

JUL 19 1995

**Decision 95-07-018 July 19, 1995**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Suspension and Reinstatement of the Public Utilities Commission's own motion of tariff filed by Advice Letter No. 938-W of Southern California Water Company, Santa Maria District, in San Luis Obispo County and Santa Barbara County, California, Case No. 94-07-025 filed July 20, 1994, (Filed July 20, 1994) by the Mesa Royale development companies of Orcutt, California, and Oaklawn, California, before the California Water Commission, by O'Malley & Meyers, by Patricia A. Schmiege, Attorney at Law, and Floyd Wicks and Daniel A. Dell'Osa, for Southern California Water Company, respondent.

John S. Seitz, Attorney at Law, for Nipomo

Peter Fairchild, Attorney at Law, for the Division of Ratepayer Advocates.

**OPINION****1. Summary of Decision**

This decision authorizes Southern California Water Company (SCWC) to extend the service territory of its Santa Maria District to serve up to 88 new customers. The protest of Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) is denied, and SCWC's proposal to serve 19 customers in the Mesa Royale development is approved.

**2. Background**

On June 23, 1994, under Advice Letter 938-W, SCWC filed tariff sheets to extend the existing service areas of the Orcutt and Vista systems, both of which are within its Santa Maria District. The Orcutt system is located in Santa Barbara County, and a small portion is within the City of Santa Maria. The Vista System is located in the Nipomo Mesa area of San Luis Obispo County. SCWC proposed the extensions to serve housing developments for which developers had requested service. Two developments, Mesa Verde and Oaklawn, are contiguous to the Orcutt system. A

201 81 JUL

development known as Lauringson Enterprises is contiguous to the Vista system. The Mesa Royale development assertedly is.

NCSD and Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) protested the advice letter filing. NCSD alleged that the proposed extension of the Vista system is within its sphere of influence as determined by the San Luis Obispo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LACCO) and that LACCO prefers that NCSD, not SCWC, serve this area. NCSD's concern is in the area of Nipomo bound on the west by Tefft Street, on the north by Orchard Road, on the east by Division Street, and on the south by Hazel Lane. This area encompasses the Mesa Royale development.

The advice letter indicated a water deficiency in each system at full build-out. SCWC explained that the deficiencies would be met by additional wells and noted that it had an entitlement to purchased water from the State Water Project and was negotiating to participate in the Coastal Aqueduct Project. DRA contended that the addition of new wells to an overdrafted groundwater basin would exacerbate a bad situation. DRA further contended that the availability of State Water Project water was questionable since Decision (D.) 93-03-066 and D. 93-07-018 denied SCWC authority to participate in the Coastal Aqueduct Project. DRA recommended that Advice Letter 938-W be rejected, and that the requested service area extensions be addressed only after the utility identifies an acceptable source of supply for full build-out.

In response to the protests, the Commission concluded that the effective date of the tariff sheets should be postponed pending investigation, hearing, and decision. It instituted this investigation to determine whether the tariff sheets filed by SCWC under Advice Letter 938-W are unreasonable or unlawful, and to issue any order or orders in the exercise of its jurisdiction in the matter. In accordance with Public Utilities Code § 455, the tariffs filed under Advice Letter 938-W were suspended until

January 30, 1995 or further. Commission Orderive By D.95-01aQ09 dated January 5, 1995, the Commission further suspended the tariffs for a period of up to six months beyond January 30, 1995, been

advised. The parties are SCWC, NCSD, and DRA. A prehearing conference was convened in San Francisco on September 29 and again October 20, 1994. Telephonic conferences were held on November 17 and November 30, 1994. Two days of hearings were held before the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Wetzell on February 7 and 8, 1995. No concurrence reply briefs or comments on the ALJ's proposed findings decision were received. We confirm and adopt its findings of fact opinion and order given below in so far as they are adopted, sans

