

Decision No. 92451 DEC 2 - 1980

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Lynn Ruggiero; Dennis Ruggiero;
Lise Smith; William Smith;
Frances Gallegos; Claire Winter,
a minor; Drue Banister; Marvin
Levin; Keith Nelson; Nancy Nelson;
Louise Patterson,

Complainants,

vs.

Camp Meeker Water System, Inc.,
a California corporation and
public utility; Chenoweth Lumber
Company; William C. Chenoweth;
Leslie C. Chenoweth; Ann S.
Chenoweth; and Jewel E. Chenoweth,

Defendants.

ORIGINAL

Case No. 10250
(Filed February 4, 1977;
amended February 13, 1979)

Frances S. Gallegos, for herself, Lynn Ruggiero,
Dennis Ruggiero, Lise Smith, William Smith,
Claire Winter, a minor, Drue Banister, Marvin
Levin, Keith Nelson, Nancy Nelson, and Louise
Patterson, complainants.

Michael J. Stecher, Attorney at Law, for Camp
Meeker Water System, Inc.; and Jack H. Dunn,
Attorney at Law (Oregon), for Chenoweth
Lumber Company, William C. Chenoweth, Leslie C.
Chenoweth, Ann S. Chenoweth, and Jewel E.
Chenoweth: defendants.

William Patrick Smith, for Camp Meeker
Recreation and Park District Board,
intervenor.

William C. Bricca, Attorney at Law, and Leslie D.
Hay, for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Case No. 10250 was the subject of a Proposed Report
(report) issued after hearing by the assigned Administrative Law
Judge. Exceptions to the report were filed by most of the complainants,

the Commission staff, and the representative of the State Department of Health Services (DOH). A reply to the exceptions was filed by defendant Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. (water company). This decision deals with the report and the exceptions taken to it.

Discussion of Exceptions

The exceptions of complainants are directed primarily to the alleged failure of the report to recognize that the specific problems of the water system are the result of an inadequate distribution system and lack of water storage for summer use. They claim that the establishment of new well water sources as directed by the report and proposed by water company's consulting engineers will not solve any of the customers' problems. They conclude that the report erred in not ordering water company to cause a study to be undertaken with emphasis on developing storage ponds and gradually upgrading water company's distribution facilities. They also object to the report's failure to order the immediate construction of two additional storage tanks and the failure to order water company to comply with General Order No. 103, which requires a water utility to test the water for turbidity and make public lists of all water outages, breaks in pipes, or leaks in the system. They join with the staff and DOH in objecting to lifting the freeze on service connections as proposed in the report.

In its Reply to Exceptions water company urges adoption of the report as the Commission's decision.

We believe the report recognizes the roots of water company's physical problems and the present maximum capability of water company to correct them. It recognizes the immediate need (as expressed by most of the complaining customer witnesses) of improving water quality by ordering the installation of a filtration plant and electrically operated hypochlorinators to

eliminate or drastically reduce turbidity and over- and under-chlorination. Many of the sudden water outages and drops in water pressure are due to the failure of the manually operated water system to automatically adjust itself. The report orders the installation of additional pumps to increase the system's delivery reliability and localize any outages or pressure drops.

Complainants object that the report does not order the water company to commission a comprehensive study and to draw up and implement plans to upgrade the water system. The water company has no money or credit standing to finance a comprehensive study and draw up plans to upgrade the system, let alone to finance the upgrading of the system. Under the circumstances, if the customers of the water system, which was constructed eighty years ago with service demands in mind far less than those now levied on the system, want a higher grade of service than the water company is physically and financially able to offer them, they should employ community self-help; for example, establish a water district. Our advice to water company's customers contained in our 1963 decision (Decision No. 65119, pages 2 and 3) bears repeating:

". . . The distribution problem is one of community-wide interest. Indeed, it is a community as well as a utility problem and is of no little magnitude...its ultimate solution lies within the community and its financial abilities to work it out. The Commission urges the leaders of the community to face the problem squarely and to devise a means by which money may be obtained to provide the community with the grade of service which it desires."

Water company has been remiss in complying with some of the testing, reporting, and administrative requirements of General Order No. 103. These requirements were set up to promote good customer relations and to encourage efficiency and economy of operation. Some of water company's problems as expressed by the witnesses can be traced to the laxity of water company in complying with these requirements. Water company should be ordered to bring its operation in compliance with these requirements.

