



City Hall
 10300 Torre Avenue
 Cupertino, CA 95014-3255
 PH: (408) 777-3354
 FX: (408) 777-3333

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

January 6, 2017

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

This letter provides information on a proposed increase in rates for water service fees of up to **3.83% effective March 3, 2017 (retroactive to January 1, 2017)**. The enclosed notice and fee schedule are also posted online at www.cupertino.org/waterrates. You are receiving this packet because you are an individual responsible for paying water bills and/or a record owner of a property with a metered connection to the Cupertino Municipal Water System with service provided by San Jose Water Company; you may receive multiple copies, as a packet is sent for each service address.

The City Council of the City of Cupertino will hold a public hearing on the proposed increase in rates for water service fees on:

Tuesday, February 21, 2017 at 6:45 p.m.
 Cupertino Community Hall Council Chambers
 10300 Torre Ave.
 Cupertino, CA 95014

If you wish to oppose or comment on the proposed rate increase for water service fees for consideration by the City Council, you may attend the City Council meeting and provide input during the public hearing when the item is called. You may also submit *written* comments in opposition or support to the Office of the City Clerk in the form of a letter, fax, or e-mail. **Written comments must be received by 6:30 p.m. on February 21, 2017** to be considered.

Mail(or hand-deliver) to	Fax to	Phone to	E-mail to
Water Rate Service Fee Increase City of Cupertino – Office of the City Clerk 10300 Torre Avenue Cupertino, CA 95014	(408) 777-3333 Subject line: Water Rate Service Fee Increase	Public Works Department (408) 777-3354	WaterRates@cupertino.org By 6:30 p.m. on 2/21/17



City Hall
10300 Torre Avenue
Cupertino, CA 95014-3255
PH: (408) 777-3354
FX: (408) 777-3333

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED WATER RATE SERVICE FEE INCREASE

At the Council meeting on February 21, 2017, at 6:45 p.m. or as soon thereafter as may be heard, the Cupertino City Council will conduct a public hearing regarding proposed increase in rates of water service fees of up to 3.83% proposed to be effective on March 3, 2017, and is retroactive to January 1, 2017. The water service fee for the period of January 1 through March 2, 2017, will be recovered via surcharge on water bills received after March 3, 2017. This surcharge is equivalent to a 3.83% increase had it been implemented January 1, 2017.

These rates and charges are administered by San Jose Water Company as the lessee of the system. Rates apply to residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial customers. Answers to frequently asked questions and a history of prior water rate increases may be viewed at www.cupertino.com/waterrates.

Reason for the Proposed Rate Increase for Water Service Fees

The Cupertino Municipal Water System purchases, treats, and delivers an average of 2.9 million gallons of potable water per day to residences and businesses. The system includes pipelines, pump stations, fire hydrants, storage tanks, wells, and water meters as well as facilities and processes required to comply with all state and federal drinking water standards. Water rate service fee are set at a level to generate enough revenue to cover the costs of operating and maintaining this system.

San Jose Water Company (SJWC) is a Class A water company subject to the jurisdiction of the State of California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). As the Lessee of a City of Cupertino (City) owned water system, SJWC is also subject to the provisions contained within the Agreement for Lease of Real Property (Water System) between the City and SJWC. Per this agreement, the City's approval of rates shall not be unreasonably withheld. In determining reasonableness, the City shall consider all relevant information, including the CPUC approved rates. Pass through rate adjustments for changes in wholesale costs – such as changes due to increases or decreases in water and power (as well as certain unanticipated changes in volumes) are allowed to be automatically passed through without prior City approval, so long as it is done in a manner substantially similar to that permitted by the CPUC.

