

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 59706

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application)
 of CLEAR LAKE WATER COMPANY, a cor-) Application No. 41331
 poration, for authority to increase)
 certain rates within its territory.)

John A. Young, for applicant.
Chamberlain & Chamberlain, by T. L. Chamberlain, Sr.
and T. L. Chamberlain, Jr., for Western Yolo
 Water Users Association, protestant.
William L. Knecht, for California Farm Bureau Fed-
 eration, interested party.
C. F. Clark and C. V. Shawler, for the Commission
 staff.

O P I N I O N

By the above-entitled application, filed July 23, 1959,
 Clear Lake Water Company, a corporation, seeks authority of this
 Commission to increase the rate for irrigation water delivered for
 all purposes except for the growing of rice, in Yolo County.

Public Hearings

Public hearings in the matter were held before Examiner
 E. Ronald Foster in Woodland on December 16 and 17 and in San
 Francisco on December 28 and 29, 1959. About 25 customers of the
 utility were present on the first day of hearing. Five exhibits were
 received and six witnesses testified during the course of the hear-
 ings. The matter was submitted on January 20, 1960, upon receipt of
 a brief by counsel for protestant, the Western Yolo Water Users
 Association.

Rates, Present and Proposed

The present rate for all irrigation water service rendered
 in applicant's service area lying generally west and south of
 Woodland, in Yolo County, was authorized by the Commission's Decision
 No. 48355, dated March 10, 1953, in Application No. 33456. This rate,

effective since March 31, 1953, is \$3.25 per acre-foot of water measured at the point of delivery from applicant's canal.

Applicant requests that the rate for irrigation water delivered for all purposes except rice growing be increased to \$4.75 per acre-foot, representing an increase of \$1.50 per acre-foot, or 46.2 percent, over the present rate. Applicant has requested no change in the rate for water delivered for the purpose of growing rice. Neither is any change requested in the special conditions pertaining to service to all crops regarding signed applications which must be accompanied by deposits of \$1.50 per acre, which deposits are credited toward water bills, nor in penalty charges of \$1.25 per acre for general crop applications filed after March 15.

Applicant also has on file two schedules of rates filed with Advice Letter No. 4 and made effective August 12, 1956, and a third schedule filed with Advice Letter No. 5 and made effective July 4, 1958, all for service available only upon contract for water pumped from Clear Lake through facilities owned and operated by the customer and for use in the area adjacent to the shores of Clear Lake, in Lake County. Applicant has requested no changes in these three schedules.

Applicant's Position

Applicant's reasons for a differential between the rates for water delivered to rice and that delivered to all other crops may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Government restrictions on the planting of rice based on a quota system have resulted in a reduction of the acreage of this crop planted within applicant's service area, with a corresponding increase in the acreage planted to general crops, so that the total number of irrigated acres has remained about the same. However, the total demand for water is less because the water requirements per acre of general crops are less than for rice.

2. The relatively high consumptive use of water per acre of rice and the fact that rice fields are generally larger than those planted to other crops, and the further fact that, once started, irrigation is nearly continuous on rice fields, means that the larger volumes of water are delivered for rice irrigation at a lower unit cost to applicant than for the irrigation of an equivalent acreage of general crops. This also results in lower capital costs of delivery structures devoted to rice irrigation in relation to the volume of water supplied.
3. Since methods of irrigation for general crops require closer controls and more frequent changes than for rice, ditch tending is more costly for general crops.
4. Due to the considerable conversion of plantings from rice to general crops, the lower demand for water has increased the reliability of the water supply by allowing greater carryovers in storage, with a corresponding increase in the value of the water service rendered.

Applicant alleges that the rate increase requested herein is necessary to produce revenues sufficient to maintain its credit, to pay the expenses of its water operations, and to meet its responsibilities in rendering utility service.

Description of the System

The principal source of supply for this system is water impounded in Clear Lake by means of a dam located on Cache Creek near Lower Lake, which permits the storage of approximately 310,000 acre-feet of water. Except for a limited period of time, the level of the water required to be maintained in Clear Lake, which has been established by two court decrees^{1/}, must be between the limits of zero and 7.56 feet on the Rumsey gauge at Lakeport in Lake County.

^{1/} Gopcevic v. Yolo Water and Power Company, Superior Court of Mendocino County, No. 9118 dated October 7, 1920, and Mary E. Bemmerly and Agnes N. Bemmerly v. County of Lake, et al., Superior Court of Yolo County, No. 8812 dated December 18, 1940 (C. 4826 and C. 4684, Dec. No. 39058, dated June 5, 1946, 46 CRC 501, 508).

