

Decision No. 81908

**ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the investigation )  
upon the Commission's own motion )  
to determine the propriety of )  
requiring public utilities to )  
invite publicly, written sealed )  
bids for the purchase of their )  
securities. )

Case No. 4761

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER

Good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Subparagraph (5) of the first ordering paragraph of the Order in Decision No. 38614, dated January 15, 1946, as amended by Decision No. 49941, dated April 20, 1954, in the above-entitled matter, is hereby further amended by increasing the maximum amount of the competitive bidding exemption from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the second sentence of the second ordering paragraph of said Decision No. 38614 is hereby amended by changing the word "ten" to "five" so that said sentence will read as follows:

Such invitation shall be given not less than five days, unless a shorter time is authorized by the Commission, prior to the opening of the bids.

RECEIVED  
JUL 31 1991  
LINDA YI HSIEN CHENG

C. 4761-S HN

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 25<sup>th</sup>  
day of September, 1973.

Vernon L. Stevens  
President  
William Eugene J.  
William J. [unclear]  
[unclear]  
[unclear]  
Commissioners

Bids should be opened only at such time and place as is specified in the invitation. A duly authorized representative of any person submitting a bid should be permitted to be present at the opening of the bids and examine each bid submitted. The utility, when inviting bids, should reserve the right to reject all bids and call for new bids or seek such other relief as may be warranted.

## ORDER

The Commission having considered the evidence and argument submitted in this case, finds that an order requiring public utilities to invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities coming within this order is in the public interest, therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that public utilities, whose security issues come within Section 52 of the Public Utilities Act, shall invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities, except the following:

(1) The issuance of any security by a public utility in exchange for outstanding securities where no commission or other remuneration is paid or given directly or indirectly for soliciting such exchange.

(2) The issuance of any security offered pro rata to existing security holders pursuant to any pre-emptive right or privilege.

(3) Any security issued by a public utility in exchange for an outstanding security in connection with a reorganization or financial adjustment pursuant to the decree of a court of competent jurisdiction.

(4) Any note or conditional sale contract issued by a public utility and payable within five years after date provided no fee or remuneration is to be paid for negotiating the loan represented by said note or conditional sale contract.

(5) Any security issued and sold where the total consideration received by the issuing public utility is <sup>35</sup> \$1,000,000 or less.

(6) Any security as to which the Commission shall find, upon due showing by a public utility that the sale thereof at competitive bidding should not be required.

subpara. (7)  
added in  
D. 75556

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that each public utility shall by newspaper publication invite the submission, at a <sup>five</sup> stated date, hour and place, of sealed, written bids for the purchase of the specified security. Such invitation shall be given not less than ~~ten~~ days, unless a shorter time is authorized by the Commission, prior to the opening of the bids. The invitation shall state the name and address of the person from whom information regarding the public utility and the proposed issue may be obtained. The duly authorized representative of any person submitting a bid shall be entitled to be present at the

modified in  
D. 49941 +  
D. 81908

modified in  
D. 81908

19-45654

(7) As used in this order, the word "security" refers to a debt security.

opening of the bids and to examine each bid submitted. The public utility shall reserve the right to reject any or all bids.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that no public utility shall accept any bid from any person who has received or is to receive, directly or indirectly, any fee for services rendered to it, directly or indirectly, in connection with or relating to the issuance and proposed sale of a security, or the issuance or proposed sale of a security. The term "proposed sale" contained in the foregoing shall not include a resale by an underwriter or purchaser.

*vacated  
in D. 49941*

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that as a condition precedent to the entering of an order authorizing a public utility to issue any security covered by this order, it shall file with the Commission an application setting forth each bid received and which bid it is ready to accept. The Commission reserves the right to deny the application or grant it conditionally.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that this order is effective twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 15th day of January, 1946.

ANDERSON, CRAEMER, CLARK, HULS, *Commissioners.*

ROWELL, C., *dissenting:*

I regret that I cannot concur in the foregoing decision. If there are facts of record that justify the action here taken, they should substantially be set forth in the opinion, and findings made, so that the Commission's reasoning processes be fully revealed. Nothing in the opinion points to the existence of evils in the issuance of utility securities in this State that would justify the prescription of such a competitive bidding rule as that here imposed. And I am convinced that the rule as prescribed is an unworkable one. I would readily join in the declaration of a policy that would continue our practice of judging the need for competitive bidding on debt securities of substantial amount when the facts presented upon the hearing of each application before us appear to justify that procedure. But the rule here imposed, made applicable to stocks as well as debt issues, and even to conditional sales contracts, is in my opinion without any justification whatever on the evidence presented in this proceeding.

ROWELL, *Commissioner.*

- D 75549, A 50797** (April 8, 1969). The San Diego & Coronado Ferry Co. authorized to discontinue operation of ferries between San Diego and Coronado upon completion of new toll bridge, and Cal. Dept. Pub. Works authorized to acquire its boats and other property.
- D 75550, C 5441** (Pet. Mod. 154), **C 5432** (Pet. Mod. 524) (April 9, 1969). Proceedings reopened for further hearing.
- D 75551, A 50800** (April 15, 1969). City of Industry authorized to construct Chestnut Street at grade across track of So. Pac. Co.
- D 75552, A 50525** (April 15, 1969). City of Ontario authorized to construct crossing at separated grades over tracks of So. Pac. Co. and Union Pacific Railroad Co. in Ontario.
- D 75553, A 50939** (April 15, 1969). Cal. Dept. Pub. Works authorized to widen existing South Tustin Overhead over tracks of AT&SF Ry. Co. in Orange County.
- D 75554, C 5098, C 7192** (April 15, 1969). Cases 5098 and 7192 reopened for the purpose of adding provisions to General Order No. 98-A adopted by D 69331.
- D 75555, C 8647** (April 15, 1969). Petition of P.T.&T. Co. for rehearing of D 75379 (John Faia III v. P.T.&T. Co.) denied.