The proposed rate increase for water service fees is needed for increased costs of operation and is in response to a December 19, 2016 CPUC authorization to grant SJWC a 3.83% increase in rates for 2017. The supporting document links of the proposed change in rates for water service fees are as follows:

Application of San Jose Water Company for Authority to Increase Rates for Water Service to the CPUC - http://sjwater.s3.amazonaws.com/files/documents/2015_GRC_Application.PDF

CPUC Decision 16-06-004 regarding Revenue Requirements for San Jose Water Company – <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M163/K202/163202231.pdf>

San Jose Water Company request for 3.83% increase to CPUC – www.cupertino.org/waterrates-Attachment-1

December 19, 2016 CPUC Authorization of 3.83% to San Jose Water Company - www.cupertino.org/waterrates-Attachment-2

Billing Impacts

The proposed increase of 3.83% to potable water rates and charges are shown on Tables 1, 2, and 3 below. If the City Council approves the proposed increase, the impact to your bill can be calculated using the proposed meter rates and quantity charges as shown in the sample calculations below. Utility tax and offset surcharges¹ are not included in the sample calculations and your actual bill will be different. Specific questions can be directed to San Jose Water by calling 408-279- 7900 or visiting www.sjwater.com.

Sample Water Bill Calculations Comparing Current and Proposed Rates

Water Bill Amount (without utility tax and/or offset surcharge) = Meter Charge + (Quantity x Rate per HCF)

Residential Example (using Tables 1 and 2):

Residential charges use a three-tiered rate structure, with a higher rate applying as water use exceeds tier breakpoints of 3 HCF and 18 HCF. In the example below, a resident using 15 HCF will need to calculate the sample bill using two of the tiered rates:

Monthly Usage: 15 HCF

Meter Size: 3/4-inch

Current Rate: $\$23.98 + (3 \text{ HCF} \times \$4.0581) + (12 \text{ HCF} \times \$4.5090) = \$90.26$

Proposed Rate: $\$25.02 + (3 \text{ HCF} \times \$4.2210) + (12 \text{ HCF} \times \$4.6900) = \$93.96$

Non-Residential Example (using Tables 1 and 3):

Monthly Usage: 100 HCF

Meter Size: 2-inch

Current Rate: $\$127.87 + (100 \text{ HCF} \times \$4.5090) = \$578.77$

Proposed Rate: $\$133.41 + (100 \text{ HCF} \times \$4.6900) = \$602.41$

HCF = hundred cubic feet; 1 HCF = 748 gallons

¹Offset surcharge (due to increase in wholesale water costs) is currently \$.4229 per HCF consumed

Table 1: All Customers Monthly Meter Charge

MONTHLY METER CHARGE (based on meter size)		
Meter Size	Current Charges	Proposed Charges
5/8-inch	\$23.98	\$25.02
3/4-inch	\$23.98	\$25.02
1-inch	\$39.94	\$41.66
1.5-inch	\$79.91	\$83.36
2-inch	\$127.87	\$133.41
3-inch	\$239.75	\$250.12
4-inch	\$399.58	\$416.87
6-inch	\$799.15	\$833.73
8-inch	\$1278.65	\$1333.98
10-inch	\$1838.07	\$1917.62

Table 2: Residential Monthly Quantity Charge (does not include offset surcharge of \$.4229 per HCF)

Tier	Current Charges per HCF	Proposed Charges per HCF
Tier 1: 0 to 3 HCF	\$4.0581	\$4.2210
Tier 2: 3+ to 18 HCF	\$4.5090	\$4.6900
Tier 3: >18 HCF	\$4.9599	\$5.1590
Example Monthly Water Bill	\$90.26	\$93.96

Table 3: Non-Residential Monthly Quantity Charge (including water production offset surcharge)

	2016-17 Current Charges per HCF	2017-18 Proposed Charges per HCF
Quantity Rates	\$4.5090	\$4.6900

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional information about the rate increase, including Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), the Lease Agreement between the City and San Jose Water Company, and Water Service Area Maps can be found online at <http://www.cupertino.org/waterrates>. Other supporting information from SJWC, including links to FAQ's may be found at:

https://www.sjwater.com/for_your_home/home_customer_care/rates_regulations/general_rate_information

