

Decision No. 55720**ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of)
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY for)
 authority, among other things, to)
 increase its electric rates and to)
 make a fuel adjustment clause appli-)
 cable to its electric rates.)

Application No. 38811

(Electric)

A list of appearances is appended
 hereto as Attachment 1.

O P I N I O NNature of Proceeding

By the above-entitled application, filed February 8, 1957, Pacific Gas and Electric Company seeks an order of this Commission authorizing it (1) to increase all electric rates by 5.94 per cent, except those rates for street and highway lighting service and excluding the minimum charges in all schedules and the service charges in general service and domestic schedules, (2) to add a "fuel adjustment clause" to all of its electric rate schedules, except those rates for street and highway lighting service and other schedules which may have no rates for energy, and (3) to increase, similarly, the rates and include a similar fuel adjustment clause in all of its special power contracts except those customers (a) under contract now containing a fuel clause, (b) under contract involving interchange of energy, (c) under contract providing for street lighting service, (d) under contract providing for payment of fuel for electric energy, and (e) under Federal Power Commission jurisdiction. ^{1/}

1/ Exempted contract power customers are specifically named in Exhibit I attached to the application.

Study

Applicant estimates that if the proposed new rates were in effect for the full year 1957, assuming an average year basis and the price of fuel oil at \$2.90 per barrel and gas rates as requested in Application No. 38668, its gross electric department revenues would be increased by \$19,259,000 or 5.90 per cent overall, and that its electric department rate of return on a depreciated rate base would be increased from 4.99 per cent to 5.61 per cent. Applicant further estimates \$19,783,000, or 6.06 per cent, increase in gross revenues at \$2.95 oil and requested gas rates.

Public Hearing

After due notice to the public, such notice having included publication in 92 newspapers and individual notices to each county and to each district attorney, to each city and to each city attorney within the service area of applicant, as well as to the Governor and to the Attorney General of California, public hearings in the matter were held before Commissioner Ray E. Untereiner and/or Examiner F. EVERETT Emerson in San Francisco on May 15 and 16, July 10, 11, 17, 18, 19, 22, 31 and August 1, 1957.

The matter was submitted on August 1, 1957, subject to the receipt of briefs and written argument, the last of which was filed with the Commission on September 3, 1957.

Applicant's Position and Proposal

By Decision No. 47832 in Application No. 32589, issued October 15, 1952 (52 Cal. PUC 111) the Commission found that a future rate of return of at least 5.55 per cent on a depreciated rate base was fair and reasonable and authorized rates designed to produce net revenue equivalent to 5.75 per cent, based on the estimated level of business in 1952. Applicant's calculated rate of return has since declined and under presently effective electric rates is estimated at 4.99 per cent for the year 1957, at \$2.90 oil and requested gas rates.

According to applicant, the most immediate, far-reaching and important reason for the present level of rates not producing sufficient revenues to permit its electric department to realize at least a 5.55 per cent rate of return, is the frequent and large increases in

the cost of fuel used in its steam-electric power plants. Electric energy generated by such plants is now about two-thirds of all of applicant's generation in an average year. The cost of fuel is beyond the control of applicant, is a major item of operating expense and an increasingly important factor in applicant's total cost of generating electric energy.

Basically, applicant seeks to restore its earning position to that which the Commission has heretofore found to be reasonable. In that respect, applicant's position is that the present proceeding is an "offset" case.

In order to compensate for increased fuel costs, applicant proposes a general 5.94 per cent increase in electric rates and the inclusion of a fuel adjustment clause designed to increase or decrease effective electric rates as changes occur in the prices of fuel oil and natural gas.

The factors included in the fuel clause, according to applicant, express the additional cost of producing electric energy as the prices of fuel oil and natural gas change. Since applicant does not propose to make the fuel adjustment clause applicable to the first 200 kwh per month for substantially all domestic and small commercial service and since there are variations in the number of significant digits in the different rate schedules, five versions of the proposed fuel adjustment clause are required to meet applicant's proposal to include such a clause as a special condition of its rate schedules. Basically, however, an amount per kilowatt hour would be added or deducted, respectively, for each 1¢ that the price of fuel oil is above or below a base price of \$2.75 per barrel and for each 1¢ that the effective rate for Schedule G-55 for interruptible natural gas is above or below 35.8¢ per mcf for 1,100 Btu gas.

