

**ORIGINAL**Decision No. 76057

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application  
of the SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER  
COMPANY, for an order authorizing  
it to increase the rates and  
charges for water service in its  
Bay District, Contra Costa County. }

Application No. 50880  
(Filed February 10, 1969;  
Amended April 28, 1969.)

O'Melveny & Myers, by William J. Bogaard,  
for applicant.  
David R. Larrouy and William Figg-Hoblyn,  
Counsel, and George A. Amaroli, for  
the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Applicant Southern California Water Company seeks authority to increase rates for water service in its Bay District.

Public hearing was held before Examiner Catey in San Francisco on June 24 and 25, 1969. Copies of the application had been served, notice of filing of the application published, and notice of hearing published and posted, in accordance with this Commission's rules of procedure. The matter was submitted on June 25, 1969.

Testimony on behalf of applicant<sup>1</sup> was presented by its president, its vice president in charge of operations, and its Rate and Valuation Department manager. The Commission staff representation<sup>1</sup> was made through two accountants and two engineers. One customer testified in her own behalf.

<sup>1</sup> Testimony and exhibits relating to overall company operations had been presented by witnesses for applicant and the staff in Applications Nos. 50460 and 50570, the Simi Valley District and San Gabriel Valley District rate proceedings. The testimony and exhibits were incorporated by reference in Application No. 50880.

Service Area and Water System

Applicant owns and operates water systems in 17 districts and an electric system in one district, all in California. Its Bay District includes unincorporated areas of Contra Costa County approximately four miles west of the City of Pittsburg. The service area slopes upward from Suisun Bay, at the mouth of the Sacramento River, into the hills south of the bay. The customers are almost all in the residential or business category.

The water supply for this district is obtained from two outlets of the Contra Costa Canal of Contra Costa County Water District (CCCWD). The canal water is treated and filtered before introduction into applicant's system.

The distribution system includes about 26 miles of distribution mains, ranging in size up to 10 inch. There are about 2,200 metered services and 100 public fire hydrants. A reservoir, a storage tank and seven booster pumps maintain system pressure and provide storage for the system. An emergency booster pump is driven by a gasoline engine.

Service

Field investigations of applicant's operations, service and facilities in its Bay District were made by the Commission staff. A staff engineer testified that no informal complaints have been registered with the Commission by customers in the Bay District since applicant acquired the system in 1966. The engineer's review of applicant's records revealed that, when applicant first took over the operation, numerous complaints were made by customers regarding low water pressure, dirty water, leaky pipes and inaccurate meters. Applicant has upgraded such things as flushing schedules, valve location and operation programs and automation of water treatment

processes. This has resulted in a substantial reduction in number of complaints.

One of the service problems inherent in the operation of the Bay District is the relatively poor quality of the raw water source. Applicant recently has invested a substantial amount of money in a new filter unit, which should improve the quality of the water delivered to customers. If the district continues to enlarge, further expansion of treatment facilities may be necessary. In Exhibit No. 6, the staff recommends that any such expansion be preceded by an engineering study to explore the possibility of (1) obtaining treated water from CCCWD, or (2) obtaining water from East Bay Municipal Utility District with replenishment arrangements through CCCWD. The staff recommends that a copy of such study should be provided to the staff for its review. The staff recommendations appear sound and should be followed by applicant.

Applicant contends that its predecessor had deferred maintenance and had adopted substandard practices with respect to operations, employee relations and deferral of needed capital improvements. Applicant further contends that, upon acquisition of the system, it instituted a program requiring extensive investment in utility plant to bring the operations of the Bay District into accord with good utility practices.

There is conflicting testimony, however, as to the condition of the utility plant. A Commission staff accountant studied the recorded maintenance expenses of applicant and its predecessor for the period from 1962 through 1968 and compared those expenses with applicant's projected estimates for the full year 1969. The accountant concludes that applicant's contention relative to depressed levels of maintenance, presumed to exist during the tenure

of predecessor management, is not warranted and that, on the contrary, applicant has effected an even more conservative approach to the alleged conditions. On the other hand, a Commission staff engineer testified that, during his first field investigation, there was still an excessive amount of deferred maintenance of plant and poor housekeeping conditions at the two treatment facilities, and that applicant has taken steps to eliminate these conditions.