NCSD confirmed at hearing that its opposition to the Vista System extension does not involve the Lauringson Enterprises development in NCSD's only objection is to the Mesa Royale who did not extend its protest to limited water supply issues. In DRA who takes no position on the Mesa Royale extension insofar as it is concerned about the adequacy of supply is pursuant, and find that the above objection is SCWC presented testimony updating the advice letter to filing as SCWC's request to extend the service area of the Orcutt System now involves a projected 60 new customers in Phases 5-7 of the Mesa Verde development (41 acres divided into 60 lots). This is a reduction from the 120 customers projected in the advice letter. The projection of 28 new customers in the Vista System (11 acres divided into 9 lots for Lauringson Enterprises) and 21 acres is divided into 19 lots for Mesa Royale) is unchanged from the advice letter.

In addition, SCWC reduced the scope of the proposed extension of the Orcutt System to reflect (1) deletion of the Oak Glen housing area in development due to inactivity of the developer and (2) a redesignation of Phases 1-4 of the Mesa Verde development from the "Service Area" added by the filing of this Map ("Existing Service Area"). After submitting the advice letter, SCWC determined that Phases 1-4 of the Mesa Verde development are already part of the

Orcutt System. As revised, the proposed extension encompasses Phases 5+7 of the Mesa Verde development, and adds a revised

Based on reduced estimates of vacant or unserved lots in both of the existing systems, an increase in estimated available supply, and the reduced scope of the Orcutt System extension, SCWC revised the supply forecasts that were submitted with the advice letter. As described below, SCWC now projects water surpluses in each system. SCWC concludes that it has sufficient water to serve the proposed service area extensions. Based on its forecasts through the year 2010, SCWC believes there is no chance it will need to purchase state water to meet demands in the Santa Maria area, regardless of the impact of groundwater management plans being under consideration for the Santa Maria Basin.

SCWC's total supply available to meet maximum day demand in the Orcutt System is presently 14,600 gallons per minute (gpm) without participation in the Coastal Aqueduct Project. This amount is obtained exclusively from 15 wells and from storage in SCWC's projects that at full build-out, including the proposed extension, the Orcutt System will have 11,915 customers. The required supply for 11,915 customers is 14,298 gpm. Thus, there is an excess of supply of 302 gpm. Additionally, SCWC notes, the proposed addition of 60 customers accounts for 72 gpm, or 0.5% of total maximum day demand. SCWC considers this to be an insignificant increase in demand. SCWC concludes that there is an adequate supply of water, with adequate fire flow, to meet the requirements of all existing customers; the anticipated growth in the system at full build-out; and the fully developed Mesa Verde subdivision.

SCWC's total supply available to meet maximum day demand in the Vista System, obtained exclusively from 7 wells and from 10 storage, is 2,060 gpm. SCWC's projects that at full build-out, including the proposed extensions, the Vista System will have 1,545 customers. The supply required for 1,545 customers is 1,854 gpm, or 12% less than the proposed extension of the Vista System. Thus, there is an excess supply of 206 gpm in the Vista System, again due to fire flow requirements of the Mesa Verde subdivision to P-1 areas.

The proposed addition of 28 customers' accounts for 34 gpm of their 1,854 gpm demand. As with the Orcutt System, SCWC considers this 1.8% increase in total maximum day demand to be insignificant.

SCWC concludes that there is an adequate supply of water for the Vista System, with adequate fire flow, to meet the requirements of all existing customers, the anticipated growth in the system at full build-out, and the fully developed Lauringson Enterprises and Mesa Royale subdivisions of antiquity notwithstanding to no jurisdictional

and the SCWC's uncontested testimony regarding the projected supply of, and demand for water in, the Orcutt and Vista Systems. It demonstrates that it has sufficient supplies to serve the proposed service area extensions without the need for new wells or DRA participation in the Coastal Aqueduct Project. Moreover, SCWC's testimony affirms that the proposed extensions will not increase rates or charges or cause the withdrawal of service. DRA appears to agree that SCWC has enough water to serve the reduced size of the Orcutt extension, and it explicitly concurs that SCWC has sufficient water to serve Lauringson Enterprises. As noted, DRA also takes no position with respect to the contested Mesa Royale extension.

