate to be implemented.
3. Provide the annual depreciation expense using the proposed rate base of the acquired assets. If the exact depreciation expense is not available, provide the best estimate of the annual depreciation expense. Show how the depreciation expense is calculated.
4. Provide an estimate of the annual revenue requirement of the system proposed to be acquired. Provide the assumptions for the annual revenue requirement, including expected rate of return, expected depreciation expense, O&M expenses, etc.
5. Other than the revenue requirement data requested above, separately identify all other approved and/or intended impacts to customer bills (*i.e.*, surcharges, passthrough fees, etc.).
6. Provide a listing of any entities that currently receive free service from the acquired utility.
7. If the acquired utility has increased rates in the last year, please state the date of the increase and provide a copy of

⁷¹ California Water Association July 2019 Reply Comments at 5.

⁷² The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission July 2019 Comments at Attachment 1.

the new rate schedule and the total annual revenues produced under the new rates.

8. Are there any leases, easements, and access to public rights-of-way that Buyer will need in order to provide service which will not be conveyed at closing? If yes, identify when the conveyance will take place and whether there will be additional costs involved.
9. Provide a breakdown of the estimated transaction and closing costs. Provide invoices to support any transaction and closing costs that have already been incurred.
10. Describe known and anticipated general expense savings and efficiencies under Buyer's ownership. State the basis for all assumptions used in developing these savings and efficiencies and provide all supporting documentation for the assumptions.
11. Provide a copy of the Seller's request for proposals (if there was one) and any accompanying exhibits with respect to the proposed sale of the water system or water system assets.
12. Provide a copy of the request for proposals and exhibits of the Buyer for the purchase of the acquired water system or water system assets.
13. Provide a copy of the Buyer's offer to purchase the acquired water system or water system assets and the Seller's response to that offer.
14. Provide a copy of all offers to purchase the water system or water system assets received by the Seller.
15. For each Utility Valuation Expert (UVE) providing testimony or exhibits, please provide the following:
 - a. A list of valuations of utility property performed by the UVE;
 - b. A list of appraisals of utility property performed by the UVE;
 - c. A list of all dockets in which the UVE submitted testimony to a public utility commission or regulatory

- authority related to the acquisition of utility property;
and
- d. An electronic copy of or electronic link to testimony in which the UVE testified on public utility fair value acquisitions in the past two years.
16. Explain each discount rate used in the appraisals and valuations, including explanations of the capital structure, cost of equity and cost of debt. State the basis for each input. Provide all sources, documentation, calculations and/or workpapers used in determining the inputs.
17. Explain whether the appraisal/valuation used replacement cost or reproduction cost and why that methodology was chosen.
18. Provide a copy of the source for the purchase price and number of customers for each comparable acquisition used in the appraisals.
19. Have Buyer and Seller either directly or through an intermediary (*i.e.* UVE) corresponded with regard to negotiating a fair market value or acquisition price of the assets at issue in this case? If yes, provide the following information:
- Identify the nature and date(s) of correspondence;
 - Identify the type(s) of correspondence (*i.e.* written, verbal, etc.); and
 - Provide copies of any written correspondence exchanged.
20. Are there any outstanding compliance issues, including but not limited to water quality violations, that the Seller's system has pending with the Board's Division of Drinking Water? If yes, provide the following information:
- Identify the compliance issue(s);
 - Provide an estimated date of compliance;
 - Explain Buyer's anticipated or actual plan for remediation;
 - Provide Buyer's estimated costs for remediation; and,

- e. Indicate whether the cost of remediation was or is anticipated to be factored into either or both fair market valuation appraisals offered in this proceeding.
21. Are there any outstanding compliance issues that the Seller's system has pending with the US Environmental Protection Agency? If yes, provide the following information:
 - a. Identify the compliance issue(s);
 - b. Provide an estimated date of compliance;
 - c. Explain Buyer's anticipated or actual plan for remediation;
 - d. Provide Buyer's estimated costs for remediation; and
 - e. Indicate whether the cost of remediation was or is anticipated to be factored into either or both fair market valuation appraisals offered in this proceeding.
22. Provide copies of all notices of a proposed acquisition given to affected customers.
23. Provide copies of all disclosures and customer notices required by Pub. Util. Code § 10061 related to the sale and disposal of utilities owned by municipal corporations.
24. Describe other requests to be included in the application, including but not limited to requests for approval of:
 - a. Consulting, transition of service, water wholesaling, or other agreements;
 - b. Interim rate increases outside of a general rate case proceeding or other special rate treatment (*e.g.*, CPI-U rate increases, or rate increases under Class C/D requirements);
 - c. Facilities construction;
 - d. Memorandum or Balancing Accounts.
25. Identify the ratepayer benefits that accrue to current ratepayers of the system being acquired due to this transaction.

