

McS-

Decision No. 6316

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

-oOo-

Lola V. Joyner,	)	
	:	
Complainant	)	
	:	Case No. 1311.
-vs-	:	
John T. Gaffey, owner of	)	
the Gaffey Water Company,	:	
Defendant.	)	

Lola V. Joyner in propria persona.  
John T. Gaffey in propria persona.

By the COMMISSION.

O P I N I O N

The complaint in the above entitled proceeding alleges in effect that complainant, residing at 763 Sepulvida Street, San Pedro, on which is located a water main owned by defendant, has made application for water service for domestic purposes and has been refused. The Commission is asked for an order compelling defendant to extend service to complainant's property.

1.

Defendant's answer alleges that the entire supply of water for the territory served is secured from the City of Los Angeles under a contract entitling defendant to 50,000 gallons per day; that notification has been given him that a draft on the City's system in excess of that quantity will not be allowed; that the use of water by present consumers is equal to the total amount to which he is entitled under his contract and that refusal to extend service to complainant is based only upon an insufficient supply. Dismissal of the complaint is therefore asked.

A public hearing was held in Los Angeles on May 5th, 1919.

Defendant serves approximately 132 consumers in what is known as the La Rambla District of Palos Verdes Ranch adjacent to San Pedro in Los Angeles County. Approximately fifty percent of the consumers have metered service and practically all the use of water is for domestic purposes, although there are a few persons who consume larger quantities for irrigation purposes.

The evidence shows that the average draft on the City's water system has exceeded the contractual allowance of 50,000 gallons in at least one month during the year 1918 and that permission to exceed that quantity has been refused.

Testimony also disclosed the fact that any other source of supply is out of the question owing to remoteness and consequent excessive cost.

An inspection of the plant of defendant was made by Mr. F. M. Foude, one of the Commission's Hydraulic Engineers who testified that while the physical condition of the water system is as good as is generally found in systems of like character and size, that there are means of conserving the present supply thereby making it possible to extend service to the complainant, whose requirements for the present season at least are for domestic use only. He testified that there now exists upon the system, leaks which if repaired would conserve a considerable supply of water and also that there is considerable waste of water due to pumping into a tank which is a part of defendant's system, after the tank has been filled. We believe that if the defendant will use diligence in repairing leaks in water mains and discontinue pumping as soon as the tank is filled that complainant herein can be supplied with water without working any hardship upon the present consumers of defendant.

#### ORDER

ICLA V. JOYNER, having filed complaint in the above entitled proceeding, a public hearing having been held thereon, being fully informed in the matter, and basing the order upon the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant proceed with due diligence to install a service pipe from his water main to the property of complainant and thereafter to furnish an adequate supply of water for domestic purposes,

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant avoid all preventable waste of water on his system; that all leaks in the distribution pipes be repaired as soon as possible after they occur; and that defendant's tanks shall not be allowed to overflow.

.Dated at San Francisco, California, this 12<sup>th</sup>  
day of May, 1919.

Edwin O. Edgerton  
H. D. Brundage  
H. D. Brundage

Commissioners.