

	Comments	Response
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>DATE: 1/9/17 TIME: 10:51 am</b> SIR I HAVE READ IT ALL AND ALL THE ATTACHMENTS. AND THIS RATE INCREASE IS APPLIED FOR TO THE PUC, NOT CUPERTINO. SO WHERE IS THE APPLICATION TO THE CITY OF CUPERTINO AND THE DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED INCREASE OTHER THAN WATER AND POWER RATE INCREASES? I SUBMIT THAT THIS IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE LEASE AGREEMENT IN ANY WAY AND THAT THERE IS NOT A APPLICATION FROM SJW FOR A RATE INCREASE FOR APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL AT A CITY COUNCIL MEETING. THE CITY COUNCIL HAS NO AUTHORITY TO VOTE ON THIS PER THE LEASE AGREEMENT AND SJW IS AGAIN IN NON COMPLIANCE OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT. ANY APPROVAL OF A RATE INCREASE BY THE PUC DOES NOT HAVE ANY AUTHORITY IN THE CASE OF THE CUPERTINO OWNED WATER SYSTEM, SINCE IT IS A MUNICIPAL UTILITY SYSTEM. THIS AGENDA ITEM MUST BE CANCELLED FROM THE AGENDA UNTIL A VALID APPLICATION IS SUBMITTED BY SJW.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/9/17, 10:54 pm</b> ROGER THIS LETTER OF APPROVAL FROM THE PUC MEANS NOTHING IN CUPERTINO. THE PUC HAS NO AUTHORITY OVER A MUNICIPAL WATER SYSTEM OWNED BY A INCORPORATED CITY. (Exhibit 1)</p>	
<p><b>Customer #2</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/12/17, 8:22 pm</b> To Whom It May Concern, I respectfully request that the Cupertino City Council vote No to the San Jose Water Company rate increase. If the City Council does not vote No to this, I will vote No on the council members re-election. San Jose Water Company is already extremely profitable and has remained so throughout the drought. They have been taking more of my money throughout the drought.</p>	

	<p>In June of 2015 I spent over \$1000 in materials and 30 hours of my own time to reduce the water needs on my property. Comparing the full year of 2016 (with water savings in place) and the full year of 2014 (before I implemented the water savings), I reduced my water consumption by 34% from 377CCF to 247CCF. The reward for all of this expense and manual labor? 38% more money given to San Jose Water company! The 2014 bill total was \$1,709.99 and 2016 was \$2,359.90.</p> <p>And now they want more money? I don't think so.</p> <p>Additionally they (or some other slimey outfit in their name) keeps bombarding our mailbox with water line insurance offers. This is a total waste of trees, not to mention water need in the paper making process. I understand the risks, I prefer to self insure myself on this. I can't make this barrage of offers stop.</p> <p>Please don't give in to these unjustified increases from this monopolistic company. Let them get their own house in order to increase profits.</p> <p>Thank You</p>	
<p><b>Customer #3</b> <b>Vicky Ho</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/13/17; 1:07 pm</b></p> <p>We oppose this fee increase.</p> <p>Seems that rates increases when we do not have enough rain and increases when we have enough rain.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #4</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/13/17; 2:30 pm</b></p> <p>Office of the City Clerk,</p> <p>We like to voice our opposition to the proposed increase of the water rate by 3.83%. Our water rate has been increased continually over the last several years without good justification. We have been saving water over the same time period because of the drought and are still paying more for the reduced water amount we are using. As retired people we do not get increases in our social security payments etc. but some costs such as the water rates are going up again and again. The increase is way too high and also making the increase retroactive should not be allowed.</p> <p>Please vote against this proposed increase.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #6</b> <b>Yu Jen Wang</b> <b>Jessica Cheng</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/13/17; 10:32 pm</b></p> <p>Owners of [REDACTED] Cupertino oppose the 3.83% water rate increase unless City provides enough reasons to justify this proposal. The letter dated 1/6/2017 sent by the Public Work Department does not provide sufficient reasons to justify this rate increase.</p>	