Controlled releases from Clear Lake, supplemented by the unregulated flows of the North Fork of Cache Creek and Bear Creek, are diverted into the distribution system by two dams on Cache Creek, one located near the town of Capay and the other about eight miles west of Woodland. The availability of stored water is greatly reduced by evaporation from Clear Lake and the net yield at delivery points is further reduced by seepage and other losses from the canals both above and below the diversion dams.

Applicant's service area contains about 55,000 acres of irrigable land and is served, entirely by gravity flow, through a distribution system consisting of some 170 miles of canals and laterals and approximately 1,000 control structures. In addition, water is delivered to several mutually owned canal systems, no parts of which are included in applicant's plant accounts. As compared with a high of about 29,000 acres in 1946 and a low of 13,444 acres in 1947, the total acreage actually irrigated from applicant's system in 1958 was reported at nearly 19,000 acres, supplied through 405 active service connections.

Applicant's operations are highly seasonal in nature and deliveries of water vary considerably from year to year. Factors affecting water sales are climatological conditions of precipitation, evaporation and temperature during the irrigation season, the nature and acreage of the various crops planted, and the available supply of water, both from storage and stream runoff. This variation is exemplified by the following tabulation of actual water sales for the years 1957 and 1958 and through September 30, 1959:

<u>Crops Irrigated</u>	<u>Water Sales in Acre-Feet</u>		
	<u>1957</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1959 (9 Mos.)</u>
Rice	23,479	23,175	30,224
All Other	<u>42,386</u>	<u>35,306</u>	<u>53,062</u>
Total	65,865	58,481	83,286

Accounting Records

The examination of applicant's records by Commission staff accountants revealed that, with the exception of a failure to properly record plant retirements, they are well maintained in conformity with the Commission's prescribed uniform system of accounts, with supporting data readily available.

The present recorded plant accounts reflect an appraisal made in 1925, which was used by the Commission in 1927 as the basis for a security issue upon the reorganization of the applicant corporation at that time,^{2/} plus additions and betterments to plant since 1927. As of December 31, 1956, applicant prepared a detailed inventory and cost record of all the plant in service, the physical quantities of which were field-checked by Commission engineers during 1957.

Up to 1957, accruals to the depreciation reserve were made on a straight-line basis at rates and lives furnished by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Generally, the Bureau's rates are higher and the lives assigned are shorter than those used by the Commission. By letter dated August 26, 1957, applicant requested the Commission's approval to adjust its reserve for depreciation for excess or unearned depreciation accruals taken in past years. By Resolution No. U-855, dated December 16, 1957, the Commission authorized applicant to adjust its reserve for depreciation as stated in the last paragraph of the resolution:

"BE IT RESOLVED that Clear Lake Water Company be and it hereby is authorized to credit intangible plant by \$88,507, and debit its surplus account with a like amount, and debit its depreciation reserve by \$312,344, and credit its surplus account by \$312,344, and to provide for accruals in the future according to the straight-line remaining life method starting with the date on which the adjustment to the reserve is made effective."

The journal entries adjusting intangible plant and depreciation reserve were recorded on the books as of the end of 1957

^{2/} Decision No. 18580 dated July 8, 1927, in Application No. 13763 (30 CRC 123, 125).

and, beginning with that year, depreciation accruals have been made on the straight-line remaining life basis.

As of December 31, 1958, applicant's total recorded plant was \$1,776,961 and the corresponding depreciation reserve was \$773,053, which amounts were used as starting figures by both the staff and the applicant in the determination of rate bases for the test years 1959 and 1960. However, the staff made certain substantial adjustments to these amounts which were not taken into account by applicant in its presentation.

In connection with the present application, the staff used the inventory made as of December 31, 1956, as a basis for ascertaining the net investment in plant as of December 31, 1958. Recorded additions and retirements during 1957 and 1958 were applied to the inventory, which was then test checked by a Commission engineer for reasonableness of count. Further test checks were made as to the reasonableness of the costs. As explained in detail in Chapter 2 and set forth in Table 2-A of its report, introduced in the instant proceeding as Exhibit No. 2, the staff's adjustments result in a net decrease in recorded utility plant of \$4,202 and a decrease in the reserve for depreciation of \$21,647, making an increase in net utility plant of \$17,445 as of December 31, 1958. The latter amount represents the estimated cost of rebuilding the Capay retaining wall, which cost had been erroneously charged to operating expenses.