Lifting the service connection freeze at this time would be premature and we will disallow it. If water company desires a lifting, either in part or in whole, of the freeze it should file a separate petition and be able to show that circumstances have changed since Decision No. 65119 which warrants the lifting of the freeze.

Accordingly, the report has been modified herein to eliminate the lifting of the freeze; to order water company to comply with the testing, reporting, and other administrative requirements of General Order No. 103; and to recommend community self-help. Otherwise, we have adopted the report.

The Complaint and the Evidence

The complaint, as amended, of complainants Lynn Ruggiero, Dennis Ruggiero, Lise Smith, William Smith, Frances Gallegos, Claire Winter, a minor, Drue Banister, Linda Faltersack, Marvin Levin, Lesly F. Hall, Keith Nelson, Nancy Nelson, Patricia C. Brown, Phyllis A. Bay, Terry Renee Rosemark, and Louise Patterson alleges that the defendant water company, a water corporation, is rendering inadequate and unsatisfactory domestic water service; that the logging operations of defendant Chenoweth Lumber Company (lumber company) will adversely impact water company's water supply; and that defendants William C. Chenoweth, Leslie C. Chenoweth, Ann S. Chenoweth, and Jewel E. Chenoweth (Chenoweths), who own both water company and lumber company, have a conflict of interest in owning such companies which is detrimental to the interest of water company's customers. Complainants, who are customers of water

company, request that the Commission order water company to upgrade its water system and forbid lumber company from disturbing the watershed alleged to be necessary to water company's water supply. A hearing was held on the matter before Administrative Law Judge Pilling at Camp Meeker on April 17 and 18, 1979 and at San Francisco on June 6, 1979.

Complainants' specific grievances against water company and, where applicable, against the other defendants, are as follows:

- "(1) That following normal rainfall the water [furnished by water company] contains such an excessive amount of suspended matter as to cause it to turn color and to render it undrinkable.
- "(2) That as a result of inconsistent chlorination procedures the water takes on such a high level of chlorination as to render it undrinkable, a hazard to health and in violation of Commission General Order 103; and at other times failure to use adequate quantities of chlorine results in such high levels of contamination as to cause it to be hazardous to health.
- "(3) That Complainants believe that respondents have failed to test the quality of the water in the manner prescribed in Commission General Order 103.

"(4) That on numerous occasions during many months of the year and other than during the recent drought, respondents have by reason of their failure to properly operate or by reason of inadequate facilities or water sources, found it necessary to interrupt water service without adequate notice or without any prior notice, thereby causing inconvenience and health hazards particularly for the elderly and for infant children and thereby depriving others of water usage for normal hygienic purposes.

"(5) That water pressures are erratic and inadequate and fail to meet the requirements set by Commission General Order No. 103.

"(6) That mains visible from the surface are not of a size which can transmit and distribute reasonable quantities of water and believe that other mains not visible are also of insufficient size.

That many mains throughout the system protrude above the surface of the ground; that other mains are suspended from trees thus making them vulnerable to damage and also causing them to leak and in turn causes inadequate service and outages.

"(7) That throughout the system main and service pipes can be observed to be leaking. That storage tanks overflow and leak and that these overflows and leaks are not attended to or repaired within reasonable periods of time; that it is believed no program of preventive maintenance is practiced; that spillage from broken pipes causes large pools of water to collect on road ways and cause severe damage.

- "(8) That it is believed that certain springs, reservoirs, wells and other sources of water, direct and indirect, which have been used and useful to the system, have been removed or diverted to other uses.
- "(9) That Complainants believe that Defendants may have unlawfully sold, leased, assigned, encumbered or otherwise disposed of the whole or parts of their system necessary and useful in the performance of the water company's service to its customers.
- "(10) That it is believed that Defendants by carrying on logging operations both within and outside of the water shed area have done so in such a manner as to cause damage to said areas and to the water supply and water system and thereby deprive complainants of water and water sources.
- "(11) That we believe that Defendants have generally failed to upgrade facilities to meet present day requirements and failed or neglected to provide an adequate level of service.
- "(12) That complainants believe that a conflict of interest detrimental to their interest as customers exists by reason of the fact that there is an interrelationship of ownership, management and control between the Water Company, the lumber company, Chenoweth, Inc., a corporation, and the individual shareholders named in the complaint."