Evidence Respecting Earnings

Testimony and exhibits with respect to the present and prospective earning position of applicant were presented through 14 witnesses for the utility and 5 witnesses for the Commission staff. A

number of interested and protesting parties participated extensively in the examination of witnesses.

The following tabulations will serve to summarize the exhibits introduced by applicant and by the Commission staff to reflect applicant's earning position in its electric department under present and proposed electric rates, assuming, as a base, a posted price of \$2.90 per barrel of fuel oil for tank car delivery and assuming "normalized" operations, for the calendar year 1957. Applicant, in a separate proceeding (Application No. 38668), is seeking certain increased gas revenues, hence electric department earnings are also tabulated assuming the full-year effect of increased gas rates as proposed by applicant in such proceeding.

SUMMARY OF EARNINGS, ESTIMATED YEAR 1957

Electric Department

Present Electric Rates, \$2.90 per bbl. Oil and Present Gas Rates

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u> (Thousands of dollars)	<u>CPUC Staff</u> (Thousands of dollars)
Operating Revenues	\$ 326,334	\$ 328,479
Operating Expenses		
Cost of natural gas	28,768	29,980
Cost of oil and other fuel	25,728	23,144
All other expenses*	<u>197,660</u>	<u>199,906</u>
Total Operating Expenses	252,156	253,030
Net Revenue	74,178	75,449
Rate Base (depreciated)	1,419,739	1,416,189
Rate of Return	5.22%	5.33%

Present Electric Rates, \$2.90 per bbl. Oil and Proposed Gas Rates

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u> (Thousands of Dollars)	<u>CPUC Staff</u> (Thousands of Dollars)
Operating Revenues	\$ 326,334	\$ 328,479
Operating Expenses		
Cost of natural gas	35,975	37,459
Cost of oil and other fuel	25,728	23,144
All other expenses*	<u>193,774</u>	<u>195,873</u>
Total Operating Expenses	255,477	256,476
Net Revenue	70,857	72,003
Rate Base (depreciated)	1,419,739	1,416,189
Rate of Return	4.99%	5.08%

Proposed Electric Rates, \$2.90 per bbl. Oil and Present Gas Rates

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u> (Thousands of dollars)	<u>CPUC Staff</u> (Thousands of dollars)	
Operating Revenues	\$ 338,748	\$ 340,989	
Operating Expenses			
Cost of natural gas	28,768	29,980	✓
Cost of oil and other fuel	25,728	23,144	✓
All other expenses*	<u>204,393</u>	<u>206,691</u>	✓
Total Operating Expenses	258,889	259,815	✓
Net Revenue	79,859	81,174	✓
Rate Base (depreciated)	1,419,739	1,416,189	
Rate of Return	5.62%	5.73%	✓

Proposed Electric Rates, \$2.90 per bbl. Oil and Proposed Gas Rates

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u> (Thousands of dollars)	<u>CPUC Staff</u> (Thousands of dollars)	
Operating Revenues	\$ 345,593	\$ 347,904	
Operating Expenses			
Cost of natural gas	35,975	37,459	✓
Cost of oil and other fuel	25,728	23,144	✓
All other expenses*	<u>204,197</u>	<u>206,408</u>	✓
Total Operating Expenses	265,900	267,011	✓
Net Revenue	79,693	80,893	✓
Rate Base (depreciated)	1,419,739	1,416,189	
Rate of Return	5.61%	5.71%	✓

*including income taxes based upon a straight-line computation of depreciation expense for tax purposes.