For the estimated years 1959 and 1960, the staff made other adjustments, the important ones of which will be discussed later herein.

Summary of Showings and Earnings

Evidence was presented by applicant's vice president and general manager, the substance of his testimony being embodied in a report entitled "Data and Information in Support of Clear Lake Water Company's Application to Increase Rates" (Exhibit No. 1).

Experts of the Commission staff also presented a report (Exhibit No. 2) showing the results of their independent investigation of applicant's operations for the year 1958 recorded and for the years 1959 and 1960 estimated. The earnings information contained in these reports for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960 is summarized in the following tabulation:

SUMMARY OF EARNINGS

Applicant's Showing - Exhibit No. 1

<u>Item</u>	<u>Year 1958 Recorded</u>	<u>1959 Estimated</u>		<u>1960 Estimated</u>	
		<u>Present Rates</u>	<u>Proposed Rates</u>	<u>Present Rates</u>	<u>Proposed Rates</u>
Operating Revenues	<u>\$191,278</u>	<u>\$191,565</u>	<u>\$249,582</u>	<u>\$191,565</u>	<u>\$249,582</u>
Expenses					
Main. & Oper.	136,646	149,730	149,730	164,720	164,720
Taxes Other					
than Income	20,183	21,487	21,487	22,357	22,357
Taxes on Income	5,189	529	24,435	-	17,021
Depreciation	<u>17,691</u>	<u>17,346</u>	<u>17,346</u>	<u>17,498</u>	<u>17,498</u>
Total Exp.	<u>179,709</u>	<u>189,092</u>	<u>212,998</u>	<u>204,575</u>	<u>221,596</u>
Net Revenue	11,569	2,473	36,584	(13,010)	27,986
Depr. Rate Base	990,723	991,014	991,014	986,843	986,843
Rate of Return	1.2%	0.2%	3.7%	(1.3)%	2.8%

(Red Figure)

CPUC Staff - Exhibit No. 2

<u>Item</u>	<u>Year 1958 Adjusted</u>	<u>1959 Estimated</u>		<u>1960 Estimated</u>	
		<u>Present Rates</u>	<u>Proposed Rates</u>	<u>Present Rates</u>	<u>Proposed Rates</u>
Operating Revenues	<u>\$191,535</u>	<u>\$214,250</u>	<u>\$273,850</u>	<u>\$221,350</u>	<u>\$273,850</u>
Expenses					
Main. & Oper.	119,201	146,650	146,650	146,650	146,650
Taxes Other					
than Income	20,183	26,750	26,750	26,900	26,900
Taxes on Income	5,189	4,025	33,575	6,300	33,350
Depreciation	<u>17,691</u>	<u>18,000</u>	<u>18,000</u>	<u>18,400</u>	<u>18,400</u>
Total Exp.	<u>162,264</u>	<u>195,425</u>	<u>224,975</u>	<u>198,250</u>	<u>225,300</u>
Net Revenue	29,271	18,825	48,875	23,100	48,550
Depr. Rate Base	-	1,001,400	1,001,400	996,800	996,800
Rate of Return	-	1.88%	4.88%	2.32%	4.87%

1. Operating Revenues

Applicant's revenues are derived primarily from measured irrigation water sales. Such revenues vary widely from year to year and depend largely upon the demands for deliveries placed by the farmers and, to a limited extent, upon the amount of irrigation water available. In their development of normalized averages, both applicant and staff used records of the past 43 or 44 years.

In his forecast for the future, applicant's witness estimated an average annual demand of 62,000 acre-feet from which he deducted a deficiency allowance of 3,460 acre-feet, determined as an average of 44 years' experience, leaving an estimated average delivery of 58,540 acre-feet per annum for both years 1959 and 1960.

After considering the average annual water sales over the past 43 years and the recent trending of individual crop averages, the staff based its estimates of revenue at proposed rates for both 1959 and 1960 on normalized water sales of 65,500 acre-feet per year.

The differences between the two estimates of operating revenues at proposed rates caused by this disparity in the estimated total water sales is partially offset by the fact that applicant estimated 33.9 percent of such sales as applying to rice irrigation and 66.1 percent as applying to general crops, whereas the staff estimated 39.4 percent of the water would be used for rice and 60.6 percent for other crops.

