ORIGINAL

Decision No. 47803

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

INTER-COUNTY CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Complainant,

VS.

Year Case No. 5269

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA, A California corporation, Defendant.

Appearances for complainant: Edward M. Berol and B. S. Silver.

Appearance for defendant: Warren A. Palmer of Orrick, Dahlquist, Neff and Herrington.

Interested parties: Albert F. Coombs, for the Logger-Tidings; J. J. Deuel and Edson Abel, for the California Farm Bureau Federation.

OPINION

The Inter-County Chambers of Commerce of Northern
California, an unincorporated association composed of the following
civic organizations: The Modoc County Chamber of Commerce, the
Bieber Chamber of Commerce, The Fall River Valley Chamber of
Commerce, The Burney Chamber of Commerce, The Redding Chamber of
Commerce, The Shasta Dam Area Chamber of Commerce, The Anderson
Chamber of Commerce, The Cottonwood Chamber of Commerce, The
Weaverville Chamber of Commerce, The Hayfork Chamber of Commerce,
The Shasta Dam Area Improvement Association, and the Arcata
Lumberjacks Association on February 14, 1951 filed this formal
complaint against the Citizens Utilities Company of California,
a public utility corporation furnishing telephone service, among
others to certain communities located between Redding and Alturas,
excluding Redding. It charged that the practices, equipment,

C-5269 * Defendant's Answer On April 26, 1951, the Citizens Utilities Company of California filed its answer to the complaint and in general denied the allegations of the complaint. As one defense to said complaint it incorporated by reference in its answer Interim Decision No. 45497, dated March 27, 1951, under Application No. 31842, wherein this Commission granted the defendant an annual increase in revenue of \$125,000 based on the immediate economic needs under existing circumstances resulting from today's inflated costs of material and labor to enable it to keep up with the rapid growth and development in its service area. The defendant proposed a number of improvements in the rate case and was ordered to file bimonthly progress reports on the installation of the improvements with the Commission. As a further defense it listed the following improvements to service: In August, 1950, a new central office building, outside plant system and Relaymatic 1,000-line dial switchboard was installed at Alturas. Prior to August, 1950, it converted the Cedarville, Eagleville, Fort Bidwell, Lake City, Adin and Canby exchanges to dial service. In January, 1951, the Burney exchange was converted from magneto to common battery operation and all telephone sets were replaced. In March, 1951, the Fall River Mills central office was moved to a more advantageous site and a larger magneto type switchboard installed. For the Montgomery Creek exchange dial equipment was proposed in the 1951 construction budget, as well as two additional toll circuits to Redding and a carrier channel from Montgomery Creek to Big Bend. In connection with improvements at Montgomery Creek the defendant planned to incorporate the Ingot exchange with Ingot subscribers receiving suburban service from Montgomery Creek. A microwave toll system between Redding and Alturas was proposed and will enable rearrangement of carrier facilities to provide additional toll outlets for Fall River Mills, Bieber, Montgomery Creek and Bella Vista exchanges. -3November 27, 1951 and at San Francisco on April 7, 1952 and
June 30, 1952 before Examiner M. W. Edwards. At the conclusion of
the hearing on June 30, 1952 the matter was submitted for Commission
decision subject to filing of briefs within 15 days after receipt
of transcript. The complainant waived its right to submit a
brief and was willing to stand on the record as made. Defendant's
brief was received on August 12, 1952. Counsel for complainant
filed a letter on August 22, 1952 which reiterated its position as
set forth in closing argument on the last day of hearing.
Complainant's Case

At the hearings in Burney, Fall River Mills and Bieber testimony was presented by a total of 33 witnesses for the complainant in support of the complainant's case. These witnesses described telephone service conditions in the area, in general confirming the allegations contained in the complaint filed by the Inter-County Chambers of Commerce of Northern California. Beside testimony as to delay in obtaining an operator or completing toll calls some witnesses told of difficulty in hearing or transmitting on toll calls. Another told of service outage in stormy or windy weather. Several testified as to difficulty or delay in obtaining new service connections.

On November 27, 1951 complainant made a motion seeking immediate construction of an 8-mile telephone circuit extension to the Round Valley area east of Adin. Opening and reply briefs were filed on this subject but the Commission did not enter an interim order on this matter because the defendant was proceeding with new construction on the basis of a program required by the Commission in connection with the rate case; to order this extension out of turn would increase the over-all cost of the project and therefore would not be in the public interest.

C-5269 Conclusion Based on a review of the evidence, it is apparent that service conditions were improved during the progress of the case, that hearing difficulty on toll calls was corrected, that the management is seeking to maintain service standards of reasonable quality and relieve held orders, and that the characteristics of the area are such that it is beyond normal financial means of the public in the area to support as high a grade of service as is found in the dense urban areas of the state. In light of the testimony and conditions it is not apparent to the Commission that an order of this Commission can stop delays beyond defendant's control due to strikes, manufacturing slowdowns, shortage of critical materials or inherent climatic and terrain difficulties of the area. In the August 21, 1952 letter, counsel for complainants states that the complainant and the defendant are in substantial agreement as to the service necessary in the area and that the complainant does not request any punitive measure or inequitable order which, in effect, would coerce the defendant. As a result of these statements it is the Commission's opinion that the completion of the construction program proposed by the defendant will alleviate this complaint. The only requirement that appears warranted to conclude this matter is to require defendant to keep complainant advised of construction progress. ORDER Public hearing having been held in the above-entitled case, the matter having been submitted, and the Commission being fully advised, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows: Complainant's motion requesting construction of a project ahead of the programmed date is denied.

- 2. Complainant's request for an order specifying exact project completion dates is denied:
- 3. Defendant shall furnish complainant a copy of the future bimonthly progress reports being furnished in connection with the rate case under Application No. 31842 until construction work in complainant's territory is completed.
- 4. A copy of each and every report furnished complainant under Item 3 above shall be furnished to the Commission for filing under this file, Case No. 5269.

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

days after the date hereof.

Dated at .

California, this

day

of /ether), 1952.

100

Commissioners.