	Comments	Response
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>DATE: 1/9/17 TIME: 10:51 am 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>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/9/17, 10:54 pm 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>Customer #2</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/12/17, 8:22 pm 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>Customer #3 Vicky Ho</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/13/17; 1:07 pm</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>Customer #4</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/13/17; 2:30 pm</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>Customer #6 Yu Jen Wang Jessica Cheng</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/13/17; 10:32 pm</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>	

Customer #7	Email message dated 1/14/17; 3:19 pm I am writing to advise that I am against the proposed increase.	
Customer #8 Randy Hylkema	Email message dated 1/17/17; 12:51 pm 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	
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/17/17; 1:41 pm 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>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>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/17/17; 5:08 pm</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>Email message dated 1/18/17, 6:51 am</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>Customer #9 Anonymous</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/17/17; 6:17 pm 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>Email message dated 1/17/17; 6:17 pm City of Cupertino Thank you for your questions. Please find below responses to your questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?recordid=1728&page=2 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. 2. Annual increases are likely. Please refer to this question and response in the FAQ document referenced.

		3. The proposed increase is not related to the Apple facility.
<p>Customer #10 Rosa Li</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/18/17; 3:35 pm 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>Email message dated 1/19/17; 12:17 pm 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 https://www.sjwater.com/news/topic/comprehensive-drought-information. 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. Email message dated 1/20/17; 6:21 am San Jose Water Company 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>

		http://www.eastbaytimes.com/2017/01/18/residents-blast-25-percent-water-rate-hike-proposal/ http://news.wef.org/u-s-epa-survey-reveals-need-for-drinking-water-infrastructure-investment/ http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/water-infrastructure/ http://www.waterrf.org/Pages/Projects.aspx?PID=4617
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/18/17; 4:18 pm 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.	Email message dated 1/18/17, 4:17 pm From City of Cupertino Will post comments less any personal info by close of business Friday. Will update each week.
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/18/17; 4:18 pm 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	
Customer #11 Henry Buffalow	Email message dated 1/19/17; 12:12 pm 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.	
Customer #12	Email message dated 1/19/17; 3:46 pm	

	<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>Customer #13 Anonymous</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/21/17; 6:39 am Does this rate increase apply to the facilities of St. Jude's Episcopal Church at Stelling & McClellan?</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/21/17; 6:39 am City of Cupertino 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 http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?recordid=1728&page=26 .</p>
<p>Customer #14</p>	<p>Phone call dated 1/23/17 Rates too high already. Not practical. Above and beyond what should be expected.</p>	<p>Phone conversation dated 1/23/17 City of Cupertino</p>
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/23/17; 12:34 pm No letters yet on the site! http://www.cupertino.org/index.aspx?page=26&recordid=1728&returnURL=%2findex.aspx%3fpage%3d1</p>	
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/24/17; 11:23 am Thanks for getting the letters on the site But the county leaves the submitters</p>	

	<p>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>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/24/17; 3:52 pm</p> <p>Difference Between Publicly and Investor-Owned Utilities</p> <p>http://www.energy.ca.gov/pou_reporting/background/difference_pou_iou.html</p>	
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/24/17; 5:52 pm</p> <p>Statement, Questions and required answers from the city council</p> <p>Regarding the proposed water rate increase. Before a vote can be made</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This city owned utility regulates the rates with rate payer approval</p> <p>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</p> <p>SJW cannot say the puc approved the rate increase</p> <p>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</p> <p>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 rate increase per the lease they have to put that application into</p>	

	the city of cupertino and show details of what it is for, water and operation costs.	
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/26/17; 4:23 pm http://cmua.org/wpcmua/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Briefing_Background.pdf (Exhibit 2)	
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/26/17; 6:55 pm 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? Email message dated 1/27/17; 10:12 am 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	Email message dated 1/27/17; 10:04 am Specific questions can be directed to San Jose Water by calling 408-279- 7900 or visiting www.sjwater.com .
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/27/17; 8:02 am 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 Winter storms have made 'a significant dent' Half of state is drought-free By Paul Rogers progers@bayareanewsgroup.com 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. 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

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.

