

Mailed  
MAR 18 1997

Decision 97-03-028 March 18, 1997

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of )  
California Water Service Company )  
(U-60-W), a corporation, for an )  
order authorizing it to increase )  
rates charged for water service )  
in the Stockton District. )

Application 95-09-005  
(Filed September 8, 1995)

ORIGINAL

And Related Matters. )

Application 95-09-006  
Application 95-09-007  
Application 95-09-008  
Application 95-09-009

William J. Newell and Gregory L. Bowling,  
Attorneys at Law, for California Water  
Service Company, applicant.

Donald Maynor, Attorney at Law, and Desi  
Alvarez, for City of Redondo Beach; and  
Paul D. Jones II, for the West Basin  
Municipal Water District, interested  
parties.

James S. Rood, Attorney at Law, and Sazedur  
Rahman, for the Office of Ratepayer  
Advocates (now, the advocacy unit of the  
Water Division of the Commission).

O P I N I O N

1. Summary

This decision approves a memorandum of understanding entered into between California Water Service Company (Cal Water) and the Commission's Water Division, dealing with procedures by which Cal Water will notify the Commission of service area extensions. This decision also adopts ratepayer credits and slightly reduced rates for the utility's Visalia District and Bakersfield District. This decision brings to a close the utility's 1995 general rate case proceeding involving five CWS water districts.

2. Background

Cal Water is the state's largest privately owned water utility, serving 370,000 customers in 20 operating districts. On September 8, 1995, Cal Water filed these applications seeking rate adjustments in five districts: Bakersfield, Hermosa-Redondo, Stockton, East Los Angeles and Visalia. Following public participation hearings and evidentiary hearings, the Commission in Decision (D.) 96-06-034 (June 6, 1996) issued an interim opinion authorizing rate adjustments for the five districts.

The interim opinion made the rate changes subject to refund, pending further staff investigation of certain service map adjustments and acquisitions for which Cal Water had sought approval in its general rate case. Cal Water had submitted updated service area maps to reflect additions and deletions to three service territories. The new service maps included acquisition of four small water systems, one a mutual water company and three that were operated by a city and by water districts, in areas that were contiguous to Cal Water service territories. Changes in rate base attributable to these acquisitions were included in Cal Water's proposed rate adjustments.

The Commission stated that, pursuant to General Order (GO) 96-A, Section I(E), extension of service into contiguous territory not served by a public utility of like character requires advance filing of a revised service area map. Normally, after such a filing, any changes in rate base or rates caused by the extensions are reviewed and approved or disapproved in the utility's next general rate case. (Re Fulton Water Company (1995) 58 CPUC2d 646.) Since the GO 96-A filings were not made in advance in this case, the Commission noted that a prior review of the extensions and acquisitions had not been conducted, and thus the Commission lacked a record upon which to approve the effects that those changes had on rate base and rates.

The Commission established a second phase of this proceeding to deal with the service maps and acquisitions, and it directed the administrative law judge to conduct further hearings, as necessary, to resolve the outstanding matters.

3. Positions of the Parties

Both Cal Water and the Commission's advocacy staff submitted further pleadings in Phase 2 of this proceeding, and a prehearing conference was conducted on October 18, 1996. Cal Water took the position that its acquisitions involved either a mutual water company or water companies operated by government agencies, and that, therefore, under the second paragraph of Public Utilities Code § 1001, the utility's extension of service into these areas required only the filing of revised service maps.

Cal Water indicated that it had not filed revised maps in advance because, in previous filings, Commission staff had insisted that the acquisition of a non-regulated water system required the filing of an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity. Cal Water also admitted that, in circulating rates to take account of the acquisitions, it had inadvertently erred in its ratemaking adjustments for the Bakersfield and Visalia Districts, and it proposed rate credits in those districts to correct the error.

The Commission's advocacy staff noted that GO 96-A requires the filing of a revised map prior to commencing service to an extension of its service territory. Cal Water had begun such service months before it filed its map revisions as part of this rate case. Staff argued that this constituted a breach, and that a penalty was in order. Staff also argued that Cal Water should have filed an application seeking approval of its acquisition of the small municipal water companies. Staff agreed with Cal Water on the needed ratemaking adjustments, but it proposed that, pursuant to PU Code § 2107, the company should be subject to a fine of

\$20,000 for its error in calculating Bakersfield rates and \$20,000 for its error in calculating Visalia rates.

