

Decision No. 7304

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ORIGINAL

---oOo---

In the Matter of the Application of )  
MT. WHITNEY POWER AND ELECTRIC COM- )  
PANY, a corporation, for an order ) Application No. 5172  
establishing just and reasonable )  
rates for the sale of electricity. )

Roy V. Reppy, E. C. Farnsworth and Fred E. Pettit, Jr., for Applicant.

Power & McPadzean, by Morris E. Power, for Visalia Electric Railroad Company.

James F. Farragher, S. I. Merrill, Andrew Hancock and J. B. Ely, for Kern County Farm Bureau.

Irvin H. Althouse, for Terra Bella Irrigation District.

E. I. Feenster and C. H. Holley, for San Joaquin Valley Public Utility Association.

E. W. Holland, for City of Tulare.

F. M. Eldridge, for Board of Trustees, City of Tulare.

MARTIN, Commissioner:

O P I N I O N

Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company, hereafter designated as applicant, asks authority to charge such increased rates for the sale of electricity as will be just

and reasonable and afford applicant a fair return upon its operative property. Applicant urges that the cost of material and labor has constantly increased during the past year and applicant's costs of operation have accordingly increased; that higher schedules of wages and material costs will prevail in the future; that the present rates, including the 15% surcharge, have not returned to applicant a reasonable return upon its operative property.

Hearing in this matter was held in Visalia on January 6th, 1920, at which time evidence was introduced by applicant relative to its operations in the past and estimates for the future.

At this hearing it was stipulated that the existing surcharge of 15%, which automatically ceased to be effective on January 15th in accordance with Decision 6475 in Application 3891, be continued by order of the Commission until such time as the Commission rendered its decision in the present application. In accordance with the stipulation, the Commission, under date of January 12th, 1920, issued its Decision No. 7028 extending the effective date of the Commission's Decision No. 6475 supra pending further order of this Commission.

At the hearing held in Visalia on January 6th it was agreed that the adjourned hearing would also be held at Visalia in order that those desiring to present evidence could do so conveniently. However, due to the epidemic of influenza existing in the San Joaquin Valley at the time of the adjourned hearing on February 5th it was not possible for the Commission to hold the hearing in Visalia, and, as it did not appear advisable to further postpone this proceeding, the adjourned hearing was held in San Francisco on February 5th, 1920. In

order that all parties unable to appear in San Francisco might not be deprived of their rights, it was stipulated and agreed by both the representatives of the utility and the consumers that 10 days be allowed, following the final hearing, for filing of evidence and protests in documentary form with the Commission, and that this information be considered by the Commission as introduced in the proceeding. It was further stipulated that all evidence in former proceedings affecting Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company, and general data on file with the Commission, should be considered in evidence in so far as relevant.

Protests and statements in the form of briefs or documentary evidence submitted during the subsequent period referred to above are as follows:

Protest - San Joaquin Valley Public Utility Association - Submitted by E. I. Feemster, Attorney - together with three exhibits submitted by C.E. Holley, Engineer.

Transcript setting forth series of questions and answers between J. F. Farragher and 14 consumers of San Joaquin Light & Power Corporation and Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company.

The existing rates of Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company were originally fixed by this Commission in Decision No. 3242, Application No. 1673, dated April 6th, 1916 (Opinions and Orders of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, Vol. 9, page 628). These rates were based upon cost of operation during pre-war conditions of prices of material and labor and fuel oil. The Commission, under date of August 29th, 1918, Decision No. 5729 (Opinions and Orders of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, Vol. 15, page 1113), authorized applicant to increase the basic rates by a 10% surcharge. Further increased costs of operation

occurred and on July 2nd, 1919, in D this Commission authorized applicant, Decision No. 6475 supra rates by a surcharge of 15% in place to an existing surcharge of 10%. The surcharge of 15% authorized therein was made effective until January 15th, 1920 for metered service and until January 31st, 1920 for flat rate service. As above stated, the surcharge has been continued, by Commission order, pending further action by the Commission.

Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company serves electricity for lighting and power in Kings, Tulare and Kern Counties. Practically 80% of the business of Mt. Whitney Company is agricultural pumping, the majority of which is in Tulare County. The business of Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company has increased rapidly. Applicant has not, however, developed additional power plants to meet the requirements, depending upon Southern California Edison Company for increased supply of power to meet demands, that company controlling operations of applicant, arranging for financing of necessary additions to its system and supplying power required in excess of applicant's existing plant output.