In any event, applicant's personnel have assured the staff that, within a reasonable period of time, corrective measures will be effected to the end that plant in the Bay District will be in similar condition to plant in applicant's other districts. A review of past Commission decisions shows that, almost without exception, applicant's plant in other districts has been in good condition.

The customer who testified did not have any complaints regarding the service rendered by applicant. Her objections to the application relate to the magnitude of the increase requested.

#### Rates

Applicant's present tariffs include a schedule for general metered service in the Bay District, a schedule for private fire protection service, a schedule for public fire hydrant service, a schedule for construction flat rates, and a schedule for service to company employees. The Bay District rates for general metered service and public fire hydrant service became effective in 1952 for a predecessor of applicant.

Applicant proposes to increase its rates for general metered service, to change from a four-block to a three-block form of rates, to increase the private fire protection rate and to simplify the public fire hydrant service schedule. The following Table I presents a comparison of applicant's present general metered service rates, those requested by applicant, and those authorized herein.

TABLE I  
Comparison of Monthly Rates

General Metered Service		Present	Proposed	Authorized#
Service Charge		\$1.75*	\$2.30*	\$2.20
First	500 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.	.30	.382	.37
Next	500 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.	.25	.382	.37
Next	2,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.	.25	.332	.32
Next	2,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.	.20	.332	.32
Next	10,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.	.20	.252	.25
Over	15,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.	.18	.252	.25

\* Service charge for a 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter. A graduated scale of increased charges is provided for larger meters.

# Until the 10% surcharge to federal income tax expires, bills computed under authorized rates are to be increased by 1.11%.

For a typical commercial customer with average monthly consumption of 1,300 cubic feet through a 5/8 by 3/4-inch meter, the average monthly charge would have increased 36 percent from \$5.25 under present rates to \$7.12 under the rates proposed by applicant. The temporary surcharge would have added \$0.07 to this average monthly charge at proposed rates. Under the rates authorized herein, the average monthly charge for the typical commercial customer will increase 31 percent to \$6.86 under the basic rates, with an additional \$0.08 while the temporary surcharge remains in effect.

Applicant's present "company-wide" private fire protection service schedule excludes six specific districts. In rate proceedings involving those districts, the Commission found that a monthly charge of \$2 per inch diameter of service was reasonable, rather than the \$1 per inch set forth in the "company-wide" schedule. Eventually, when all districts have had rate proceedings, the present "company-wide" schedule can be replaced with a revised schedule. In the meantime, as each district is covered by a rate proceeding, a separate increased schedule is being authorized for that district.

Results of Operation

Witnesses for applicant and the Commission staff have analyzed and estimated applicant's operational results. Summarized in Table II, from applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 and 3 and the staff's Exhibit No. 6, are the estimated results of operation for the test year 1969, under present rates and under those proposed by applicant, before considering the additional expenses and offsetting revenue requirement resulting from the 10 percent surcharge to federal income tax. For comparison, this table also shows the corresponding results of operation modified as discussed hereinafter.

TABLE II

Estimated Results of Operation  
(Test Year 1969)

