

ORIGINAL

Decision No. §1396

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application)
of DOMINGUEZ WATER CORPORATION,)
a corporation, for authority to)
increase its rates for service.)

Application No. 42262

J. P. Bradley and T. V. Tallon, for applicant.
William L. Knecht, for California Farm Bureau
Federation; and L. F. DeMartini and Elmer W.
Solomon, for Los Angeles County Farm Bureau,
protestants.
Richard H. Keeler, for Department of Water &
Power, and George Blumfield, for Department
of Public Utilities and Transportation,
City of Los Angeles; Henry E. Jordan, for
the City of Long Beach; Lathon B. Brewer,
for Los Angeles County Fire Department;
Ray L. McCoy, for Southern California Water
Company; William M. Belding, for Broadway
Department Store, and Del Amo Shopping Center;
Charles Pierce Moores, for Broadway Depart-
ment Stores; and Everett M. Odell, for
Sears Roebuck and Company, interested parties.
Cyril M. Sarcyan and Donald B. Steger, for the
Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Dominguez Water Corporation, a corporation, by the above-entitled application, filed May 18, 1960, seeks authority to increase its rates for water service in portions of the Cities of Los Angeles, Torrance, and Long Beach, and in unincorporated territory of Los Angeles County, comprising about 35 square miles of service area, by a gross annual amount of approximately \$571,000, based on estimated operations for the year 1960. This represents a requested overall increase of 33.5 per cent. Included in the application is a request to discontinue the applicant's present Schedule No. 2 for irrigation

service and present Schedule No. 3 for combination domestic and irrigation service. Increases in rates for fire hydrant service and for fire protection sprinkler service are also requested; rate Schedule No. 6 for flat rates for construction work is the only present schedule for which no change is requested.

Public hearings were held before Examiner Stewart C. Warner on October 19, 20, 21 and 25, 1960, at Torrance. Although notices were published in newspapers of general circulation throughout the applicant's service area, and publicity was given, not only to the filing of the application but to the hearings, no protests were entered except those of the California Farm Bureau Federation representing truck farmers and other irrigation customers, and by the Broadway Department Store. The matter was submitted on the last-named date, subject to the receipt of late-filed Exhibit No. 8 on or before October 31, 1960, and receipt of memorandum briefs on or before October 31, 1960, and replies to such briefs by November 7, 1960. Such exhibit and briefs having been received, the matter is now ready for decision.

General Information

Applicant's service area is part of Rancho San Pedro, dating back to early days of Southern California history. Applicant's parent and sole stockholder, the Dominguez Estate Company, together with Carson Estate Company, Watson Land Company, and Del Amo Estate Company, have owned and controlled the land and development of the applicant's service area. Said companies, to some extent or other, are related to or have some of the same officers or directors as the applicant. The record shows that of the total service area remaining to be developed, or subdivided or developed for industrial purposes, 20 per cent is still owned or controlled by the four related companies, and 50 per cent of said 20 per cent is owned or controlled by the Dominguez Estate Company. Many of the irrigation customers lease their land from one of the estate companies for truck farming and the growing of flowers or dairying.

Description of Water System

Originally, the water system was operated by Dominguez Water Company, a mutual company, incorporated in February 1911. By Decision No. 33739, dated January 16, 1940, in Application No. 22763, the applicant was granted a certificate of public convenience and necessity to operate as a public utility water corporation under the jurisdiction of this Commission.

As of December 31, 1959, applicant was furnishing water service to 15,245 domestic and commercial customers and to 142 industrial customers under its general metered service schedule of rates; to 395 irrigation customers under its irrigation service schedule; and to 22 customers under its combination domestic and irrigation schedule of rates.

The applicant has been furnishing water service to the Shell Oil Company for its refineries, to Shell Chemical Corporation and to Harvey Aluminum Company, under special contracts for industrial water service. Applicant also has requested Commission authorization of a special contract to furnish water service to the Richfield Oil Corporation refinery, to Johns-Manville Products Corporation and to Hancock Chemical Company. ✓

Exhibit No. 1 contains a map showing the service area and distribution system of the applicant. They extend west from the Long Beach Freeway to the city limits of Redondo Beach, and south from 190th Street to Lomita Boulevard.