The water system presently serves 350 customers in an unincorporated area known as Camp Meeker, located in Sonoma County 15 miles west of Santa Rosa. The area is hilly, heavily forested, and covered with thick undergrowth. The initial construction of the water system began around the turn of the century. The housing stock at Camp Meeker is typically of pre-World War II vintage and summer home origin and there has been virtually no new home construction in the past two decades. Many of the homes are owned by absentee owners. The houses were built without benefit of an area master

plan. In the past ten years, an increasing number of summer homes have become occupied by year-round residents. Irrigated landscaping and lawns are nonexistent and nearly all water consumed is for household purposes. The present population of Camp Meeker is represented to be between 800 and 900 persons.

The water company was acquired by the Chenoweths in 1951 and incorporated by them in 1959. They own water company and lumber company in equal shares. Defendant William C. Chenoweth has been president of water company since 1951. Water company and its predecessor companies have sought only one rate increase in the last 30 years and that was eight years ago when the Commission granted a yearly flat rate increase to \$51, comprising only half of the requested increase. At that time water company's rate base was \$19,100, and the increased revenues were designed to produce a 7.07 percent rate of return. The water system is unmetered. For the year 1978 water company reported gross revenues of \$18,120 and operating expenses of \$23,696 for a net loss of \$5,576. The 1977 net loss was reported to be \$7,859. The Chenoweths own considerable acreage in the area.

The design of the water system is extremely complex. There can be as many as 24 separate sources of supply delivering into the water system under temporary emergency conditions. No single source is believed to have a capacity greater than 25 gallons per minute under optimum conditions and many drop to 1-2 gallons per minute during the dry season in late summer and early fall before the winter rainy season. The water system has 18 storage reservoirs with an aggregate capacity of 144,000 gallons which discharge into seven general service zones. Most of the reservoirs are supplied directly by springs and wells, and the springs are in remote areas which are inaccessible except by walking. Spring A and Spring A-1, which are very important water sources to the system, are not located on water company property but on the properties of a Mr. Bacon and the Chenoweths, respectively. Springs B-2 through B-8, which are used but rarely, are also not on water company property but on property belonging to the defendants Chenoweths.

The distribution system includes more than 82,000 feet of piping of which nearly 74,000 feet are 2-inch diameter or smaller. The transmission pipe is above ground and follows the contour of the ground. Some of the system's pipe is about 75 years old. Practically all of the active service connections are of $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch pipe (see Decision No. 60283 dated June 20, 1960). The staff witness found that pressure within the distribution system normally ranges between 25 and 75 pounds per square inch gauge (psig). The water system is operated manually, including the disinfecting process. The operator checks each tank daily and operates transfer pumps as necessary to keep the tanks full. The operator also checks the chlorination facilities on each visit. There is no filtration equipment in the system nor measuring devices to determine the quantity of water produced by each source. During most of the year the water sources produce more water than the storage tanks will hold.

Rule 2B of water company's tariff filed in 1959 (and ostensibly still effective) provides that water company will supply water during normal times at no less than the minimum pressure of 25 psig and during periods of peak load at the minimum pressure of 20 psig. Decision No. 84334 dated April 15, 1975 amended General Order No. 103 to increase the required minimum water pressures from 25 psig and 20 psig, respectively, to 40 psig and 30 psig, respectively, and allowed tariffs filed in response to this increase in pressure to designate by special condition low pressure areas within its system where minimum pressures of 25 psig and 20 psig, respectively, would be maintained. The Commission's records do not reveal that the water company filed such tariff amendment. There have been three decisions which limited the number of service connections the utility could have to the approximate present number of connections. These decisions were Nos. 60283, June 20, 1960; 62831, November 21, 1961; and 65119, March 19, 1963.

Water company's tariff Rule 2C provides that the water furnished, so far as practical, will be free from objectionable odors, taste, color, and turbidity.