**DECISION NO. 75556, CASE NO. 4781**  
(April 15, 1969)

First Supplemental Opinion and Order on petition of *Cal. Water & Tel. Co.* for modification of Competitive Bidding Rule exempts stock issues from Competitive Bidding Rule.

[1] **SECURITIES—EQUITY SECURITIES—COMPETITIVE BIDDING.** All equity securities should be removed from Commission's competitive bidding rule, and Commission should reserve right to require competitive bidding with respect to equity securities in individual instances when it deems such procedure justified.

**FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION ON PETITION FOR  
MODIFICATION OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING RULE**

On January 15, 1946, by Decision No. 38614, the Commission entered an order requiring public utilities to invite written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities, with certain exceptions, which requirement is referred to as the Commission's competitive bidding rule.

By Decision No. 49941, dated April 20, 1954, the Commission granted, in part, a petition filed by California Water & Telephone Company increasing from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000 the amount which the consideration to be received from the issuance and sale of a security must exceed before such security would become subject to the competitive bidding rule. In said Decision No. 49941, the Commission denied without prejudice California Water & Telephone Company's request that the Commission exempt equity securities from the competitive bidding rule. The only protestant to such public utility's petition was Halsey, Stuart & Co. Inc., an investment banker specializing in debt securities and not dealing in equity securities.

In its Annual Report to the Governor for the 1961-62 fiscal year, the Commission stated on page 69 that . . .

"Although the Commission has denied only one request to exempt a stock issue from competitive bidding since it promulgated the competitive bidding rule in 1946, it generally does not ex-

empt bon

The same hold for the Comm to obtain exer bidding rule ii exceed \$3,000 should be in a ties more clos

The Commi ter & Telep competitive b: sary with resp of public hear securities is ad not necessary.

[1] On the equity securiti tive bidding ri to require cor individual ins

IT IS ORDE

1. Subparagr of Decision No 49941 (7) As used security only.

2. The Comi ding with resp deems such pr

3. The effect modification of date hereof.

Dated at Sar

ronado Ferry Co. authorized to discontin-  
onado upon completion of new toll bridge,  
its boats and other property.

4 (April 9, 1969). Proceedings reopened

authorized to construct Chestnut Street at

horized to construct crossing at separated  
o Railroad Co. in Ontario.

orks authorized to widen existing South  
Orange County.

8 and 7192 reopened for the purpose of  
ed by D 69331.

Co. for rehearing of D 75379 (John Faia

NO. 4761

Water & Tel. Co. for modification of  
Competitive Bidding Rule.

ING. All equity securities should be  
and Commission should reserve right to  
urities in individual instances when it

ON PETITION FOR  
BIDDING RULE

38614, the Commission en-  
invite written sealed bids  
certain exceptions, which  
sion's competitive bidding

1, the Commission grant-  
& Telephone Company  
amount which the con-  
d sale of a security must  
bjeet to the competitive  
he Commission denied  
hone Company's request  
ies from the competitive  
ublic utility's petition was  
nker specializing in debt  
es.  
e 1961-62 fiscal year, the

d only one request to ex-  
ling since it promulgated  
t generally does not ex-

empt bond issues from such rule." . . .

The same holds true today. It no longer appears necessary or desirable for the Commission to require public utilities subject to its jurisdiction to obtain exemption of their equity securities from the competitive bidding rule in instances where the consideration to be received will exceed \$3,000,000. Without this requirement such public utilities should be in a better position to time their offerings of equity securities more closely to favorable market conditions.

The Commission has given further consideration to California Water & Telephone Company's petition for modification of the competitive bidding rule, and finds that said rule is no longer necessary with respect to equity securities, and that the time and expense of public hearings required for the exemption showing for equity securities is adverse to the public interest. A further public hearing is not necessary.

[1] On the basis of the foregoing findings, we conclude that all equity securities should be removed from the Commission's competitive bidding rule, and that the Commission should reserve the right to require competitive bidding with respect to equity securities in individual instances when it deems such procedure to be justified.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER ON PETITION FOR  
MODIFICATION OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING RULE

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Subparagraph (7) is hereby added to the first ordering paragraph of Decision No. 38614, dated January 15, 1946, as modified by Decision No. 49941, dated April 20, 1954, to read as follows:

(7) As used in this order, the word "security" refers to a debt security only.

2. The Commission reserves the right to require competitive bidding with respect to equity securities in individual instances when it deems such procedure to be justified.

3. The effective date of this first supplemental order on petition for modification of competitive bidding rule shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 15th day of April, 1969.