The city council can vote to drop ours now. The puc has no authority here

Customer #1

Email message dated 1/27/17; 8:14 am

<p>John Kolski</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>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/27/17; 8:57 am 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>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/27/17; 10:36 am 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. 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>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/28/17; 2:15 pm 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. 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. The city council is accountable to the rate payers of this water system, not sjw who only leases it from cupertino.</p>	<p>Email message dated 1/27/17; 12:28 am Subject: Automatic reply: Question and required answer please before you the city council can vote on thre proposed rate increase by SJW</p> <p>Thank you. Your email to WaterRates@cupertino.org<mailto:WaterRates@cupertino.org> 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 will be responded to within three business days. You may also call the City of Cupertino Public Works Department at (408) 777-3354. Questions regarding operation of the municipal water system, including factors</p>

		contributing to the proposed rate increase requested by SJWC can be inquired directly to SJWC at either www.sjwater.com or 408-279-7900.
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/28/17; 6:34 pm 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.	
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/30/17; 9:07 am THAT WHEN A PERSON STANDS IN FRONT OF THE CITY COUNCIL AND GIVES COMMENTS THEY HAVE TO GIVE THIER NAME AS PUBLIC INFORMATION FIRST BUT THE COMMENTS SUBMITTED FRO THE RECORD HAVE THE NAMES LEFT OFF. WHY?	
Customer #15	Email message dated 1/30/17; 3:23 pm Hi, I am the resident in Cupertino. Last year water service fees already tremendously increase. This year there are lots of raining and have enough water to use for the whole year. It has no reason to increase the water service fees again. Please pass my objection voice to San Jose Water Company. Thanks.	
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/30/17; 3:43 pm to sjw and the city of cupertino...for your information about the rate increase proposed by sjw i called a spoke to the editor of the san jose mercury news paper today about the article in the cupertino paper two weeks ago. i notified him that the facts were reported incorrectly and all the facts were not included in the article and that how is was reported is misleading to the rate payers of cupertino who own the water system. i informed him that the cpuc is not the regulatory authority over the city of cupertino's city owned water system and has no authority to approve rate	

	increases as sjw is not the regulator either. only the city council of cupertino is the regulatory authority over this water system.	
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 1/30/17; 3:55 pm question regarding the rate increase proposed by sjw how can the rate in create be voted on as retroactive back to january 1, 2017, when the rate increase has not even been voted on yet and approved by the city council? and if approved at the february meeting how can the city council inact a retroactive policy when the cpus decision has nothing to do with cupertino.	
Customer #1 John Kolski	Email message dated 2/1/17; 2:53 pm I HAD SEND THIS IN ONCE BUT DON'T SEE IT IN THE POSTED COMMENTS OF THE CITY SITE IT SHOWS THE RATE PAYERS WHO REGULATES THE CITY WATER SYSTEM AND THAT THE CPUC HAS NO AUTHORITY TO APPROVE RATE INCREASES http://www.energy.ca.gov/pou_reporting/background/difference_pou_iou.html	

Differences Between Publicly and Investor-Owned Utilities

Investor-owned utilities (IOUs) are private electricity and natural gas providers. California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) oversees IOUs. Pacific Gas and Electric, San Diego Gas and Electric, and Southern California Edison comprise approximately three quarters of electricity supply in California.

Publicly owned utilities (POUs) are subject to local public control and regulation. POUs are organized in various forms including municipal districts, city departments, irrigation districts, or rural cooperatives. Municipal districts may include territories outside city limits or may not even serve the entire city. Cooperatives are owned by the customers they serve usually in rural areas.

There are more than 40 POUs in the state that account for approximately a quarter of electricity supply in California. Most POUs are smaller than IOUs in the electricity sales and the number of customer accounts.

The largest POU, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides services to 3.9 million customers. The smallest utilities have less than 400 customers. One-third of the POUs account for over 90 percent of POU electricity sales. Most of the POUs serve between 1,800 and 100,000 customers. The table below summarizes differences between POUs and IOUs.