<u>Item</u>	<u>:Applicant:</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>:Modified:</u>
<u>At Present Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$162,000	\$164,000	\$163,000
<u>Deductions</u>			
Supply, Pumping, Treatment Expense	46,100	47,100	46,600
Meter Expense	2,900	1,000	1,000
Other Oper. & Maintenance Expense	23,800	23,800	23,800
Direct Admin. & General Salaries	7,300	5,800	7,300
Regulatory Commission Expense	3,000	1,700	2,800
Other Direct Admin. & General Expense	8,300	8,200	8,200
Other Allocated Admin. & General Exp.	9,100	8,500	9,000
Taxes, Excl. Franchise & Income Taxes	21,300	20,700	20,700
Depreciation	27,600	27,600	27,600
Subtotal	149,400	144,400	147,000
Local Franchise Taxes	2,400	2,400	2,400
Income Taxes	(18,600)	(15,000)	(16,800)
Total	133,200	131,800	132,600
Net Revenue	28,800	32,200	30,400
Rate Base	735,900	732,800	733,300
Rate of Return	3.91%	4.39%	4.15%
<u>At Rates Proposed by Applicant</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$217,800	\$220,100	\$219,000
<u>Deductions</u>			
Excl. Franchise & Income Taxes	149,400	144,400	147,000
Local Franchise Taxes	3,200	3,300	3,300
Income Taxes	9,900	13,600	11,700
Total	162,500	161,300	162,000
Net Revenue	55,300	58,800	57,000
Rate Base	735,900	732,800	733,300
Rate of Return	7.51%	8.02%	7.77%
<u>At Rates Authorized Herein</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ -	\$ -	\$213,000
<u>Deductions</u>			
Excl. Franchise & Income Taxes	-	-	147,000
Local Franchise Taxes	-	-	3,200
Income Taxes	-	-	8,600
Total	-	-	158,800
Net Revenue	-	-	54,200
Rate Base	-	-	733,300
Rate of Return	-	-	7.4%

From Table II it can be determined that, exclusive of any temporary increase due to an income tax surcharge, the increase in operating revenues would be 34 percent under applicant's proposed rates and will be 31 percent under the rates authorized herein.

Operating Revenues

The principal difference between the revenue estimates presented by applicant and the staff is in revenues from industrial customers. Applicant's two industrial customers, an oil company and a steel company, commenced service in 1968 and the steel company was operating at only partial capacity until December of that year. This did not provide much history upon which applicant could base its estimates when preparing Exhibit No. 1. The staff estimates in Exhibit No. 6 of revenue from the steel company were based upon the assumption that the average monthly consumption for the three-month period ended with February 1969, would continue throughout the year.

A witness for applicant testified that his recent review of the probable consumption by the steel company shows that its consumption will be higher than he originally estimated but lower than estimated by the staff. The three-month period for which data were available when the staff estimates were being prepared was apparently a period of abnormally high water use when the steel company first went into full production. By exercising certain economies, such as recirculating cooling water, the steel company reduced its monthly usage so that, for the three-month period ended with May 1969, its water consumption averaged only 431 Ccf as compared with 824 Ccf for the previous three-month period. Applicant's revised estimate of industrial revenue, based upon this later information, falls midway between its original estimate and the staff's estimate. The later consumption data are recognized in the revenue estimates adopted in Table II.



Direct Administrative and General Expenses

Applicant's estimate of direct administrative and general expenses includes allocation of the salary of the manager of applicant's Northern Division, based in part on the premise of weekly trips to the Bay District from his base in applicant's Cordova District. The staff estimate allows for only one day per month of the division manager's time devoted to the Bay District.

The amount of time that a division manager should devote to any particular system for which he is responsible is largely a matter of judgment. A staff witness testified that his estimate was influenced somewhat by the fact that the division manager had been acting in the dual role of manager of three districts and superintendent of one of those districts. A witness for applicant testified that the dual role was a temporary situation and that each of the three districts now has its own superintendent responsible for day-to-day operations, under the general managerial supervision of the division manager.

It does not appear reasonable, nor in the public interest, for the division manager to devote only 12 days a year to the Bay District. One rough guide as to whether or not a given percentage of the manager's time is excessive for a given district is a comparison of that percentage with the percentage that would prevail under the four-factor formula adopted in Commission decisions<sup>2</sup> relating to districts within much larger divisions, where it is not feasible for district managers to keep detailed records as to how much of their time is chargeable to each of many districts under their supervision. On the four-factor basis, the percentage of the

<sup>2</sup> For example, Decision No. 74524, dated August 13, 1968, in Application No. 49938, involving applicant's Pomona Valley District.

division manager's time allocated to the Bay District would be even greater than the percentage assumed in applicant's estimates. Applicant's estimate of direct administrative and general salaries, as set forth in Table II, is adopted.

Regulatory Commission Expense

The estimates for regulatory commission expense by applicant and the staff differ primarily in the assumed frequency of rate proceedings. The staff assumed the equivalent of a full rate proceeding every five years, whereas applicant assumed about a three-year cycle. A staff witness testified that his choice of a five-year spread of rate proceeding costs was influenced by two factors: (1) some previous Commission decisions had adopted a five-year period, and (2) he wished to ease the burden on customers.