4. Settlement Proposal

Hearings in this matter were continued on representations by the parties that they were close to settling the issues involved. In a ruling dated October 22, 1996, the administrative law judge set January 8, 1997, for hearing unless parties had reached settlement prior to that time. On January 2, 1997, the parties announced that they had reached agreement. A joint motion for adoption of a stipulation and an agreed-upon memorandum of understanding was filed on January 9, 1997.

The stipulation and memorandum of understanding are attached to this decision as Appendix A. Essentially, the memorandum obligates Cal Water to supply additional information to the Commission's Water Division when it proposes to acquire a non-regulated water system (like a mutual system or a municipal system) and when it files a revised service map for extension of service into areas contiguous to Cal Water's service territory. Cal Water agrees that it will file either an application or an advice letter for all future acquisitions of non-regulated water systems, complete with cost and ratemaking information. For extensions of service, Cal Water agrees to provide information to staff in addition to the revised service area map required by GO 96-A.

On ratemaking adjustments, the Water Division and Cal Water agreed on a one-time credit of \$94,329 to the Visalia District balancing account, and a \$5,671 credit to the Bakersfield District balancing account. The credits benefit ratepayers by reducing any undercollection in the balancing accounts.

Cal Water also agrees to reduce the revenue requirement for the Visalia District by \$50,765, resulting in slightly reduced quantity rates for metered customers (approximately a half-cent per 100 cubic feet of water consumed) and a small reduction in monthly flat rates (about 10 cents, depending on size of residence).

Revised tariff sheets for the Visalia District are attached to the stipulation and would replace the tariff sheets approved provisionally in D.96-06-034.

5. Discussion

When a public utility like Cal Water extends service in an area contiguous to its service territory, it is not required to file an application seeking a certificate of public convenience and necessity with the Commission. Under PU Code § 1001, no such certificate is required for an extension into contiguous territory "not theretofore served by a public utility of like character." (Re Fulton Water Company, supra.)

Similarly, when a public utility extends service to a contiguous area by acquiring a mutual water company (that is, a water company organized to deliver water to mutual members at cost), certification is not necessary because a mutual is not a public utility of like character. (Re Alisal Water Corporation (1994) 53 CPUC2d 154, 157.) PU Code § 2705 specifically exempts mutual water companies from our jurisdiction.

The only requirement in cases like these is that of GO 96-A, Section I(B), which provides:

"The utility shall, before commencing service, file tariff service area maps for extensions into territory contiguous to its line, plant, or system and not theretofore served by a public utility of like character."<sup>1</sup>

In this case, Cal Water extended its service territory into contiguous territory by acquiring both a mutual water company and small water systems operated by a municipality or by special districts. Cal Water argues -- persuasively, we think -- that a

<sup>1</sup> The filing of tariff sheets reflecting an extension is done by transmitting advice letters. Such tariff sheets, unless suspended by the Commission either upon complaint or its own motion, become effective as set forth in GO 96-A.

municipal water system or a special district water system is no more a "public utility of like character" than a mutual system, and, therefore, the only requirement in such a case is the filing of a revised service area map to reflect the new service territory.

Nevertheless, as Cal Water concedes, it began service in all of these cases before it filed a revised service area map as required by GO 96-A.

The filing requirement is an important one. The Commission must have accurate service area maps on file for all public utilities that it regulates if it is to respond promptly to complaints by consumers and others. Moreover, as seen here, when advance filing does not take place, it becomes more difficult to monitor the utility's adjustments in rate base and ratemaking caused by the extension of service. Our further investigation in this case has in fact resulted in a reduction in rates for customers in Visalia and Bakersfield.

Rather than pursue a penalty against Cal Water, the Water Division obviously has decided that the public interest is best served by seeking Cal Water's agreement to provide timely information about future acquisitions and extensions of service in order to prevent any lapses in filings or rate reductions that extended service may entail. Cal Water apparently agrees. The result is a memorandum of understanding that requires Cal Water to provide our staff with more information than might otherwise be legally mandated, but which clearly is not unduly burdensome for the utility.