Water is obtained from 16 wells, 11 of which are located in the West Coast Basin, and five of which are located in the Central Basin, and from the Metropolitan Water District through the West Basin Municipal Water District at two locations. In addition thereto, the applicant has requested Commission authorization to acquire a Metropolitan Water District tap for the Richfield Oil refinery, Johns-Manville Products Corporation, and Hancock Chemical Company, and has made an additional tap at the location indicated as "Proposed MWD Tap" on the chart contained in Exhibit No. 1, supra. ✓

The service area is divided into three principal pressure zones designed to provide adequate operating pressures for large industry, and to distribute water to all customers from reservoirs and storage facilities at satisfactory operating pressures.

The annual production of water from wells in the West Coast Basin is subject to an agreement administered by a water-master appointed by the Los Angeles County Superior Court. By the terms of said agreement the applicant is limited to

9,374 acre-feet of pumping per year from the West Coast Basin. For the year 1960 the applicant estimates it will produce 16,848 acre-feet from all of its wells and purchase about 10,500 acre-feet from the Metropolitan Water District for a total of 27,300 acre-feet. A total slightly in excess of 35,000 acre-feet of water flow is available to the applicant from all sources, of which 13,500 acre-feet are available from the Metropolitan Water District.

On July 1, 1960, a water replenishment assessment of \$3.19 per-acre foot of water extracted by producers of water within its boundaries was made by the West and Central Basin Water Replenishment District which was formed in 1959 by the electorate within the boundaries of said District. The estimated assessment for applicant's well production for the year 1960 was estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$55,000. Water is purchased from the Metropolitan Water District by the Replenishment District which latter District spreads the water so purchased to increase ground water storage in the West Coast and Central Basins.

Water purchased by the applicant from the West Basin Municipal Water District (M.W.D. water) was at the rate of \$25.50 per acre-foot during 1959, and for the first six months of 1960; was reduced to \$23.50 per acre-foot for the second half of 1960; and reverted to \$25.50 on January 1, 1961.

The applicant maintains a main pumping plant and offices at the southeast corner of Carson Street and Alameda Street. The plant installations, including booster-plant facilities, storage tanks, reservoirs, and the main office, are shown in photographs in Exhibit No. 1, and living quarters are furnished to five

employees, two of which said quarters are located at the main plant. The other quarters are located at pumping plants or reservoirs. The applicant alleged that their occupation by applicant's employees provided security for the water system, and that they were required to be maintained on a 24-hour stand-by basis because of possible unusual industrial water service requirements, and for other emergency purposes.

Basis of Application

Applicant bases its application for increased rates on its allegations of a constant decline in its net earnings and rate of return occasioned by increased costs and labor, transportation, and material. In addition, it is alleged that as a result of the litigation and agreement among the water producers in the West Coast Basin heretofore outlined it has become necessary to purchase increasing amounts of Metropolitan Water District water at costs substantially greater than the cost of producing water from wells. Additive operating costs will be incurred as the result of the annual assessment made by the Water Replenishment District heretofore outlined.

Rates

Applicant's present rates were established by Decision No. 48550, dated April 28, 1953, in Application No. 33508.

The following tabulation is a comparison of the applicant's present, proposed, and hereinafter authorized general metered service rates:

COMPARISON OF PRESENT, PROPOSED, AND
AUTHORIZED GENERAL METERED SERVICE RATES

Quantity Rates:

Per Meter Per Month
Present Proposed Authorized

First	600 cu.ft. or less	\$1.75	\$2.50	\$2.15
Next	1,900 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ..	.23	.30	.29
Next	17,500 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ..	.17	.25	.21
Next	80,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ..	.12	.20	.15
Next	1,900,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ..	.08	.15	.104
Over	2,000,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ..	.06	.10	.08

The following tabulation compares monthly charges for general metered service for consumption in cubic feet at the present and proposed rates and at the rates hereinafter authorized. Said tabulation also shows the percentage increase of the proposed rates over the present rates and of the authorized rates over the present rates.