<p><b>Customer #7</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/14/17; 3:19 pm</b> I am writing to advise that I am against the proposed increase.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #8</b> <b>Randy Hylkema</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/17/17; 12:51 pm</b> In your letter to Cupertino residents you solicited comments about the proposed 3.8% 2017 increases. Of course the water district and SJW have submitted arguments that this increase is reasonable and necessary. But please keep in mind the steep increases of recent years. I think I am a fairly typical homeowner, and in our case: Total water charges increased from 2013 to 2016 by 15% while in those three years our annual water usage decreased by 36%. As a result our per unit total cost for water increased by 80%! So please scrutinize the proposal to see if this 3.8% is truly necessary and justified. Regards</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/17/17; 1:41 pm</b> PER THE LEASE AGREEMENT THE CITY COUNCIL CAN APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE A RATE INCREASE BASED ON RECEIVING A RATE INCREASE APPLICATION FROM SJW THAT IS VALID. THE CURRENT APPLICATION IS NOT SUBMITTED AS A COMPLETE AND VALID APPLICATION FOR A RATE INCREASE FOR THIS SERVICE AREA OF THE LEASE. THIS SERVICE AREA IS NOT REGULATED BY THE PUC AND ANY RATE INCREASE APPROVED, PRE-APPROVED OR APPROVED WITH EFFECTIVE DATES BY THE PUC ARE NOT BINDING IN THIS MUNICIPAL WATER UTILITY DISTRICT BECAUSE IT IS OWNED BY THE CITY AND ONLY LEASED BY SJW. ANY RATE INCREASE SAID TO BE RETROACTIVE IS ALSO NOT BINDING. THE CITY COUNCIL IS THE GOVERNING BODY FOR APPROVAL OF A VALID RATE INCREASE APPLICATION BY SJW AT THE TIME OF AN APPLICATION SUBMITTAL. CONTINUING, PER THE LEASE AGREEMENT THE COUNCIL CAN CONSIDER WHAT RATES ARE IN SURROUNDING AREA BUT IS NOT IN ANY WAY REQUIRED TO ADOPT THOSE RATES. RATE INCREASES FOR WATER ONLY AND FOR POWER CAN BE CONSIDERED BUT THIS CURRENT INCOMPLETE RATE INCREASE APPLICATION DOES NOT DETAIL OUT WHAT THE INCREASES IN FOR</p>	

	<p>AND SEEMS TO INCLUDE INCREASES FOR OPERATIONAL COSTS OUTSIDE THIS SERVICE AREA.</p> <p>SJW CANNOT CHARGE FOR THE COSTS OF BRINGING WATER TO THIS SERVICE AREAS BOUNDARIES AND IF FACT SCVWD BRINGS THE WATER WE PAY FOR TO THE BOUNDARIES NOTR THRU ANY SJW OTHER SERVICE AREA SYSTEMS.</p> <p>ALSO IF THIS IS FOR A RATE INCREASE FOR WATER, WHICH WATER THAT IS BEING SUPPLIED TO US? THE IMPORTED WATER FROM SJW THAT THEY PAY FOR FROM SCVWD [AND WHAT DO THEY PAY FOR THE WATER?] OR THE WATER SJW GETS FROM THE CITY OWNED WELLS THAT THEY ONLY PAY A WELL TAX ON [AND WHAT IS THE WELL TAX COST?]?</p> <p>ANY PROPOSED RATE INCREASE FOR ANY OPERATIONAL COSTS HAVE TO BE DETAILED OUT AND ARE ONLY FOR WITHIN THIS SERVICE AREA. [EXAMPLES IN THE PUC APPLICATION; PUMP STATIONS IN LOS GATOS???] OUR IMPORTED WATER THAT WE PAY FOR DOES NOT COME FROM LOS GATOS AND THE CITY OWNED WELL ARE IN THIS SERVICE AREA.</p> <p>THIS WATER SYSTEM IS OWNED BY THE PEOPLE OF CUPERTINO AND BOTH THE CITY COUCIL OF CUPERTINO AND SJW ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PEOPLE OF CUPERTINO FOR HOW IT IS RUN AND THE RATES WE PAY.</p> <p>TRANSPARENCY BY BOTH PARTIES WHO SIGNED THE LEASE IS MANDATORY.</p> <p>AT THIS TIME, AS IN THE PAST BOTH PARTIES ARE IN NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT.</p> <p>BECAUSE THIS CURRENT APPLICATION FOR A RATE INCREASE IS NOT VALID THE CITY COUNCIL CAN NOT APPROVAL IT AS SUBMITTED.</p> <p>PLEASE MAKE SURE THIS IS IN THE CITY COUNCILS MEETING PACKAGE</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/17/17; 5:08 pm</b></p> <p>and letters or comments to the agenda item on the proposed water rate increase should be posted as they are received by the city at any time before the meeting so that residence can see other comments and prepare for the meeting, otherwise they only see the letters at the meeting.</p> <p>transparency!</p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/18/17, 6:51 am</b></p> <p>City of Cupertino</p> <p>I understand your request. The comments will be included with the staff report and available a week prior to the meeting. I will get back to you today about getting</p>