A review of all of the testimony relating to this element of the results of operation leads to the conclusion that less emphasis should be given to the long period of previous experience and more reliance placed on the more recent years when government controls have caused a reduction in the acreage planted to rice. Assuming that the effects of such regulation have become stabilized,

it appears that under present conditions a total annual average demand of 62,000 acre-feet of water may reasonably be expected, which can be satisfied without any anticipated deficiency in the supply. From the records of 1957, 1958, and 1959, it further appears that about 37 percent of the total demand will normally be used for rice irrigation and 63 percent for irrigation of other crops. Based on such amounts the estimated revenues from water sales for 1960 would be \$201,500 at the present rates and \$260,100 at the proposed rates. To these amounts there should be added about \$1,500 for miscellaneous other revenues, making total estimated operating revenues of \$203,000 and \$261,600 at present and proposed rates, respectively, which amounts are found to be reasonable and will be adopted for the purposes herein.

In the foregoing discussion, due recognition has been accorded the fact that actual water deliveries in 1959 exceeded the average annual amounts as estimated by applicant and the staff, and as adopted herein. The latest figures available at the time of the hearing were 83,286 acre-feet of water delivered up to September 30 and gross revenues of \$274,313 as of October 31, 1959. The evidence shows that these higher amounts resulted from favorable water supply conditions, partly due to storage carried over from the previous year, combined with unusually heavy demands caused by a prolonged dry and warm irrigating season. The record does not reveal the corresponding actual expenses, which were too incomplete for analysis at the time the operation reports were being prepared.

It may be noted that none of the estimates of revenues includes any amount derived from usage of water in Lake County, since applicant is presently not obtaining any revenue from the rates applicable there. It is understood that litigation to enforce those tariffs is being considered by applicant.

2. Expenses

Analysis of the detailed accounts which comprise maintenance and operation expenses reveals that the considerable difference in the two estimates for the year 1960 is largely due to the fact that applicant's estimates, projected on the basis of recorded expenses for 1957 and 1958, reflect items that should have been capitalized, such as the reconstruction of the Capay retaining wall, previously discussed, and certain equipment which the staff has determined should be deducted from expenses and added to plant. In some accounts, applicant's estimates include an anticipated annual five percent increase in costs, whereas the staff has estimated such costs for 1960 at the same general level of 1959. Both estimates for 1960 include the salary for an engineer added to the force in 1959.

The staff's 1960 estimate of taxes other than those based on income is computed at the latest known tax rates and is somewhat higher than applicant's estimate, due mainly to ad valorem taxes on utility plant, the amount of which has been adjusted upward by the staff, as explained later herein.

Taxes on income vary, of course, with the amount of taxable income which, in turn, depends upon the gross revenue and the allowable deductions. This largely accounts for the staff's estimates of income taxes being considerably higher than applicant's. The staff also based its calculations on the fact that the state corporation franchise tax rate has been increased from 4 percent to 5½ percent, and the minimum from \$25 to \$100. The results herein adopted will reflect such increased rates, of which the Commission takes official notice.

The staff's treatment of depreciation expense appears to be consistent with its adjusted plant figures.

In general, the staff's estimates of expenses appear to be the more consistent and realistic and they will be adopted as reasonable for the purposes of this proceeding.

3. Rate Base

The differences of about \$10,000 between the depreciated rate bases developed by applicant and those developed by the staff are the net results of major differences in the several components which may be briefly explained, as follows:

- a. As previously discussed under the heading of "Accounting Records", the staff reduced the recorded utility plant of \$1,776,961 as of December 31, 1958, by an amount of \$4,202 representing the difference between unrecorded retirements of \$21,647 and the \$17,445 cost of the reconstructed Capay retaining wall.
- b. The staff added to plant the cost of \$28,759 for the realignment of the Cottonwood Canal caused by a highway relocation, \$3,229 for additional cost of the Capay Dam, and \$10,625 for equipment, or a total of \$42,613.
- c. Both the staff and applicant added amounts of \$9,718 and \$6,889, representing net additions to plant in 1959 and 1960, respectively.
- d. For working capital the staff added \$6,000 for materials and supplies and \$17,000 for working cash, as compared with amounts of \$6,310 and \$42,200, respectively, used by the applicant. The staff's working cash allowance is a judgment amount which gives effect to the manner in which applicant's expenses are incurred in relation to the months when revenues are received and also to the offsetting effect of federal income tax accruals.
- e. As contributions in aid of construction, for the year 1960 the staff deducted an amount of \$82,600, as compared with the applicant's \$60,062; the difference consisting principally of that portion of the cost of realigning the Cottonwood Canal which was refunded in 1959 by the State Highway Department.

