ORIGINAL

Decision No. 47427

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application

of

WEST COAST TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA

to increase rates.

Application No. 33119.

Appearance for Applicant: Claude N. Rosenberg.

Interested Party: California Farm Bureau Federation by J. J. Deuel.

Other Appearances: W. W. Dunlop and H. F. Wiggins for the Commission's staff.

## <u>o p i n i o n</u>

West Coast Telephone Company of California, engaged in the business of rendering telephone and telegraph service in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, California, filed the above-entitled application of February 13, 1952, for authority to increase telephone rates to yield additional annual revenue of approximately \$32,000 from exchange and toll service at the level of business estimated for the year 1952. Applicant's proposed increased rates are set forth in Exhibits "C" and "D" of the application. After due notice a public hearing was held on this application before Commissioner Harold P. Huls and Examiner M. W. Edwards on May 28, 1952, at Crescent City, California. Applicant's Facilities

The West Coast Telephone Company of California is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and is the wholly owned subsidiary of West Coast Telephone

The company's witness testified that because of the rapid growth in the area it is difficult to estimate requirements for service more than one year in advance. Furthermore, he pointed to the fact that the economic situation in the lumber business is of vital importance to the utility and it is not sound to overexpand telephone development during a boom period in the lumber business such as exists at present. During a slump in the lumber market toll revenues fall off. During lean years the area would not support a very large telephone plant investment, in his opinion.

This witness also told of project completions in the past few weeks that provided 13 new toll circuits out of the area to handle long distance calls to other points in California or to other states, and a new central office in Crescent City with two additional switchboard positions to give faster service on toll or local calls. Some of the held orders are from persons so far removed from the company's lines that it would cost \$1,000 or more per station to make line extensions. This witness could not give many details as to plans to handle the held orders but said that the company's service now is adequate to handle the telephone requirements of the area for the year 1952.

## Over-all Cost to Serve

For the purpose of determining whether or not the applicant is entitled to a rate increase the Commission considers, among other things, the relationship of the revenues to the over-all cost of rendering the utility service. Such costs include the expense of maintenance of plant and equipment, traffic expense, general office and management expenses, depreciation expense, city, county, state and federal taxes, and interest or return paid for the use of capital necessary to provide plant facilities for the public service.

The applicant's Exhibits Nos. 14 and 15 show that its rate of return after payment of the other expenses above enumerated have declined from 8.17% in 1949 to 4.46% in 1951 as follows:

Year	1949	8.17%
Year	1950	5.60
Year	1951	4.46

Exhibit No. 15 also shows that in 1951 the adjusted rate of return was 3.43% after reflecting increases in wages and current operating conditions. The staff's analysis for 1951 showed 4.52% return and an adjusted figure of 3.42% by Exhibit No. 19.

## Evidence of Future Earnings

Both the applicant and the Commission's staff presented estimates of the earnings of the West Coast Telephone Company of California for the year 1952. The estimates, which are summarized below, were prepared on the basis of present rates and proposed rates shown by the applicant in its Exhibits "C" and "D" attached to the application.

Estimated Earnings in 1952

** · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	THE STREET STREET	* ** - / W/- 1		
Item	: Compa : Exhibit : Present : : Rates :	No. 16 Proposed	Present	No. 19 :
Operating Revenue			\$204,500	
Operating Expenses Operation and Maintenance Operating Taxes Depreciation Subtotal, Expense	150,226 15,090 23,804 189,120	150,226 26,854 23,804 200,884	19,800	159,200 22,400 19,800 201,400
Net Revenue	9,804	30,466	11,900	35,000
Rate Base (Depreciated)	582,563	582,563	581,000	581,000
Rate of Return	1.68%	5.23%	2.05%	6.02%

The company took no particular exception to the staff's estimate but did not concur in the over-all results of the staff's study. The engineer who presented the staff's study used the

"remaining life" method of computing depreciation expense and recommended that the company should spread the original cost of plant, less estimated net salvage and depreciation reserve, over the estimated remaining life of the property. The company used the "total life" method of computing depreciation expense but did not agree at the hearing to adopt the remaining life method for the future stating that this was a matter for further consideration by management. Such change will be required by the order herein.