For the year 1919 applicant reports a rate base of \$5,977,121 and a gross revenue of \$1,360,582; operating expenses, including depreciation, of \$1,029,132.55, and a net return of \$331,450.09, or 5.55% upon the investment.

Applicant's operating expenses increased for the year approximately \$25,000 over that estimated in the Commission's Decision No. 6475. The earnings, however, of applicant were less than estimated exclusive of the increase of 5% in the surcharge.

The operating conditions of applicant for the year 1920 will be in general similar to those in 1919 with the ex-

ception that it will be necessary for applicant to purchase a greater amount of power from Southern California Edison Company than during the previous year, and, in addition, it has experienced a further increase in its cost of labor and supplies.

Applicant's investment in property, exclusive of working cash capital and material and supplies, on December 31st, 1919, based upon the previous findings of the Commission, was \$5,979,141.21. Applicant estimates an increase in capital of \$743,000 for the first six months of 1920. This is an increase materially in excess of that normally experienced in the past, and, in view of the shortage of power supply of Southern California at the present time, it would appear that this total expenditure will not, in all probability, be experienced. The rate base for 1920 will be the following sum:-

Capital, exclusive of Material and Supplies and Working Cash Capital	\$6,500,000
Material and Supplies	250,000
Working Cash Capital	<u>100,000</u>
Total . . . . .	\$6,850,000

Table No. 1 sets forth the actual operations of applicant for the years 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919 together with applicant's estimate of operations for 1920. Applicant's estimate of increase in sales as set forth in its Exhibit No. 9 appears to be reasonable - in fact it is possible that applicant will not increase its sales for irrigation power to the extent estimated owing to the shortage of power existing, which will require the deferring of the taking on

TABLE NO. 1  
OPERATIONS OF MOUNT WHITNEY POWER & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
1916 to 1919 AND ESTIMATE FOR 1920

	1916	1917	1918	1919	Est. 1920 (Present Rates)
Rate Base	\$4,464,351.00	\$4,918,130.00	\$5,215,776.00	\$5,977,120.86	\$6,850,000.00
Total Revenue	773,929.76	811,574.71	1,046,453.30	1,360,582.64	1,568,000.00
<u>Operating Expenses:</u>					
Production:					
Fuel Oil	28,869.54	41,365.24	35,223.50	127,173.54	40,000.00
Purchased Power	13,333.32	123,351.56	386,110.75	357,207.11	582,000.00
Other Expenses	55,625.31	79,560.29	57,987.44	75,033.18	108,000.00
Total	97,828.17	244,277.09	479,321.69	559,413.83	730,000.00
Transmission	15,569.32	8,064.67	7,737.87	8,454.16	7,000.00
Distribution	63,226.97	60,047.51	103,508.07	168,251.40	180,000.00
Commercial	40,896.75	46,023.99	42,912.97	46,862.64	52,000.00
General & Misc.	72,544.28	78,274.36	62,570.86	62,760.78	69,000.00
Taxes	41,782.14	45,000.00	48,566.23	57,669.74	81,000.00
Uncollectible Bills	8,986.94	11,168.38	9,258.34	6,000.00	7,000.00
Total	\$340,834.57	\$492,856.00	\$753,878.03	\$909,432.55	\$1,126,000.00
Net for Int. & Deprec.	433,095.19	318,718.71	292,575.27	451,150.09	462,000.00
Depreciation	85,830.00	96,144.00	102,000.00	119,700.00	137,000.00
Net for Interest	347,265.19	222,574.71	190,575.27	331,450.09	325,000.00
Percent Return	7.77%	4.52%	3.65%	5.55%	4.75%

of additional consumers. I will accept the estimate of applicant as to sales of electric energy.

Applicant's estimate of operating expenses other than purchased power appears reasonable when consideration is given to the increase in cost of labor and supplies.

Referring now to the cost of purchased power, it is estimated that the total purchase of power will be 67,000,000 k.w.hrs. from Edison Company and 4,000,000 k.w.hrs. from San Joaquin Light & Power Corporation, the latter being used in the distribution system at Hanford. The cost of this power to Mt. Whitney Company has been computed at 8.3 mills per k.w.hr. for delivery from Edison system, and slightly in excess of 1¢ per k.w.hr. for energy delivered from San Joaquin system.

