

ek.

Decision No. 80704

ORIGINAL

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 for water service
in its Big Bear District.

Application No. 53045
(Filed December 6, 1971;
Amended July 21, 1972)

O'Melveny & Myers, by Donn B. Miller, Attorney
at Law, for applicant.
Cyril M. Saroyan, Attorney at Law, and John E.
Brown, for the Commission staff.

INTERIM OPINION

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

Public hearing was held before Examiner Catey at Big Bear Lake on August 1, 2 and 3, 1972. Copies of the application had been served, notices of filing the application and of the hearing had been published and posted, and hearing notices had been mailed to customers, in accordance with this Commission's Rules of Procedure. The matter was not submitted on August 3, because an amendment had been filed by applicant on July 21, which required further study by the Commission staff. Staff counsel recommended, however, that a decision on basic rates covered by the original application be made in the form of an interim decision and that the additional plant improvements and resultant incremental rate increases proposed in the amendment be covered later by a final decision. He further suggested that if the staff's review of the data relating to the amendment indicated that further hearing was appropriate, such further hearing be held in Los Angeles. No objections to staff counsel's recommendations were voiced by anyone at the hearing.

Applicant presented testimony of its president, its vice-president in charge of revenue requirements, and its assistant secretary-assistant manager of the rate evaluation department. The Commission staff presentation was made through an accountant and three engineers. In addition, certain evidence of a general nature covering overall company operations, which had been presented by witnesses for both applicant and staff in Application No. 53069, the recent Bay District proceeding, was incorporated by reference. Seventeen customers testified, primarily concerning service problems.

Service Area and Water System

Applicant owns and operates water systems in the Counties of Contra Costa, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Bernardino and Ventura, and an electric system in San Bernardino County. One of the San Bernardino County systems is known as the Big Bear District, which serves about ten square miles of territory in three separate areas adjacent to and near Big Bear Lake. The areas are designated Big Bear Lake Area, Sugarloaf Area and Rimforest Area.

There is relatively little industrial development in the Big Bear District and the commercial enterprises are largely those associated with a resort area. The approximate distribution of other than fire protection customers is 4,500 in the Big Bear Lake Area, 1,200 in the Sugarloaf Area, and 200 in the Rimforest Area.

Several sources of water supply are utilized for the Big Bear District. Eight vertical wells, 14 slant wells and three springs supply the Big Bear Lake Area, five vertical wells supply the Sugarloaf Area, and three vertical wells and a supplemental connection to mains of Crestline-Lake Arrowhead Water Agency supply the Rimforest Area. No treatment is required of the water from any of those sources.

The distribution systems consist of some 130 miles of distribution mains, ranging in size up to 12-inch but including considerable amounts of small mains. Storage facilities totalling over two million gallons capacity are located at strategic points in the three areas to maintain system pressures and provide storage for use during peak periods of demand. There are about 4,900 metered services and 1,000 flat-rate services supplying primarily residential and business customers, and 320 flat-rate fire protection services supplying primarily public fire hydrants.

Service

Staff Exhibit No. 11 states that there have been only ten informal complaints received by the Commission from Big Bear District customers since the beginning of 1969, and only one of those related to service problems. The staff's review of customer complaints received at applicant's Big Bear District office disclosed 191 complaints during each of the years 1970 and 1971. About 26 percent of these complaints originated in the Sugarloaf Area. About 20 percent of the district's customers are in the Sugarloaf Area.

The staff also reviewed customers' letters to the Commission relating to this rate proceeding. Many of those letters referred to service problems in the Sugarloaf Area during the last week in December, 1971, primarily consisting of low pressure and frozen pipelines. Several of the customers who testified at the hearing referred to those same problems. The staff concluded that no significant dissatisfaction with service is evident in the Big Bear Lake Area and Rimforest Area but recommended that applicant submit a plan for improvements in the Sugarloaf Area.

Other service complaints were cited by customers who testified at the hearing. Those complaints relate to such matters as low pressure, inadequate fire protection, dirty water after applicant's repair work is completed, delay and poor workmanship in replacing streets after repair work is completed, numerous leaks in mains, oil in the water, rusty water, small mains and inconvenience or damage to customers premises from applicant's wintertime bleeding of mains.