COMPARATIVE MONTHLY CHARGES FOR GENERAL METERED SERVICE

Consumption Cubic Feet	Present Rates	Proposed Rates	Authorized Rates	<u>Percent Increase</u>	
				<u>:Proposed : Over : Present :</u>	<u>:Authorized: : Over : Present :</u>
600	\$ 1.75	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.15	42.9	22.9
1,000	2.67	3.70	3.31	38.6	24.0
2,000	4.97	6.70	6.21	34.8	24.9
5,000	10.37	14.45	12.91	39.3	24.5
10,000	18.87	26.95	23.41	42.8	24.1
30,000	47.87	71.95	59.41	50.3	24.1
50,000	71.87	111.95	89.41	55.8	24.4
100,000	131.87	211.95	164.41	60.7	24.7
200,000	211.87	361.95	268.41	70.8	26.7
500,000	451.87	811.95	580.41	79.7	28.4
1,000,000	851.87	1,561.95	1,100.41	83.4	29.2
10,000,000	6,451.87	11,061.95	8,540.41	71.5	32.4
20,000,000	12,451.87	21,061.95	16,540.41	69.1	32.8
50,000,000	30,451.87	51,061.95	40,540.41	67.7	33.1

The present monthly rates for irrigation service are a minimum of \$1.75 per meter, and a quantity rate of 7 cents per 100 cubic feet. The present monthly combination domestic and irrigation rate schedule provides for a flat rate surcharge of \$1.75 per month over the irrigation rate minimum charge.

The record shows that the adjusted average consumption of general metered service schedule customers is approximately 1,600 cubic feet per month. At the present rates the charge for such consumption is \$4.05; at the proposed rates such charge would be \$5.50, an increase of 35.8 percent; and at the authorized rates such charge would be \$5.05, an increase of 24.7 percent.

The record further shows that if present irrigation service customers were placed on the general metered service schedules their monthly bills would vary from \$2.10 for consumption of 3,000 cubic feet per month at present rates to \$9.45 for such consumption at the proposed rates; and for consumption of 300,000 cubic feet per month the present charge is \$210.00, and it would be \$511.95 at the proposed rates.

The proposed increase in rates for public fire protection service from \$1.50 per hydrant per month to \$2.50 per hydrant per month has in part, been contracted for with the Los Angeles County Fire Protection District, but has not been included in a new contract with the City of Torrance.

The applicant proposes to increase private fire protection service charges from \$1 to \$4 per month per inch of diameter of service line.

Under special contracts with Shell Oil Company, Shell Chemical Corporation, and Harvey Aluminum Company the monthly minimum charge is \$2,166 for the first 2 million cubic feet and 8 cents per 100 cubic feet of consumption over the minimum. The special contract proposed to be entered into with Richfield Oil Corporation, Hancock Chemical Company, and Johns-Manville

Products Corporation, in accordance with which the applicant will acquire said customers' M.W.D. tap facilities and certain other properties owned by said customers, provides for a charge of 7 cents per 100 cubic feet for monthly consumption over 2 million cubic feet.

Accounting Practices and Financial Analyses

Chapter 2 of Exhibit No. 5, submitted by the Commission staff accounting and finance witness, contains a report on the applicant's accounting practices and analyses of its financial operations and condition covering the period of said operations up to December 31, 1959. This exhibit discloses numerous deviations from and exceptions to accounting practices prescribed by the Commission, although the record shows that the applicant's accounting records have been and are well maintained and generally follow good accounting practice in conformity with the requirements prescribed by the Commission. The exceptions to prescribed accounting practices are clearly set forth in the chapter. They are too numerous to outline in detail herein. The exceptions having been made of record in the proceedings in the application, in the presence of the applicant's president, attorney and general manager, constitute notice to them of said exceptions which the Commission expects will be promptly rectified.

Earnings

Exhibits Nos. 1 and 1-B contain earnings data for the recorded and adjusted years 1958 and 1959, and for the estimated year 1960 at present and proposed rates as submitted by the applicant. Exhibit No. 5-A contains earnings data for the

year 1959 recorded, and for the year 1959 adjusted and the year 1960 estimated, at present and proposed rates, as submitted by a Commission staff engineering witness. The earnings data contained in Exhibits Nos. 1, 1-B and 5-A are summarized as follows:

SUMMARY OF EARNINGS

Item	Year 1959		Year 1960 Estimated		
	Recorded		Present Rates		Proposed Rates
	Per Company		Per PUC		Per Company
	Exh. 1	Exh. 1	Exh. 5-A	Exh. 1-B	Exh. 5-A
Operating Revenues	\$1,223,340	\$1,482,688	\$1,538,950	\$2,053,510	\$2,136,650
Operating Expenses	785,684	1,050,330	931,750	992,878	935,900
Depreciation	208,341	228,280	219,300	245,322	219,300
Taxes	110,117	128,170	208,700	408,154	533,000
Subtotal	1,104,142	1,406,780	1,359,750	1,646,354	1,688,200
Net Oper. Revenue	119,198	75,908	179,200	407,156	448,450
Rate Base	5,352,173	5,521,672	5,157,000	5,578,760	5,157,000
Rate of Return	2.2%	1.37%	3.47%	7.3%	8.7%

The record shows a difference of approximately \$83,000 in the estimates of operating revenues for the test year 1960 at proposed rates between the applicant and the staff. The precise reason for such difference is not clear in the record except that a different method of calculation of estimated revenues from the proposed change-over of irrigation service customers to general metered service customers appears to be the reason, at least in part. The total difference of approximately 4 per cent is reasonably within the range of different engineering estimates.