Twenty-one customers of the water system appeared and gave testimony at the hearing. Most of the witnesses experienced some degree of turbidity after a rainfall. A few witnesses experienced turbidity at all times and others not at all. The degree of turbidity experienced ranged from mere cloudy water to water deemed by some of the witnesses to be unfit to drink. Several witnesses attributed their sicknesses and the sicknesses of the members of their families to the dirty water. Several witnesses complained that the water tasted and smelled as though it was overchlorinated, one witness stating that when she ran a bathtub full of water it smelled like a swimming pool. The customer witnesses variously complained about leaking water mains, overflowing storage tanks, water pressure so low that a householder could turn on only one faucet at a time, and prolonged water outages. None of the witnesses took pressure gauge readings to determine how much or how little pressure they were getting. During the drought of 1978, the water company had to haul water in tank trucks from other areas to supplement its supply of water. Several witnesses complained that the water company does not give its customers notice before the water company turns off the water when it has to fix the mains. Exhibit 1 consists of nine pictures taken by a witness showing exposed transmission and distribution pipes of the water system snaking along the top of the ground, running through piles of slash, supported by the limbs of trees, and looping into the air. The exposed pipes are subject to breakage by falling timber. On Memorial Day of 1979, a falling tree severed one of the pipes. Because the broken pipe was in a remote area, the break was not discovered until all of the water of one tank had emptied out through the break and caused a water outage for some of the customers.

One of the witnesses at one time had the water tested for coliform bacteria. The test showed undesirable results which were reported to the water company which determined that a neighbor's 32

cows had recently broken through his fence on to water company's property near one of the springs during a heavy rainstorm. The witness for the Sanitary Engineering Section of the State Department of Health and Services testified that all his reports, with the one exception previously noted, show the bacteriological quality of the water meets the water quality standards. However, his section has not as yet received any reports relative to the turbidity quality of the water.

Defendant William C. Chenoweth, who draws the salary of \$100 a month as president of water company, testified that before there is a planned water cutoff his manager travels through the area announcing the cutoff periods over a loud speaker and that a notice of the cutoff is posted on the bulletin board at the local post office. He stated that mailing cutoff notices to billing addresses would be impractical because of the absentee-ownership of a great many of the houses. He stated that he was not aware of any unfavorable bacterial test results made in the last ten years except when the cows broke through the fence. He stated water company's chlorination process, if strictly attended to, was adequate but admitted that there would be a more even flow of chlorine if a mechanical process was used. He also stated that he was aware of the turbidity problem but that it only occurred when it rained. He testified that during the recent logging operations no one was without water. He was of the opinion that the manner in which the mains were laid did not interfere with the mains carrying all the water the mains were designed to carry. He testified that except in late summer and the fall of the year, the water system requires only 50 percent of the water produced by the water sources but that in late summer and the fall of the year, when some of the sources go dry and the water yield of the other sources decreases, the water system experiences a shortage of water and water outages occur frequently. He stated that Springs B-2 to B-8 provide very limited production of water and are used only sporadically and that he did not consider them to be part

of the water system. He stated that water company's internally generated funds were insufficient to finance needed improvements.

Defendants presented a written petition signed by 61 customers of the water system requesting that the Commission dismiss this case.

The annual reports submitted by water company to the Commission as required by General Order No. 104 reveal that since January 1, 1969 the water company has claimed \$9,973 as depreciation expense and has expended only \$3,919 on plant additions for the same period. Since 1971 the water company has expended only \$398 on plant additions. During five of those ten years, the water company made a profit totaling \$6,739, and in the remaining five years had a loss totaling \$24,212 for an overall net loss for that period of \$17,473. This utility is not being forced to operate at a loss. The Commission will entertain a request for rate relief at any time, but it is incumbent upon the utility to initiate and substantiate the request. Application No. 59317 for a substantial increase in rates is the subject of Decision No. 92450 issued today.

The water company's consulting engineers made studies on the cost of upgrading the water system. They determined that the complete refurbishment of the water system to current standards together with the development of an adequate and reliable supply of imported water would cost \$2,136,000, equal to \$40 per month per customer for debt service alone if the money was borrowed at 5 percent for 20 years. They estimated that it would cost \$1,200,000 to replace the distribution system alone. In May of 1979 company filed an application with the State Department of Water Resources under the California Safe Drinking Water Bond Act of 1976 for a loan of \$275,000 to effect immediate improvements to its system suggested by its consulting engineers. The suggested immediate improvements consist of the following, as set out in Exhibit 6:

1. The installation of electrically operated hypochlorinators at each tank receiving water directly from a surface water source.