WILLIAM SYMONS, JR.  
*President*

A. W. GATOV  
FRED P. MORRISSEY  
J. P. VUKASIN, JR.  
THOMAS MORAN  
*Commissioners*

D 49932, A 35314 (Apr. 20, 1954). So. Counties Gas Co. authorized to issue \$15,000,000 1st mortgage Series A bonds after competitive bidding.

D 49933, A 34901 (Apr. 20, 1954). J. Fernandez, et al. (Brentwood Village W. Co.) authorized to operate water system in Sacramento Co.

D 49934, A 34539 (Apr. 20, 1954). W. Dunning authorized to sell Linda Center W. System to A. Dententer. (1st Supp.)

D 49935, A 35180 (Apr. 20, 1954). P. G. & E. Co. granted certificate to exercise electric franchise in City of San Joaquin.

D 49936, A 35181 (Apr. 20, 1954). P. G. & E. Co. granted certificate to exercise electric franchise in City of Ione.

D 49937, A 35236 (Apr. 20, 1954). P. G. & E. Co. and Turlock Irr. Dist. authorized to serve electricity within redefined areas in Merced and Stanislaus Counties.

D 49938, A 34632 (Apr. 20, 1954). Crocker-Huffman L. & W. Co. authorized to increase Merced system water rates.

D 49939, A 35168 (Apr. 20, 1954). W. A. Hansen, et al., authorized to transfer Jacumba W. System to H. La Zare, et al.

D 49940, A 35324 (Apr. 20, 1954). Independent Tel. Co. authorized to transfer Knights Landing exchange to C. H. Ivey (Enterprise Tel. Co.)

**DECISION No. 49941, CASE No. 4761**

(April 20, 1954)

Investigation to determine whether competitive bidding rule should be modified.

[1] SECURITIES AND EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS—COMMISSION JURISDICTION—SALES PRICE—COMPETITIVE BIDDING. The exemption of equity securities and of debt securities sold privately or to institutional investors was fully considered by the Commission in promulgating the competitive bidding rule. There is no evidence in the instant proceeding warranting such exemption.

[2] SECURITIES AND EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS—COMMISSION JURISDICTION—EXEMPTIONS FROM COMPETITIVE BIDDING. Upon the basis of the Commission's experience with the competitive bidding rule, it appears reasonable to increase the present exemption from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000.

[3] PRACTICE BEFORE COMMISSION—SECURITIES AND EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS—SALES PRICE. The Commission may at its option authorize a utility to issue and sell its securities at competitive bidding on the most favorable terms offered without the necessity of a supplemental application for approval of the price offered.

*Claude N. Rosenberg and Chas. DeY. Elkus, Jr.*, for California Water & Telephone Company, petitioner; *John Francis Neylan*, for Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc., protestant; *Orrick, Dahlquist, Herrington & Sutcliffe and Warren A. Palmer*, for California-Pacific Utilities Company, interested party; *Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison*, by *George D. Rives*, for The California Oregon Power Company, interested party; *O'Melveny & Myers*, by *Frederick N. Edwards*, for Southern California Water Company, interested party; *McCutchen, Thomas, Matthew*.

Griffiths & Greene, by *Robert Minge Brown*, for California Water Service Company and San Jose Water Works, interested parties; *Fred Oldendorf*, for California Electric Power Company, interested party; *J. T. Phelps*, for the Commission's staff.

OPINION ON PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF COMPETITIVE  
BIDDING RULE

On January 15, 1946, the Commission made its order requiring public utilities to invite written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities, with certain exceptions. The Commission's requirement is set forth in its Decision No. 38614 and is referred to as its competitive bidding rule.

At this time we have under consideration a petition filed by California Water & Telephone Company requesting the Commission to amend its competitive bidding rule in the following respects:

- (a) Equity securities should be exempted from said rule.
- (b) Debt securities should be exempted from said rule when they are sold privately or solely to institutional investors and not through a public offering.
- (c) The present exemption on the sale of securities where the total consideration received by the issuing public utility is \$1,000,000 or less should apply only to debt securities, and should be enlarged so as to exempt the sale of securities where the total consideration received by the issuing public utility is \$3,000,000 or less.

Public hearings on the petition for modification were held in San Francisco before Commissioner Mittelstaedt and Examiner Coleman, the matter being taken under submission on April 14, 1954. A motion to dismiss the petition was made by counsel for Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc.

The Commission prescribed its competitive bidding rule in 1946 after extended hearings. In the exercise of its administrative functions it concluded that the issue by utilities of securities, including equity securities, should be made at competitive bidding, with certain exceptions as set forth in the rule. It recognized there might be cases where competitive bidding should not be required and it made provision for exemption upon due showing by a utility in any particular issue. The records of the Commission clearly show that it has not been unwilling to grant exemption from the application of the competitive bidding rule upon showing being made that more advantageous terms might be expected from negotiated underwriting and by private placement than by competitive bidding.