The principal difference in estimates of operating expenses between the company and the staff results from the staff having recommended an allowance for the payroll portion of administrative and general salaries which is approximately \$11,000 less than the recorded amount for the year 1959 of \$72,300. The staff allowance for this item amounted to \$61,400 for the year 1960 estimated, with related reductions in the expense of employee

pensions and benefits. The staff also recommended an allowance for maintenance of general plant which is about \$12,000 less than the recorded amount of \$37,314 for the year 1959. The staff allowance for this item amounted to \$25,000 for the year 1960 estimated and, in part, consisted of the elimination of the cost of landscaping and maintaining company-owned cottages occupied by employees. The staff also reduced the amount of uncollectibles by \$7,150 from \$18,000 to \$10,850 to reflect a 5-year average ratio of uncollectibles related to commercial revenues. After detailed analysis of transportation costs it was determined by the staff that the average cost per mile for the year 1959 was 22.7 cents, excluding depreciation on company-owned vehicles which, if included, would raise such average cost to 26.4 cents per mile. The record shows that the applicant owned or leased 41 vehicles on December 31, 1959, about half of which were leased. Of the total number of vehicles owned or leased, one was used by Dominguez Estate Company for the use of which said company was charged 10 cents per mile. The average number of cars used by water company employees during 1959 was 39, and the average mileage per vehicle was 7,200. The low average usage of vehicles resulted, in part, in the cost of operation which the staff recommended should reasonably have been in the neighborhood of not more than about 11.4 cents per mile.

In its development of the average depreciated rate base for the year 1960 estimated, the staff recommended certain adjustments to utility plant for nonoperative utility plant (\$78,242); the cost of test wells, \$11,934; the cost of remodeling company cottages and buildings for residential and unessential decorative purposes (\$80,946); and a nonrecurring cost of installing IBM

equipment of \$14,348, said latter item having been determined to have been more properly chargeable to operating expense; other plant adjustments for the transfer from construction work in progress of operative utility plant installed in 1954, 1955, and 1956, in the City of Torrance; the addition of the cost of the purchase of additional pumping rights in the West Basin of \$5,000, \$3,461 for water rights adjudication, which said cost had been treated by applicant as chargeable to operating expenses in 1959; the inclusion of the cost of plant facilities constructed for Harvey Aluminum Company and plant facilities purchased from the Richfield group; and the cost to applicant resulting from Harbor and San Diego Freeway construction in 1960. The total of all adjustments recommended by the staff was \$387,752, and depreciation requirement and annual expenses were adjusted accordingly.

Advances for construction were adjusted to include the transfer to contributions in aid of construction of unrefunded amounts on expired contracts for advances of construction and the inclusion of \$334,467, representing the cost of facilities serving Dominguez Estate Company properties financed principally by interest-bearing advances from applicant's parent amounting to \$241,132 and the cost of a main extension amounting to \$93,335 paid for by applicant to meet water quality needs of Shell Chemical Corporation. Also included in advances pursuant to Decision No. 59363 was an amount of \$363,775 covering plant facilities which are located in nine tracts within the City of Torrance. Of this amount, \$323,721 had been held by the applicant in the account construction work in progress.

Protests of Irrigation Customers

Irrigation, and combination domestic and irrigation customers, through the California Farm Bureau Federation and the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, protested that portion of the application which proposed to transfer them to the general metered service schedule of rates on the grounds that the proposed increases would extensively increase their costs for water service. Truck farmers producing radishes, romaine, spinach, beets, celery, cabbages, berries, squash, cucumbers, and other green vegetables, testified that the prices received for their products at the wholesale market had not greatly increased since 1950, and that the proposed increases in water service charges might force them out of business. Like testimony was given by growers of geranium cuttings, and a general rancher growing beans, hay, and livestock.