It is the obligation of this Commission to adopt expenses for rate-making purpose which reflect, on a continuing basis, the average annual expenses reasonably incurred for regulatory commission expense. Each situation must be judged on the particular circumstances so we can adopt no inflexible policy as to a specific number of years over which to spread the cost of a single proceeding. An important factor, which of course cannot be predicted in advance by either applicant or the staff in preparing their estimates, is the extent to which the record will support an accurate projection of probable future trend in rate of return which will be given recognition in setting rates. Further, it would not be proper, even out of commendable compassion for the customers, to adopt an expense which is lower than the circumstances show to be reasonable. With the relatively frequent reviews of applicant's rates which may be necessary due to the uncertainty as to the probable trend in rate of return for this district, applicant's estimate of average annual

cost for regulatory expenses appears more reasonable and is adopted in Table II, after correction for an apparent duplication of a payroll item.

Allocated Administrative and General Expenses

The treatment of profits or losses from electronic data processing work which applicant performs for outside parties is discussed in detail in the recent decision in Application No. 50570, involving applicant's San Gabriel Valley District. Consistent with that decision, the 1969 staff estimate of allocated administrative and general expenses for the Bay District is increased by \$500 in Table II.

Ad Valorem and Payroll Taxes

In Exhibit No. 3, applicant's estimates of ad valorem taxes for 1969 are based upon the average of the last five years' effective composite tax rates, applied to estimated plant investment. The staff 1969 estimates are based upon the use of the actual 1968-69 composite tax rate, which is slightly lower than the five-year average used by applicant. The effective composite tax rate for this district has been quite erratic over the past five years and shows no reasonably well-defined trend. Under the circumstance, the staff's estimate, based upon the projection of neither an upward nor a downward trend from the actual 1968-69 rate, appears reasonable and is adopted in Table II.

Income Taxes

The various differences between applicant's, the staff's and the adopted estimates of revenues and expenses affect the corresponding estimates of income taxes. The 1969 income taxes adopted in Table II reflect the revenues and expenses adopted in that table.

Rate Base

The rate base estimates of applicant and the staff differ in two components: Working cash and common plant allocated depreciation reserve. The basis adopted in Table II for working cash and common plant allocated depreciation reserve is consistent with the basis adopted in the recent decision relating to applicant's San Gabriel Valley District and need not be discussed again herein.

Surcharge to Federal Income Tax

A 10 percent surcharge to federal income taxes was imposed by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The surcharge was retroactive for the full year 1968 and was to have expired June 30, 1969, but has been reinstated until December 31, 1969. Applicant's Exhibit No. 1 indicates that a 1.04 percent surcharge on bills computed under the metered service rates requested in the application would have been required to offset the effect of the income tax surcharge and produce the same net revenues indicated hereinbefore in Table II. Revised calculations show that the surcharge, at the rates authorized herein, should be 1.11 percent. This surcharge on applicant's bills will offset only the future effect of the tax surcharge and is not designed to recoup any of the increased taxes on net revenue produced prior to the effective date of the increased water rates authorized in this proceeding.

Rate of Return

In the recent rate proceeding involving applicant's San Gabriel Valley District, the Commission found that an average rate of return of 7.0 percent over the next four years was reasonable for applicant's operations. The basis for the 7.0 percent allowable return is discussed in considerable detail in the decision in that proceeding and need not be repeated herein. In the current proceeding, applicant's president testified to higher interest rates for

interim bank borrowings than originally anticipated. In Exhibit No. 11, the staff shows that, since the introduction of a similar exhibit in the San Gabriel Valley District proceeding, increases in interest rates which applicant must pay on borrowed funds have increased the required overall return on total capitalization by about 0.1 percent to provide the same returns on common equity shown in the earlier exhibit. For this proceeding we will adopt as reasonable a 7.1 percent return on rate base.

Decision No. 71569, dated November 22, 1966, in Application No. 48772, states that a witness for applicant testified that a rate increase would not be generated by the transfer of the water system from the predecessor. This cannot be construed, however, as a perpetual moratorium on increases in the water rates that were established in 1952, where increases are justified by increases in operating expenses and plant investment which would have occurred under proper operation by the predecessor.