[1] A review of the record in the pending matter shows that the reasons now advanced for modification of the bidding requirements, in general, are the same as those presented to the Commission in the

origi  
missio  
no ad  
modif  
The  
missio  
that s  
\$3,000  
has ex  
that a  
missio  
little i  
of less  
which  
were c  
our ex  
that it  
to \$3,0

[3]

forth i  
Under  
of secu  
applic  
request  
proving  
that th  
so as t  
mission  
mental  
utility  
under  
discho

Pub  
the C  
opin  
bidd

IT  
1.3  
Dec



California Water Service Com-  
missioner Fred Oldendorf, for Cali-  
fornia, and F. Phelps, for the Com-

#### OF COMPETITIVE

its order requiring  
the purchase of their  
Commission's requirement is  
to as its competitive

petition filed by Cali-  
fornia, the Commission to  
in certain respects:

in said rule.  
in said rule when they  
and not

securities where the total  
utility is \$1,000,000  
securities, and should be  
securities where the total  
utility is \$3,000,000

hearings were held in San  
Francisco by Examiner Coleman,  
April 14, 1954. A motion  
was filed for Halsey, Stuart &

the bidding rule in 1946  
for administrative func-  
tion of securities, including  
competitive bidding, with certain  
exceptions where there might be cases  
and it made pro-  
vision in any particular  
matters that it has not been  
the Commission of the competitive  
rule and the more advantageous terms  
and by private place-

This matter shows that the  
bidding requirements,  
the Commission in the

original proceeding. These matters were fully considered by the Com-  
mission at the time it promulgated its present rule. In our opinion,  
no additional evidence is now before us which would warrant us to  
modify our requirements as requested by petitioner.

The record in this proceeding does not show, however, that the Com-  
mission has exempted all preferred stock issues of less than \$3,000,000,  
that since 1948 it has exempted all common stock offerings of less than  
\$3,000,000 when requested to do so, and that since 1950 it similarly  
has exempted all applications involving debt financing of less than  
that amount. From a review of the information now before the Com-  
mission, it appears that in general security underwriters have shown  
little interest in competitive bidding proceedings involving financing  
of less than \$3,000,000 and that sales of securities in that amount  
which were made by private placement or by negotiated underwriting  
were consummated under reasonable terms. [2] Upon the basis of  
our experience with the competitive bidding rule, it appears to us  
that it is reasonable to increase the present exemption from \$1,000,000  
to \$3,000,000.

[3] One further modification of the administrative procedure set  
forth in our competitive bidding rule will be considered at this time.  
Under our existing rule the utility, in each proceeding involving sales  
of securities at competitive bidding, is required to file a supplemental  
application setting forth information regarding the bids received and  
requesting issuance by this Commission of a supplemental order ap-  
proving the price offered by the successful bidder. It appears to us  
that this provision of the competitive bidding rule should be modified  
so as to eliminate the mandatory requirement. In the future the Com-  
mission, while retaining the right to require the filing of supple-  
mental applications as in the past, may at its option authorize the  
utility to issue and sell its securities at competitive bidding to the  
underwriter or underwriters offering the most favorable terms as  
disclosed by the bids received.

#### ORDER ON PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING RULE

Public hearings having been held on the above entitled matter, and  
the Commission having considered the evidence and being of the  
opinion that an order should be entered amending the competitive  
bidding rule in certain respects; therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. Subparagraph 5 of the first ordering paragraph of the order in  
Decision No. 38614, dated January 15, 1946, reading as follows:

"5. Any security issued and sold where the total consideration received by the issuing public utility is \$1,000,000 or less."

be, and it hereby is, modified to read as follows:

"5. Any security issued and sold where the total consideration received by the issuing public utility is \$3,000,000 or less."

2. The fourth ordering paragraph of the order in said Decision No. 38614, reading as follows:

"IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that as a condition precedent to the entering of an order authorizing a public utility to issue any security covered by this order, it shall file with the Commission an application setting forth each bid received and which bid it is ready to accept. The Commission reserves the right to deny the application or grant it conditionally."

be, and it hereby is, vacated and set aside.

3. Except to the extent indicated herein, the petition for modification is denied without prejudice.

4. The effective date of this opinion and order on petition for modification of competitive bidding rule shall be 20 days after the date hereof.

The foregoing order, in effect, disposes of the motion to dismiss.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 20th day of April, 1953.

MITTELSTAEDT, *President*

CRAEMER, POTTER, MITCHELL, SCOGGINS, *Commissioners*

---

D 49942, A 31767 (Apr. 20, 1954). Clear Lake Park W. Co. Time to issue \$20,000 1st mortgage 5% bonds extended to Mar. 31, 1955. (5th Supp.)

---

D 49943, A 35153 (Apr. 20, 1954). A. V. Harvey, et al. (W.O.T. Co.) authorized to change route and transfer bus certificate and assets to West Orange Transit Co., Inc.; latter to issue \$2,600 stock.  
SECURITY ISSUES—STOCK—GOOD WILL. The Commission is not warranted in accepting an amount claimed for good will as the basis for authorizing a stock issue.

---

D 49944, A 35317 (Apr. 20, 1954). Garden City Warehouse Co., Inc., authorized to issue \$30,000 common stock.

---

D 49945, A 34186 (Apr. 20, 1954). L. A. Transit Lines. Pet. for reh. of D 49860 denied.

---

D 49946, A 34186 (Apr. 20, 1954). L. A. Transit Lines. Pet. of State Dept. of P. Works for reh. of D 49860 denied.

---

D 49947, A 30638 (7th Supp.) (Apr. 20, 1954). Asbury Rapid Transit System granted bus certificate in Burbank and North Hollywood.  
CERTIFICATES—LIMITATIONS ON BUS CERTIFICATE. A condition in a temporary bus certificate, to the effect that losses should not be urged as a reason for fare increases on more productive lines, is not a normal limitation, and was removed in issuing permanent certificate.