Findings and Conclusions

After a careful review of the record the Commission finds as a fact and concludes that the applicant's presently-filed rates for water service in its service area would produce an unreasonably low rate of return for the test year 1960; that estimated earnings for such test year are deficient; and that the applicant is entitled to and in need of financial relief. It is further found as a fact and concluded, however, that the revenues which would be produced by the rates proposed in the application are unreasonable, and that the rate of return which would result from the granting of the application is excessive.

The estimates of operating expenses submitted by the staff for the test year 1960, as shown in Exhibit No. 5-A, amounting

to \$935,900 are found as a fact and concluded to be reasonable, except that an additional allowance thereto of \$14,100 for administrative and general office salaries, pensions, retirements, and transportation expense is found as a fact and concluded to be required in order to fully compensate the applicant for out-of-pocket expenses associated with the particular characteristics of its operations, including its several large-quantity-of-water-use industrial customers. The rate base submitted by the staff is found as a fact and concluded to be reasonable and is hereby adopted.

In view of the intimate relationship between the applicant and its parent company and estate companies associated therewith, as disclosed by the record and as outlined hereinbefore, and further, in view of the fact that the beneficial interests of the applicant and the estate companies are so mutual, it is found as a fact and concluded that a rate of return of 6 percent on the rate base heretofore adopted is just and reasonable.

The following tabulation summarizes the adopted summary of applicant's earnings for the test year 1960:

ADOPTED SUMMARY OF EARNINGS

Test Year 1960

Operating Revenues	\$1,844,300
Operating Expenses	950,000
Depreciation	219,300
Taxes	<u>365,600</u>
Subtotal	\$1,534,900
Net Operating Revenues	309,400
Rate Base	5,157,000
Rate of Return	6.0%

The estimates of operating revenues for the test year 1960 heretofore set forth are based on new schedules of rates, which the order hereinafter will authorize applicant to file, which, will, among other things, authorize the applicant to increase fire hydrant rentals and charges for private fire protection service as proposed in the application; will authorize an increase of one cent per 100 cubic feet, from 7 to 8 cents in the quantity rates for irrigation, and combination domestic and irrigation service rather than the placing of irrigation customers on the general metered service schedule as proposed in the application; and take into full account the applicant's special contracts with Shell Oil, Shell Chemical, and others, which, as noted heretofore, have been approved by the Commission or are pending before the Commission.

The staff engineering witness recommended in Chapter 12 of Exhibit No. 5 that the applicant be ordered to comply with seven specific recommendations covering items of depreciation; the filing of a map; the filing of a revised and complete set of tariff schedules; the maintenance of normal operating gauge pressures in accordance with General Order No. 103; the application of its main extension rule to all subdivisions and extensions and the adjusting of advance deposits to conform to that rule; the filing of a separate monthly minimum charge rate for 5/8 by 3/4-inch meters and for 3/4-inch meters; the testing of meters on the basis set forth in General Order No. 103; and informing the Commission of any use of liberalized depreciation for tax purposes after the year 1959. It is found as a fact and concluded that the staff recommendations are reasonable and

they will be and hereby are adopted, and they will be included in the order which follows.

The new schedules of rates authorized to be filed by the order which follows will produce the hereinbefore noted estimated gross annual revenues of \$1,844,300, an increase of approximately \$362,000 over the gross revenues which would be produced for the estimated test year 1960 at the present rates, but approximately \$209,000 less than the increases in gross revenues requested in the application.

The Commission further finds as a fact and concludes that the increases in rates and charges authorized herein are justified and that present rates in so far as they differ from those herein prescribed will, for the future, be unjust and unreasonable.

O R D E R

Application as above entitled having been filed, public hearings having been held, the matter having been submitted, and now being ready for decision,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

- 1.(a) That Dominguez Water Corporation, a corporation, be and it is authorized to file in quadruplicate with the Commission, after the effective date of this order, in conformity with the Commission's General Order No. 96, the schedules of rates shown in Appendix A attached hereto, and upon not less than five days' notice to the Commission and to the public to make such rates effective for water service rendered on and after February 20, 1961.
- (b) That concurrently with the filing authorized herein, Dominguez Water Corporation be and it

is authorized to withdraw and cancel by appropriate advice letter its presently effective rate schedules as follows:

Schedule No. 1, General Metered Service,
 Schedule No. 2, Irrigation Service,
 Schedule No. 3, Combination Domestic and
 Irrigation Service,
 Schedule No. 4, Fire Hydrant Service
 Schedule No. 5, Fire Sprinkler Service,
 Schedule No. 6, Flat Rate (Construction).