On the second day of hearing, applicant's president presented a preliminary report on applicant's investigations into the service problems brought up by the various customers. Recording pressure gauges were to be installed on the premises of customers who had complained of low pressure, a main flushing program was to be instituted where customers had received rusty water, water samples were to be analyzed where a customer complained of oil in the water, applicant will work with the local fire district to arrange for fire hydrants that can be installed in some areas to be selected by the fire district, wintertime bleeding of mains for prevention of freezing will be moved to locations where there is natural drainage, applicant will arrange for better compaction of trench fill wherever possible, and an air relief valve will be installed. The witness also pointed out that many of the complaints related to conditions which had existed prior to completion of the many improvements already effected. Late-filed Exhibit No. 9 is a consolidation of the final reports on the various customer complaints after all of the investigations were completed. A review of that exhibit indicates that applicant has made careful analyses of the problems and taken prompt action to correct them wherever further steps were needed.

Many of the distribution mains in Big Bear District were installed at a time when the customer density was considerably lower than now. Further, some of the water systems acquired by applicant from other entities had not been adequate even for the more sparse, early developments. Also, the corrosiveness of the soil in this area has proven over the years to be higher than expected, which has shortened the useful life of some mains.

Applicant has installed larger mains when replacing the original pipes that had reached the end of their useful lives. Applicant also has installed supplementary mains where the original pipes were still usable but where increased water usage or customer density required additional capacity. Since 1967, applicant has expended over \$700,000 in system improvements in the Big Bear District.

Applicant intends at least to continue its present program of system improvements. It contends that any acceleration of the program should not be confined to the Sugarloaf Area, as suggested by the staff's recommendation, but should be applied selectively wherever significant benefits can be achieved in any of the areas within the district. The amendment to the application proposes an accelerated five-year program of system improvements and corresponding annual incremental rate increases. The amendment will be considered in a final decision, after further study by the staff.

Rates

Applicant's present tariffs for the Big Bear District include: rates for general metered service in the Big Bear Lake Area, Rimforest Area and Sugarloaf Area; rates for flat rate service in the Sugarloaf Area and the Moonridge Zone of the Big Bear Lake Area; and public and private fire protection service. Company-wide schedules for construction and other temporary flat rate service and for service to employees also apply.

The present basic rate levels for the Big Bear Lake Area were established in 1952 and modified in 1967 to eliminate the distinction between seasonal customers and year-round customers. Practically all of applicant's investment in facilities to serve the public is required whether customers use water all year or only on holidays, weekends and vacations. Also, many of the operating expenses, such as taxes, depreciation and maintenance, are incurred regardless of the percentage of time customers utilize their homes in the area.

In the Sugarloaf Area, a predecessor of applicant had been authorized in 1962 to increase its rates upon completion of certain improvements. Applicant acquired the system before the improvements were made, completed the required improvements, and requested that only half of the increase authorized for the predecessor be made effective. That request was granted by the Commission.

In the Rimforest Area, the present rates were established in 1959 for a predecessor utility. They were continued without change upon applicant's acquisition of that system, among others, in 1962.

Applicant proposes to increase its rates for general metered service and for flat-rate residential service in the Moonridge Zone of the Big Bear Lake Area, and to withdraw the schedule for residential flat-rate service in the Sugarloaf Area under which no customers have been served since 1968. No changes are proposed in the other schedules. The following Table I presents a comparison of the present rates which applicant proposes to change, the revised rates requested by applicant and those authorized herein.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF RATES