The correctness of the rate for energy from Edison Company has been questioned by San Joaquin Valley Public Utility Association, it being urged by that Association that applicant should not be charged for steam power but should be charged for the cost of hydro-electric power produced by Southern California Edison Company's plants in the San Joaquin Valley, claiming that the San Joaquin Valley had first and prior right to such power. Protestants submitted figures estimating the cost of producing hydro-electric power in the San Joaquin Valley plants of Southern California Edison Company, estimating that the cost of this power was materially less than 8.3 mills.

This contention of San Joaquin Valley Public Utility Association is not sound. This theory of fixing of rates would also be disastrous to the communities in general outside of San Joaquin Valley which have been built up and are dependent upon the power of the Edison Company's system

regardless of where produced. It is well to note also that the power plants of Edison Company were constructed and the power transmitted from the San Joaquin Valley prior to the time there was any demand for a supply of power from these plants to be delivered to the consumers on the applicant's system.

Considering the history of the Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company and its present status, it is my opinion that, as far as the cost of power is concerned, the Mt. Whitney Company's consumers should be considered as receiving service from an integral part of Southern California Edison Company's system. Applicant is owned and controlled by Southern California Edison Company. It is dependent upon that company for its financing and for its policies as regards power development, and, if it is not considered as a part of the Edison system its consumers will be subject to possible unfair treatment. If Mt. Whitney is considered as a part of the Edison system, then it would appear that the cost of power delivered to that system should be determined on the same basis as the cost of power to any other portion of the Edison Company's system.

This Commission has not only to fix the rates of applicant but it has before it at this time the determination of the rates of the entire Southern California Edison Company system, including the rate to Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company, and the charge for power must be based upon equity to all consumers both north and south of the Tehachapi. Consumers of Edison system should not be required to make up deficits on applicant's system, nor should the reverse be true.

From investigation of records of the Edison Company now with the Commission I must conclude that the rate of 8.3

mills per k.w.hr. estimated by applicant is not excessive on the basis of consideration of applicant as a part of the Edison system - in fact it is in all probability low, and, for this proceeding, I will use the rate of 8.3 mills in determining the rates to be charged by Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company. If Mt. Whitney Company is not to be considered as a part of Edison Company's system then applicant would be required to bear the whole cost of full operation of its steam plants, which would materially increase the cost of service.

Referring again to Table No. 1, it would appear that with the existing rates upon applicant's system its earnings for 1920 will be approximately 4.7% of the rate base as compared with a return for 1917 of 4.52%, for 1918 of 3.65% and for 1919 of 5.55%. The effect of the present dry year will not materially increase the operating costs of applicant except as it may involve the price of purchased power as the output of applicant's hydro-electric plants will not be greatly reduced.

The cost of money to applicant is in excess of 6%. It has rendered service during the past three years at an average rate of approximately 5% on its reasonable investment, <sup>return</sup> which is a rate of ~~interest~~ less than the cost of the money it has had to borrow to meet the demands of applicants for service. This cannot continue indefinitely without detriment to service or a condition of additional increase of rates on Southern California Edison Company's system which will be unfair to consumers on that system.

It is well to emphasize in connection with the matter of increase in rates for electric service that even with

the increases herein authorized the percentage of increase in cost of service over pre-war conditions will be materially lower than the general increase in cost of labor and supplies which applicant has had to pay, and less in general than the increase in price of labor and supplies paid by consumers and the increase in price received by applicant's consumers for their products.

Evidence in this proceeding shows that since 1916, when the rates were fixed for applicant, certain of the products of applicant's consumers have increased at least 100% in price while applicant's rates have, so far, been <sup>in general</sup> less than in effect prior to that date, and, even with the increase herein granted, will not exceed the rates in effect in January 1916 by more than 20%. Government statistics tend to show that, on an average, prices received for commodities have increased in excess of 50% and at the present time the purchasing power of \$1.00 is reduced to 50 cents compared with its purchasing power in 1915. It is true that these facts in themselves are not sufficient to justify increase in rates but consumers of applicant should bear these in mind in connection with the increases granted.

I feel certain that applicant's consumers will gladly meet their responsibility by paying the increased rates when they realize that it is vitally essential that Mt. Whitney Company be granted an increase in rates in order to continue to serve their patrons adequately and meet the large and increasing demands for power which are continually being made upon its system.

Considering now the subject of the rates to be charged by Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company, the present rates in effect, especially agricultural, are of the flat rate form, the charge being based upon the connected load or the maximum demand

of the installation. Complaint has, in the past, been received by the Commission regarding this form of rate, and, in view to determining the correct form of rates to be charged in the future, conferences were held between the Commission's Electrical Division and representatives of applicant's consumers and applicant in view to arriving at the form of schedule which would be most advantageous to the consumers and most readily apportion the cost of service between the various consumers. It was the general agreement that the flat rates should be discontinued, as not just, especially under present condition of shortage of hydro-electric power with the resultant increase in steam production of energy. The flat rates are not conducive to economy in use of power and in some instances encourage wasteful use of both power and water, a matter of serious consideration at the present time.