	POU	IOU
Ownership	A local government body and/or customers/members of the utility. Usually limited to the service area.	Shareholders or investors. Not limited to the service area.
Structure/ Management/ Regulation	Non-profit public entity managed by locally elected officials/ public employees.	Private company. Shareholder-elected board appoints management team of private sector employees. Regulated by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

	Rates Setting and Regulation	<p>Customer rates are set by each utility's governing body-board or city council in a public forum.</p>	<p>Customer rates are set and regulated by CPUC through public process that includes some customer participation.</p>	
	Mission/Goals	<p>Optimize benefits for local customer owners usually in the form of lower energy rates.</p>	<p>Optimize return on investment for shareholders.</p>	
	Financing	<p>Public utilities have access to tax-free bonds and co-ops have access to low-interest loans usually at the local level.</p>	<p>Stockholders (investors), the sale of bonds and bank borrowing help finance the utility's operations.</p>	
	Power Generation	<p>Operate their own generation facilities or purchase power through contracts.</p>	<p>Purchase power through contracts and operate their own generation facilities. After the energy crisis, IOUs resumed electricity procurement in 2002 (Public Utility Code 454.5). Every two years, the CPUC holds a Long Term Procurement Plan (LTPP) proceeding to review and adopt the IOUs' ten-year procurement plans. The LTPP proceeding evaluates the utilities' need for new fossil-fired resources and establishes rules for rate recovery of procurement transactions.</p>	

	<p>Profit/Net Revenue</p> <p>Rates are set to recover costs and earn additional return to maintain bond ratings and invest in new facilities.</p>	<p>Utility rates are set to recover costs and earn a reasonable return as profits for investors in return for the risk they bear for investing in new facilities.</p>	
	<p>Size/heterogeneity</p> <p>Although POUs dramatically differ in size and number of customers they serve, most are small or mid-sized with an exception of LADWP and SMUD.</p>	<p>Very large in size and number of customers. Complex, heterogeneous customer mix.</p>	
<p>Customer #16</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/7/17; 7:09 pm</p> <p>City of Cupertino,</p> <p>I am writing to express my concern about the current water rate increase that you are considering. Given the increase in precipitation over the last few months, it seems wise to wait until the spring when snow pack levels can be measured. I understand that there are other costs associated with water—overhead, delivery, etc...--but the actual cost of water does not logically seem like it will be increasing soon. It would appear quite ironic for the city to raise water rates when we are starting to see such large gains in water levels. Over the last year or two we have seen higher and higher water bills due to overage charges and base rates which are not based on our actual use. It would add insult to injury to have a water rate increase backing up to what have already been higher water bills. Please put off this decision or, even better, don't increase our rates.</p> <p>Regards.</p>		
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/7/17; 8:10 pm</p> <p>HOW MUCH WATER THAT THE CITY SERVICE AREA AND THE RATE PAYERS GETS AND PAY FOR COMES FROM AND AS IMPORTED WATER FROM SCVWD AND HOW MUCH WATER COMES FROM THE CITY OWNED WELLS [IN GALLONS]?</p>		
<p>Customer #1</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/7/17; 8:32 pm</p>		