Item	Per Service Connection Per Month ^(a)							
	Present			Proposed		Authorized		
	Big Bear Lake	Rimforest	Sugarloaf	Big Bear Lake	Rimforest & Sugarloaf	Big Bear Lake	Rimforest	Sugarloaf
<u>Metered Service</u>								
Minimum Charge ^(b)	\$3.00	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$4.00	\$7.80	\$3.75	\$7.80	\$7.30
Quantity Rates ^(c)								
First 3 Ccf, per Ccf	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Next 1 Ccf	.00	.60	.00	.55	.55	.53	.55	.00
Next 2 Ccf, per Ccf	.50	.60	.00	.55	.55	.53	.55	.00
Next 3 Ccf, per Ccf	.50	.60	.00	.55	.55	.53	.55	.50
Next 1 Ccf	.50	.60	.63	.55	.55	.53	.55	.50
Next 8 Ccf, per Ccf	.35	.60	.63	.45	.45	.37	.45	.37
Next 15 Ccf, per Ccf	.35	.60	.45	.45	.45	.37	.45	.37
Next 33 Ccf, per Ccf	.35	.60	.30	.45	.45	.37	.45	.37
Next 84 Ccf, per Ccf	.35	.60	.25	.45	.45	.37	.45	.37
Over 150 Ccf, per Ccf	.20	.60	.25	.25	.25	.23	.45	.23
Flat Rate Service	4.00 ^(d)	-	6.00	5.25 ^(d)	-	5.00 ^(d)	-	-

Notes: (a) Annual minimum charges and annual flat-rate charges shown as equivalent monthly charges for comparative purposes.

(b) Minimum charge for a 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter. A graduated scale of increased minimum charges is provided for larger meters.

(c) Ccf = 100 cubic feet.

(d) Moonridge Zone only.

Applicant proposes several changes which would simplify its tariffs. One such proposed change is a modification of the special conditions of the tariffs which now provide basically for annual rates covering calendar years. The proposed change would eliminate proration of opening bills for new customers by establishing the date of service, rather than January 1, as the anniversary date for that customer. Another proposed change would extend to all customers the option, presently available, pursuant to the tariffs, only to permanent residents, permitting them to pay annual minimum and flat-rate charges subsequent to the initial year in installments, rather than lump sums. The staff witness responsible for review of the proposed changes in special conditions of the tariffs testified that the staff is in favor of those changes.

Another simplification proposed by applicant is the consolidation of the schedules for metered service rates in the Rimforest and Sugarloaf Areas. A staff witness pointed out that the quantity of water included in the present Sugarloaf Area schedule is 900 cubic feet per month and that reduction to the 300 cubic feet allowed in the present Rimforest Area schedule would be a rather severe change to effect at this time. He agreed that 900 cubic feet was excessive but suggested that the amount be reduced at this time to 600 cubic feet in the Sugarloaf Area. That appears to be a reasonable interim step in the eventual establishment of a service-charge form of rates for the entire Big Bear District, which is a long-term objective of applicant. The staff recommendation is adopted and will avoid the extremely high percentage increases for some users in the Sugarloaf Area which would result from applicant's proposed consolidation.

There are other factors which militate against consolidation of the Rimforest and Sugarloaf Area schedules at this time. One factor, which is not necessarily controlling, is the fact that the Rimforest Area is about 30 miles away from the rest of the Big Bear District. More important is the showing by both applicant and the staff that uniform rates in the two areas would produce almost twice the rate of return on the Sugarloaf Area rate base as it would on the Rimforest Area rate base. With that much disparity, consolidation is not appropriate.

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. 6 and 7 and from staff Exhibit No. 11, are the estimated results of operation for the test year 1972, under present water rates and under those proposed by applicant. For comparison, this table also shows the results of operations adopted in this decision under the water rates authorized herein. Total district operations are shown on the first page of Table II. These results are segregated on subsequent pages among the three tariff areas.