We note that the procedures entailed in the memorandum of understanding are not a precedent for other utilities. The procedures apply only to Cal Water. They are proposed voluntarily by the parties in order to resolve disputes that arose in this rate case proceeding.

We will approve the stipulation, the memorandum of understanding and the Visalia and Bakersfield rate adjustments set

forth in Appendix A. The agreement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law, and in the public interest. (Rule 51.1(e), Rules of Practice and Procedure.) In addition, the settlement agreement meets Commission standards established in D.92-12-019 (46 CPUC2d 538), the San Diego Gas & Electric Company's rate proceeding. Although not sponsored by all parties in this proceeding, the parties not signing do not oppose the agreement. No statutory provisions are offended by the agreement, and the terms are reasonable. The agreement provides sufficient information to permit us to discharge future regulatory obligations with respect to the parties and their interests.

6. Comments on Proposed Decision

The draft decision of the administrative law judge was mailed to all parties pursuant to PU Code § 311 and Rule 77.1. No comments have been filed by any party.

Findings of Fact

1. Cal Water on September 8, 1995, filed these applications seeking rate adjustments in the utility's water districts serving Bakersfield, Hermosa-Redondo, Stockton, East Los Angeles and Visalia.
2. The Commission on June 6, 1996, issued D.96-06-034, an interim opinion authorizing rate adjustments in the five districts.
3. Rates approved in D.96-06-034 were made subject to refund pending further investigation of service map adjustments and acquisitions for which Cal Water had sought approval in its general rate case.
4. A prehearing conference in Phase 2 of this proceeding was conducted on October 18, 1996.
5. Cal Water and the Commission's Water Division on January 9, 1997, filed a joint motion for adoption of a stipulation, an agreed-upon memorandum of understanding, and rate adjustments benefiting ratepayers in the Visalia District and the Bakersfield District.

Conclusions of Law

1. The stipulation, memorandum of understanding and rate adjustments proposed by the parties are reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law, and in the public interest, and should be approved.

2. The procedures entailed in the memorandum of understanding between the parties are not a precedent for other utilities.

3. This order should be made effective immediately in order that rate adjustments benefiting ratepayers may go into effect promptly.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The motion of California Water Service Company and the Commission's Water Division for approval of the Stipulation and Memorandum of Understanding attached hereto as Appendix A is approved.

2. The Stipulation and Memorandum of Understanding attached hereto as Appendix A are approved.

3. The following applications are closed: Application 95-09-005, Application 95-09-006, Application 95-09-007, Application 95-09-008, Application 95-09-009.

This order is effective today.

Dated March 18, 1997, at San Francisco, California.

P. GREGORY CONLON  
President  
JESSIE J. KNIGHT, JR.  
HENRY M. DUQUE  
JOSIAH L. NEEPER  
RICHARD A. BILAS  
Commissioners



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

In the Matter of the Application	)	
of California Water Service	)	
Company (U 60 W), a corporation,	)	Application 95-09-005
for an order authorizing it to	)	(Filed September 8, 1995)
increase rates charged for water	)	
service in the Stockton district.	)	
<hr/>		
	)	Application 95-09-006
And Related Matters	)	Application 95-09-007
	)	Application 95-09-008
	)	Application 95-09-009

## STIPULATION

The parties (Parties) to this Stipulation now pending before the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) are Applicant California Water Service Company (CWS) and Water Division (WD). WD is the successor to the Commission's Division of Ratepayer Advocates' water regulation responsibilities in general rate proceedings. The Parties, desiring to avoid the expense, inconvenience, and uncertainty attendant to litigation of the matters in dispute between them, have agreed upon these Stipulations in the form of the attached Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which they now submit for approval.

In addition, since these Stipulations represent a compromise by them, the Parties have entered into each Stipulation on the basis that its approval by the Commission not be construed as an admission or concession by any Party regarding any fact or matter or law in dispute in this proceeding. Furthermore, the Parties intend that the approval of these Stipulations by the Commission not be construed as a precedent or statement of policy of any kind for or against any Parties in any current or future proceeding unless specifically provided for in the Stipulation.

