June 23, 2017

Rami Kahlon, Director
Water Division California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: San Jose Water Company’s Advice Letter 510-W

Dear Mr. Kahlon:

The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) of the California Public Utilities Commission hereby submits its timely Protest to Advice Letter (AL) 510, which was designated Tier II and filed by San Jose Water Company (SJWC) on June 6, 2017.

The 20-day protest period of AL 510 ends on June 26, 2017.

**A. SUMMARY OF ADVICE LETTER REQUEST**

In AL 510, SJWC proposes to refund a three-year period of overcharges purportedly totaling $1.8 million that the company claims were “a result of a change in billing practice effective January 1, 2017.”

**B. GROUNDS FOR PROTEST & RECOMMENDATION**

Consistent with General Order 96-B, General Rule 7.4.2, ORA protests AL 510 on the grounds that the relief requested in the advice letter requires consideration in a formal hearing and is inappropriate for the advice letter process.

Rule 5.1 of General Order 96-B states that, “The advice letter process provides a quick and simplified review of the types of utility requests that are expected neither to be controversial nor to raise important policy questions.” Based upon information presented to the Commission in a pending formal complaint, the request contained in AL 510 appears to raise significant policy questions and to be highly controversial.

---

1. Advice Letter No. 510, page 2
2. C.17-06-009
California Public Utilities Commission
Water Branch, Office of Ratepayer Advocates
Richard Smith, Program Manager

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

E. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The issue raised in AL 510 cannot be adequately examined and resolved through an informal

unmediated proceeding.

In order to fully consider the matter and the customer's concerns, the case and matter file shall be
examined in an evidentiary record. A determination of the relevant issues should be made and the
case(s) and matter file should be resolved by the commission and should be

E. DISCUSSION

On June 6, 2017, SWC filed AL 510 with the Commission.

On April 17, 2017, the customer submitted a formal complaint to the Commission.

The customer's complaint concerned service charges, the customer's attempts to have the
charges billed to a different account number, and the customer's concern about the accuracy of the
charges.

C. BACKGROUND

In a parallel formal complaint, both parties should be consulted with the scope of a formal

investigation. Since the issues in AL 510 parallel those presented in the Commission
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