## DECISION No. 38614, CASE No. 4761

(January 15, 1946)

Investigation of propriety of a competitive bidding rule for public utility securities.

**SECURITY ISSUES—COMPULSORY COMPETITIVE BIDDING RULE.** Public utilities whose security issues come within P.U.A. Sec. 52 are directed to invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities, with certain exceptions. (Rowell, C., dissents.)

**SECURITY ISSUES—PUBLIC INTEREST IN PRICE.** It is in the public interest that utilities sell their securities at the highest price obtainable.

**SECURITY ISSUES—COMMISSION POWER TO REQUIRE COMPETITIVE BIDDING.** The power to grant or deny authority to issue securities implies the power to grant with qualification or condition (P.U.A. Secs. 52(a), 52(b)). A rule requiring competitive bidding would constitute merely a condition attached to the grant in the public interest.

**SECURITY ISSUES—PRICE—EVIDENCE.** While the Commission has positive authority to fix the price at which a utility may sell its securities, it should do so only upon competent evidence before it.

**SECURITY ISSUES—MANAGERIAL DISCRETION.** The sale of securities by utilities is no longer a matter that rests exclusively with the management of the utilities. (*Pittsburgh & W. V. Ry. Co., et al. v. I. C. C., et al.*, 293 Fed. 1001.)

**SECURITY ISSUES—PRICE OF SECURITIES AS FACTOR IN REGULATORY PROCESS.** The regulation of security issues is an essential step in maintaining a just relation between the utility and its consumers, as in fixing a fair return the Commission takes cognizance of outstanding securities and the burden, in the way of interest and dividends, that they impose upon a utility. The price at which securities are sold enters into that determination.

*Edward C. Renuick*, for Interstate Transit Lines; *E. J. Foulds*, for Southern Pacific Company and Affiliated Companies; *Reginald L. Vaughn*, for Vallejo Electric Light and Power Company; *G. C. Larkin*, for Southern California Edison Company, Ltd.; *James S. Moore, Jr.*, for The California-Oregon Power Company; *Charles F. Mason* and *Harry L. Dunn*, for Associated Telephone Company, Ltd.; *Hugh Gordon*, for Pacific Freight Lines and Pacific Freight Lines Express; *D. L. King*, for California Electric Power Company and Interstate Telegraph Company; *Ralph Elsmann*, for San Jose Water Works and California Water Service Company; *J. Maatta*, for Pacific Greyhound Lines; *Chickering & Gregory*, by *Allen Chickering*, for San Diego Gas and Electric Company; *William B. Bosley*, *Robert H. Gerdes* and *R. W. DuVal*, for Pacific Gas and Electric Company; *Arthur T. George*, for The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company and Southern California Telephone Company; *Gerald C. Kepple* and *James S. Campbell*, for Consolidated Telephone Company; *H. G. Hayes*, for Coast Counties Gas and Electric Company; *John L. Lilienthal*, for California Water and Telephone Company; *L. A. Bailey* and *Reginald L. Vaughn*, for California Warehousemen's Association and Pacific States Cold Storage Warehousemen's Association; *Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher*, by *Max Eddy Utt*, for Los Angeles Transit Lines; *Paul Overton*, for San Gabriel Valley Water Service; *Leroy M. Edwards*, for Southern California Gas Company and Southern Counties Gas Company of California; *Herman Phleger* and *B. J. Feigenbaum*, for Investment Bankers Association of America, California Group; *Robert W. Cross*, for Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company; *Frank W. Walker*, Financial Vice President, for Stanford University; *Benjamin C. Corlett*, Superintendent of Banks for the State of California; *Edward M. Daugherty*, Commissioner of Corporations for the State of California; *G. M. Cuthbertson*, for Securities and Exchange Commission; *John Francis Neylan*, for Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc.

## OPINION

Hearings were had in this proceeding on June 27, August 15, 17, 18 and 22, and September 6 and 17. The parties were given an

opportunity to file opening concurrent briefs on or before October 17, and reply briefs on or before October 31. Some of them have filed briefs and the matter is now ready for decision.

At the initial hearing, which was before Commissioners Anderson, Craemer, Sachse and Rowell, utility representatives and others made general statements for and against a competitive bidding rule. The statements were not made under oath and those making them were not subject to cross examination. The Commission at the opening of the hearing suggested that the statements be general, and that testimony and evidence be presented at subsequent hearings to be held by Examiner Fankhauser. He conducted the hearings on the days above mentioned subsequent to June 27.

During the hearings conducted by Examiner Fankhauser, representatives of nine utilities<sup>(1)</sup> submitted evidence against a compulsory competitive bidding rule, while Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc., submitted evidence in support of such a rule. The Investment Bankers Association of America, California Group, who indicated in an earlier proceeding before the Commission that it desired an opportunity to present its views, called no witness. Its counsel did file an opening and reply brief. The other parties who entered an appearance at the initial hearing offered no evidence.

This case presents but one issue, to wit, should the Commission require certain utilities to invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities. The term "securities" as used herein, unless otherwise specifically stated, covers stocks and stock certificates or other evidence of interest or ownership, and bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness.