The Parties agree that no signatory to these Stipulations nor any member of the staff of the Commission assumes any personal liability as a result of these Stipulations. The Parties agree that no legal action may be brought by any party in any state or federal court, or any other forum, against any individual signatory representing the interest of WD, attorneys representing WD, or the WD itself related to these Stipulations. All rights and remedies of the Parties are limited to those available before the Commission.

No Party to these Stipulations will provide, either privately or publicly, before this Commission any rationale or strategies for support of any compromises reached herein beyond any explicitly stated herein unless otherwise agreed to by all the Parties.

All issues between the Parties have been resolved. The Parties have agreed that no issues remain to be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,



Project Manager  
Water Division

January 6, 1997



Vice President  
Regulatory Affairs  
California Water Service Co.

Jan 7, 1997

## MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING IN APPLICATION 95-09-005

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between California Water Service Company (Cal Water) and Water Division (WD), jointly referred to as parties, addresses California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) regulatory requirements for Cal Water's non-Commission regulated water system acquisitions. Additionally, the MOU addresses Cal Water's service area map filing requirements associated with water main extensions and revenue adjustments relating to Cal Water's acquisition adjustment accounts.

In Application (A.) 95-09-005 et al the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) raised issues concerning PUC approval and ratemaking treatment for non-Commission regulated water system acquisitions. Cal Water and WD agree that this MOU appropriately addresses DRA's issues raised in A.95-09-005 et al and their applicability to future Cal Water acquisitions, unless the MOU is terminated by mutual consent of both parties. Water system acquisitions for the purpose of the MOU represent the permanent transfer of assets to Cal Water ownership. Lease and operating agreements are not defined as acquisitions and are specifically excluded from the MOU.

Listed below are the MOU requirements for Cal Water water system acquisitions.

1. Within 5 working days from the date of an agreement to acquire a non-Commission regulated water system, Cal Water shall contact and if required meet with WD staff to explain the details of the proposed acquisition.
2. Within 30 days from the date of execution of an agreement to acquire a non-Commission regulated water system Cal Water shall file an acquisition advice letter with the WD.
3. The acquisition advice letter shall include, but not be limited to, the following items. Appendices need only be filed with WD, however, the acquisition advice letter should indicate that appendices are available upon request.
  - A. A copy of the executed purchase agreement. (Appendix)

## B. Proposed rates.

Cal Water's established rates may be applicable to the acquired customers, but adequate justification must be provided.

C. A detailed description of water system facilities being acquired, based on the best information available from the acquired water system operator and Cal Water's good faith effort to supplement deficiencies. This should include, but not be limited to, such items as a distribution system map, showing pipe sizes and fire flow and pressure area deficiencies. Acquisition advice letters for water systems which do not meet the minimum design and service standards of General Order (G.O.) 103 shall require Commission action by Resolution.

D. Cal Water's planned water system improvements for the acquisition, including estimated costs and the rate impact on the acquired and existing Cal Water customers.

E. Estimated Summary of Earnings before and after the acquisition both with and without the estimated cost of water system improvements from D. above.

F. The names and addresses of all utilities, corporations, persons or other entities, whether publicly or privately operated, with which the acquisition is likely to compete, and of cities or counties within which service will be rendered.

G. A certification that a copy of the acquisition advice letter has been served upon or mailed to each such entity or person in F. above.

H. A map of suitable scale showing the location of the acquisition and its relation to other public utilities, corporations, persons or entities with which the same is likely to compete. (Appendix)

I. A statement identifying the franchises and such health and safety permits as the

appropriate public authorities have required or may require.

- J. A detailed statement of the amount and basis of the original cost (estimated if not known) of all plant and of the depreciation reserve and purchase price. The parties understand that the original cost is subject to change after verification of the acquired system's records and facilities.
4. Cal Water shall include a full showing for each acquisition in the next general rate application which affects the acquisition.
  5. The Director of WD shall review all filed protests and concerns raised by WD staff to the acquisition advice letter. Where appropriate, the Division may recommend the Chief Administrative Law Judge convert the advice letter to a formal application. Prior to such conversion, Cal Water shall have an opportunity to supplement its advice letter, as provided by General Order 96-A, to address the filed protests.
  6. The advice letter filing shall not be considered complete unless it complies with all the provisions of this MOU.
  7. Acquisition advice letters for water systems that will not be contiguous to a Cal Water water system shall require Commission action by Resolution.