26. Provide a copy of the due diligence analysis, if any, prepared by the applicant in connection with the proposed transaction.
27. Identify all actions the applicant has taken with governmental agencies related to obtaining required permits and/or approvals to effectuate the acquisition.
28. Provide all workpapers that support the testimony for each of the witnesses that accompany the application, in native format where possible.

In addition to the items listed above, we find the following information, when presented as part of the application or with the MDR and subsequently included in the record will help streamline consideration of an application for consolidation:

- A list of recommended, proposed or required capital improvements to the acquired water system for the next ten years, with cost estimates;
- If applicable, supporting documentation for the designation of Disadvantaged Community; and
- If applicable, documents required by Pub. Util. Code Section 10061(c).

The use of MDRs balances the need for speedy consideration of the applications and advice letters with our statutory requirements.

10.3. Maintenance of At-Risk Timeline

The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission and California Water Association agreed that time has caused certain Commission procedural requirements to conflict with the 245-day and 100-day schedules. Both the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission⁷³ and

⁷³ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission Comments dated July 10, 2019 at 6.

California Water Association⁷⁴ noted that D.99-10-064's 245-day timeline does not allow for a Scoping Memo, as required by Pub. Util. Code Section 1701.5(b)(1). The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recommended the timeline in D.99-10-064 should be modified to comport with Pub. Util. Code Section 1701.5(b)(1), Commission Rules 2.6(a) and Rule 2.6(e), and General Order (GO) 96-B (General Rules 7.4.1 and 7.4.3), with specific timelines at the beginning of applications that allow for public input and participation. Both California Water Association and the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission acknowledged that there is no way to both stay within the current timelines and accommodate these procedural requirements.

We distinguish here between the urgency when a system is at-risk and out-of-compliance with Section 116655 of the Health and Safety Code for failure to meet primary or secondary drinking water standards, as defined in Section 116275 of the Health and Safety Code. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission stated that only one recent Commission water acquisition was for a troubled system, which appears consistent with the examples California Water Association provided of Commission-approved acquisitions of troubled systems.⁷⁵ As noted in the Staff Report on the Workshop held on December 15, 2017, over 30 water acquisitions have occurred over the last decade. However, according to the California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) draft report attached to the September 4, 2019 Ruling, approximately one-third of the 2,903 community

⁷⁴ California Water Association Comments dated July 10, 2019 at 9. Also *see* at 11, where California Water Association simultaneously recommends against any extension of the 245-day schedule.

⁷⁵ California Water Association Comments on Scoping Memo of February 23, 2018 at 3.

water systems were out-of-compliance for the presence of one contaminant. From a composite water quality score established by OEHHHA, 9% had scores meriting concern.⁷⁶ In the spirit of all current and pending legislation incentivizing and streamlining consolidation to address these safety issues, the Commission should be encouraging Commission-regulated utilities to thoroughly consider acquiring at-risk systems. Those applications are processed through Advice Letter, therefore eliminating the need for a Scoping Memo. As outlined by the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission, incorporating the required protest periods mean that 2.5 months of the 4 months (which is already more than 100 days) are consumed by required timeframes, leaving approximately 1.5 months for consideration.⁷⁷ Because safety is a stake, we will not extend this timeline any further and instead emphasize that these applications should be given the highest priority.

Non-troubled systems may still be ripe for consolidation purposes, especially when the affordability issues are identified and customer benefits conclusively demonstrated.⁷⁸ Communities designated as disadvantaged should be prioritized. However, these timelines can and should incorporate minor modifications to bring the timelines established by D.99-10-064 in line with subsequent Commission and Board actions. Specifically, we will modify the timeline to standardize initial steps in the proceedings⁷⁹ and change the language

⁷⁶ OEHHHA Draft Report, August 2019, at 40 and Table 17. The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission Comments of February 23, 2018 at 3 provided that the Board identified a total of 332 out-of-compliance systems serving 513,794 connections as of February 1, 2018.

⁷⁷ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission 2019 Comments at 8.

⁷⁸ California Water Association 2019 Comments at 13-14.

⁷⁹ California Water Association 2019 Comments at 11.

of coordination between Commission authorization and the State Water Resources Control Board's permitting process. We decline to limit the scope of the applications as recommended by the Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission,⁸⁰ as this is an activity more properly performed in each proceeding as the Scoping Memo is developed.