<p>John Kolski</p>	<p>SJW ONLY PAYS THE CITY A \$1.00 PER YEAR FOR THE USE OF CITY WATER SERVICE AREA AND THEY COLLECT MILLIONS EACH YEAR FROM THE RATE PAYERS AND HAVE PUT NOTHING INTO LONG TERM MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM AND “THEY WANT ANOTHER UNJUSTIFIED RATE INCREASE”</p> <p>As additional consideration, Lessee agrees to pay to City as annual rental (hereinafter called the “Base Rental”) for the use of the Water System, the sum of \$1.00/year. The Base Rental shall be paid to City on the basis of City’s fiscal year which commences July 1st and ends on June 30th.</p>	
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/7/17; 8:55 pm</p> <p>THE LEASE OF THE CITY RATE SYSTEM TO SJW HAS BEEN IN THE PAST AND STILL IS A “CASH COW” FOR SJW.</p> <p>JUST MULTIPLY THE NUMBER OF RATE PAYERS BY AN AVERAGE MONTHLY BILLING AMOUNT OF \$175.00/M ADN SEE HOW MUCH THEY MAKE FOR EACH YEAR OF THE LEASE. IT IS IN THE AREA OF \$9,000,000.00/YEAR AND THEY ONLY PAID \$6.8 MILLION FOR THE LEASE AT THE START AND PAY \$1.00/Y. THE LEASE TERM IS FOR 25 YEARS. ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS READ THE LEASE AND OBSERVE HOW SJW HAS DELT WITH THE LEASE AND THE CITY DURING THE LEASE PERIOD.</p> <p>THEY ARE IN NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT AND WORSE HAVE NOT PUT ANY MONEY INTO THE SYSTEM FOR LONG TERM MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT OF AGING INFRASTRUCTURE.</p> <p>EVERY CITY RATE PAYER SHOULD READ THE LEASE, HOLD THE CITY TO THEIR RESPONSIBILITY AS REGULATOR AND DEMAND THAT THEIR CITY OWNED WATER SYSTEM BE OPERATED TO THE BENEFIT OF THE RATE PAYERS NOT SJW.</p>	
<p>Customer #17</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/7/17; 10:51 pm</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>I am a residence of Cupertino City. My home address is 10818 Juniper court, Cupertino 95014.</p>	

	<p>I am writing to provide input regarding the proposed raise in water service fees. I request this proposed raise be delayed until spring given the abundance of rain and snow we received this season.</p> <p>I request that this be delayed until the end of Spring when the actual/residual level of the snow pack is measured and confirmed that we are done with the drought. I think it's only sensible to do after proper assessment as opposed to rushing in to increase the rates.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>	
<p>Customer #18</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/8/17; 5:30 pm</p> <p>Based on abundance of rain this season and already raised water rates I strongly object to any water rate increase. At the very least I encourage you to wait until spring when actual total rain levels could determine the appropriate water rates. If the company responsible is unable to reduce its cost perhaps it is time to change its management instead of constantly request rate hikes.</p>	
<p>Customer #19</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/9/17; 5:03 pm</p> <p>Sirs:</p> <p>Your proposed Water Rate Increase is unreasonable.</p> <p>You just recently raised the rates.</p> <p>Can you justify the latest increase vis- a -vis our recent rain totals and snow pack?</p> <p>Please think again about your proposal.</p> <p>Regard</p>	
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/9/17; 7:53 pm</p> <p>REGARDING THE BELOW E-MAIL.</p> <p>IF MY STATEMENTS CONCERN ANYONE, THEN THE REGULATOR OF THE CITY WATER SYSTEM WHICH IS THE CITY COUNCIL IS MUST ASK SJW FOR DETAILED ANSWERS AND MAKE THOSE ANSWERS OPEN INFORMATION TO THE RATE PAYERS OF CUPERTINO BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING. THIS LEASE IS PUBLIC INFORMATION AND MUST HAVE FULL TRANSPARENCY TO ITS RATE PAYERS.</p> <p>On Feb 7, 2017, at 8:54 PM, John Kolski <ducksfly10@gmail.com> wrote: THE LEASE OF THE CITY RATE SYSTEM TO SJW HAS BEEN IN THE PAST AND STILL IS A "CASH COW" FOR SJW.</p>	