Another controversial issue in A.95-09-005 concerns water main extensions into areas outside Cal Water's filed service territory. Section I.E. of General Order 96-A authorizes a utility to file tariff service area maps for extensions into territory contiguous to its line, plant, or system not theretofore served by a public utility of like character.

This MOU between Cal Water and WD requires Cal Water to provide specific information and follow certain procedures when expanding its service area in connection with a water main extension.

1. A Revised service area map filed in accordance with GO 96-A.
2. A copy of the customer application for service shall be included with the service area map filing.
3. Areas contiguous to and which can be served directly from the main extension without further main extensions should be included in the requested service area expansion, unless the areas are under

the sphere of influence of another water purveyor. The new transmission mains to serve the proposed areas shall be designed to accommodate growth during the economical life of such mains.

4. Parcels of land for which Cal Water has not notified the owners shall not be included in the proposed service area extension.
5. When the nearest customer to be served by the main extension is located more than 2000 feet from the existing service area, adequate justification that the water main extension is the best alternative in providing water service should be included in the filing.
6. A statement confirming that the Local Agency Formation Commission has been sent a copy of the revised service area map filing.
7. Documentation demonstrating that the project for which the service area is being extended, has at least preliminary approval of the local permitting agency.
8. Documentation, normally in the form of a letter from the local fire protection entity having jurisdiction, that the fire protection entity is satisfied with the fire flow capability of the system planned for the new area.
9. A map of the proposed water main extension and supporting computations showing compliance with the minimum design and water supply standards of General Order 103.

Finally, Cal Water and WD have also reached agreement concerning ratemaking adjustments related to the plant acquisition adjustment account. In its "RESPONSE TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUIRING ADDITIONAL FILING BY APPLICANT" dated August 6, 1996, Cal Water argued its position and provided detailed accounting entries relating to various water system acquisitions in its Bakersfield and Visalia districts. WD (DRA's successor) also addressed this issue in its "REPORT IN RESPONSE TO CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING OF JUNE 27, 1996". Both Cal Water and WD recommended rate adjustments to reflect the Commission's acquisition adjustment policy. Accordingly, the Parties have had settlement meetings and have agreed to the following adjustments:

1. A one time \$94,329 credit to the Visalia district Balancing Account. This credit will

benefit ratepayers by reducing the Balancing Account undercollection.

2. A one time \$5,671 credit to the Bakersfield district Balancing Account. This credit will benefit ratepayers by reducing the Balancing Account undercollection.
3. A reduction in the Visalia district's annual revenues by approximately \$50,765. Attached are revised Visalia district rate schedules reflecting the reduction.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with the discussion above Cal Water and WD jointly make the following recommendations:

1. The Commission should adopt the Cal Water procedural filing requirements set forth in this MOU which address:
  - A. Non-Commission regulated water system acquisitions, and
  - B. Water main extensions into areas outside Cal Water's service territory.
2. Cal Water should be authorized to file with WD the revised service area maps submitted with Application 95-09-005 et al.
3. Cal Water should be directed to credit its Visalia district and Bakersfield district Balancing Accounts by \$94,329 and \$5,671, respectively.
4. The Commission should adopt the attached Visalia district rate schedules that reflect a \$50,765 reduction in annual revenues.

Schedule No. VS-1

Visalia Tariff Area

GENERAL METERED SERVICE

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all metered water service.

TERRITORY

Visalia and vicinity, Tulare County.