2. That applicant shall review annually the accruals to depreciation reserve which should be determined for each primary utility plant account by dividing the original cost of the utility plant less the estimated net salvage, less depreciation reserve, by the estimated remaining life of the plant. Results of these reviews shall be submitted annually to this Commission.
3. That applicant, within sixty days after the effective date of this order, shall file with this Commission four copies of an up-to-date comprehensive map drawn to an indicated scale of not smaller than 600 feet to the inch, delineating by appropriate markings the various tracts of land and territory served; the principal water production, storage, transmission and distribution facilities; and the location of the various water system properties of applicant.
4. That applicant, within sixty days after the effective date of this order, shall file in quadruplicate with this Commission in accordance with the provisions of General Order No. 96, a revised and complete set of tariff schedules reflecting present day practices and setting forth rules, a tariff service area map, and sample copies of printed forms that are normally used in connection with customers' services. Such rules, tariff service area map and forms shall become effective upon five days' notice to the Commission and to the public after filing as hereinabove provided.
5. That applicant shall maintain normal operating gauge pressures of not less than 25 psig and not more than 125 psig at the service connection and in accordance with the other pressure provisions of General Order No. 103.
6. That applicant shall apply its main extension rule to all subdivisions and extensions to serve individuals and adjust advance deposits to conform to that rule.
7. That applicant shall test meters on the basis set forth in General Order No. 103 or submit, not later than July 1, 1961, a meter testing program for Commission approval.

8. That applicant shall inform the Commission, in writing, of any use of liberalized depreciation for tax purposes after 1959 to enable the Commission to consider the effect of this tax treatment on applicant's rates.
9. That in all other respects the application be and it is denied.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 24th day of January, 1961.

Everett R. Ray
President
John E. McMillen
Edwin Fox

Commissioners

APPENDIX A
Page 1 of 7

Schedule No. 1

GENERAL METERED SERVICEAPPLICABILITY

Applicable to all metered water service, excepting Metered Irrigation Service and excepting Combination Residential and Irrigation Service.

TERRITORY

Approximately 35 square miles located south of the City of Los Angeles, north of the community of Wilmington, east of the City of Redondo Beach, and west of the Los Angeles River, all in the County of Los Angeles. Included are portions of the Cities of Torrance, Los Angeles, and Long Beach.

RATES

Per Meter
Per Month

Quantity Rates:

First	600 cu.ft. or less	\$ 2.15
Next	1,900 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.29
Next	17,500 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.21
Next	80,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.15
Next	1,900,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.11
Over	2,000,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.08

Minimum Charge:

For	5/8 x 3/4-inch meter	\$ 2.15
For	3/4-inch meter	3.50
For	1-inch meter	5.75
For	1 1/2-inch meter	11.00
For	2-inch meter	16.00
For	3-inch meter	28.00
For	4-inch meter	45.00
For	6-inch meter	80.00
For	8-inch meter	120.00
For	10-inch meter	160.00
For	12-inch meter	220.00

The Minimum Charge will entitle the customer to the quantity of water which that minimum charge will purchase at the Quantity Rates.

APPENDIX A
Page 2 of 7

Schedule No. 3M

METERED IRRIGATION SERVICEAPPLICABILITY

Applicable to all metered irrigation water service, excepting Combination Residential and Irrigation Service.

TERRITORY

Approximately 35 square miles located south of the City of Los Angeles, north of the community of Wilmington, east of the City of Redondo Beach, and west of the Los Angeles River, all in the County of Los Angeles. Included are portions of the Cities of Torrance, Los Angeles, and Long Beach.

RATES

Quantity Rate:

Per Meter
Per Month

For each 100 cu.ft. or fraction thereof \$0.08

Minimum Charge:

For all meter sizes \$2.15

The Minimum Charge will entitle the customer to the quantity of water which that minimum charge will purchase at the Quantity Rates.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. An application for the foregoing service shall be filed by the customer with the utility. Such application shall set forth the conditions of service requested and the proposed use of water.
2. The size of meter for the foregoing service shall not be greater than reasonably necessary to furnish service to the area to be irrigated.

APPENDIX A
Page 3 of 7

Schedule No. 3L

COMBINATION RESIDENTIAL AND IRRIGATION SERVICEAPPLICABILITY

Applicable to all combination residential and irrigation water service.