2. The installation of a water filtration plant at the Tower Tanks to reduce storm-water-induced turbidity problems. (During periods of heavy rainfall, other surface water sources would be shut off and the system would be supplied from the Tower Tanks and wells.)
3. Installation of a replacement pump at the Tower Booster Pumping Station to enhance the reliability of this key facility.
4. Installation of a new pump at the Fern Tanks.
5. Construction of three new 10,000-gallon storage tanks to replace certain deteriorated tanks and the expansion of clear water storage at the Tower Tanks installation.
6. The drilling of ten test wells and installation of three well stations.
7. A reservoir and filtration plant in Baumert Gulch if the well program fails.

The consulting engineers and the State Health Department feel that, in view of the limited supply situation, piecemeal replacement of small segments of the distribution system would do little to improve water service and that the present distribution system provides a reasonably effective means of controlling excessive water usage.

The proposed logging operations have been the subject of several court actions, have been approved by the California Division of Forestry, and have been completed.

The staff witness testified that the water service was adequate for the type of service rendered and that water company has generally improved its service over the last few years. The witness recommends that the A-Springs and B-Springs be declared dedicated to public utility status. The witness agrees, generally, that the recommendations of water company's consulting engineers should be implemented, except that replacing part of the distribution system should have a higher priority than replacing two of the three storage tanks.

Discussion

Water company should be ordered to proceed as rapidly as possible to make the immediate improvements suggested by its consulting engineers. The installation of filtration facilities and electrically operated hypochlorinators, as suggested by the engineers, will insure that the quality of water will be free from objectionable odors, taste, color, and turbidity, and the addition of new producing wells will insure the maintenance of water pressures as guaranteed by water company's tariffs, particularly during the dry season.

Rule 2B of water company's tariff, first published in 1959 and still ostensibly effective, provides that water company will maintain water pressures at 25 psig and 20 psig, respectively. Decision No. 84334 dated June 6, 1975 amended General Order No. 103 to increase the minimum pressures required to be maintained by water utilities from 25 psig and 20 psig, respectively, to 40 psig and 30 psig, respectively. That decision permitted a water utility to deviate from maintaining those increased pressures only if the water utility filed a tariff sheet setting forth as a special condition lower minimum pressures within generally described or delineated areas of its system. Water company has not amended its tariff in response to Decision No. 84334 or to General Order No. 103 and is, therefore, in violation of the mandates contained therein in respect to minimum water pressures. We will order the water company to amend its tariff Rule 2B to set forth the increased pressures required by General Order No. 103 and allow it to include in such amendment designated low pressure areas with minimum pressures of no less than 25 psig and 20 psig, respectively.

The water system is ancient but still workable. In many respects, it does not meet minimum standards for design and construction required by current General Order No. 103. The general order does not require replacement or abandonment of facilities made substandard by changes in the general order prior to the expiration of the economic utilization of those facilities, unless the Commission finds the facilities inadequate for proper utility service and enters an order directing abandonment or replacement. Water system's facilities have not been shown to be inadequate. Hence, we will not at this time order replacement of water system's facilities. Additional facilities, as suggested by the consulting engineers, rather than replacement of facilities pose the greatest potential for service improvement.

Water company has no money or credit standing to finance a comprehensive study and draw up plans for upgrading the system let alone to finance the upgrading of the system. Before the improvements ordered herein can be accomplished, the Safe Drinking Water Bond Act loan must be approved. Under the circumstances, if the customers of water system, which was constructed eighty years ago with service demands in mind far less than those now levied on the system, want a higher grade of service than water company is physically and financially able to offer them they should employ community self-help, for example, establish a water district.

Findings of Fact

1. Complainants are homeowners served by a water system which was initially constructed around the year 1900.
2. Complainants and their witnesses frequently experience prolonged water outages and inordinate low water pressures during the late summer and early fall of the year.
3. To a lesser degree, complainants and their witnesses experience unannounced and unexpected water outages and low pressure during other times of the year.
4. In some areas of the water system, complainants experience extreme turbidity of the water during most times of the year.
5. Customers in some areas of the water system experience various degrees of turbidity only after rainstorms.
6. The water served to some complainants is objectionably high in chlorine content.
7. Some complainants do not receive notice from water company when planned water outages are scheduled to occur.
8. Water company has 350 unmetered customers living in a hilly, heavily forested, thickly underbrushed area.
9. The houses in the area were once all vacation places, but now a substantial number of homes are occupied the year around.

10. Water company's tariff Rule 2B provides that it will supply water during normal times at no less than the minimum pressure of 25 psig and during periods of peak load at the minimum pressure of 20 psig.

