

ORIGINAL

Vey Cramer, Complainant  
vs.  
Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Defendant.

Case No. 720

Vey Cramer in propria persona.  
Charles P. Cutten for Defendant.

GORDON, COMMISSIONER:

O P I N I O N

This is a complaint by Vey Cramer of Orangevale, Folsom, R. D. No.1, against the Pacific Gas and Electric Company alleging that defendant refuses to extend its lines and provide the necessary facilities to serve complainant with electric energy for lighting and power purposes.

The subject matter of the present complaint was taken up informally with the Commission on July 10, 1914, at which time lighting service only was requested. Later it appeared that complainant would require power service for a two horsepower motor.

The formal hearing in this case was held at Sacramento on February 15, 1915, and from the evidence submitted it appears that the facts are as follows:

The complainant, Mr. Vey Cramer, is a farmer, owning about ten acres of orchard described as lot number 293

of Orangevale. The larger part of the property is irrigated from the Orangevale irrigation system.

Mr. Vey Cramer desires electric service for lights in his dwelling, tank house, barn and garage and for the purpose of furnishing power to run a two horsepower motor for domestic pumping to supply water for household purposes and the irrigation of an acre or more of lawn and berries.

The defendant's present lines consist of a 2300 volt primary extension along Green Park Lane and a secondary extension, 1100 feet in length, southward along the public road to within 800 feet of Mr. Cramer's residence. Originally Mr. Cramer applied for lighting service only, and in which case the defendant proposed to extend the secondary line provided the complainant would advance a part of the cost of the extension.

To give the service at present requested by the complainant will require the reconstruction of the present 1100 feet of secondary extension by replacing the 25 ft. poles now installed by higher poles and extending primary lines thereon and constructing 800 feet of primary extension along the road to reach Mr. Cramer's residence.

The total cost of this extension will be approximately \$271.00. The revenue to be obtained from this service is estimated at \$42.00 per year and it appears that there is little or no prospect of additional revenue to be obtained from this extension.

At the hearing the complainant and the defendant, through its attorney, Mr. Charles P. Cutten, mutually agreed to a settlement whereby the complainant agreed to pay defendant \$90.00 to cover the estimated cost of the line extension from

his residence to the defendant's present secondary line and further to guarantee an annual revenue of \$45.00 per year. Further that should additional business be obtained on this extension, an adjustment of the guarantee and rebate on the amount advanced would be arranged.

I recommend that the terms of this agreement be adopted by the Commission in its order. This voluntary agreement between the parties, however, must not be regarded as a precedent for future cases before the Commission.

After a careful consideration of the settlement agreed to by complainant and defendant, I find that complainant is entitled to receive service and that defendant should construct the necessary line, supply and install the necessary facilities and connections and furnish electric energy to complainant under the conditions which are specified in the order herein.

I submit the following form of order:-

#### O R D E R

A public hearing having been held in the above entitled proceeding, and the case having been submitted and now being ready for decision,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Pacific Gas and Electric Company within twenty days after the payment of the sum of \$90.00 by Vey Cramer to it shall construct and extend its electric lines and furnish complainant with electric power for lighting and power purposes as requested;

PROVIDED that Vey Cramer shall agree to pay to the Pacific Gas and Electric Company a minimum annual revenue of \$45.00 per year for a period of five years or until such less

time as the rates or regulations covering this matter are changed by this Commission.

The foregoing opinion and order are hereby approved and ordered filed as the opinion and order of the Railroad Commission of the State of California.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 5th day of March, 1915.

Max Shelton

A. J. Boardman

Wm. F. Boardman

Edwin O. Edgerton

Commissioners.