TERRITORY

Approximately 35 square miles located south of the City of Los Angeles, north of the community of Wilmington, east of the City of Redondo Beach, and west of the Los Angeles River, all in the County of Los Angeles. Included are portions of the Cities of Torrance, Los Angeles, and Long Beach.

RATESIrrigation Service

Per Meter
Per Month

Quantity Rate:

For each 100 cu.ft. or fraction thereof \$0.08

Minimum Charge:

For all meter sizes 2.15

The Minimum Charge will entitle the customer to the quantity of water which that minimum charge will purchase at the Quantity Rates.

Residential Service

Per Month

A flat rate in addition to the foregoing charges for irrigation service. \$2.15

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Combination Residential and Irrigation Service is available only to those customers being served as of the effective date of this schedule. Service to new occupants of premises which have been served under this schedule will be available only under other appropriate tariff schedules.

APPENDIX A
Page 4 of 7

Schedule No. 4

PRIVATE FIRE PROTECTION SERVICE

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all water service furnished for privately owned fire protection systems.

TERRITORY

Approximately 35 square miles located south of the City of Los Angeles, north of the community of Wilmington, east of the City of Redondo Beach, and west of the Los Angeles River, all in the County of Los Angeles. Included are portions of the Cities of Torrance, Los Angeles, and Long Beach.

RATE

Per Month

For each inch of diameter of the service connection \$4.00

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The customer shall pay, without refund, the entire cost of installing the fire protection service connection. Such service connection shall become and remain the property of the utility.
2. The minimum diameter of the connection for fire protection service will be 4 inches and the maximum diameter will be the diameter of the main to which the service is connected.
3. The customer's installation must be such as effectively to separate the fire protection system from all of the customer's other piping systems. The installation shall include a detector type meter or other similar device acceptable to the utility.
4. No cross connection between the fire protection system and any source of supply other than that of the utility will be allowed without specific approval of the utility. Such approval will not be forthcoming until a double check valve installation, or other device acceptable to the utility, has been installed at the customer's expense. Unauthorized cross connections may be grounds for immediate discontinuance of service without liability to the utility.

(Continued)

APPENDIX A
Page 5 of 7

Schedule No. 4

PRIVATE FIRE PROTECTION SERVICE
(Continued)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

5. For water delivered for other than fire protection purposes, charges will be made at the quantity rates under Schedule No. 1, General Metered Service.

6. The utility will supply only such water at such pressure as may be available from time to time as a result of its normal operation of the system.

APPENDIX A
Page 6 of 7

Schedule No. 5

PUBLIC FIRE HYDRANT SERVICEAPPLICABILITY

Applicable to all fire hydrant service furnished to municipalities, duly organized or incorporated fire districts or other political subdivisions of the State.

TERRITORY

Approximately 35 square miles located south of the City of Los Angeles, north of the community of Wilmington, east of the City of Redondo Beach, and west of the Los Angeles River, all in the County of Los Angeles. Included are portions of the Cities of Torrance, Los Angeles, and Long Beach.

RATEPer Month

For each hydrant	\$2.50
------------------------	--------

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. For water delivered for other than fire protection purposes, charges will be made at the quantity rates under Schedule No. 1, General Metered Service.
2. The cost of installation and maintenance of hydrants will be borne by the utility.
3. Relocation of any hydrant shall be at the expense of the party requesting relocation.
4. The utility will supply only such water at such pressure as may be available from time to time as a result of its normal operation of the system.

APPENDIX A
Page 7 of 7

Schedule No. 9CF

CONSTRUCTION FLAT RATE SERVICE

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all water service to settle the refill of earth in trenches.

TERRITORY

Approximately 35 square miles located south of the City of Los Angeles, north of the community of Wilmington, east of the City of Redondo Beach, and west of the Los Angeles River, all in the County of Los Angeles. Included are portions of the Cities of Torrance, Los Angeles, and Long Beach.

RATE

Per Foot

For each lineal foot of trench or fraction thereof,
per 4-foot multiple, or fraction thereof, of depth ... \$0.015

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Water for the foregoing service shall be taken from existing outlets designated by the utility or from special outlets installed at the expense of the customer.
2. The foregoing rate is predicated upon a trench not exceeding 2 feet in width. For a trench wider than 2 feet, the charge therefor shall be increased proportionately.