Certain rates were submitted as the conclusions of the engineers as to the best form of rates to be charged and as to relative division of cost between classes of consumers and consumers in the classes. These rates were not proposed as the rates actually to be charged except those proposed by Mr. H. A. Barre of applicant. Mr. Barre's testimony discloses that no analysis was made by him as to the relative costs between different classes of service, and, although the cost is not the only factor to be considered, it seems inadvisable to give serious weight to his suggestions.

The rates submitted by the engineers are, in form, apparently agreed upon as most satisfactory based upon normal conditions of operation. Since the proceeding was submitted, however, a power shortage has developed which will in all probability require curtailment of the use of power, and, with

this fact in mind, it would appear advisable to so modify the rates that the bills will be readily adjusted in case of actual curtailment.

All of the power companies in the southern part of the state have agreed to a general pooling of power in order that the entire shortage will not be thrown upon a small portion of the entire system. Under this pooling it is very probable that applicant will be required to reduce the use of power of its consumers.

In view of these facts and the probable curtailment of power on the San Joaquin system as well as on this system, and the fact that these systems are serving, in general, the same type of territory, it appears reasonable that the rates on Mt. Whitney system for this year should be the same as those on the San Joaquin system for the same class of service. These rates will be considered as temporary, being applicable during the emergency created by the water shortage, and will be reconsidered based upon a normal basis as soon as normal conditions again exist.

The form of rates proposed will make possible ready correction of bills in case curtailment occurs and will also do away with the difficulty existing due to the present flat rates, which in no way encourage conservation and are actually resulting in detriment to the consumers in the Valley in some instances owing to the wastage of water.

The rates herein proposed to apply to the power sold by Mt. Whitney Power and Electric Company will, it is estimated, result in a net return upon the investment of 7.3 per cent.

O R D E R

Mount Whitney Power and Electric Company having filed herein its supplemental application asking authority to increase its rates charged for electric energy, public hearings having been held, this proceeding having been submitted and now ready for decision,

The Railroad Commission hereby finds as a fact that the existing rates for electric energy sold by Mount Whitney Power and Electric Company together with the surcharge now authorized are, under existing conditions, unjust and unreasonable, and that the rates herein established are just and reasonable rates.

Basing its order on the foregoing findings of fact and on the other findings of fact contained in the Opinion preceding this Order,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that all electric rates and surcharges now charged by Mount Whitney Power and Electric Company be and the same are hereby cancelled, effective for all electric service rendered, based on meter readings taken on and after April 1, 1920.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Mount Whitney Power and Electric Company be and the same is hereby authorized to charge and collect for all electric service rendered, based upon meter readings taken on and after April 1, 1920 and upon all flat rate service rendered on and after April 1, 1920, the following rates:

SCHEDULE NO. 1  
(Cancelling Schedule No. 1 now in effect)

GENERAL DOMESTIC AND COMMERCIAL LIGHTING

TERRITORY:

Applicable to entire territory served by the Company.

RATE:

First	20 k.w.h. per meter per month	...	9¢	per k.w.h.
Next	80 " " " " " "	...	6¢	" "
Next	200 " " " " " "	...	5¢	" "
All over	300 " " " " " "	...	4¢	" "

MINIMUM CHARGE:

\$1.00 per meter per month.

SCHEDULE NO. 2  
(Cancelling Schedule No. 2 now in effect)

COMMERCIAL LIGHTING SERVICE:

TERRITORY:

Applicable to all territory served by Company.

RATE:

(a) Readiness to Serve Charge:

First	4 kilowatts of maximum demand per month	...	\$10.00
All over	4 kilowatts of maximum demand per month	...	2.00 per K.W.

(b) Energy Charge:

First	1000 k.w.h. per meter per month	...	2½¢ per k.w.h.
All over	1000 " " " " " "	...	2¢ " "

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

(a) The total monthly charge is the sum of the Readiness-to-Serve and Energy Charges.

(b) Under this schedule watt demand indicators and watt-hour meters will, in all cases, be installed and maintained

by the Company and at the Company's expense.

(c) The maximum demand shall be the greatest average kilowatt demand registered during any 15 minute interval during the month.