TABLE II

ESTIMATED RESULTS OF OPERATION
BIG BEAR DISTRICT
TEST YEAR 1972

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Adopted</u>
<u>At Present Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 380,760	\$ 384,500	\$ —
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Operation & Maintenance	161,500	163,620	
Admin., Gen'l & Miscell.	19,400	21,370	
Ad Valorem & Payroll Taxes	54,400	50,840	
Depreciation	57,800	58,700	
Allocated Common Exp.	21,700	21,000	
Subtotal Excl. Taxes Based			
Upon Revenue & Income	314,800	315,530	
Local Franchise Taxes	4,700	4,720	
Income Taxes	(26,040)	(22,760)	
Total Operating Expenses	293,460	297,490	
Net Revenue	87,300	87,010	
Rate Base	1,769,613	1,745,900	
Rate of Return	4.93%	4.98%	
<u>At Applicant's Proposed Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 499,420	\$ 504,700	
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Excl. Taxes Based Upon Rev. & Inc.	314,800	315,530	
Local Franchise Taxes	6,100	6,200	
Income Taxes	34,560	38,910	
Total Operating Expenses	355,460	360,640	
Net Revenue	143,960	144,060	
Rate Base	1,769,613	1,745,900	
Rate of Return	8.14%	8.25%	
<u>At Rates Authorized Herein</u>			
Operating Revenues	—	—	469,200
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Excl. Taxes Based Upon Rev. & Inc.	—	—	315,530
Local Franchise Taxes	—	—	5,770
Income Taxes	—	—	20,700
Total Operating Expenses	—	—	342,000
Net Revenue	—	—	127,200
Rate Base	—	—	1,745,900
Rate of Return	—	—	7.29%

Staff
Estimates
Adopted

(Red Figure)

TABLE II
(Continued)ESTIMATED RESULTS OF OPERATION
BIG BEAR LAKE AREA
TEST YEAR 1972

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Adopted</u>
<u>At Present Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 275,550	\$ 273,200	\$ —
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Operation & Maintenance	118,750	118,990	
Admin., Gen'l & Miscell.	14,390	15,850	
Ad Valorem & Payroll Taxes	40,910	37,670	
Depreciation	42,040	42,700	
Allocated Common Exp.	16,100	15,570	
Subtotal Excl. Taxes Based Upon Revenue & Income	232,190	230,780	
Local Franchise Taxes	3,400	3,350	
Income Taxes	(21,660)	(20,820)	
Total Operating Expenses	213,930	213,310	
Net Revenue	61,620	59,890	
Rate Base	1,191,831	1,171,400	
Rate of Return	5.17%	5.11%	
<u>At Applicant's Proposed Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 361,860	\$ 359,000	
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Excl. Taxes Based Upon Rev. & Inc.	232,190	230,780	
Local Franchise Taxes	4,420	4,410	
Income Taxes	22,430	23,200	
Total Operating Expenses	259,040	258,390	
Net Revenue	102,820	100,610	
Rate Base	1,191,831	1,171,400	
Rate of Return	8.63%	8.59%	
<u>At Rates Authorized Herein</u>			
Operating Revenues	—	—	332,100
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Excl. Taxes Based Upon Rev. & Inc.	—	—	230,780
Local Franchise Taxes	—	—	4,080
Income Taxes	—	—	9,400
Total Operating Expenses	—	—	244,260
Net Revenue	—	—	87,840
Rate Base	—	—	1,171,400
Rate of Return	—	—	7.50%

Staff
Estimates
Adopted

(Red Figure)

TABLE II
(Continued)ESTIMATED RESULTS OF OPERATION
RIMFOREST AREA
TEST YEAR 1972

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Adopted</u>
<u>At Present Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 17,980	\$ 18,000	
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Operation & Maintenance	8,970	9,310	
Admin., Gen'l & Miscell.	970	1,070	
Ad Valorem & Payroll Taxes	2,580	2,550	
Depreciation	2,680	2,700	
Allocated Common Exp.	1,080	1,050	
Subtotal Excl. Taxes Based Upon Revenue & Income	16,280	16,680	
Local Franchise Taxes	220	220	
Income Taxes	(1,830)	(2,050)	
Total Operating Expenses	14,670	14,850	
Net Revenue	3,310	3,150	
Rate Base	113,167	114,500	
Rate of Return	2.92%	2.75%	
<u>At Applicant's Proposed Rates</u>			
<u>Authorized Herein</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 21,510	\$ 21,600	
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Excl. Taxes Based Upon Rev. & Inc.	16,280	16,680	
Local Franchise Taxes	260	270	
Income Taxes	(30)	(210)	
Total Operating Expenses	16,510	16,740	
Net Revenue	5,000	4,860	
Rate Base	113,167	114,500	
Rate of Return	4.42%	4.24%	