The posted price of fuel oil at the time of the last electric rate proceeding was \$1.80 per barrel for tank car lot deliveries and remained at such level throughout the year 1952 and until February 16, 1953, when the price was increased to \$1.90 per barrel. After approximately 32 months at such level, the price became \$2.05 per barrel in October 1955 but this price was effective for less than four months when it again increased. During 1956, three additional price increases occurred, the November 22, 1956, posted price reaching \$2.60 per barrel. In January 1957, three of the major oil companies posted prices of \$2.75 per barrel. Between the date of applicant's filing herein and the first date of hearing, a further increase to \$2.90 per barrel became effective. It is on this latter base price of fuel oil that both applicant and the Commission staff presented the respective evidence on earnings, the results of which are summarized in the foregoing tabulations. Still another increase became effective, however, during the course of this proceeding and as of the latter part of June, 1957, the price of oil was posted at \$2.95 per barrel.

Landy

The evidence is clear, as the above tabulations respecting earnings under present electric rates indicate, that applicant's earnings for the estimated average year 1957 will be below that level of earnings heretofore found by this Commission to be fair and reasonable. No evidence to the contrary is before the Commission.

While dollar amounts of differences between the applicant's and staff's estimates may appear, at first glance, to be large, it should be noted that revenues differ by only seven-tenths of one per cent and that total operating expenses and rate base differ by only three-tenths of one per cent. Overall results of operations, as indicated by the calculated rates of return, differ by only eleven-one hundredths of one per cent. ✓

Dollar amount differences, although large in some instances, are readily reconcilable. In operating revenues, the staff had available to it, for most accounts, the actual results of the first four months of 1957 operations, whereas as of the time its estimates were prepared applicant did not. In production expenses, the staff assumed a somewhat greater availability of natural gas for electric plant operations and, further, based its estimates of fuel oil requirements on the average heating values of delivered fuel oils rather than on the contract minima assumed by applicant. The staff's treatment appears to be reasonable. With respect to general expenses, the staff followed long-established practice in eliminating certain dues, subscriptions and contributions. The ad valorem taxes calculated by the staff were based on the latest known tax rates, while those calculated by applicant were based on the trending of experience in the past several years, which trend indicates yearly increases during the last five years. Taxes on income appear to have been computed accurately by both applicant and staff on their respective bases and the difference between the two is a direct reflection of the use of the respective totals of revenues and expenses. Depreciated rate

bases differ by \$3,550,000, \$2,342,000 of such amount being attributable to the calculation of working cash, the staff deriving a lower figure than that of applicant. Applicant's calculation was made on the so-called "retail basis" whereby profit, yet unrealized because of lag in expenses and revenues, is an element taken into account in determining the working cash allowance. The staff's calculation was made on a "cost basis" whereby unrealized profit is not given weight in determining a working cash allowance. We shall follow the staff method. Also of some import in calculation of working cash is the treatment to be accorded accelerated amortization and accelerated depreciation as respects taxes on income. This latter subject of acceleration will be further discussed hereinafter.

In view of the evidence we adopt, and hereby find to be reasonable for the purposes of this proceeding, the following tabulated estimated results of operations for the average year 1957 under present electric rates, \$2.90 per barrel oil and existing gas rates.

ADOPTED 1957 ESTIMATE OF
RESULTS OF OPERATIONS AT PRESENT RATES

<u>Item</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Operating Revenues	\$ 328,479,000
Operating Expenses	253,030,000
Net Revenue	75,449,000
Rate Base (depreciated)	1,416,189,000
Rate of Return	5.33%

Position and Evidence of Protestants and Others

The United States Government showed the cost of electric power to its installations, served by applicant, at present and proposed electric rates. Its witness opposed any automatic fuel adjustment clause and particularly that proposed by applicant. Five exhibits were introduced to support this position.

The California Farm Bureau Federation presented nine exhibits and the testimony of seven witnesses to support its position that exemption of agricultural power users from a rate increase at

this time is justified and in the interest of the entire California economy and of applicant as well as of the farmers. Its witnesses testified regarding the declining water table and consequent increased pumping costs in the San Joaquin Valley, about efforts being made to obtain additional supplies of water, and about the cost-price squeeze in which the farmers find themselves. Testimony was offered respecting the efforts of farmers to find suitable crops which might cover increased costs of pumping and also respecting exemption of agricultural power users, located on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, from any increases until such time as they may obtain the benefit of supplemental river water through the efforts of various non-utility or governmental agency projects.