- f. As a further deduction, the staff's average depreciation reserve for 1960 was \$772,100, as compared with the amount of \$791,729 used by applicant. The difference results largely from the \$21,647 adjustment for unrecorded retirements, partially offset by slightly larger depreciation accruals for the years 1959 and 1960.

After a careful review of all of the evidence, it appears that the staff's development of rate bases, including its various adjustments to the several balance sheet accounts incorporated therein, has been properly determined and is reasonable. Therefore, the staff's average depreciated rate base of \$996,800 for the estimated year 1960 will be adopted for the purpose of testing the reasonableness of the rates for water service to be authorized herein.

Revised Results of Operation
and Rate of Return

Using the amounts of operating revenues, expenses and rate base found reasonable in the foregoing discussion, the following tabulation indicates the revised results of applicant's operations as estimated for the year 1960 at present rates and at applicant's proposed rates:

<u>Item</u>	<u>1960 Estimated</u>	
	<u>Present Rates</u>	<u>Proposed Rates</u>
Operating Revenues	<u>\$203,000</u>	<u>\$261,600</u>
Operating Expenses		
Maintenance and Operation	146,650	146,650
Taxes Other than Income	26,900	26,900
Taxes on Income	150	26,650
Depreciation	<u>18,400</u>	<u>18,400</u>
Total Expenses	<u>192,100</u>	<u>218,600</u>
Net Revenue	10,900	43,000
Depreciated Rate Base	996,800	996,800
Rate of Return	1.1%	4.3%

Customer Participation

Counsel for the California Farm Bureau Federation evinced considerable interest in the proceeding by questioning the various witnesses but he produced no witnesses and introduced no evidence.

Through its counsel, the Western Yolo Water Users Association, consisting of about 180 members who use water or own land in applicant's service area, protested the proposed increase in water rates. Counsel minutely cross-examined witnesses for both applicant and the Commission staff. A number of questions by counsel concerned the propriety of using applicant's plant accounts, which are primarily based upon an inventory and appraisal made by representatives of the predecessor utility at about the time of applicant's acquisition of the properties in 1927.

In his brief filed on behalf of the protestant, counsel questioned the soundness of the valuation placed on applicant's properties used in determining the depreciated rate base. In this regard, reference is made to the prior discussion herein under the heading of "Accounting Records" and to former decisions by the Commission in connection with two previous rate increase applications, Decision No. 41993 dated August 24, 1948, in Application No. 29179 (48 CRC 219) and Decision No. 48355 dated March 10, 1953, in Application No. 33456 (not printed). It may be noted that, in at least three previous proceedings, the basic appraisal and applicant's records have been carefully examined by the Commission's staff. In the instant proceeding the staff similarly scrutinized all records, including the 1956 inventory prepared by applicant, as hereinbefore described. In the absence of any proof to the contrary, it appears that the applicant's balance sheet accounts, when adjusted in accordance with the staff's recommendations, to a reasonable degree of accuracy state the historical cost of both intangible and tangible

plant items which, together with the associated reserve for depreciation, represent applicant's net investment in plant facilities devoted to rendering its public utility service.

Relying upon his observation and experience as a farmer in the area both before and since the previous water rate increase in 1953, one witness for protestant testified that any further increase in such rate would actually result in a reduction of consumption of water from applicant's system, which would have an adverse effect upon the anticipated revenues. In support of his contention, this witness introduced in evidence a pamphlet entitled "Irrigation Pumping Costs - Yolo County" (Exhibit No. 3) published at Woodland in July, 1959, by the University of California, Agricultural Extension Service. Another witness, employed as Extension Irrigationist by the University of California, testified as to the manner in which the pamphlet had been prepared. The import of their testimony was that costs of pumped water for irrigation use become more and more competitive with those for water delivered from applicant's canal system as applicant's rates are increased, at least in some portions of the service area.

Protestant's representative also quoted flat rates for rice irrigation in certain nearby districts which are publicly owned or mutually operated, to show that water rates are lower than those charged by applicant for similar service. He gave this as one reason why growers in applicant's service area had transferred considerable government-allotted rice acreage to other areas.