Staff
Estimates
Adopted

(Red Figure)

TABLE II
(Continued)ESTIMATED RESULTS OF OPERATION
SUGARLOAF AREA
TEST YEAR 1972

<u>Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Adopted</u>
<u>At Present Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 87,230	\$ 93,300	
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Operation & Maintenance	33,780	35,320	
Admin., Gen'l & Miscell.	4,040	4,450	
Ad Valorem & Payroll Taxes	10,910	10,620	
Depreciation	13,080	13,300	
Allocated Common Exp.	4,520	4,380	
Subtotal Excl. Taxes Based			
Upon Revenue & Income	66,330	68,070	
Local Franchise Taxes	1,080	1,150	
Income Taxes	(2,550)	110	
Total Operating Expenses	64,860	69,330	Staff Estimates Adopted
Net Revenue	22,370	23,970	
Rate Base	464,615	460,000	
Rate of Return	4.81%	5.21%	
<u>At Applicant's Proposed Rates</u>			
Operating Revenues	\$ 116,050	\$ 124,100	
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Excl. Taxes Based Upon Rev. & Inc.	66,330	68,070	
Local Franchise Taxes	1,420	1,520	
Income Taxes	12,160	15,920	
Total Operating Expenses	79,910	85,510	
Net Revenue	36,140	38,590	
Rate Base	464,615	460,000	
Rate of Return	7.78%	8.39%	
<u>At Rates Authorized Herein</u>			
Operating Revenues	-	-	\$ 115,500
<u>Operating Expenses</u>			
Excl. Taxes Based Upon Rev. & Inc.	-	-	68,070
Local Franchise Taxes	-	-	1,420
Income Taxes	-	-	11,510
Total Operating Expenses	-	-	81,000
Net Revenue	-	-	34,500
Rate Base	-	-	460,000
Rate of Return	-	-	7.50%

(Red Figure)

From Table II it can be determined that applicant's requested rates would result in an increase of about 31 percent for the combined areas in the Big Bear District, 31 percent for the Big Bear Lake Area alone, 20 percent for the Rimforest Area alone, and 33 percent for the Sugarloaf Area alone, whereas the rates authorized herein will produce corresponding increases, respectively, of 22, 22, 20 and 24 percent. The percentage increase for individual bills will vary somewhat, depending upon type of service and level of use.

Operating Revenues, Expenses and Rate Base

The differences between the Big Bear District revenue estimates presented by applicant and the staff result from the fact that the staff had more recent information on actual numbers of customers in the various areas. The staff revenue estimates and corresponding local franchise tax estimates are adopted in Table II.

Similarly, the principal difference between the Big Bear District direct expense estimates, exclusive of taxes, and the rate base estimates, presented by applicant and the staff stem from the availability of more recent information at the time the staff estimates were being prepared. The staff estimates of those expenses and rate bases are adopted in Table II.

The reasons for adopting the staff estimates of indirect or allocated expenses relating to applicant's overall operations were discussed in Decision No. 80586, dated October 11, 1972, in Application No. 53069, the recent decision involving applicant's Bay District. The basic data is the same in both proceedings. The staff estimate of common expenses allocated to Big Bear District is adopted in Table II.

In preparing the 1972 calendar year ad valorem tax estimates presented in Exhibit No. 11, the staff took exception to both the basic data used by applicant in Exhibit No. 6 and the manner in which those data were used in projecting 1972-73 fiscal year tax estimates. Applicant's tax witness conceded that corrections to the Exhibit No. 6 estimates of ad valorem taxes were appropriate and incorporated them in Exhibit No. 7.