Newhall Land and Farming Company, operators of four large ranches within applicant's territory, presented two exhibits and the testimony of one witness to support its position that applicant's requested increase is excessive, that electric rates should not be permitted to escalate with the price of fuel oil without limit, as proposed by applicant, and that in basing electric rates on the price of fuel oil the Commission would be relinquishing its regulatory authority. The exhibits presented were also in support of a further position that, because of declining revenues and increasing costs, farmers should not have to pay any portion of any rate increases which the Commission may find to be justified in this proceeding.

Friant Water Users Association, through one witness, introduced one exhibit in opposition to the proposed fuel clause, and to any increase to agricultural users, at this time, on the basis of the farmers' economic condition. The testimony covered efforts to balance San Joaquin Valley water supplies by canal systems, underground water storage and pumping, and urged a favorable agricultural power rate to encourage pumping by public water districts.

The California Farm Research and Legislative Committee, through one witness, presented testimony questioning applicant's need for a rate increase, describing the cost-price squeeze on farmers and urging that the application be denied in so far as it applies to farmers.

The Northern California Municipal Electric Association, presented a statement of position in which applicant's proposed treatment of income tax depreciation was questioned and in which opposition to the proposed fuel clause was expressed. The Association's representative pointed out the fact that resale service customers were subjected to a greater than average rate increase in 1952.

Simpson Redwood Company, through one witness, made a plea for discontinuing higher than system rates in applicant's Humboldt Division, stressing the growth and development of the Humboldt area since 1952. On this same subject, the Mayor of the City of Blue Lake, and an official of the Roddiscraft Company at Arcata gave further testimony regarding the growth and development of Humboldt County and regarding the justification of applying system rate levels. The County Counsel of Humboldt County, as a statement of position, gave statistics as to population, assessed valuation, retail sales, increases in lumber mills and lumber production and urged elimination of the existing differential in rates as between the Humboldt Division and the balance of applicant's system.

The San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, through one of its members, on the first day of hearing, moved to dismiss the application on the ground that applicant was not going to present testimony respecting cost of money and on the second day of hearing moved that the application be denied in its entirety on the ground that applicant had shown no hardship as to its earnings position and, further, that if such second motion should be denied, that that portion of the application pertaining to the establishment of fuel

clauses be denied. No further participation in this proceeding was undertaken by this party after the second day of hearing.

Conclusions

In our opinion, applicant has conclusively demonstrated its need for and entitlement to increased revenues. The specific amount of gross revenues sought by applicant, however, is predicated on the assumption that applicant's request for increased gas department revenues (Application No. 38668) would be wholly granted. Since such request has not been wholly granted, the gross electric revenues to be produced from the rates authorized in the following order will take into proper account the increased cost of gas for Schedule G-55 as authorized by this Commission on September 24, 1957. Also taken into proper account will be the revenue and expense effect of an oil price of \$2.95 per barrel, such price being that which became effective during the course of this proceeding. Gross electric revenues of \$345,616,000 should be produced by the rates authorized herein, an increase of \$17,137,000 on an average-year annual basis.^{2/} We find such gross revenues and increased revenues to be fair and reasonable for the purposes of this decision. The relationship of such revenues to applicant's electric department earning position is as follows:

Gross Operating Revenues	\$ 345,616,000
Total Operating Expenses	264,185,000
Net Revenue	81,431,000
Rate Base (depreciated)	1,416,189,000
Rate of Return	5.75%

The above-stated dollar amounts are based on the estimated level of business during the average year 1957. The rate of return is the same as that rate of return heretofore allowed by the Commission for the test year 1952. Accordingly, the gross revenue increase authorized by this decision is \$16,967,000, or \$2,816,000 less than the \$19,783,000 sought by applicant, and represents a level of earnings which recognizes applicant's premise that this proceeding is one of offsetting increased costs of operation rather than one of determining a fair and reasonable rate of return under present-day conditions.