		<p>the comments posted as they are received. A once a week update should be manageable.</p>
<p><b>Customer #9</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/17/17; 6:17 pm</b>  Dear Council....  I will not be able to attend the meeting but I would like a response to the following:  - How is this 3.83% increase comparable to other municipalities within the SC county that is served by SJ Water?  - Is this increase unique to this year or can we expect an increase each year going forward?    - Does the new Apple facility impact this increase in rates?  Thank you for your time and subsequent response.</p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/17/17; 6:17 pm</b>  <b>City of Cupertino</b>  Thank you for your questions. Please find below responses to your questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed 3.83% increase to rates of customers served by the municipal water system leased to San Jose Water Co. will, if authorized, be slightly less than the rate currently charged by California Water Service Company (CWSC). CWSC serves the City of Los Altos and about 1/3 of Cupertino . A comparison example of the two rates is in the "Water Rate Increase FAQ's" document on the City's website: <a href="http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?recordid=1728&amp;page=26">http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?recordid=1728&amp;page=26</a>.</li> <li>6. Due to varying charges for meters and quantity points established by water retailers, it is challenging to make direct comparisons among the retailers. For example, the City of Santa Clara charges a flat \$4.95 per hundred cubic feet of water consumed and a monthly charge of \$14.30/mn for a ¾" meter.</li> <li>2. Annual increases are likely. Please refer to this question and response in the FAQ document referenced.</li> </ol>

		3. The proposed increase is not related to the Apple facility.
<p><b>Customer #10</b> <b>Rosa Li</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/18/17; 3:35 pm</b> City of Cupertino, I am strongly opposed to the proposed rate increase of 3.83%. Cupertino residents have already had several rate increases in the past few years. In light of the storm levels this month, there is no shortage of water in our city. Our family has taken every possible measure to conserve water, and do not feel like we should continue to pay for the inefficiency of others. Instead of a rate increase, we were expecting a rate decrease now that the water levels are back to normal. Please forward my opposition to whoever is proposing these rate increase. Thank you</p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/19/17; 12:17 pm</b> San Jose Water Company Thank you for your feedback. Please know that San Jose Water Company does not declare drought shortages. We are responding to the drought mandates and targets from the Governor as well as the Santa Clara Valley Water District. Over the last few years, we have gone to great lengths to engage and inform our customers on the relationship between rates and conservation as well as the need to invest in our water system to ensure safe, high quality, and reliable water service. The investment issue is impacting utilities all over the US while the drought issue is more local to our state. More information can be found on our comprehensive drought page at <a href="https://www.sjwater.com/news/topic/comprehensive-drought-information">https://www.sjwater.com/news/topic/comprehensive-drought-information</a>. The Value of Water video contains an explanation on the rates-conservation nexus. If you have further questions, please don't hesitate to contact me. <b>Email message dated 1/20/17; 6:21 am</b> <b>San Jose Water Company</b> Please see below links to information that further illustrate the rates-conservation nexus as well as the need to invest in our water systems. I hope you find them informative. Best, John</p>