There is still an issue as to the projection of 1972-73 ad valorem taxes, half of which fiscal year taxes are an operating expense in the calendar year 1972. Based upon a reasonably well-defined historical upward trend in the composite tax rate applicable to plant in this district, applicant's estimate assumed a continuation of that trend into 1972-73. The staff witness, on the other hand, assumed that the 1972-73 rate would be the same as the actual rate for 1971-72. We have stated in numerous previous decisions over a period of several years that it is appropriate to project a reasonably well-defined trend in ad valorem tax rates when estimating future expenses. However, in view of the general efforts being undertaken on a national level to reduce inflationary pressures and in particular, because of the required finding that the rates authorized herein "do not reflect future inflationary expectations", the use by the staff of the latest known ad valorem tax rates is appropriate in this proceeding. The staff ad valorem tax estimates are adopted in Table II.

The various differences between applicant's and the staff's estimates of operating expenses result in differences in estimates of income taxes. The income taxes adopted in Table II are consistent with the revenues and expenses adopted in that table.

Rate of Return

The basis for a 7.50 percent allowable return on applicant's rate base and corresponding 11.8 percent return on common equity is discussed in Decision No. 80586, supra. The rates requested by applicant for the Rimforest Area will not produce that high a return but we do not consider it appropriate to authorize at this time a higher level of rates than requested. If we were to grant rates in the Big Bear Lake and Sugarloaf systems which would, in combination with the Rimforest rates, produce a composite 7.50 rate of return for the Big Bear District, the Big Bear Lake Area customers and Sugarloaf Area customers would be subsidizing the Rimforest customers. We therefore have authorized rates for the Big Bear Lake Area and Sugarloaf Area which produce the allowable 7.50 percent return in each. This results in a composite 7.29 percent rate of return for the Big Bear District.

Findings and Conclusion

The Commission finds that:

1.a. Applicant is in need of additional revenues, but the rates proposed by applicant for the Big Bear Lake Area and Sugarloaf Area are excessive.

b. The adopted estimates, previously discussed herein, of operating revenues, operating expenses and rate base for the test year 1972 reasonably indicate the results of applicant's operations for the near future.

c. A rate of return of not greater than 7.5 percent on applicant's rate base for 1972, and the corresponding 11.8 percent return on common equity are reasonable.

d. 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.

2. In Compliance with Rule 23.1 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure:

- a. The increased rates are expected to provide an increase of \$84,700 in applicant's annual revenues.
- b. The rate of return on the herein adopted rate base is expected to be 7.29 percent, as compared with 4.98 percent at present rates.
- c. The increases are cost-justified and do not reflect future inflationary expectations; the increases are reduced to reflect productivity gains; the increases are the minimum rates which are necessary to assure continued and adequate service; and there is no increase in the rate of return allowed previously in Decision No. 80586, dated October 11, 1972, in Application No. 53069, and is the minimum rate of return needed to attract capital at reasonable cost and which will not impair applicant's credit.

The Commission concludes that the application should be granted to the extent set forth in the order which follows.

INTERIM ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that after the effective date of this order, applicant Southern California Water Company is authorized to file for its Big Bear District the revised rate schedules attached to the order as Appendix A, and concurrently to withdraw and cancel Schedule No. BES-2AR. 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 8th day of NOVEMBER, 1972.

Vermon L. Sturgeon
President
William J. Lyons

[Signature]
Commissioners

Commissioner J. P. Vukasin, Jr., being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner Thomas Moran, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

APPENDIX A
Page 1 of 7

Schedule No. BBL-1

BIG BEAR DISTRICTBig Bear Lake Tariff Area

(T)

GENERAL METERED SERVICE

(T)

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all metered water service.

TERRITORY

Big Bear Lake and Moonridge, and vicinity, San Bernardino County. (T)

RATES

		Per Meter Per Month	
Quantity Rates:			
First	300 cu.ft. or less	\$ 3.75	(I)
Next	700 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.53	
Next	14,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.37	
Over	15,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.23	
Minimum Charge:			
For	5/8 x 3/4-inch meter	\$ 3.75	(I)
For	3/4-inch meter	5.00	
For	1-inch meter	7.50	
For	1 1/2-inch meter	13.50	
For	2-inch meter	18.50	
For	3-inch meter	32.00	
For	4-inch meter	46.00	
For	6-inch meter	72.00	
For	8-inch meter	96.00	

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

(Continued)

APPENDIX A
Page 2 of 7

Schedule No. BBL-1

BIG BEAR DISTRICT

Big Bear Lake Tariff Area

(T)

GENERAL METERED SERVICE

(T)

(Continued)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

(T)

1. Applicant for service shall pay in advance an amount equal to the minimum charge for service for a period of twelve months. This payment will entitle the customer to the quantity of water each month for twelve months which the monthly minimum charge will purchase at the quantity rates.