Conclusion on Earnings

After giving consideration to both estimates of operating results for 1952, it is our conclusion that the staff's estimates of revenue, expenses and rate base are reasonable amounts that the utility can attain with efficient operation. For the year 1952 we adopt a rate base of \$581,000 and find that applicant's proposed rates will yield a not revenue of \$35,000 at the current level of business, resulting in a rate of return of 6.02%. In our opinion, a rate of return of 6.02% for this utility is not unreasonable; therefore, applicant's requested rates will be authorized.

## Authorized Rates

A comparison of the present rates for the basic classifications of exchange service with the rates requested by applicant and authorized in the order herein follows:

	: Rate per Month									
	Residence Service : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :			: Business Service						
				: Proposed &:						
Grade of Service	:Present:Authorized:Increase:Present:Authorized:Increase									
Crescent City Exchange										
l-Party	\$3.50	\$4.75	\$1.25	<del>-</del> \$5.00	\$7.75	\$2.75				
2-Party	-	-	-	4.50	6.50	2.00				
4-Party	2.50	3.25	.75	4.00	5.50	1.50				
Suburban	2.50	3.50	1.00	4.00	5.75	1.75				
Farmer Line	•	1.50	-	-	2.50	_				
Extension	1.00	1.25	.25	1.50	1.75	.25				
•	Klame		rick Exchar	-		_				
1-Party	3.25	4.75	1.50	4.75	7.75	3.00				
2-Party	-	_	•	4.50	6.50	2.00				
4-Party	2.50	3.25	.75	-	-	-				
Suburban	2.25	3.50	1.25	3.75	5.75	2.00				
Farmer Line	1.00*	1.50	.50*	1.50*	2.50	1.00*				
Extension	1.00	1.25	.25	1.50	1.75	.25				
	Sr		c Exchange	_	•	-				
l-Party	3.25	4.75	1.50	4.75	7.75	3.00				
4-Party	2.25	3.25	1.00	4.25	6.50	2.25				
Suburban	2.25	3.50	1.25	3.75	5.75	2.00				
Farmer Line	-	1.50	•	-	2.50	-				
Extension	1.00	1.25	.25	1.50	1.75	.25				
		-	-	-	-	•				

<sup>\*</sup> Applicable in Klamath Exchange only.

In addition to the increases in the basic exchange rates, the applicant requests increases in monthly rates for miscellaneous services, including rates for PBX switchboards, trunks, and stations, joint user service, directory listings, local private line service, and in charges for moves and changes, service connections, and line extensions. The rates requested for these services appear reasonable and will be authorized.

Applicant has also requested that the rate for pay station service be increased from 5 cents to 10 cents per exchange message. This appears to be a necessary step since this class of service should bear a portion of the increase and will be authorized.

applicant stated that to provide service to 54 applicants for service in Klamath and 35 in the Klamath Glenn area would cost \$30,000, that it was not economically good business for applicant to serve them at this time, that the existing line extension rules would not apply to such applicants for service and that it would not be fair to shoulder the expense for such installations in rugged mountainous territory upon subscribers in densely populated areas. The witness further stated that applicant company had not had time to find out how such service could be supplied. The order herein will require the applicant to make and file with the Commission a definite program ightharpoonupfor the supplying of service to all held order applicants within a reasonable period of time. Said program shall state the proposed date of service installation, shall enumerate the number of such applications for service that come within the presently filed line extension rule and shall propose possible variants of said rule to cover applications of those in mountainous areas such as the Klamath and Klamath Glenn areas, to the end that such service be afforded at a cost fair to both applicant company and such applicants for service. Conclusion

After reviewing all of the evidence of record, the statement.

by subscribers' representatives and the public, and giving full

weight to the service, operating and financial problems

of General Order No. 96, together with current forms that are normally used in connection with customer service.

- 4. Applicant shall review annually the accruals to depreciation reserve which shall be based upon spreading the original cost of the plant, less estimated net salvage, and less depreciation reserve, over the estimated remaining life of the property; and the results of these reviews shall be submitted annually to the Commission.
- 5. On or before November 1, 1952 applicant shall file with the Commission a program for furnishing service to all held order applicants within a reasonable period of time as cutlined in the foregoing opinion.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty (20)

days after the date bereof.

Dated at MINAUNISCO, California, this 30th

day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 1952.

Commissioners.

Commissioner....., being necessarily absont, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.