		<a href="http://www.eastbaytimes.com/2017/01/18/residents-blast-25-percent-water-rate-hike-proposal/">http://www.eastbaytimes.com/2017/01/18/residents-blast-25-percent-water-rate-hike-proposal/</a> <a href="http://news.wef.org/u-s-epa-survey-reveals-need-for-drinking-water-infrastructure-investment/">http://news.wef.org/u-s-epa-survey-reveals-need-for-drinking-water-infrastructure-investment/</a> <a href="http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/water-infrastructure/">http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/water-infrastructure/</a> <a href="http://www.waterrf.org/Pages/Projects.aspx?PID=4617">http://www.waterrf.org/Pages/Projects.aspx?PID=4617</a>
<b>Customer #1 John Kolski</b>	<b>Email message dated 1/18/17; 4:18 pm</b> ALL INCOMING COMMENTS SHOULD BE POSTED WHEN THEY ARRIVE IN FOR THE RESIDENCE TO READ AND NOT WAIT TO POST THEM TILL THE STAFF REPORT IS OUT, THATS TO LATE AND DOES NOT SHOW TRANSPARENCY BY THE CITY.	<b>Email message dated 1/18/17, 4:17 pm</b> <b>From City of Cupertino</b> Will post comments less any personal info by close of business Friday. Will update each week.
<b>Customer #1 John Kolski</b>	<b>Email message dated 1/18/17; 4:18 pm</b> THATS GOOD ON MY THREE LEAVE MY LETTERS ON EACH WITH MY NAME TAKE OFF ANY OTHER STUFF INCLUDING SIGNATURE/SIGN-OFFS LINES AND MY E-MAIL ADDRESSES THAT WILL SHOW	
<b>Customer #11 Henry Buffalow</b>	<b>Email message dated 1/19/17; 12:12 pm</b> I find the proposed increases to be ludicrous. First we are asked to cut water usage, then impose a penalty schedule for using more than allocated, then because of less income to SJ Water due to lesser use we now have a new proposed increase. Only thing is the water restriction should be eliminated very soon. So, greater water use in the horizon with higher rates means a surplus. Unfortunately the citizens will not receive a rebate. What is worse is unilaterally deciding to apply the new rates retroactive. What other private business can get away with that? Why are the citizens held accountable for inefficiencies of the water monopoly and local government. It is just wrong. Had the higher rates been in place at the right time customers would have had the opportunity to adjust their use, now they don't. In my case I had a water leak that has now been fixed. I paid for the excess water usage, the repair and now I'll be required to pay even more. It's just wrong. Overall I'm not opposed to the increase only as that happens with all utilities, just the retroactive component. It's just wrong.	
<b>Customer #12</b>	<b>Email message dated 1/19/17; 3:46 pm</b>	

	<p>Yay it's raining! We all hope this keeps up of course. I would like to state that I hope that Cupertino is fighting for our share of the state's water allocation. I have been amazed every time I travel to Southern California. There does not appear to be any water crisis there!! There, all the lawns are green. Yes, completely green. In all my travels there I have yet to see a "think drought" sign anywhere. Why is it, I ask, that only our area seems to be subjected to these water saving measures? Further, when I compare water costs with relatives down in the LA area their water rates are much cheaper than ours. What is going on?</p> <p>And so I hope that Cupertino is standing up for our portion of CA water rights. We will do our part, but southern CA appears to be rather callously using up OUR water!</p> <p>No doubt we all hope this year will bring more rain. I hope that rates will adjust back DOWN quickly once water resources are replenished.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #13</b> <b>Anonymous</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/21/17; 6:39 am</b> Does this rate increase apply to the facilities of St. Jude's Episcopal Church at Stelling &amp; McClellan?</p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/21/17; 6:39 am</b> <b>City of Cupertino</b> No, the St. Jude's Episcopal Church is not within the area served by the municipal water system. The church is served by a system owned and operated by San Jose Water Company (SJWC). Customers served by SJWC had their rates increased 3.83% effective January 1, 2017. The water service boundary map can be found at the City's website <a href="http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?recordid=1728&amp;page=26">http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?recordid=1728&amp;page=26</a>.</p>
<p><b>Customer #14</b></p>	<p><b>Phone call dated 1/23/17</b> Rates too high already. Not practical. Above and beyond what should be expected.</p>	<p><b>Phone conversation dated 1/23/17</b> <b>City of Cupertino</b></p>
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/23/17; 12:34 pm</b> No letters yet on the site! <a href="http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?page=26&amp;recordid=1728&amp;returnURL=%2findex.aspx%3fpage%3d1">http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?page=26&amp;recordid=1728&amp;returnURL=%2findex.aspx%3fpage%3d1</a></p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/24/17; 11:23 am</b></p>	