We conclude that the supply issues raised by DRA in its protest have been resolved by SCWC's testimony. We will approve two SCWC's uncontested proposals to extend the Orcutt System to serve in Phase 5-7 of the Mesa Verde subdivision and to extend the Vista System to serve Lauringson Enterprises. We address SCWC's proposal to serve the Mesa Royale development in the following section.

However, our finding that SCWC has adequate supply to serve the proposed extensions applies to this portion of the Vista extension as well.

#### 4. Mesa Royale Extension

SCWC's position is that the Commission should not deny its proposed extension on the ground that the annexation of the 19-lot

(one acre) contiguous to the proposed extension is not yet made.

Mesa Royale development to NCSD may someday occur if SCWC contended that annexation to NCSD is speculative. At the time of the hearing, it was SCWC's current belief that SCWC is currently providing water service to several lots in the Mesa Royale development. The developer approached SCWC in 1989 with a request for service. SCWC honored the request, still believing that as a public utility it had an obligation to serve its those customers. The developer invested about \$80,000 for full installation of distribution pipelines to serve the area. SCWC will reimburse the developer over a forty-year period under the Commission's Rule 1516. SCWC has reimbursed the developer \$8,677.40 to date. The area of service is described and is part of the disputed area.

**4.2 NCSD's Position** It has been the position of SCWC that service to the NCSD is a public agency which provides water, sewer, trash, drainage, and lighting services in the Nipomo area of San Luis Obispo County. NCSD's current water service area is adjacent to, but does not include the disputed Mesa Royale area. Its sphere of influence<sup>1</sup>, as determined by the LAFCO, fully encompasses the disputed area, and in fact encompasses a significant portion of the currently authorized Vista System.

NCSD expects that the Mesa Royale development will be annexed to NCSD at some time in the future. Several property owners have written to LAFCO to express their approval of annexation to NCSD.<sup>2</sup> SCWC provides only water service, but NCSD also

provides other functions such as wastewater collection and disposal.

---

<sup>1</sup> NCSD's witness explained that its sphere of influence establishes the boundaries for determining which agency should ultimately provide services to the designated area.

<sup>2</sup> NCSD submitted a declaration with its brief purporting to show that after the hearings, residents of the proposed Vista System extension filed annexation petitions with LAFCO. However, the first of two attachments to the declaration appears to be a copy of an undated petition (although an accompanying "Environmental

Impact Statement" dated November 1993, states otherwise).

provides both water and sewer service? since NCSD has a policy of not providing sewer/water service alone if the property owners prefer annexation to NCSD so that they can obtain sewer as well as water service. This will allow them to subdivide their properties.

According to NCSD, allowing SCWC to extend its Vista System to serve the Mesa Royale development is not in the best interest of the residents of the area because they are seeking annexation to NCSD. Additionally, NCSD avers, LAFCO objects to the proposed Vista extension due to possible off-site impacts resulting from the extension.

If the Vista System extension is approved, NCSD is concerned that when the expected annexation occurs, it will have to condemn and pay just compensation to SCWC for the affected area. Just compensation could include loss of future profits, and the two residents might have to negotiate a buyout of SCWC's interest at a greater than the present fair market value without Commission's input.

The declaration also states that the Mesa Royale area is not within the boundaries of the proposed Vista System. It further states that the declaration is being filed to obtain copies of SCWC's documents relating to the proposed extension. It also states that the declaration is being filed to advise neighbors of the proposed extension.