RATES

Quantity Rates:

Per 100 cu. ft. .... \$ 0.4727 (R)

Service Charge:

	Per Meter Per Month
For 5/8 x 3/4-inch meter .....	\$ 5.60
For 1-inch meter .....	10.20
For 1-1/2-inch meter .....	21.28
For 2-inch meter .....	26.88
For 3-inch meter .....	50.00
For 4-inch meter .....	69.00
For 6-inch meter .....	113.00
For 8-inch meter .....	171.00
For 10-inch meter .....	216.00

The Service Charge is a readiness-to-serve charge which is applicable to all metered service and to which is added the charge for water used computed at the Quantity Rate.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Due to the under-collection in the balancing account, a surcharge of \$ 0.014 per 100 cu. ft. of water used is to be applied to the quantity rates for 12 months from June 11, 1996, the effective date of Advice Letter 1417.
2. To recover an increase in Federal Income Taxes due to the elevation of the corporate income tax rate from 34.12% to 35.12%, a surcharge of \$ 0.003 per 100 cu. ft. of water used is to be applied to the quantity rate for 12 months from June 11, 1996, the effective date of Advice Letter 1417.
3. To refund an amount agreed to in Decision 95-08-058 for the injuries and damages reserve account, a surcredit of \$0.04 per service connection is to be applied to each bill for 60 months from June 11, 1996, the effective date of Advice Letter 1417.
4. To recover extraordinary maintenance expenses, a surcharge of \$ 0.002 per 100 cu. ft. of water used is to be applied to the quantity rate for 12 months from June 11, 1996, the effective date of Advice Letter 1417.
5. To recover costs tracked in the meter retrofit memorandum account, a surcharge of \$ 0.010 per 100 cu. ft. of water used is to be applied to the quantity rate for 12 months from June 11, 1996, the effective date of Advice Letter 1417.
6. All bills are subject to the reimbursement fee set forth on Schedule No. UF.

(To be inserted by utility)

Advice Letter No. 1417

Decision No. \_\_\_\_\_

Issued by

FRANCIS S. FERRARO

NAME

Vice President

TITLE

(To be inserted by Cal. P.U.C.)

Date Filed \_\_\_\_\_

Effective \_\_\_\_\_

Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_



Schedule No. VS-2R

Visalia Tariff Area

RESIDENTIAL FLAT RATE SERVICE

APPLICABILITY

Applicable to all flat rate residential water service.

TERRITORY

Visalia and vicinity, Tulare County.

RATES

For a single-family residential unit, including premises having the following areas:	<u>Per Service Connection per Month</u>	
6,000 sq. ft., or less .....	\$ 13.33	(R)
6,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. ....	18.22	(R)
10,001 to 16,000 sq. ft. ....	23.12	(R)
16,001 to 25,000 sq. ft. ....	28.93	(R)
 For each additional single-family residential unit on the same premises and served from the same service connection .....	 11.17	

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The above flat rates apply to service connections not larger than one inch in diameter.
2. All service not covered by the above classifications shall be furnished only on a metered basis.
3. For service covered by the above classifications, if the utility or the customer so elects, a meter shall be installed and service provided under Schedule No. VS-1, General Metered Service.
4. This Schedule is closed to all new connections as of July 23, 1992, the effective date of Tariff Sheet No. 4220-W.
5. Due to the under-collection in the balancing account, a surcharge is to be applied according to the following schedule for a period of 12 months from the effective date of this rate schedule:
 

For a single-family residential unit, including premises having the following areas:	<u>Surcharge per Service Connection per Month</u>
6,000 sq. ft., or less .....	\$ 0.26
6,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. ....	0.32
10,001 to 16,000 sq. ft. ....	0.39
16,001 to 25,000 sq. ft. ....	0.51
For each additional unit served from the same connection.....	\$ 0.20
6. To recover an increase in Federal Income Taxes due to the elevation of the corporate income tax rate by 1%, a surcharge is to be applied according to the following schedule for a period of 12 months from the effective date of this rate schedule:
 

For a single-family residential unit, including premises having the following areas:	<u>Surcharge per Service Connection per Month</u>
6,000 sq. ft., or less .....	\$ 0.06
6,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. ....	0.09
10,001 to 16,000 sq. ft. ....	0.11
16,001 to 25,000 sq. ft. ....	0.10
For each additional unit served from the same connection.....	\$ 0.04

(continued)

(To be inserted by utility)

Advice Letter No. \_\_\_\_\_

Decision No. \_\_\_\_\_

Issued by

FRANCIS S. FERRARO

Vice President  
NAME

(To be inserted by Cal. PUC)

Date Filed \_\_\_\_\_

Effective \_\_\_\_\_

Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_

(END OF APPENDIX A)