	<p>Thanks for getting the letters on the site But the county leaves the submitters name on letters sent in and takes off all other personal information of the submitter.</p> <p>The council and residents should know who cares either way about our city and who knows the facts.</p> <p>I feel the names should be on them. I can't see any reason why they were taken off. The comments were sent in as public record.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/24/17; 3:52 pm</b> Difference Between Publicly and Investor-Owned Utilities <a href="http://www.energy.ca.gov/pou_reporting/background/difference_pou_iou.html">http://www.energy.ca.gov/pou_reporting/background/difference_pou_iou.html</a></p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/24/17; 5:52 pm</b> Statement, Questions and required answers from the city council Regarding the proposed water rate increase. Before a vote can be made When the city operated this city owned water system, it bought water from Scvwd which was and still is delivered to this service area in pipe from Scvwd the border of this service area. The city did not get the water thru any operations of SJW SJW now leases this service area and they get the same water from the same source at the same location. Not thru any of their operations in any of their other service areas. This city owned utility regulates the rates with rate payer approval The puc has no authority here. Only the city has regulatory responsibility over this water system. This city owned water system has no connection to SJW's other water service area they own SJW cannot say the puc approved the rate increase And only operation cost within this service area borders can apply to our rates or increases to them. SJW cannot charge the service area for anything but water costs and operational costs within this service area The rate payers must be shown all the operational records of this service area before the council meeting, including the cost of water SJW buys, SJW operational costs and improvement costs in order for a rate increase to even be considered by the city council</p>	

	<p>And the rate paid in this service area has nothing to do with what other service areas are paying</p> <p>If SJW what a rare increase per the lease they have to put that application into the city of cupertino and show details of what it is for, water and operation costs.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/26/17; 4:23 pm</b>  <a href="http://cmua.org/wpcmua/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Briefing_Background.pdf">http://cmua.org/wpcmua/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Briefing_Background.pdf</a> (Exhibit 2)</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/26/17; 6:55 pm</b>          Question and required answer please before you the city council can vote on the proposed rate increase by SJW          As a rate payer in this city owned water system in which you are the regulator of.          What has SJW done per the lease agreement in maintenance of and upgrades/replacements to in this service area that the rate payers pay for in rates they pay?  <b>Email message dated 1/27/17; 10:12 am</b>          What is this e-mail? A joke. I don't accept this response at all. The city is the regulator of our water system and hare responsible to the rate payers not SJW. I asked the question to the city not SJW. I EXPECT THE ANSWER FROM THE CITY</p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/27/17; 10:04 am</b>          Specific questions can be directed to San Jose Water by calling 408-279- 7900 or visiting <a href="http://www.sjwater.com">www.sjwater.com</a>.</p>
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/27/17; 8:02 am</b>          Read the article. And tangs statement. It is the cites responsibility to the rate payers as regulator to make sure he does what he said          The Mercury News          01/27/2017 - Page B01  <b>Winter storms have made 'a significant dent'</b>   <b>Half of state is drought-free</b>   <b>By Paul Rogers</b>  <a href="mailto:progers@bayareanewsgroup.com">progers@bayareanewsgroup.com</a>          Hammered with record rainstorms and blizzards, nearly half of California is no longer in a drought, and the rest of the state saw dramatic improvement over the past week, federal scientists reported Thursday.</p>	

Overall, 49 percent of the state is now drought free, the highest level since April 2013, according to the U.S. Drought Monitor, a weekly study by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

A year ago, only 5 percent of the state was classified as not in drought conditions.