The record shows that the sale of public utility securities under competitive bidding is no longer in an experimental stage. In 1926 the Interstate Commerce Commission announced that railroads as a condition precedent to the sale of equipment trust obligations should invite tenders therefor. By its Decision of May 8, 1944, effective July 1, 1944, in Ex Parte 158, that Commission found that for the proper administration, execution and enforcement of Section 20-a of the Interstate Commerce Act it should require as a condition to the approval of the sale of railroad bonds that they be offered for sale at competitive bidding.

On April 7, 1941, the Securities and Exchange Commission proceeding under the authority conferred upon it by the Holding Company Act of 1935, adopted its Rule U-50, effective May 7, 1941. Under this

<sup>(1)</sup> Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
The California-Oregon Power Company  
Southern California Edison Company Ltd.  
California Electric Power Company  
Southern California Gas Company  
Southern Counties Gas Company of California  
San Gabriel Valley Water Service  
Los Angeles Transit Lines

rule holding companies and their subsidiaries as defined in said act are required to invite publicly, sealed written proposals for the purchase of the securities which are not specifically exempt by the rule.

On May 23, 1939, the Federal Power Commission modified its rules of practice and regulations and requires an applicant seeking permission to issue securities to make a showing that it has in an adequate manner publicly called for and has made diligent effort to obtain competitive bids for its securities. The New York Public Service Commission and the Railroad Commission of California have recently in specific instances required utilities to invite bids for the purchase of securities.

The following table shows the volume of debt securities sold by public utilities and by railroads through negotiated sales and under competitive bidding from 1941 to August 1, 1945.

Year	Public Utilities		Railroads	
	Negotiated Sales	Competitive Sales	Negotiated Sales	Competitive Sales
1941 -----	\$330,575,000	\$162,527,000	\$36,418,000	\$41,897,000
1942 -----	31,000,000	205,500,000	5,995,000	9,500,000
1943 -----	16,000,000	320,800,000	28,483,000	31,700,000
1944 -----	300,450,000	675,343,000	4,500,000	401,825,000
To 8-1-1945 -----	56,984,000	624,656,000	---	657,801,000

The principal reasons advanced by the utilities against a compulsory competitive bidding rule may be summarized as follows:

- (a) A competitive bidding rule deprives the utilities of bankers' advice.
- (b) Competitive bidding does not result in the best price.
- (c) A competitive bidding rule is an unnecessary interference with the management of utilities.

The utilities also question the Commission's authority to enter an order prescribing a compulsory competitive bidding rule.

(a) Bankers' Advice

Some of the utilities submitted evidence showing that investment bankers to whom they sold their securities under negotiated sales advised them on interest rates, redemption prices, sinking fund provisions, maturity dates and on other matters. They reviewed the trust indentures securing the payment of bonds and rendered assistance in the preparation and filing of registration statements. They advised them as to the time when an offering might be made to avoid competition with other offerings and to take advantage of favorable market conditions. One witness testified that the smaller utilities are not financially able to keep a professional security expert on their payrolls and therefore must of necessity depend on advice from investment bankers. For services thus rendered, the bankers' compensation is in the spread, that is, the difference between what the utility receives for its securities

and the price at which the securities are offered to the public. They fear that under a compulsory competitive bidding rule they would not have the advice of the bankers in the particulars mentioned.

**(b) Best Price**

The evidence does not specifically define the term "best price". It points to a price at which securities can be sold to the public less compensation to the investment banker. It appears to be a price slightly below rather than above the current market value for comparable securities. Most of the utilities prefer to have their security issues sold quickly and, as one witness put it, not be "hanging around for a long time". They feel it adds to the prestige of the issuer if its securities can be promptly sold by the underwriter. The record on this point, however, is not unanimous. One utility witness looks upon the underwriter as a prime contractor on his own and if the market went bad it would be his misfortune. On the other hand, if the market went up it would be his good luck. He testified that none of his company's issues went "out the window" and expressed the hope that so long as he sold the company's securities no issue ever "goes out the window". Another witness testified that the utilities have no way of knowing what prompts a sealed bid. The bid may be based on a desire to get some business away from someone else, or it may be actuated by a desire to show somebody up, or it may be submitted by someone hungry for business or prestige or it may be based on honest judgment of the market prices for securities. A price not predicated on current market price is viewed with suspicion and as not being in the best interest of the issuer. The evidence shows that neither a negotiated nor competitive bidding sale is any assurance that the investors will buy a security at its initial offering price.

**(c) Interference with Management**

The utilities, according to their evidence, should be permitted to sell their securities in the manner deemed by their management to be most advantageous to them. The evidence indicates that they have exercised some influence over the principal underwriter as to who should be included in the underwriting group. They seem to be fearful that a competitive bidding rule might force upon them a syndicate containing some undesirable members. The evidence shows a marked difference of procedure followed by the utilities in the sale of their securities. One utility determines the price at which it will sell its securities and then proceeds to find an underwriter who will pay that price. However, to date, the underwriter first contacted has always paid the price wanted by the utility. Other utilities select the underwriter and fix the price by negotiation with him. The fixing of the price is the final

step  
they  
does  
und  
with  
com  
mak  
othe

man  
free  
is d  
migl  
peti

Evid

cate  
of s  
rule  
that  
und  
to d  
banl  
pric  
mar  
of t  
banl  
in t  
mad  
the  
that  
wer  
that  
form  
serv  
ties  
proc