10.3.1. Identification of Opportunities for Consolidation

While consolidations should be considered outside of GRC timelines, we should also enhance GRC requirements to consider in a more comprehensive manner consolidation as a remedy for safety and affordability concerns. The current requirement in GRCs is for utilities to identify adjacent mutual, or Class C or D companies, for potential consolidation.⁸¹ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission recommended utilities be required to perform a "cross check" with the Board's most current list of drinking water systems statewide that are out of compliance with drinking water standards.⁸² Even though GRCs will occur every three years at the most, this requirement provides an opportunity for routine oversight of Water Action Plan item 6. However, we will remove the word adjacent from the requirement, and include all types of out-of-compliance systems regardless of geographic proximity.

11. Utility Affiliate Transaction Rules and Safe Drinking Water Loan Funds

We agree with parties that no changes are needed to our affiliate transaction or safe drinking water loan fund rules at this time. Both the Public

⁸⁰ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission 2019 Comments at 5.

⁸¹ D.07-05-062, Appendix A, Attachment 1 (Minimum Data Requirements for Utility General Rate Case Application and Testimony), Section II.K.3.

⁸² https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/hr2w/docs/data/inventory_map_summary.xls

Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission and California Water Service Company argued the existing affiliate transaction rules established in D.10-10-019 provide enough flexibility to allow for Commission-regulated utilities to administer failing systems and also provide important consumer protections that guard against ratepayer subsidization of nonregulated services.⁸³ California Water Association sought greater assistance from Commission staff in working with Board staff in the application and implementation process.

We will, therefore, maintain current utility affiliate transaction rules. We did not identify any specific suggestions to improve our processes as they relate to safe drinking water loans. We agree with California Water Association that Commission staff should continue to provide as much assistance as possible in the safe drinking water application process.

12. Next Steps

12.1. Phase II Scoping Memo and Ruling Directing Covid-19 Related Reporting

On June 2, 2020, Second Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling was issued in this proceeding to gather information and consider additional Commission responses to the COVID-19 pandemic.

On March 16, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-28-20 requesting the Commission monitor measures undertaken by public and private utilities to implement customer service protections in response to COVID-19 pandemic.

⁸³ The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission Comments dated September 16, 2019 at 11, California Water Association Comments dated September 16, 2019 at 25. Also see The Public Advocates Office of the Public Utilities Commission and California Water Association Comments of February 23, 2018.

On March 17, 2020, the Commission's Executive Director, Alice Stebbins, issued a letter to Class A and B water utilities ordering immediate protections for water utility customers, including a moratorium on disconnections. The Commission subsequently ratified that order through Resolution M-4842.

On April 2, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-42-20 affirming the Commission's moratorium on water disconnections and additional customer protections.

These actions are just some of the initial steps in responding to this emergency and in order to assess the impact of these actions, the overall impact of the emergency, and to help us formulate our next steps, we have opened a new phase in this proceeding as this Rulemaking already deals with many of the subjects impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, we have expanded the scope of this existing rulemaking proceeding to add a Phase II to seek input on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on water utilities and their customers to formulate our next step(s).

This proceeding will remain open to address these Phase II issues upon issuance of this decision.

12.2. Alignment with Statewide Programs and Processes

There remain several issues that may be affected by pending statewide legislative action. Most prominently, the low-income assistance programs may be funded and structured consistently statewide.⁸⁴ The Board's final recommendation is to fund assistance programs through general taxes. Additionally, the Board proposes to help renters who are not directly customers

⁸⁴ <https://innovation.luskin.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Recommendations-Low-Income-Water-Rate-Assistance-Program.pdf>

of water utilities through a tax credit. We do not know the timeline for implementation of the Board's final recommendation, yet we want to accommodate parties' ability to adapt as necessary the current water rate assistance programs.

13. Conclusion

This decision summarizes our review of the low-income rate assistance programs for Class A water utilities under the Commission's jurisdiction and ensures consistency in program terminology for the different utilities. In addition, the decision concludes our initial review of sales forecasting and requires utilities to adopt a Monterey-style WRAM as part of our efforts to keep rates just and reasonable. Further, we require water utilities to provide analysis in their next GRC to determine the appropriate Tier 1 breakpoint that aligns with the baseline amount of water for basic human needs for each ratemaking area. This decision also identifies areas of reporting that has been inconsistent and requires water utilities to provide consistent reporting in the future, and provides direction for a small scale pilot programs to test delivering benefits to low-income renters in multi-family buildings that do not pay a water bill directly. Finally, we have initiated a Phase II in this proceeding to address the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on water utilities and their customers to formulate our next step(s) addressing those impacts.

14. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____ and reply comments were filed on _____.

15. Assignment of Proceeding

Martha Guzman Aceves is the assigned Commissioner and Robert Haga is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The WRAM/MCBA ratemaking mechanism provides that when actual water sales are less than adopted, the difference in sales revenue will be recovered through a balancing account.

2. If actual sales exceed adopted sales, the WRAM/MCBA mechanism will return the over-collected revenues to customers through a balancing account. WRAM/MCBA ratemaking mechanisms were adopted by settlements in GRCs for California-American Water Company, California Water Service Company, Golden State Water Company, Liberty Utilities (Park Water) Corp., and Liberty Utilities (Apple Valley Ranchos Water) Corp. in 2008.

3. The major purpose of adopting WRAM/MCBA was to decouple sales from revenues and thus promote conservation.

4. The MCBA provides that variable costs are reduced when there is a reduction in water quantity sales.

5. The ICBA provides that variable costs are reduced under the Monterey-Style WRAM mechanism.

The various options for modifying or eliminating WRAM/MCBA as ordered by D.12-04-048 were not adjudicated and resolved in subsequent GRC proceedings.

6. Although D.16-12-026 concluded that the WRAM/MCBA ratemaking mechanism should be continued at that time, it noted the reasons for continuing WRAM included forecast uncertainty, conservation, and the need for investment during the drought.

7. The quantification of changes in risk due to the existence or elimination of WRAM/MCBA has not been addressed since the WRAM/MCBA was adopted.

8. While the WRAM/MCBA was adopted to encourage conservation, the application of this ratemaking mechanism has led to substantial under-collections and subsequent increases in quantity rates.

9. Conservation of water use is by customers, not the utility.

10. Average consumption per metered connection for WRAM utilities is less than the consumption per metered connection for non-WRAM utilities.

11. Conservation for WRAM utilities measured as a percentage change during the last 5 years is less than conservation achieved by non-WRAM utilities, including Class B utilities.

12. Since WRAM/MCBA is implemented through a balancing account, there are intergenerational transfers of costs.

13. The WRAM/MCBA mechanism is not the best means to minimize intergenerational transfers of costs when compared to an alternative available to the utilities and the Commission.

Tiered rate design causes customers to use less water at increased costs per unit consumed; thus, use of tiered rate design is a reasonable means to stabilizing revenues.

14. The Monterey-Style WRAM combined with the ICBA is a method to account for lesser quantity sales and stabilize revenues.

Implementation of a Monterey-Style WRAM means that forecasts of sales become very significant in establishing test year revenues.

15. No quantification of the risk effects of using the WRAM/MCBA mechanism is evident in past GRC proceedings.

16. During a governor declared drought emergency, it is reasonable to provide utilities not using a WRAM/MCBA mechanism to establish lost revenue memorandum accounts.

17. A single, straight-forward name will aid outreach to consumers and statewide coordination in the delivery of assistance to low-income consumers. California-American Water Company's Advice Letter 1221 for establishing a tariff that provided a discount to low-income multi-family renters provides a good starting point for a pilot.

18. The information delineated in Section 10, Water Consolidation Timelines, above is a reasonable minimum amount of information required to begin a streamlined review of the proposed consolidation transaction.

Conclusions of Law

1. This decision should be effective today to provide timely notice to Class A water utilities in advance of their next GRC filings.

2. Consideration of changes to the WRAM/MCBA is and has always been within the scope of this proceeding as part of our review of how to improve water sales forecasting.

3. Elimination of the WRAM/MCBA mechanism is a policy decision not determined by law.

The Monterey-style WRAM provides better incentives to more accurately forecast sales while still providing the utility the ability to earn a reasonable rate of return.

4. As WRAM utilities have individual factors affecting a transition to Monterey-Style WRAM mechanism, this transition should be implemented in each WRAM utilities' respective upcoming GRC applications.

5. A reasonable transition to the new uniform name should be adopted.

The Customer Assistance Program (CAP) name should be used for all Commission-regulated water utilities for their low-income water assistance programs.

6. It is reasonable to allow each water utility to adopt the uniform CAP name as part of its next general rate case.

7. The process to achieve consolidation should be as effective and efficient as possible.

8. Water utilities should provide analysis in their next GRC case to determine the appropriate Tier 1 breakpoint that aligns with the baseline amount of water for basic human needs for each ratemaking area.

