

Decision No. 10393

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

---oOo---

ORIGINAL

In the Matter of the Application of )  
SAN JOAQUIN LIGHT AND POWER CORPORA- )  
TION for a revision and adjustment )  
of rates. )

Application No. 6651

In the Matter of the Investigation )  
of the electric rates, service and )  
operations of SAN JOAQUIN LIGHT AND )  
POWER CORPORATION, on the Commis- )  
sion's own motion. )

Case No. 1544

BY THE COMMISSION:

OPINION ON PETITION FOR REHEARING

E. Easton, a power consumer, and California Farm Bureau Federation, by F. S. Brittain, Attorney, have filed a petition for rehearing herein. We will consider such of the allegations of said petition as seem to require mention.

Petitioners question whether the decision No. 10348 in the above entitled matters allows the Company the interest on accrued depreciation in addition to return, operating expenses and depreciation annuity, or as a deduction from the fair return allowed. Study of the decision will show clearly that the allowance in operating expenses for depreciation is the depreciation annuity, and that the interest on the accrued depreciation which the Company is ordered to add to the reserve is to be set aside out of the fair return upon the investment.

Petitioners urge that the full allowance of the invest-

ment in the Midway steam plant and enlargement of the Bakersfield steam plant should not be made, it being contended that part of the investment is not beneficially used and useful in its entirety by the regular consumers. The Commission gave full consideration to this question in the main decision and included in the gross revenue the revenue from the sale of 40,000,000 kilowatt hours to Pacific Gas and Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company, which sales will result in net revenue sufficient to justify inclusion of the entire investment in these properties as a part of the rate base.

Petitioners urge that the Commission erred in its computation of state taxes. This matter has been the subject of very careful consideration by the Commission, and the claim of petitioners in this matter does not appear to be sound.

Petitioners urge that further consideration should be given to the question of agricultural rates. This claim is apparently based upon a lack of careful study of the decision and does not appear to justify reopening the proceeding.

We conclude from consideration of the petition for rehearing and re-consideration of the evidence that rehearing in this matter should not be granted.

#### ORDER ON PETITION FOR REHEARING

E. Easton, a power consumer, and California Farm Bureau Federation having filed petition for rehearing in the above entitled proceeding, careful consideration having been given to said petition,

The Railroad Commission hereby finds that the rehearing as requested should not be granted.

Basing its order on the foregoing finding of fact and each statement of fact contained in the Opinion dated April 25th, 1922 and the Opinion which precedes this order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition for rehearing filed by E. Easton, a power consumer, and California Farm Bureau Federation be, and the same is, hereby denied.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this

4th day of May, 1922.

*H. B. Brundage*

*James M. ...*  
*Charles H. ...*  
*W. H. ...*

Commissioners.