2. After twelve months of service the customer will be billed at the monthly rate above with the minimum charge billed in advance.

(T)

APPENDIX A
Page 3 of 7

Schedule No. BBR-1

BIG BEAR DISTRICT

Rimforest Tariff Area

GENERAL METERED SERVICE

(T)

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all metered water service.

TERRITORY

Rimforest, and vicinity, San Bernardino County.

(T)

RATES

Quantity Rates:

	Per Meter Per Month	
First 300 cu.ft. or less	\$ 7.80	(I)
Next 700 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.55	
Next 14,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.45	
Over 15,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.25	

Minimum Charge:

For 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter	\$ 7.80	
For 3/4-inch meter	9.50	
For 1-inch meter	12.00	
For 1 1/2-inch meter	15.00	
For 2-inch meter	20.00	(I)
For 3-inch meter	35.00	(N)
For 4-inch meter	50.00	
For 6-inch meter	75.00	
For 8-inch meter	100.00	(N)

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

(Continued)

APPENDIX A
Page 4 of 7

Schedule No. BBR-1

BIG BEAR DISTRICT

Rimforest Tariff Area

GENERAL METERED SERVICE

(Continued)

(T)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

(T)

1. Applicant for service shall pay in advance an amount equal to the minimum charge for service for a period of twelve months. This payment will entitle the customer to the quantity of water each month for twelve months which the monthly minimum charge will purchase at the quantity rates.

2. After twelve months of service the customer will be billed at the monthly rate above with the minimum charge billed in advance.

(T)

APPENDIX A
Page 5 of 7

Schedule No. BBS-1

BIG BEAR DISTRICT
Sugarloaf Tariff AreaGENERAL METERED SERVICE

(T)

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all metered water service.

TERRITORY

Sugarloaf, and vicinity, San Bernardino County.

(T)

RATES

Quantity Rates:

	Per Meter Per Month	
First 600 cu.ft. or less	\$ 7.30	(I)
Next 400 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.50	
Next 14,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.37	
Over 15,000 cu.ft., per 100 cu.ft.23	

Minimum Charge:

For 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter	\$ 7.30	
For 3/4-inch meter	9.00	
For 1-inch meter	11.00	
For 1 1/2-inch meter	14.00	
For 2-inch meter	18.50	(I)
For 3-inch meter	35.00	(N)
For 4-inch meter	50.00	
For 6-inch meter	75.00	
For 8-inch meter	100.00	(N)

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

(Continued)

APPENDIX A
Page 6 of 7

Schedule No. BBS-1

BIG BEAR DISTRICT

Sugarloaf Tariff Area

GENERAL METERED SERVICE

(T)

(Continued)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

(T)

1. Applicant for service shall pay in advance an amount equal to the minimum charge for service for a period of twelve months. This payment will entitle the customer to the quantity of water each month for twelve months which the monthly minimum charge will purchase at the quantity rates.

2. After twelve months of service the customer will be billed at the monthly rate above with the minimum charge billed in advance.

(T)

APPENDIX A
Page 7 of 7

Schedule No. BBM-2

BIG BEAR DISTRICT
Moonridge Tariff Area

FLAT RATE SERVICE

(T)

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all flat rate water service.

(T)

TERRITORY

Moonridge and vicinity, San Bernardino County.

RATES

Per service connection per month \$5.00

(I)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

(T)

1. Applicant for service shall pay in advance an amount equal to the flat rate charge for service for a period of twelve months.

2. After twelve months of service the customer will be billed in advance at the monthly rate above.

3. For service covered by the above classification, if the utility so elects, a meter shall be installed and service provided under Schedule No. BBL-1, General Metered Service.

(T)