Conc

and  
req  
ties



state Commerce Commission's decision (Exhibit 4) in Ex Parte 158 requiring railroads to sell certain of their securities by competitive bidding. Parts 22, 23 and 24 (Exhibits 27-1, -2 and -3) of the 1939-1940 hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee covering testimony submitted by investment bankers are in evidence. The decisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission and of the Interstate Commerce Commission show that those Commissions had before them evidence in support of and against a competitive bidding rule similar to the evidence presented by the opponents and proponents of competitive bidding in this case. The Securities and Exchange Commission's competitive bidding rule has been in effect since May 6, 1941, and that of the Interstate Commerce Commission since June 30, 1944. Both are in effect now. It is argued that the conditions which justified those Commissions to adopt competitive bidding rules do not exist in California.

The record in this case shows that some utilities depend for advice and guidance on the investment banker to whom they intend to sell their securities. Obviously, the banker is an adversary party. It is doubtful whether the utilities should depend upon him for advice. In several instances members of investment banking firms were on the Board of Directors of the utilities whose securities they purchased. The record lacks convincing evidence that the utilities shopped around to sell their securities. A competitive bidding rule may relieve the utilities from what seems an implied right that bankers have to purchase the securities of certain utilities.

Much is said in this record about the price at which securities were sold. The price of securities is not static. It changes from day to day and varies with the vicissitudes of the business. No underwriter guarantees that the price at which he offers securities will not decline. The testimony shows that neither a negotiated sale nor a competitive bidding sale carries with it an assurance that the price will not rise above or drop below the offering price. That the price is affected by the terms of the securities, as well as by the standing of the issuer, is self-evident. It is in the public interest that utilities sell their securities at the highest price obtainable. We believe this can be achieved more readily when more than one investment banker is offered an opportunity to acquire their securities.

During the course of the hearing the Commission's authority to enter an order directing the utilities to invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities was questioned. Section 52(a) of the Public Utilities Act reads as follows:

"The power of public utilities to issue stocks and stock certificates or other evidence of interest or ownership, and bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness and to create liens on their



bit 4) in Ex Parte 158 securities by competitive -2 and -3) of the 1939- Economic Committee bankers are in evidence. Commission and of the those Commissions had a competitive biddingponents and proponents securities and Exchange in effect since May 6, Commission since June ed that the conditions petitive bidding rules

ties depend for advice m they intend to sell lversary party. It is n him for advice. In g firms were on the ities they purchased. ities shopped around rule may relieve the nkers have to purchase

which securities were changes from day to ss. No underwriter es will not decline. nor a competitive price will not rise rice is affected by g of the issuer, is s sell their securi- his can be achieved anker is offered an

ssion's authority to liely, written sealed ned. Section 52(a)

ocks and stock cer- ip, and bonds, notes create liens on their

property situated within this State is a special privilege, the right of supervision, regulation, restriction and control of which is and shall continue to be vested in the State, and such power shall be exercised as provided by law and under such rules and regulations as the commission may prescribe."

Section 52(b) provides that the Commission may by its order grant permission for the issue of such stocks or stock certificates or other evidence of interest or ownership, or bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness in the amount applied for or in a lesser amount or not at all, and may attach to the exercise of its permission such condition or conditions as it may deem reasonable and necessary. A rule requiring competitive bidding would constitute merely a condition attached to a grant of authority to issue securities.

Sections 52(a) and (b) of the Public Utilities Act have been in effect since March 23, 1912. In passing upon applications for permission to issue securities, the Commission's records show that it has granted some applications, granted some conditionally, and denied and dismissed some applications. The power to grant or deny implies the power to grant with qualification or condition. No utility has appealed to the Courts for relief from any Commission decision passing on a security application.

One utility takes the position that the directors of California utilities have the power and authority to determine the manner and mode of their financing, subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission under Section 52 of the Public Utilities Act. It alleges that the Commission is given supervisory power over utilities to protect the public interest, and that in the absence of a positive showing that the course of action proposed by the utility is detrimental to the public interest, the Commission should refrain from interfering with managerial judgment. This argument overlooks the plain and unambiguous intent of the statute, which was designed to protect the interest of the public.

While the Commission has positive authority to fix the price at which a utility may sell its securities, it should obviously do so only upon having before it competent evidence. The bids are a form of evidence helpful in determining the price at which the securities should be sold. In asking for bids a utility should reserve the right to reject any and all bids. It is for its management to decide what bid it will accept, and present to the Commission for its approval. Neither the utility nor the Commission is, under a compulsory competitive bidding rule such as is herein proposed, yielding any of its jurisdiction.

The Investment Bankers Association of America, California Group, in its brief states that it does not oppose the sale of securities by competitive bids where the issuer or any regulatory body at the time deems

such sale advisable and in the interest of the issuer, the investor and the public. It thus concedes that the Commission has the power to order competitive bids. It does not, however, concede that such power is broad enough to cover a compulsory competitive bidding rule.