A. apionce bne qdilue service to areas in adjacent cities (Footnote continued from previous page) Assessment Form" is dated January 17, 1995 and one of three annexation approval notices is dated January 19, 1995 by property owners for annexation to NCSD of three parcels near Hazel Lane and Tefft Street which are not within the proposed Vista System extension. The second attachment is a copy of a March 7, 1995 letter to LAFCO from a civil engineering firm which appears to have transmitted copies of two maps of a proposed annexation to NCSD and copies of petitions for annexation by area property owners. The second attachment to the declaration includes copies of two maps which indicate a proposal to annex the disputed area to NCSD, but it does not include copies of the referenced petitions for formal annexation. Neither attachment to the declaration shows that a formal petition or application for annexation of the Mesa Royale development to NCSD has been submitted to LAFCO. Under these circumstances we can give no weight to the declaration or either of its attachments.

approval of the extension to NCSD; it is also concerned that a publicly-owned sewer service will not be available if SCWC is the ultimate water purveyor. If so, as noted above, the City would be DCM of public works.

SCWC stipulated that if the proposed Vista System extension is either denied or approved on an interim basis only, it would continue to serve affected Mesa Royale customers (unless otherwise ordered not to) until NCSD provides water services. Noting this, NCSD proposes to maintain the status quo for an 18-month period while the affected residents negotiate the purchase of SCWC's interest in improvements at their current market value.<sup>11</sup>

#### 4.3 Discussion

This is a dispute over which water purveyor can invest in a privately-owned water utility or a public agency, should serve the 19-lot Mesa Royale development. The development is within NCSD's sphere of influence, but NCSD lacks authority to serve the development and will not do so until authorized. The Mesa Royale development is also outside of SCWC's service area as reflected in the tariff map on file with this Commission, yet SCWC is actually providing water service to approximately 10 customers within the development.

In such disputes the Commission weighs the potential alternatives in terms of service quality and economics. A publicly-owned system is not entitled to any preference, and its service is not presumed to be superior even if the disputed area is within its sphere of influence as defined by a LAFCO (Great Oaks Water Company (City of San Jose), (1991) 39 CPUC 2d 339, 344) citing Cal. Water Service (City of Bakersfield) (1986) 20 CPUC 2d 643.) Several criteria for weighing the alternatives have been established and refined over the years: managerial ability, financial capability, adequacy of supply, water quality and each environmental factors, proximity and natural service territory, rates and economic efficiency, adequacy and costs of planned extensions, benefits of extension to existing customers, preference

of developer, and first to file (utility vs. utility proceedings, no only) in ~~Idaho~~ Idaho and keep off object or application from being filed.

In this case, the parties generally do not question each other's water supply or quality, or financial or managerial ability to provide water service. Neither party has claimed that its existing customers will benefit from its serving the disputed area or that its water system is the more logical or natural provider in terms of system configuration or proximity. Neither purveyor claims that its rates are lower. Although the developer originally contacted SCWC with a request for service, and entered into a Rule 15 agreement, it now favors annexation and presumably service by the NCSD. But even the "developer preference" criterion provides a poor little basis for resolution of this case. The developer's ongoing preference for NCSD came about years after it successfully began to approach SCWC for service. And while the Mesa Royale developer and some other property owners in or near the Mesa Royale subdivision approved annexation to NCSD, it has not been established that all owners do. SCWC's witness understood that not all among the property owners were in favor of annexation. As discussed below, the one criterion that comes most into play is adequacy and cost of the planned extension(s) to the NCSD or otherwise evident below.

This record provides little basis for deciding this case on the above-described criteria. Moreover, while a decision in favor of NCSD might appear to result in availability of sewer service, which would in turn allow owners of one-acre lots to subsequently subdivide their properties into four lots per acre, this Commission is not responsible for local land use decisions such as the density of development. Our decision cannot turn on whether a particular land use policy will be favored thereby. In any event, our ultimate decision cannot prevent the availability of sewer service; at most, it might impact the cost of annexation to NCSD if it occurs prior to final resolution of the case. Finally, our resolution of the case cannot turn on the premise that, in the event of annexation and condemnation, just compensation will be paid.