9. Water utilities should consider and provide analysis for establishing a baseline not set below both the Essential Indoor Usage of 600 cubic feet per household per month, as stated in the Affordability Rulemaking (R.18-07-006) and the average winter use in each ratemaking district.

10. California-American Water Company should be directed to file a Tier 3 advice letter, within 60-days of the issuance of this decision, outlining a pilot program that provides a discount to water users in low-income multi-family dwellings that do not pay their water bill directly through the utility.

All other Class A water utilities interested in creating a low-income multi-family pilot program should file a Tier 3 advice letter that includes at least the same level of detail.

11. This proceeding should remain open to consider Phase II issues.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. In any future general rate case applications filed after the effective date of this decision, a water utility must discuss how these specific factors impact the sales forecast presented in the application:

- (a) Impact of revenue collection and rate design on sales and revenue collection;
- (b) Impact of planned conservation programs;
- (c) Changes in customer counts;
- (d) Previous and upcoming changes to building codes requiring low flow fixtures and other water-saving measures, as well as any other relevant code changes;
- (e) Local and statewide trends in consumption, demographics, climate population density, and historic trends by ratemaking area; and
- (f) Past Sales Trends.

2. Water utilities shall provide analysis in their next general rate case applications to determine the appropriate Tier 1 breakpoint that aligns with the baseline amount of water for basic human needs for each ratemaking area.

3. California-American Water Company, California Water Service Company, Golden State Water Company, Liberty Utilities (Park Water) Corporation, and Liberty Utilities (Apple Valley Ranchos Water) Corporation, in their next general rate case applications, shall transition existing Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms to Monterey-Style Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms.

4. Commission regulated water utilities shall name or rename their respective low-income water assistance program as “Customer Assistance Program” as part of their next general rate case applications. Water utilities with low-income programs shall describe their programs in filings and public

outreach with the name “Customer Assistance Program.” Water utilities may use the CAP acronym where appropriate.

5. California-American Water Company shall file a Tier 3 advice letter, within 60-days of the issuance of this decision, outlining a pilot program that provides a discount to water users in low-income multi-family dwellings that do not pay their water bill directly through the utility.

6. Each water utility shall comply with existing reporting requirements as summarized below:

- Annual reporting requirements from Decision (D.) 11-05-004.
- To each Annual Report, attach Minimum Data Requests submitted in the prior year period as part of 1) General Rate Case (GRC) filing, 2) applications for acquisitions (or expansion based on new requirement in this decision).
- Compliance, and associated data and analysis with orders from D.14-10-047, and D.16-12-026 in each GRC filing.
- Inclusion of disconnection and payment behaviors required in this proceeding beginning in June 2020 through June 2021.

7. In any application by a water utility for consolidation or acquisition of another system, the utility shall provide the information identified in Section 10, Water Consolidation Timelines, above as part of the application or with the Minimum Data Request in order to help streamline consideration of its application.

8. Rulemaking 17-06-024 remains open to consider Phase II issues.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX A – STYLE REFERENCE TABLES

Common Styles – May be Accessed from Styles Ribbon

Name	Description/Usage	Shortcut
Standard	Body text	Alt Ctrl `
Heading 1	First level headings	Alt Ctrl 1
Heading 2	Second level headings	Alt Ctrl 2
Heading 3	Third level headings	Alt Ctrl 3
List Alpha	Lower case lettered list at one indent	Alt Ctrl A
List Bullet	Bulleted list at one indent	Alt Ctrl B
Block Quote	Block quotes	Alt Ctrl Q
FoF	Findings of Fact	
CoL	Conclusions of Law	
OP	Ordering Paragraphs	

Uncommon Styles – Accessed from Styles Pane (Ctrl + Alt + Shift + S)

Name	Description/Usage	Shortcut
No Spacing	“Standard” Style – Single spaced, no indent	
Dummy	Unnumbered headings	
Heading 4	Fourth level headings (avoid deep subheadings if possible)	
Heading 5	Fifth level headings (avoid deep subheadings if possible)	
Heading 6	Sixth level headings (avoid deep subheadings if possible)	
List Num	Numbered list at one indent. Avoid if possible.	
Table Text	Text inside tables	
Main	Centered titles	
Mainex	“Order” title	
TOC 1/2/etc.	Table of Contents style by level	
TOC Heading	Table of Contents title	
Footnote Text	Footnotes	

Fonts and Usage

Font	Description/Usage
Arial 13 Bold Caps	Titles
Arial 13 Bold	Headings
Book Antiqua 13	Body text
Book Antiqua 11	Footnotes

(END OF APPENDIX A)