By his line of questioning, counsel for protestant attempted to show that there are poor public relations and inefficiency in applicant's operations; that certain canals and other facilities are over-built for the service required of them; and that there is need of storage between Clear Lake and the diversion points. In this

connection he introduced Page A-7 of Bulletin No. 20 entitled "Interim Report - Cache Creek Investigation" dated April, 1958, issued by the State of California, Department of Water Resources, Division of Resources Planning. This Exhibit No. 4 is a tabulation of "Seasonal Summary of Monthly Yield Study - Clear Lake" for the seasons from 1911-12 to 1955-56, and shows the characteristics of the storage in Clear Lake and the releases therefrom. In response to a request by protestant's counsel, applicant's witness also introduced a tabulation (Exhibit No. 5) showing the quantities of water spilled from Clear Lake by months for the years 1951 to 1959, inclusive, and the reasons for such spillage. These two exhibits serve to illustrate the responsibility placed upon applicant to regulate the storage in Clear Lake in accordance with the requirements of the Gopcevic Decree and the Bemmerly Decree (supra).

Recommendations

It is understood that various recommendations made by the staff relative to certain accounting practices and procedures have already been, or will be, adopted by applicant.

In response to a specific staff recommendation, applicant is put on notice that it should immediately initiate a detailed record of customers' complaints and applicant's respective investigations pertaining thereto, all as required by Paragraph I, 8 of the Commission's General Order No. 103.

The order herein will require applicant to carry out the staff's recommendation concerning the filing of a comprehensive map showing the territory served and applicant's water system properties in both Yolo and Lake Counties.

Findings and Conclusions

The Commission finds and concludes that the estimates of operating revenues, expenses, including depreciation and taxes, and

rate base, revised as indicated in a foregoing tabulation, reasonably represent the results of applicant's operations for the year 1960, under normal or average conditions, and they will be and hereby are adopted for the purposes of this proceeding.

The evidence is clear that revenues obtainable from existing water rates are no longer adequate to meet applicant's reasonable needs and that applicant is in need of and entitled to increased revenue. In view of all of the evidence before us in this proceeding and after giving consideration to the brief of protestant herein, the Commission finds and concludes that the revenues which applicant's proposed rates will produce and the resulting rate of return on applicant's investment will not be excessive or unreasonable. Applicant's proposed rates will be authorized.

As indicated by a foregoing tabulation, the rates hereinafter authorized are estimated to produce for the year 1960, under average conditions, total revenues of \$261,600, which revenues are \$58,600, or approximately 29 percent, more than those estimated to be obtainable from rates presently in effect. After due allowance for all reasonable operating expenses, taxes, and depreciation amounting to \$218,600, the resulting net revenue of \$43,000 represents a rate of return of 4.3 percent on the depreciated rate base of \$996,800, which rate of return we find to be no more than fair and reasonable.

Accordingly, the Commission finds as a fact that the increase in the rate for water for the irrigation of all crops other than rice as authorized herein is justified, that the rates and charges authorized herein are reasonable, and that the present rates and charges, insofar as they differ from those herein prescribed, are for the future unjust and unreasonable.

O R D E R

Clear Lake Water Company, a corporation, having applied to this Commission for authority to increase the rate for irrigation

water delivered within its serviced area in Yolo County for all purposes except for the growing of rice, public hearings thereon having been held, the matter having been submitted and now being ready for decision,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that applicant is authorized to file in quadruplicate with this Commission, after the effective date of this order and in conformance with General Order No. 96, the schedule of rates attached to this order as Appendix A and, on not less than five days' notice to this Commission and to the public, to make such rates effective for all irrigation water service rendered in its Yolo County service area on and after March 20, 1960.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, within sixty days after the effective date of this order, applicant shall file with this Commission four copies of a comprehensive map drawn to an indicated scale not smaller than one mile to the inch, delineating by appropriate markings the various tracts of land and territory served, the principal water production, storage and distribution facilities, and the location of the various water system properties of applicant in both Lake and Yolo counties.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 23rd day of February, 1960.

[Signature] President
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature] Commissioners

APPENDIX A

Schedule No. 3M

MEASURED IRRIGATION SERVICEAPPLICABILITY

Applicable to all measured irrigation water service.

TERRITORY

Within portions of Yolo County lying generally west and south of Woodland.

RATES

	<u>Per Acre- Foot</u>
For Irrigation of:	
(a) Rice	\$3.25
(b) All crops other than rice	4.75

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. All applications for irrigation water service must be signed by the irrigator, or his duly authorized agent, and must be accompanied by a deposit of \$1.50 per acre for each acre for which water service is applied. These deposits are a credit on the water bill of the applicant and are the minimum annual charge per acre for the land covered by the application, but are not transferable from one field or crop to another.

2. In the event that application for water service for general crops is made subsequent to March 15, a charge of \$1.25 per acre will be made, which charge will not be a credit on the water bill of applicant.