^{2/} \$170,000 of the total increase arises from the application of fuel clauses already in effect; thus, the revenue increase effect of this decision is \$16,967,000.

The above-stated amount for total operating expenses includes taxes on income based on the use of a straight-line computation of depreciation expense for all purposes, including tax purposes. It is clear from the record that applicant requested no increase in its rate of return found reasonable in 1952 only because it expected the Commission to credit it with "normalized" tax expense based on straight-line depreciation, even though it may reduce its actual current tax payments substantially below the normalized expense by availing itself of the accelerated depreciation and amortization options provided in Sections 167 and 168 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Commission, in connection with another application,^{3/} has given careful and extensive consideration to the rate treatment properly to be accorded tax deferrals accruing to such utilities as elect to take advantage of accelerated depreciation as permitted by Section 167 and/or are granted necessity certificates by the Office of Defense Mobilization under Section 168. While we have not yet reached definitive conclusions on the accelerated depreciation problem, for the purposes of our decision on that application we adopted tax expense calculations based on straight-line depreciation and permitted "normalization" with respect to accelerated amortization and held in abeyance any decision with respect to accelerated depreciation.^{4/} We shall accord the same treatment, which we hereby find to be reasonable, to the present applicant. Accordingly, should applicant elect to take accelerated depreciation, as provided for in Section 167, for any future year, it shall immediately report such election to the Commission; and the Commission will promptly move to adjust the rates herein authorized in such manner as it may then find to be appropriate.

^{3/} Application No. 38382, Southern California Edison Company.

^{4/} Decision No. 55703, in Application No. 38382, issued
October 15, 1957.

Amended

The evidence is convincing, and the Commission finds, that the rate treatment sought by the agricultural power users is not justified.

Many of the larger farms in the San Joaquin Valley have for years enjoyed a conjunctive billing feature not available to others. The Commission has twice found such situation to be unreasonably discriminatory and has ordered the conjunctive billing practice to be terminated. As set forth in this Commission's Decision No. 55258 in Case No. 5640, issued July 11, 1957, the date of such termination will be the same date on which the rates authorized in this order become effective.

This Commission does not look with favor on automatic cost adjustment clauses. Fuel clauses in rates may have their proper place in certain schedules where it is essential that competitive conditions be met, but applicant's present proposal that fuel clauses be placed in practically every electric rate schedule is not for such a purpose. This record contains no evidence that a competitive relationship exists. It shows, merely, that applicant has sustained substantial increases in the cost of fuel and that it seeks an automatic adjustment in its revenues to offset variable or increasing fuel costs. In view of the evidence and after considering the position of the various parties with regard to the proposed fuel clauses, the Commission is of the opinion and so finds that no fuel escalator clause should be placed in any electric rate schedule or contract not presently containing such a clause.

formerly page 14

In view of our conclusions that applicant is entitled to increased revenues and that fuel adjustment clauses should not be authorized, it necessarily follows that increased revenues must be otherwise spread amongst applicant's customers. It is appropriate that changes in energy costs be reflected in all charges per unit of energy, thus directly assigning

Insert

increased production costs to the energy produced. Other increased costs may then appropriately be spread as a percentage increase. Such method, which we hereby find to be fair and reasonable, will be adopted and the rates authorized herein will be so designed. The record indicates that an increase of 0.15 mills per kwh should be offset as an increase in energy costs. This cost will be reflected in the kwh component of the rate structure. The balance of the increase will be obtained by applying a factor of 5.11 per cent to each rate and charge in all energy schedules, excluding street lighting schedules, all minimum charges, and the service charges in domestic and general service schedules. The overall effect of such method will be an increase of 5.16 per cent in gross revenues.

Sheet

Applicant has requested that certain contracts be exempt from any increase, as heretofore mentioned. We are of the opinion that such request is reasonable and should be granted and the order herein will so provide.

Up-to-date and accurate rate spread data are essential in the design of rates. Applicant will be expected to submit such data to the Commission at the earliest possible date and immediately on completion of applicant's current rate spread study.