#### Trend in Rate of Return

Applicant's estimates for the test years 1968 and 1969 indicate an annual decline of 0.22 percent in rate of return at proposed rates. The staff's estimates show an annual decline of 0.20 percent at proposed rates, but the staff recommended that no consideration be given in this proceeding to the trend in rate of return. This is a little unusual, inasmuch as many of the adjustments made by the staff in its 1968 estimates were purportedly to eliminate distortions between the two years.

The comparative rates of return for two successive test years, or for a series of recorded years, are indicative of the future trend in rate of return only if the rates of change of major individual components of revenues, expenses and rate base in the

test years, or recorded years, are reasonably indicative of the future trend of those items. Distortions caused by abnormal, non-recurring or sporadically recurring changes in revenues, expenses, or rate base items must be avoided to provide a valid basis for projection of the anticipated future trend in rate of return.

As an indication of the causes for the trend in rate of return derived from the test years 1968 and 1969, the staff prepared Table II-B in Exhibit No. 6 showing a comparison of the changes in applicant's and the staff's items of revenues, expenses and rate base between the two successive years. Although the trends indicated by applicant and the staff are almost the same and can be expected to continue for the immediate future, it would be quite speculative to assume that the same trend would continue for four or five years into the future. The uncertainty is due to the lack of historical continuity in ownership, maintenance, operation and record keeping. For example, when applicant's meter testing program brings the system's meters into conformity with General Order No. 103, the increased revenues resulting from the greater accuracy of meters could offset some of the decline in rate of return.

In most of the recent decisions in rate proceedings involving other districts of applicant, the apparent future trend in rate of return has been offset by the authorization of a level of rates to remain in effect for four or five years and designed to produce, on the average over that period, the rate of return found reasonable. That same approach is adopted for this proceeding, except that, because of the uncertainty as to the long-term reliability of the indicated downward trend of 0.2 percent per year in rate of return, it is appropriate to project only about 2½ years into the future for the basic rates established herein.

The rate increase authorized herein will not be in effect for about the first two-thirds of the year 1969. With the indicated future trend in rate of return, the 7.4 percent return for the test year 1969 under the rates authorized herein should produce an average rate of return of 7.1 percent for a 2-1/2-year period after the rates become effective, approximately 5-1/4 percent for the year 1969 (with about one-third of the year at the new rates), 7.2 percent for the year 1970, 7.0 percent for 1971, and 6.8 percent for 1972.

#### Accounting Changes

In Exhibit No. 6 and in testimony of a staff accountant, the staff recommends that applicant make certain changes in its accounting procedures. The staff suggests that applicant distribute the salary of the Northern Division Manager of the three districts within the division on the four-factor method generally utilized by applicant in other divisions, rather than on the basis of the estimated relative time devoted to each district.

The staff contends that Decision No. 74524, dated August 13, 1968, in Application No. 49938, involving applicant's Pomona Valley District, directed applicant to use a four-factor basis of allocation. That is incorrect. The cited decision did not direct applicant to utilize any specific method. The decision did adopt a four-factor method of allocation of the salary of the manager of a large seven-district division, for rate-making purposes, because the record in that proceeding was not persuasive that it was possible to determine with any reasonable degree of accuracy the minute breakdown of the responsibilities of the manager of that large division to be reflected in the recorded expenses. As hereinbefore discussed, the one day per week devoted by the division

manager to the Bay District appears reasonable, even though the four-factor method would allocate a greater proportion of the managerial salary to Bay District.

Findings and Conclusions

The Commission finds that:

1. Applicant is in need of additional revenues.
2. The adopted estimates, previously discussed herein, of operating revenues, operating expenses and rate base for the test year 1969, and an annual decline of 0.2 percent in rate of return, reasonably indicate the probable range of results of applicant's operations for the near future.
3. An average rate of return of 7.1 percent on applicant's rate base for the next 2-1/2 years is reasonable.
4. The increases in rates and charges authorized herein are justified; the rates and charges authorized herein are reasonable; and the present rates and charges, insofar as they differ from those prescribed herein, are for the future unjust and unreasonable.

