



**FILED**

04-04-11

10:36 AM

JSW/avs 4/4/2011

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

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company Proposing Cost of Service and Rates for Gas Transmission and Storage Services for the Period 2011-2014. (U 39 G)

Application 09-09-013  
(Filed September 18, 2009)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING ON  
JOINT MOTION REQUESTING PARTY STATUS**

On March 18, 2011, a "Joint Motion Requesting Party Status" (motion) was jointly filed by the National Asian American Coalition, the Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles, and the Black Economic Council. The motion requests that they be granted party status in this proceeding. Alluding as to why these three entities did not intervene earlier in this proceeding, the motion merely states that they lacked "detailed technical expertise," and that this proceeding commenced before the San Bruno explosion and fire and the Commission's Order Instituting Rulemaking (R.) in R.11-02-019. Since these entities seek to participate as parties in R.11-02-019, they believe that the vast majority of customers in the service territory of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) are unlikely to support any rate increase before R.11-02-019 is completed. The joint motion states that they plan to conduct a survey of PG&E's customers as to whether rates should be increased, and to provide comments on the proposed decision in this proceeding.

On March 28, 2011, PG&E filed a response in opposition to the motion. PG&E's response recites the procedural history of when this proceeding was filed, the bill inserts to customers, the public participation hearings, the motion to adopt the Gas Accord V Settlement Agreement, the October 2010 evidentiary hearings on the contested issues, the opening and reply briefs that were filed, and the issuance of the proposed decision on March 15, 2011. PG&E contends that at this late date, there is no basis for granting the motion. PG&E points out that the motion did not explain why they could not have intervened in this proceeding shortly after the San Bruno explosion and fire, and these entities did not intervene when the September 15, 2010 ruling seeking comments on the proposed settlement was issued and did not intervene after the October 15, 2010 revised scoping ruling was issued.

The motion to seek party status in this proceeding was not filed until three days after the proposed decision was issued in this proceeding. As PG&E points out, this proceeding was initiated on September 18, 2009, and there were many opportunities for these three entities to seek party status in this proceeding. In addition, the public participation hearings heard from many individuals, including members of groups representing low income customers, who opposed any rate increases. A number of e-mails and letters were also sent to the Commission in opposition to any rate increase.

Since the survey issue that these three entities seek to conduct comes after the proposed decision addressing the rate increase has already issued, and because the Commission process has already heard from low income customers and representatives of low income communities to voice their opposition to the proposed increase, the motion for party status should be denied.

Therefore, **IT IS RULED** that the March 18, 2011 Joint Motion Requesting Party Status, which was jointly filed by the National Asian American Coalition, the Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles, and the Black Economic Council, is denied.

Dated April 4, 2011, at San Francisco, California.

          /s/ JOHN S. WONG            
John S. Wong  
Administrative Law Judge