Of importance: Just 2 percent of California remains in "exceptional drought," down from 24 percent a week ago, and 64 percent at this time last year.

"We're finally seeing enough precipitation falling to make a significant dent," said Richard Tinker, a meteorologist with the National Weather Service who compiled the report. "These are tangible improvements. There's a difference between above-normal and ridiculous, which is what you've seen recently."

The entire northern half of California, from San Francisco Bay to the Oregon border, is now classified as drought-free. In Thursday's report, 6.4 million more acres — an area 20 times the city of Los Angeles, and much of it in the Sierra Nevada south of Lake Tahoe — was declared drought free this week. Large sections of Southern California and the San Joaquin Valley that have been the hardest hit during the five-year disaster and the slowest to emerge also saw drought conditions ease, although not eliminated, according to the report.

The remarkable turnaround has been driven by a blitzkrieg of powerful winter storms rolling in off the Pacific. Over the past week, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara and Orange counties received 5 inches of rain — their wettest week in seven years — sparking flooding, mudslides and power outages.

The Bay Area is seeing its wettest January since 1998, according to the National Weather Service, with many cities at triple their normal monthly precipitation. Through Thursday morning, Big Sur Station had received 43.41 inches of rain since Oct. 1, more than the area's entire yearly average rainfall of 41.91 inches. Similarly, Yosemite National Park had received 44.07 inches since Oct. 1, more than its annual yearly average of 36.73 inches, with eight months still left in the rain year.

In the Sierra Nevada, a new round of blizzards closed highways and piled up immense amounts of snow. Kirkwood ski resort near Lake Tahoe on Wednesday reported receiving 9 feet of new snow over the past week, while Mammoth Mountain said it had been smothered in 20 feet since New Year's Day, breaking records for the snowiest month there on record.

Overall, the statewide Sierra snowpack — which provides one-third of California’s water supply — was at 189 percent of its historic average on Thursday. More importantly, it is already at 107 percent of the April 1 historic average, considered the key annual measurement, with two months to go. State officials continued Thursday to urge caution.

"All this rain and snowfall will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the drought, but we just don’t know yet for certain what that total impact will be," said Doug Carlson, a spokesman for the California Department of Water Resources. "Something we do know is that groundwater takes a long time to replenish once it has been depleted, and it has been severely depleted in some areas of the Central Valley."

With major reservoirs around California nearly full or already spilling — the two largest in California, Shasta and Oroville, are both 81 percent full, and Hetch Hetchy is 88 percent full — Silicon Valley’s largest water provider on Tuesday night loosened some of its drought rules.

The board of the Santa Clara Valley Water District, based in San Jose, voted to continue asking the public to conserve water by 20 percent compared to 2013 levels. But with its 10 reservoirs in Santa Clara County at 161 percent of the historic average for January and its groundwater levels steadily recovering, the board dropped its call for the 13 cities and private water companies that it supplies to use mandatory rules to meet the drought target.

Instead, the district said that voluntary rules are acceptable now, and it no longer expects cities and water companies in Santa Clara County, such as San Jose Water Company, to impose drought surcharges or penalties on customers who use large amounts of water, given the improving conditions.

John Tang, a spokesman for San Jose Water Company, said Thursday that the company is drafting a request to the state Public Utilities Commission to drop its drought surcharge program and it expects approval in a matter of weeks, rather than months.

Meanwhile, the administration of Gov. Jerry Brown, who declared a statewide drought emergency in January 2014, has said it will likely wait until April to decide whether to lift that declaration or amend it to apply only to the driest parts of the state.