There is judicial authority for the proposition that the sale of securities by utilities is no longer a matter that rests exclusively with the management of the utilities.<sup>(2)</sup> It is well-established that the Commission has the power to fix rates to protect the users of utility services and the utility itself. The regulation of security issues is an essential step in maintaining a just relation between the utility and its consumers. In fixing a fair return, the Commission takes cognizance of outstanding securities and the burden, in the way of interest and dividends, that they impose upon a utility. The price at which securities are sold enters into that determination. No one questioned the Commission's authority to fix the price at which utilities may sell their securities. As said, bids are evidence of the market value of the securities. In our opinion, Section 52 of the Public Utilities Act authorizes us to require utilities to invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities.

There remains the question as to what securities should be covered by the Commission's competitive bidding rule. The Commission is advised that the Securities and Exchange Commission regards an invitation for bids as a public offering for sale of securities under the Securities Act of 1933, and that such invitation may not be announced until a registration statement has been filed with that Commission and by it declared in effect. Because of this situation, we believe that this Commission's rule should at the outset not apply to an issue of securities, the total proceeds of which do not exceed \$1,000,000. Further, the rule should not apply to any security exchanged by the issuing utility with its existing security holders exclusively, where no commission is paid for soliciting such exchange, or to any security offered to existing security holders pursuant to any pre-emptive right or privilege. Further, it should not apply to any securities issued in exchange for outstanding securities in connection with any bona fide reorganization or financial adjustment pursuant to a decree of a court of competent jurisdiction. Neither should it apply to the conventional conditional sales contracts, if they are payable within five years after date, nor to notes payable in not more than five years after date provided no fee or remuneration is paid for negotiating the loan.

Upon the filing of an appropriate application and after a hearing had thereon, the Commission may exempt, after due showing, any security from its competitive bidding rule.

<sup>(2)</sup> 293 Federal Reporter, page 1001.

Bids should be opened only at such time and place as is specified in the invitation. A duly authorized representative of any person submitting a bid should be permitted to be present at the opening of the bids and examine each bid submitted. The utility, when inviting bids, should reserve the right to reject all bids and call for new bids or seek such other relief as may be warranted.

**ORDER**

The Commission having considered the evidence and argument submitted in this case, finds that an order requiring public utilities to invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities coming within this order is in the public interest, therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that public utilities, whose security issues come within Section 52 of the Public Utilities Act, shall invite publicly, written sealed bids for the purchase of their securities, except the following:

(1) The issuance of any security by a public utility in exchange for outstanding securities where no commission or other remuneration is paid or given directly or indirectly for soliciting such exchange.

(2) The issuance of any security offered pro rata to existing security holders pursuant to any pre-emptive right or privilege.

(3) Any security issued by a public utility in exchange for an outstanding security in connection with a reorganization or financial adjustment pursuant to the decree of a court of competent jurisdiction.

(4) Any note or conditional sale contract issued by a public utility and payable within five years after date provided no fee or remuneration is to be paid for negotiating the loan represented by said note or conditional sale contract.

(5) Any security issued and sold where the total consideration received by the issuing public utility is \$1,000,000 or less.

(6) Any security as to which the Commission shall find, upon due showing by a public utility that the sale thereof at competitive bidding should not be required.

subpara. (7)  
added in  
D. 75556

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that each public utility shall by newspaper publication invite the submission, at a stated date, hour and place, of sealed, written bids for the purchase of the specified security. Such invitation shall be given not less than ~~ten~~ <sup>five</sup> days, unless a shorter time is authorized by the Commission, prior to the opening of the bids. The invitation shall state the name and address of the person from whom information regarding the public utility and the proposed issue may be obtained. The duly authorized representative of any person submitting a bid shall be entitled to be present at the

modified in  
D. 49941 +  
D. 81908

modified in  
D. 81908

19-4565\*

(7) As used in this order, the word "security" refers to a debt security.

opening of the bids and to examine each bid submitted. The public utility shall reserve the right to reject any or all bids.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that no public utility shall accept any bid from any person who has received or is to receive, directly or indirectly, any fee for services rendered to it, directly or indirectly, in connection with or relating to the issuance and proposed sale of a security, or the issuance or proposed sale of a security. The term "proposed sale" contained in the foregoing shall not include a resale by an underwriter or purchaser.

*vacated  
in D. 49941*

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that as a condition precedent to the entering of an order authorizing a public utility to issue any security covered by this order, it shall file with the Commission an application setting forth each bid received and which bid it is ready to accept. The Commission reserves the right to deny the application or grant it conditionally.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that this order is effective twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 15th day of January, 1946.

ANDERSON, CRAEMER, CLARK, HULS, *Commissioners.*

—  
ROWELL, C., *dissenting:*

I regret that I cannot concur in the foregoing decision. If there are facts of record that justify the action here taken, they should substantially be set forth in the opinion, and findings made, so that the Commission's reasoning processes be fully revealed. Nothing in the opinion points to the existence of evils in the issuance of utility securities in this State that would justify the prescription of such a competitive bidding rule as that here imposed. And I am convinced that the rule as prescribed is an unworkable one. I would readily join in the declaration of a policy that would continue our practice of judging the need for competitive bidding on debt securities of substantial amount when the facts presented upon the hearing of each application before us appear to justify that procedure. But the rule here imposed, made applicable to stocks as well as debt issues, and even to conditional sales contracts, is in my opinion without any justification whatever on the evidence presented in this proceeding.

ROWELL, *Commissioner.*