The evidence respecting the growth and development of applicant's Humboldt Division and the Fort Bragg area is convincing that the presently existing rate differentials between such areas and the rest of applicant's system are no longer warranted and we so find the case to be. Electric rates for the Humboldt Division and the Fort Bragg area will be placed on levels appropriate to the overall system.

*formerly
Page 15*

Included in applicant's operating expenses are amounts charged to Account 801, Miscellaneous General Expense, covering the expenses associated with the development of nuclear power as a

means of electric generation. The propriety of charging such amounts to operating expenses was not questioned in this proceeding nor is the Commission raising any such question. To the contrary, the full support of the California Farm Bureau Federation is behind applicant in nuclear power development and the Commission finds the efforts of applicant, and the expenses of such development, to be in the public interest. Research and development, continuing studies on new and different reactor technologies, training of personnel, and construction of both pilot and succeeding permanent plants and associated activities will play an important role in enabling applicant to provide efficient and adequate electric service. The generation of electric power by the use of nuclear power may well provide the means by which future electric service will be of even greater benefit to this State than the modes of generation now employed. Applicant's costs here under review in this new field of endeavor are recognized to be fair and reasonable charges to its overall operations.

*shorter
pages*

With respect to the various motions placed before the Commission during this proceeding, all such motions inconsistent with the conclusions and findings herein made or with the following order are hereby each and severally denied.

The Commission finds that the increases in rates and charges authorized herein are justified; that existing rates and charges in so far as they differ therefrom are for the future unjust and unreasonable; and that an order should be issued authorizing the increased rates and charges as set forth in the following order.

Q R D E R

Pacific Gas and Electric Company having applied to this Commission for an order authorizing increases in electric rates and charges, public hearings having been held, the matter having been submitted and the Commission having been fully informed thereon, the matter is now ready for decision based upon the evidence and the conclusions and findings contained in the foregoing opinion; therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. Applicant is authorized to file in quadruplicate with this Commission, on or after the effective date of this order and in conformity with General Order No. 96, revised tariff schedules with rates, charges and conditions adjusted as set forth in Paragraph 2 of this order and on not less than five days' notice to this Commission and to the public, to make said tariff schedules effective for service rendered on and after November 15, 1957.
2. The present schedules of rates and charges stated in applicant's electric tariffs, except street lighting schedules and except certain contract customers set forth in Paragraph 5 of this order, shall be adjusted as follows:
 - a. The rate for each energy block, each demand charge, each annual service charge, fixed charge, and stand-by charge of applicant's present schedules shall be multiplied by 1.0511.
 - b. The rate for each energy block first multiplied by 1.0511 as above, shall have added to the figure so obtained 15 hundredths of a mill (\$0.00015) per kwh.
 - c. In the final computation of each item separately, the rates and charges thus computed shall be rounded to the nearest one cent in the case of rates and charges quoted in dollars, and to the nearest one-hundredth of a cent in the case of rates and charges quoted in cents.
3. Upon making effective the revised rates and charges set forth above, applicant is authorized and directed to withdraw and cancel all present schedules applicable only in the Humboldt Division and in the Fort Bragg area and transfer the customers on such schedules to the appropriate system schedules as follows:

Customers now on Schedules A-10, A-11, A-12, A-14, D-10 D-11, D-12, DM-2, P-2, P-4, and PA-2 shall be transferred, respectively, to Schedules A-3, A-5, A-6, A-13, D-3, D-5, D-6, DM-1, P-1, P-3, and PA-1.
4. Applicant is authorized to increase the rates prescribed by the following special power contracts to the same extent and in the same manner as set forth in Paragraph 2a and 2b above: ✓
✓