SCHEDULE NO. 3

(Cancelling Schedule No. 3,12 now in effect)

PUBLIC OUTDOOR LIGHTING SERVICE:

Applicable to all street, highway and other public outdoor lighting service.

TERRITORY:

Applicable to the entire territory served by Company.

RATE:

	<u>Type of Lamp</u>	<u>Rate</u>	
		<u>Annual Demand Charge per each lamp</u>	<u>Charge per each 100 lamp hours.</u>
<u>Arc Lamps</u>			
(1)	6.6 Ampere Luminous	\$43.70	\$ .60
(2)	4.0 " "	39.50	.55
<u>Incandescent Lamps</u>			
(3)	400 W. multiple or 600 c.p. series	35.40	.70
(4)	200 W. " " 400 c.p. "	32.40	.50
(5)	150 W. " " 250 c.p. "	27.60	.35
(6)	80 W. " " 100 c.p. "	19.40	.18
(7)	60 W. " " 80 c.p. "	16.10	.12
(8)	40 W. " " 60 c.p. "	15.80	.10

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

- (a) The demand charge to be paid in twelve equal monthly payments throughout the year.
- (b) The total charge for any month to be one-twelfth of the annual demand charge plus the lamp-hour charge for that month.
- (c) All-night lamps will be considered as burning 4000 hours per year.

- (d) Under the above schedule the Company bears the installation, maintenance and operating expense and provides all necessary lamp renewals.
- (e) Where the Company is required to provide ornamental lighting posts or standards an additional charge will be made for the same.
- (f) The Company furnishes ornamental lighting posts for street lighting in the City of Lindsay.

SCHEDULE NO. 4

SPECIAL STREET LIGHTING SERVICE:

(a) City of Tulare

600 c.p. 20 ampere series incandescent lamps on ornamental cement standards owned and maintained by Company, fed by underground conduit series 6.6 ampere distribution system owned and maintained by consumer.

Rate: \$63.00 per lamp per year.

City of Tulare also receives street lighting service under Schedule No. 3.

(b) City of Hanford

900 c.p. 4 ampere series luminous arcs suspended at street corners, owned and maintained by the Company.

Rate: \$5.25 per lamp per month.

600 c.p. 20 ampere series incandescent electrolier posts fed by underground series 6.6 ampere circuit, owned and maintained by the Company.

Rate: \$5.25 per lamp per month.

City of Hanford also receives street lighting service under Schedule No. 3.

(c) City of Lindsay

600 c.p. 20 ampere series incandescent lamps, iron post electroliers, owned and maintained by the Company, and fed by an underground system owned by and maintained by the consumer.

Rate: \$63.00 per lamp per year.

City of Lindsay also receives street lighting service under Schedule No. 3.

## SCHEDULE NO. 5

(Cancelling Schedule No. 11 now in effect)

### DOMESTIC HEATING, COOKING AND COMBINATION LIGHTING, HEATING OR COOKING SERVICE

Applicable to domestic service using heating and  
(or) cooking equipment of 3 kilowatts or more capacity.

#### TERRITORY:

Applicable to the entire territory served by Company.

#### RATE:

First	30	k.w.h.	per meter	per month	...	9¢	per k.w.h.
Next	130	"	"	"	...	4¢	"
All over	160	"	"	"	...	1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> ¢	"

#### MINIMUM CHARGE:

\$ .75 per kilowatt of active heating and cooking load  
per month but not less than \$2.50 per month.

#### SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

In determining the heating and cooking capacity  
lamp socket devices such as flat-irons, toasters,  
etc. shall not be included.

## SCHEDULE NO. 6

(Cancelling Schedule No. 11 now in effect.)

### COMMERCIAL HEATING AND COOKING SERVICE:

Applicable to commercial heating and (or) cooking  
service excluding all lighting service and all lamp  
socket devices.

#### TERRITORY:

Applicable to the entire territory served by Company.

#### RATE:

First	150	k.w.h.	per meter	per month	...	4¢	per k.w.h.
All over	150	"	"	"	...	1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> ¢	"

SCHEDULE NO. 6 (Cont'd.)

MINIMUM CHARGE:

\$ .75 per kilowatt of active heating and cooking load per month but not less than \$2.50 per month.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

Heating and cooking service to be delivered over a circuit and measured by a meter separate from the lighting circuit and meter.