	<p>JUST MULTIPLY THE NUMBER OF RATE PAYERS BY AN AVERAGE MONTHLY BILLING AMOUNT OF \$175.00/M ADN SEE HOW MUCH THEY MAKE FOR EACH YEAR OF THE LEASE. IT IS IN THE AREA OF \$9,000,000.00/YEAR AND THEY ONLY PAID \$6.8 MILLION FOR THE LEASE AT THE START AND PAY \$1.00/Y. THE LEASE TERM IS FOR 25 YEARS. ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS READ THE LEASE AND OBSERVE HOW SJW HAS DELT WITH THE LEASE AND THE CITY DURING THE LEASE PERIOD.</p> <p>THEY ARE IN NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT AND WORSE HAVE NOT PUT ANY MONEY INTO THE SYSTEM FOR LONG TERM MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT OF AGING INFRASTRUCTURE.</p> <p>EVERY CITY RATE PAYER SHOULD READ THE LEASE, HOLD THE CITY TO THEIR RESPONSIBILITY AS REGULATOR AND DEMAND THAT THEIR CITY OWNED WATER SYSTEM BE OPERATED TO THE BENEFIT OF THE RATE PAYERS NOT SJW.</p>	
<p>Customer #20</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/10/17; 12:20 pm Dear Sir/Madam: I'm owner of following properties in Cupertino: 10585 Merriman Road (Parcel # 342-16-079) 10340 Walnut Circle (Parcel # 357-03-040) 10840 Wunderlich Drive (Parcel# 375-22-011) The purpose of this e-mail is to submit my written opposition to Cupertino City Hall's proposed rate increase for water service fees effective March 3, 2017 (retroactive to January 1, 2017).</p>	
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/14/17; 5:01 am FOR OUR INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROPOSED RATE INCREASE IN CUPERTINO BY SJW I DO NOT THE MERCURY NEWS OR THE CITYOF CUPERTINO HAS NOTICED THE RATE PAYERS OF CUPERTINO IN A WAY TO INFORM THEM OF THE FACTS OF THE CITY OWNED WATER SYSTEM AND THE REGULATORY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CITY COUNCIL IN TOTAL THAT EFFECT EACH RESIDENT OF CUPERTINO. THE PUBLIC NOTICE IN THE CITY OF CUPERTINO WEB SITE IS ONLY VIEWED BY A SMALL NUMBER OF PEOPLE AND THE ARTICLE THAT</p>	

	<p>WAS IN THE CUPERTINO PAPER WAS FULL OF MISS INFORMATION AND DID NOT HAVE ALL THE FACTS IN IT. TRANSPARENCY BY THE CITY AND THE MEDIA HAS NOT HAPPENED. HOW CAN THE PEOPLE EFFECTED BY THIS GIVE INPUT TO THE COUNCIL IF THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON.</p>	
<p>Customer #1 John Kolski</p>	<p>Email message dated 2/14/17; 1:55 pm TODAY A RECEIVED AT LETTER ASKING ME TO DO A WATER SURVEY. FIRST IT SAYS I HAVE RECEIVED HOME WATER REPORTS FROM SJW. THAT IS NOT TRUE, I HAVE NEVER RECEIVED ANY REPORTS. AND IT SAYS I HAVE A SMART METER. THAT ALSO IS NOT TRUE. NEXT I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT INFORMATION YOUR SURVEY WANTS FROM ME BUT I AM NOT GIVING YOU ANYTHING. AND I DO NOT DO SOCIAL MEDIA SURVEYS. LIKE YOUR PROPOSED RATE INCREASE FOR CUPERTINO IN WHICH YOU ARE IN NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE LEASE AGREEMENT BY USE THE CPUC AS YOUR AUTHORITY TO INCREASE THE RATE AND THE LAW SAYS THEY HAVE NO REGULATORY AUTHORITY OVER A CITY OWNED WATER SYSTEM, THE CITY IS THE REGULATOR AND ADDITIONALLY YOU DID NOT APPLY TO THE CITY FOR A PROPOSED RATE INCREASE, YOU SUBMITTED THE APPLICATION TO THE CPUC WHICH IS INVALID. SJW CONTINUES TO OPERATE IN A MANNER THE THEY ARE OVER AND ABOVE THE LAW, THE AGREEMENTS THE Y SIGN AND THE PEOPLE THEY SERVE.</p>	
<p>Customer #21</p>	<p>Phone call dated 2/15/14 Rates are already too high. Recent rain should be considered. Does not support the increase. Senior citizen on fixed income.</p>	