Tinker, in writing this week’s Drought Monitor, noted that despite the deluges of January, some parts of California, such as the east side of the San Joaquin Valley, continue to have badly depleted groundwater.

"The deepest wells may not respond to the recent inundation for many more months," he noted.

Each week, the scientists who write the drought monitor assign six levels of drought intensity: no drought, abnormally dry, moderate drought, severe drought, extreme drought and exceptional drought.

They analyze soil moisture, stream levels, rainfall totals, snowpack, reservoir levels and other measurements in all 50 states, along with reported observations from more than 350 expert contributors around the country.

Much of California will receive a break from the rain through the weekend. The Bay Area forecast calls for sunny skies and temperatures in the 50s and 60s every day until Tuesday, with more storms likely Wednesday through Friday.

*Contact Paul Rogers at 408-920-5045.*



Winter storms have made for coursing water around California, with new calculations showing only 2 percent of California remains in "exceptional drought." The Bay Area, including Orinda (pictured), is seeing its wettest January since 1998.

SUSAN TRIPP POLLARD/STAFF

**Customer #1  
John Kolski**

**Email message dated 1/27/17; 8:07 am**

	<p>John Tang, a spokesman for San Jose Water Company, said Thursday that the company is drafting a request to the state Public Utilities Commission to drop its drought surcharge program and it expects approval in a matter of weeks, rather than months.</p> <p>The city council can vote to drop ours now. The puc has no authority here</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/27/17; 8:14 am</b></p> <p>..asking why the article last week they wrote did not state the facts honestly and miss led the rate payers of cupertino, and I got no response Did the city give them all the facts of our city owned water system, and who regulates it and what the increase is for?</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/27/17; 8:57 am</b></p> <p>So let's put the facts on the table. If the city still was operating this city owned water system as it did before it leased it to SJW, the city would not be dealing with whether or nor the puc is involved like SJW wants the rate payers here to believe and our rates would only be for water we purchased directly from Scvwd and our city operating costs in our service area.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/27/17; 10:36 am</b></p> <p>I received this response to my question to the city who is the regulator of our water system telling me as the rate payer to call sjw to get answers.</p> <p>The city council is the regulator and they should answer questions of the rate payers and they also are the ones who should be asking sjw the questions before they approve any rate increase.</p>	
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/28/17; 2:15 pm</b></p> <p>I received this response to my question to the city who is the regulator of our water system telling me as the rate payer to call sjw to get answers.</p> <p>The city council is the regulator and they should answer questions of the rate payers and they also are the ones who should be asking sjw the questions before they approve any rate increase.</p> <p>The city council is accountable to the rate payers of this water system, not sjw who only leases it from cupertino.</p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/27/17; 12:28 am</b></p> <p><b>Subject: Automatic reply: Question and required answer please before you the city council can vote on thre proposed rate increase by SJW</b></p> <p>Thank you. Your email to <a href="mailto:WaterRates@cupertino.org">WaterRates@cupertino.org</a> has been received. Your comments are appreciated and will be included anomalously with relevant materials presented to the City Council as they consider the proposed rate increase. Specific questions you may have asked</p>

		<p>will be responded to within three business days. You may also call the City of Cupertino Public Works Department at (408) 777-3354.</p> <p>Questions regarding operation of the municipal water system, including factors contributing to the proposed rate increase requested by SJWC can be inquired directly to SJWC at either <a href="http://www.sjwater.com">www.sjwater.com</a> or 408-279-7900.</p>
<p><b>Customer #1</b> <b>John Kolski</b></p>	<p><b>Email message dated 1/28/17; 6:34 pm</b> THE COUNCIL MEMBERS CANNOT VOTE ON THIS ITEM IF ANY THEM HAVE A FINANCIAL INTEREST IN SJW ( stocks or ? ) OR ANY DIRECT CONNECTION WITH SJW ( such as officer, consultant, vendor ), EITHER IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND THOSE MEMBERS HAVE TO REFRAME FROM VOTING.</p>	