SCHEDULE NO. 7

(Cancelling Schedules Nos. 4, 5, 6, 6-A, <sup>6-B</sup> now in effect)

AGRICULTURAL SERVICE:

Applicable to installations of 3 H.P. and over.

TERRITORY:

Applicable to entire territory served by Company.

RATE:

<u>Consumption per H.P. per month.</u>	<u>Rate per K.W.H. of connected loads of</u>	
	<u>3 H.P. to 6 H.P.</u>	<u>7 H.P. and over.</u>
First 125	2.4¢	2¢
All over 125	1.4¢	1.4¢

MINIMUM CHARGE:

No Minimum Charge. (During 1920.)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

Installations of less than 3 H.P. used for agricultural purposes:

- (a) May receive service under this schedule on the basis of a 3 H.P. installation or
- (b) May be classified as industrial service and receive service under the general industrial power service schedule of rates.

SCHEDULE NO. 8

(Cancelling Schedules Nos. 7 & 8 now in effect)

GENERAL INDUSTRIAL POWER SERVICE:

Applicable to agricultural installations of less than 3 H.P. capacity and to all general power service.

TERRITORY:

Applicable to entire territory served by Company.

RATE:

(a) Installations of less than 5 H.P. capacity:

First	200	k.w.h.	per	meter	per	month	..	6¢	per	k.w.h.
Next	200	"	"	"	"	"	..	3¢	"	"
All over	400	"	"	"	"	"	..	1½¢	"	"

(b) Installations of 5 H.P. or over:

Rate per K. W. H. of active loads of

Consumption per H.P. of active loads	5 H.P.		10 H.P.		25 H.P.		50 H.P.		100 H.P.	
	to	9 H.P.	to	24 H.P.	to	49 H.P.	to	99 H.P.	and	over.
First	50	K.W.H.	4.4¢	3.6¢	3.2¢	3.0¢	2.8¢			
Next	50	"	2.0¢	2¢	1.9¢	1.8¢	1.8¢			
All over	100	"	1.3¢	1.2¢	1.1¢	1.0¢	1.0¢			

MINIMUM CHARGE:

\$1.00 per horsepower of active connected load per month.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

- (a) Upon application of the consumer, or at the option of the company, the block and minimum charges may be based upon the maximum demand for installations exceeding 25 H.P., in which case the maximum demand shall not be less than 50% of the rated capacity of the connected load and not less than 25 H.P.

The maximum demand shall be determined to the nearest even 5 H.P.

SCHEDULE NO. 8 (Cont'd.)

- (b) In case the consumer requests the installation of a demand meter the company shall charge a rental charge of \$3.50 per year for the use of such meter.
- (c) The maximum demand shall be the greatest average kilowatt demand registered during any 15 minute interval during the month.

SCHEDULE NO. 9

(Cancelling Schedule No. 9 now in effect)

SUBSTATION SERVICE:

Applicable to installations receiving service directly from the Company's substation or directly from the Company's primary distributing line at the voltage of such substation or distributing line.

TERRITORY:

Applicable to the entire territory served by the Company.

RATE:

Resale and Industrial Service:

First 100,000 k.w.h. per meter per month . 1¢ per k.w.h.  
All over 100,000 " " " " " . 0.95¢ per k.w.h.

MINIMUM CHARGE:

\$12.00 per year <sup>per k.w.h.</sup> of substation capacity used, or, in case of purchase from primary distribution lines \$1.00 per month per kilowatt of highest 15 minute maximum occurring demand during the month or 11 preceding months.

SCHEDULE NO. 10

(Cancelling Schedule No. 10 now in effect)

TRANSMISSION SERVICE:

Applicable to installations receiving service directly from the Company's transmission line at the transmission

SCHEDULE NO. 10 (Cont'd.)

line voltage.

TERRITORY:

Applicable to the entire territory served by the Company.

RATE:

0.9 cents per kilowatt hour.

MINIMUM CHARGE:

\$1.00 per month per kilowatt of highest 15 minute maximum demand occurring during the month, or preceding 11 months.

SCHEDULE NO. 11

SPECIAL POWER SERVICE:

<u>Service to</u>	<u>Rate</u>
(a) Electric Railway Service	1.4¢ per k.w.h.

MINIMUM CHARGE:

No Minimum Charge.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Mount Whitney Power and Electric Company shall file with the Railroad Commission of the State of California on or before the 31st day of March, 1920, the rates herein established.

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 23<sup>rd</sup>  
day of March, 1920.

Edwin C. Edgerton

H. B. ...

Frank R. ...

H. N. ...

... ..

Commissioners.