compensation will result in unreasonably high costs to the level to condemnor. Accordingly, we decide the question essentially as if no was framed by the parties: if annexation of the Mesa Royale development to NCSD is imminent, we should defer to the request of NCSD to maintain the status quo until annexation is accomplished; or otherwise, we should approve SCWC's request. [It is also true that there is clearly substantial interest in annexation to NCSD among several property owners and/or residents in or near the Mesa Royale development. However, that interest has not matured into the form of a formal petition or application to LAFCO for annexation, and there is no assurance that a request will be filed. Once a request is submitted, there is an extensive evaluation process, and there is no foregone conclusion that it will be granted. The timing of any grant that might be forthcoming cannot be predicted with certainty. Approval of an earlier annexation application before LAFCO took three years. If approval for annexation is secured from LAFCO, NCSD's board must also approve any annexation. Again, NCSD board approval is not a foregone conclusion. Assuming it is obtained, the property owners must then agree to pay significant fees and other costs of annexation which would include compensation to SCWC. All of these factors make the possibility and timing of annexation quite uncertain.

In no During hearings, NCSD questioned whether the Mesa Royale development is contiguous to the Vista System's As shown in the company's currently-filed and proposed service area maps, its service current service area in the vicinity of the proposed extension is bounded on the north by Hazel Lane. As shown by SCWC provides service to all customers on the north side of Hazel Lane; and their property extends about thousand feet further north of Hazel Lane. As shown by SCWC's testimony, its present service area includes the properties of those customers, which in turn are adjacent to the Mesa Royale development. We find that the Mesa Royale development is not contiguous to SCWC's current service territory. In view of this,

We conclude that NCSD is not capable of providing water service to the Mesa Royale development at present time; nor will it be for an indefinite period. SCWC on the other hand is ready, willing, and able to provide water service and in fact is doing so to approximately 10 lots. Due to the degree of uncertainty regarding whether and when NCSD might annex the Mesa Royale development, an interim order maintaining the status quo and, if ever providing more time to perfect the annexation process is not warranted in our opinion as SCWC has been serving the contiguous Mesa Royale development since 1989. Its proposal to file a revised service area map which includes this development will be approved.

#### 5. Reinstatement of Service Area

SCWC has discovered that the service area now seeks to add to the Orcutt System was formerly part of its authorized service territory. As shown in Exhibit 8c when SCWC acquired California Cities Water Company (Cal. Cities) in 1978, the proposed extension of the Orcutt System was fully within Cal Cities' then authorized service area. In 1984, SCWC filed Advice Letter 676-WB with a map showing only that portion of the Orcutt System to which SCWC was then delivering water. It thereby erroneously deleted the exact area to which it now proposes to extend service. DRA

DRA recommends that the proposed Orcutt System extension be declared moot. SCWC points out, however, that the service area map now on file with the Commission does not show the proposed extension to be within its service area. Thus, as a procedural matter, SCWC requests that it be allowed to file a new tariff map. We will grant this request as soon as the new map is filed.

#### Findings of Fact

As revised, SCWC's request to extend the service area of its Santa Maria District involves 60 new customers in the Orcutt System and 28 new customers in the Vista System. Ideas need not be

2. SCWC deleted its request to serve the Oak Glen housing development due to inactivity of the developer.

13.3.8 Phases 1 & 4 of the Mesa Verde development are already part of the Orcutt System, or will be integrated with the Mesa Verde system.

13.3.9 The proposed extension of the Orcutt System encompasses Phases 5 & 7 of the Mesa Verde development, or will be integrated with

13.3.10 At full build-out, including the proposed extensions, the Orcutt System will have 11,915 customers and the Vista System will have 1,545 customers.

13.3.11 SCWC has estimated excess supplies of 302 igpm in the original Orcutt System and 1206 igpm in the Vista System to meet maximum day-end demands at full build-out, including the proposed extensions.

13.3.12 There are adequate supplies of water, with adequate fire flow, to meet the requirements of all existing customers, the anticipated growth in the Orcutt and Vista systems at full build-out, and the fully developed extensions of those systems.

13.3.13 Based on its forecasts through the year 2010, SCWC anticipates there is no chance it will need to purchase water to meet demands in the Santa Maria area, regardless of the impact of the groundwater management plans under consideration for the Santa Maria Basin.