The Commission concludes that the application should be granted in part.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that after the effective date of this order, applicant Southern California Water Company is authorized to file for its Bay District the revised rate schedules attached to this order as Appendix A. Such filing shall comply with General Order No. 96-A. The effective date of the revised schedules shall be



four days after the date of filing. The revised schedules shall apply only to service rendered on and after the effective date thereof.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 9th day of AUGUST, 1969.

William Lyons, Jr.  
President

August

Jack P. M. ...

...

...  
Commissioners

APPENDIX A  
Page 1 of 3

Schedule No. BY-1

Bay Tariff Area

METERED SERVICE

(T)

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all metered water service.

TERRITORY

In the unincorporated area west of the City of Pittsburg, in Contra Costa County.

RATES

Quantity Rates:	<u>Per Meter</u> <u>Per Month</u>	
First 1,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ....	\$ 0.37	(I)
Next 4,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ....	0.32	1
Over 5,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft. ....	0.25	(I)
 Service Charge:		
For 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter .....	\$ 2.20	(I)
For 3/4-inch meter .....	2.50	
For 1-inch meter .....	3.20	
For 1 1/2-inch meter .....	5.00	
For 2-inch meter .....	8.00	
For 3-inch meter .....	15.50	
For 4-inch meter .....	23.50	
For 6-inch meter .....	45.00	
For 8-inch meter .....	65.00	(I)

The Service Charge is a readiness-to-serve charge applicable to all metered service and to which is to be added the monthly charge computed at the Quantity Rate. (T)  
(T)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

Until the 10 percent surcharge to federal income taxes is removed, bills computed under the above tariff will be increased by 1.11 percent.

Schedule No. BY-4 (T)

Bay Tariff Area (T)

PRIVATE FIRE PROTECTION SERVICE

APPLICABILITY

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

TERRITORY

In the unincorporated area west of the City of Pittsburg, in Contra Costa County. (T)

RATE

Per Month

For each inch of diameter of service connection ..... \$2.00 (I)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The fire protection service connection shall be installed by the utility and the cost paid by the applicant. Such payment shall not be subject to refund.
2. The minimum diameter for fire protection service shall be four inches, and the maximum diameter shall be not more than the diameter of the main to which the service is connected.
3. If a distribution main of adequate size to serve a private fire protection system in addition to all other normal service does not exist in the street or alley adjacent to the premises to be served, then a service main from the nearest existing main of adequate capacity shall be installed by the utility and the cost paid by the applicant. Such payment shall not be subject to refund.
4. Service hereunder is for private fire protection systems to which no connections for other than fire protection purposes are allowed and which are regularly inspected by the underwriters having jurisdiction, are installed according to specifications of the utility, and are maintained to the satisfaction of the utility. The utility may install the standard detector type meter approved by the Board of Fire Underwriters for protection against theft, leakage or waste of water and the cost paid by the applicant. Such payment shall not be subject to refund.
5. The utility undertakes to supply only such water at such pressure as may be available at any time through the normal operation of its system. (T)

APPENDIX A  
Page 3 of 3

Schedule No. BY-5

Bay Tariff Area

PUBLIC FIRE HYDRANT SERVICE

(T)

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all fire hydrant service furnished to municipalities, organized fire districts and other political subdivisions of the State. (T)

TERRITORY

In the unincorporated area west of the City of Pittsburg, in Contra Costa County.

RATES

	<u>Per Hydrant</u> <u>Per Month</u>	
For 4-inch hydrant .....	\$2.50	(T)
For 6-inch hydrant .....	3.00	(T)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Water delivered for purposes other than fire protection shall be charged for at the quantity rates in Schedule No. BY-1, Metered Service. (N)
2. The cost of relocation of any hydrant shall be paid by the party requesting relocation.
3. Hydrants shall be connected to the utility's system upon receipt of written request from a public authority. The written request shall designate the specific location of each hydrant and, where appropriate, the ownership, type and size.
4. The utility undertakes to supply only such water at such pressure as may be available at any time through the normal operation of its system. (N)