<u>Contract</u>	<u>Dated</u>
Irrigation Districts:	
Alpaugh	February 4, 1953
Banta Carbona	May 14, 1951
Byron-Bethany	December 12, 1950
	May 14, 1951
East Contra Costa	July 10, 1951
Princeton-Codora-Glenn	July 31, 1953
West Stanislaus	December 28, 1950
	May 14, 1951
Patterson Water District	June 20, 1951
Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District	July 3, 1951
Paicines Company	January 28, 1953
J. Ramon Somavia	January 30, 1953
Resale Power Contracts:	
City of Alameda	October 13, 1955
City of Biggs	October 28, 1955
City of Gridley	October 24, 1955
City of Healdsburg	October 24, 1955
City of Lodi	December 1, 1955
City of Lompoc	November 8, 1955
City of Palo Alto	December 1, 1955
City of Redding	July 5, 1949
	December 5, 1949
City of Santa Clara	October 26, 1955
City of Ukiah	November 14, 1955

5. Applicant is not authorized to increase the rates prescribed by the following special contracts:

<u>Contract</u>	<u>Dated</u>
Dow Chemical Company	September 4, 1951
	April 11, 1952
	June 5, 1952
Hercules Powder Company	July 12, 1951
	April 11, 1952
	June 5, 1952
	November 20, 1952
	June 8, 1953
Shell Chemical Corp.	April 11, 1952
Southern California Edison Co.	January 26, 1956
	December 31, 1947
	April 10, 1951
	May 9, 1951
Sacramento Municipal Utility District	June 16, 1955
U. S. Dept. of the Interior (Yosemite)	September 26, 1955

Contract (cont'd.)

Dated (cont'd.)

City & County of San Francisco	April 18, 1945 March 14, 1945
Tidewater Oil Co.	August 30, 1937 May 16, 1955
Shell Oil Company	February 15, 1938
Union Oil Company	June 2, 1938 April 1, 1942 April 9, 1951 July 21, 1954 November 10, 1954
Hammond-Calif. Redwood Co.	April 15, 1942 November 20, 1947
California Oregon Power Co.	July 14, 1952 June 2, 1952
Sierra Pacific Power Company	March 4, 1948

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 22nd day of October, 1957.

[Signature]
President

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
Commissioners

ATTACHMENT 1

List of Appearances

For Applicant: F. T. Searls and John C. Morrissey.

Protestants: California Farm Bureau Federation, by J. J. Deuel, Bert Buzzini and Joseph O. Joynt; California Farm Research and Legislative Committee, by Walter Simcich; California Manufacturers Association, by George Rives, Robert N. Lowry and Gordon E. Davis of Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison; Friant Water Users' Association, by Robert E. Mook and James F. Sorensen; Newhall Land and Farming Company by Donald H. Ford of Overton, Lyman & Prince.

Interested Parties: Department of Defense & Executive Agencies of the United State Government, by Harold Gold, Reuben Lozner and Gerald Jones; California Municipal Electric Association, by H. D. Weller and Clarence A. Winder; Simpson Redwood Company by Noel Dyer and Dudley Zinke; United States Bureau of Reclamation, by Burle C. Laton; San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, by Bruce McKnight; Challenge Cream & Butter Association, by W. D. McKay; City of Stockton, by Monroe N. Langdon; City & County of San Francisco, by Dion R. Holm and Paul L. Beck; State Department of Water Resources, by C. F. Tarbox; City of San Pablo, by Leland F. Reaves; City of Alameda, by Glenn A. Baxter; City of Redding, by Robert W. Cowden; City of Lodi, by Robert H. Mullen; County of Alameda, by J. F. Coakley; California-Pacific Utilities Company, by Lloyd E. Cooper; City of San Leandro, by Arthur M. Carden; City of Oakland, by John W. Collier and Robert E. Nisbet; City of Richmond, by James P. O'Drain; County of Sonoma, by V. T. Hitchcock; Sacramento Municipal Utility District, by J. E. Ball; City of Hayward, by Myron A. Johnson, Jr.; City of Arcata and City of Blue Lake, by John R. Stokes; Humboldt County Board of Supervisors, Humboldt County Board of Trade, Eureka Chamber of Commerce and Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District, by Thomas M. Montgomery.

Commission Staff: J. T. Phelps, Charles W. Mors and C. V. Shawler.