13.3.14 SCWC asserts that the proposed service area extensions will not increase rates or charges on account of withdrawals of service.

13.3.15 The water supply issues raised by DRA in its protest have been resolved by revised water supply analyses presented by SCWC.

13.3.16 The Mesa Royale development is within NCSD's sphere of influence but outside of NCSD's authorized service area.

13.3.17 NCSD will not serve the Mesa Royale development until it is authorized to do so.

13.3.18 The Mesa Royale developer and other property owners in or near the Mesa Royale development approved annexation to NCSD, but it has not been established that all property owners seek or approve of annexation. SCWC defers to the developer to determine who is entitled to service of the Mesa Royale developer.

14. NCSD is not presently capable of providing water service to the Mesa Royale development, and whether and when it will be is uncertain due to the number of events which must occur before the Mesa Royale development is annexed to NCSD's jurisdiction.

15. The Mesa Royale development is outside of SCWC's service area as reflected in the tariff map on file with this Commission, but it is contiguous to the current service area and will be open to

SCWC if it is ready, willing, and able to provide water service to the Mesa Royale development and is doing so to approximately 100 lots.

16. SCWC is ready, willing, and able to provide water service to the Mesa Verde development was acquired by SCWC in 1978, and was inadvertently deleted from the map of the Santa Maria District, Orcutt System, which accompanied Advice Letter 676-W, Sheet 2708-W in 1984.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. SCWC's request to file revised service area maps of its Orcutt System to reinstate that portion of the Mesa Verde development that was deleted in 1984, and of its Vista System to serve Lauringson Enterprises, should be approved.

2. Since annexation of the Mesa Royale development to NCSD is uncertain, and SCWC is capable of serving the development now, we should approve SCWC's request to file a revised service area map which includes the Mesa Royale development.

3. Since SCWC revised its proposed Orcutt System extension after filing Advice Letter 938-W, Tariff Sheet 3800-W, which was filed under the advice letter should be rejected in favor of the tariff sheet set forth in Exhibit 1 under Tab B.

4. This decision resolves all issues in this proceeding, and the investigation should be closed.

5. Since the suspension of Advice Letter 938-W expires six months after January 30, 1995, this order should be made effective on the date it is signed.

and is now granted to the **Order** of the NCPD, M.  
and it is now and will remain in effect until the date of this Order  
and **IT IS ORDERED that:** a copy of this Order is to be filed with the  
Commissioner of the NCPD.

1. Tariff Sheet 3800-W filed by Southern California Water Company (SCWC) under Advice Letter 938-W is rejected; and

2. SCWC is authorized to file revised Tariff Sheets as soon as incorporating the proposed service area extensions set forth in Exhibit 1, Tab B and C; such filing shall comply with General Order 96-A.

3. This investigation is closed.

4. This order is effective today and the service area of the NCPD, M. and the City of San Francisco, California, as of the date of this Order.

5. The above order is effective from the date of this Order, except that the service area of the NCPD, M. and the City of San Francisco, California, will be subject to the provisions of General Order 96-A, effective January 1, 1984.

DANIEL Wm. FESSLER,  
President, California

P. GREGORY CONLON  
JESSIE J. KNIGHT, JR.

HENRY MENDOZA  
Commissioners

of the NCPD, M. and the City of San Francisco, California, effective January 1, 1984, and to the Aliso Service Area.

I CERTIFY THAT THIS DECISION WAS APPROVED BY THE ABOVE COMMISSIONERS TODAY.

*Wesley Frank Lewis*  
Wesley Frank Lewis  
Executive Director, M-83-W

Effective July 19, 1995, M-83-W, since the Executive Director has been appointed to the position of Executive Director of the NCPD, M. and the City of San Francisco, California, effective January 1, 1984, and to the Aliso Service Area.

5. Since the issuance of Advice Letter 938-W, the NCPD, M. and the City of San Francisco, California, has been responsible for the issuance of advice letters to the public regarding the implementation of the new service area.