11. Water company's tariff Rule 2C provides that water company will, insofar as practical, provide water which is free from objectionable odors, taste, color, and turbidity.

12. Water company has not amended its tariff in response to Decision No. 84334 and to current General Order No. 103 in regard to minimum water pressures.

13. The water system's distribution system normally maintains a normal operating pressure of between 25 psig and 75 psig.

14. The installation of filtration facilities and electrically operated hypochlorinators, as suggested by the consulting engineers, will insure that the quality of water will be as represented in the water company's tariffs, namely, that the water will be free from objectionable odors, taste, color, and turbidity.

15. The addition of new producing wells as contemplated by the immediate improvements suggested by the consulting engineers will insure the maintenance of minimum water pressures as guaranteed by water company's tariffs.

16. The immediate improvements suggested by the consulting engineers will enhance the water company's quality of water service.

17. Attention-getting written notices of planned water outages should be posted by the water company at conspicuous places throughout its service area to insure that all its affected customers are made aware of the planned outage.

18. During most of the year, the water system can use and requires only 50 percent of the water produced by its water sources.

19. Water company has been remiss in complying with some of the testing, reporting, and administrative requirements of General Order No. 103.

20. Some of water company's problems as expressed by some of the witnesses are traceable to water company's failure to comply with the testing, reporting, and administrative requirements of General Order No. 103.

21. The water system's facilities, by and large, have not been shown to have outlived their economic utilization nor to be inadequate for the rendition of proper public utility service to the customers now served.

22. Springs designated by water company as Spring A and Spring A-1 have been used as the major source of water for the water system since at least 1962.

23. Springs designated by water company as Springs B-2 through B-8 have been used only sporadically as a backup for the system in times of drought since at least 1970.

24. The logging operations complained of have been completed.

25. No evidence was adduced indicating that water company had divested itself of property useful and dedicated to its public utility service.

26. The individual persons named defendants have not been shown to have committed any violation of the Public Utilities Code or rule or regulation thereunder.

Conclusions of Law

1. The water purveyed by water company to some of its customers is objectionable as to odor, taste, color, and turbidity in violation of water company's tariff Rule 2C.

2. The water purveyed by water company to some of its customers is served at pressures below 25 psig and 20 psig, respectively, in violation of water company's tariff Rule 2B.

3. Water company should be ordered to proceed as rapidly as possible to make the immediate improvements and institute the procedures suggested by its consulting engineers as set out in Exhibit 6 for alleviating the unsatisfactory service experienced by some of the water company's customers.

4. Water company should be ordered to fully comply with the testing, reporting, and administrative requirements of General Order No. 103.

5. Water company should be ordered to file an amended Rule 2B to its tariff responsive to Decision No. 84334 in regard to the maintenance of minimum water pressures.

6. Water company should be ordered to post notices as set out in Finding 17 when it plans a water outage.

7. Springs designated by water company as Spring A, Spring A-1, and Springs B-2 through B-8 have been dedicated to public utility service and are part of the water system.

8. The complaint in all other respects should be denied.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. shall proceed as rapidly as possible to make the immediate improvements and institute the procedures suggested by its consulting engineers as set out in Exhibit 6.

2. Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. shall file a monthly report with the Commission no later than the first day of each and every month after the effective date of this decision setting forth in detail its progress in accomplishing or having accomplished the work set out in Ordering Paragraph 1. Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. shall mail a copy of each monthly report to the complainants at the same time it files its report with the Commission.

3. Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. shall post notices as set out in Finding 17 when it plans a water outage.

dl

4. Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. shall bring its operation in full compliance with the testing, reporting, and administrative requirements of General Order No. 103.

5. Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. shall amend its tariff Rule 2B to provide for the service of water at no less than the minimum pressures set out in current General Order No. 103 and may include in such amended provision designated low pressure areas as authorized by Decision No. 84334. The tariff amendment shall be by advice letter filing and shall be filed no later than sixty days after the effective date of this order.

6. Springs designated by the water company as Spring A, Spring A-1, and Springs B-2 through B-8 are dedicated public utility property used and useful in the public utility water service of Camp Meeker Water System, Inc.

7. In all other respects the complaint is denied.

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

Dated DEC 2 - 1980, at San Francisco, California.

Commissioner Vernon L. Sturgeon, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

John E. Byrne
President

Richard D. Keville

Commissioner Claire T. Dedrick, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Samuel M. Smith
Commissioners