SW/NB .

Decision No. 81796



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the operations, service, facilities, equipment contracts and practices of COAST WATER COMPANY, a California corporation

Case No. 9489 (Filed December 19, 1972)

OPINION AND ORDER

By letter dated May 17, 1973, respondent's attorney requested a 90-day stay of Decision No. 81182 dated March 20, 1973 because of negotiations between respondent and Southern California Water Company (SoCal) to settle litigation between the parties regarding the sale of respondent's assets to SoCal and because of respondent's difficulties in repaying the Central Basin Replenishment District.

A subsequent letter dated June 13, 1973, made in response to Commission staff requests for a detailed accounting of respondent's efforts to date to implement the Commission's decision, stated "nothing formal was done to implement the order."

On July 17, 1973 respondent and SoCal filed a joint petition and declaration of applicants in Application No. 52919 requesting an ex parte order authorizing the purchase by SoCal of substantially all of the operating properties of respondent. This sale does not include cash or respondent's pumping rights.

The petition states that SoCal and respondent believe that the issuance of the orders prayed for will provide insurance that the deficiencies noted in Decision No. 81182 will be remedied. The improvements should be made expeditiously so as to provide a sufficient supply of water under adequate pressure to meet the needs of customers in respondent's service area. Decision No. 81743 in Application No. 52919 authorized the above-mentioned transfer.

Findings

1. The 90-day extension of time to comply with Decision No. 81182 should be granted.

2. On or before the expiration of this additional 90-day period, respondent or Southern California Water Company, if it is the successor in interest to respondent, should comply with Ordering Paragraph 2 of Decision No. 81182. A professional engineer on Southern California Water Company's staff should be authorized to prepare the improvement program report.

3. The restriction contained in Ordering Peragraph 1 of Decision No. 81182 on supplying irrigation water for the Long Beach Freeway right-of-way should be lifted upon completion of the improvement program.

4. Beginning on October 1, 1973, respondent or Southern California Water Company, if it is the successor in interest to respondent, should file with the Commission monthly progress reports concerning the improvement program, the metering program, and the monthly pressure survey.

5. The investigation should be discontinued. Conclusions

1. The request for a 90-day extension of time should be granted. Respondent or Southern California Water Company, if it is the successor in interest to respondent, should comply with Decision No. 81182 as modified in the order herein.

2. Ordering Paragraph 1 of Decision No. 81182 should be modified to permit supplying of irrigation water for the Long Beach Freeway right-of-way after completion of the improvement program.

3. The investigation should be discontinued.

<u>O R D E R</u>

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. On or before August 28, 1973, respondent or Southern California Water Company, if it is the successor in interest to respondent, shall comply with Ordering Paragraph 2 of Decision No. 81182. A professional engineer on Southern California Water Company's staff is authorized to prepare the improvement program report.

2. Beginning on October 1, 1973, respondent or Southern California Water Company, if it is the successor in interest to respondent, shall file with the Commission monthly progress reports concerning the improvement program, the metering program, and a monthly pressure survey. These reports shall be filed until completion of the improvement program and metering program has been accomplished.

3. Ordering Paragraph 1 of Decision No. 81182 is modified to permit supplying of irrigation water for the Long Beach Freeway right-of-way after completion of the improvement program.

4. The investigation is discontinued.

The effective date of this order is the date hereof. Dated at _______, California, this _____ day of ______, 1973.

Commissioners

Commissioner D. W. Holmes, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.