Decision 02-05-037 May 16, 2002

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mo Kadohata, Complainant, vs. Southern California Gas Company (U 904 G), Defendant.	(ECP) Case 02-01-040 (Filed January 31, 2002)

OPINION DENYING RELIEF

Summary

Complainant asserts that Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) should connect a gas service line to her house located at 402 N. Plymouth Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90004 and should make this connection free of charge. Defendant asserts that complainant must pay the tariff charge for the service line, which is approximately $3000 and must have her home plumbed for gas service. Public hearing was held April 19, 2002.

Complainant contacted SoCalGas to connect a gas service line to her property on multiple occasions over a period of time dating back to at least 1996. In late 2000, complainant was told that in order to have the gas service, the house had to be plumbed for gas and advised that a plumber be contacted to determine the plumbing cost. Complainant is in an all-electric residence, and there is neither an active gas service line nor active gas meter at the property.

SoCalGas affirmatively alleges that Tariff Rule 21, Gas Service Extensions, E. Allowances and Payments by Applicant, 1. General, states that "Utility will provide…extension without charge provided the Utility's total estimated installed cost (including Meter Set Assembly) does not exceed the allowances…". The allowances for Permanent Residential Service per meter or residential dwelling unit, on a per-unit basis are listed in this same Rule 21, E.2.

Complainant testified that there is a gas line under her house and a disconnected meter in her back yard, which was dug up from under her house. Because there is a line and a meter she asserts that she is entitled to a reconnection at no charge.

Defendant's witness testified that he reviewed defendant's records and found no record of gas service to complainant's residence. When complainant contacted SoCalGas in 2000, complainant was supplied with a form (Request for Residential Gas Facilities) to fill out regarding proposed gas appliances to be installed at the property. To date, the complainant has not returned the form. Defendant's witness inspected the residence and found it to have no plumbing for gas; it was an all-electric house. He informed complainant that before a gas line to the residence could be installed she would have to have her residence plumbed for gas and pass a city inspection. He testified that when those conditions were met, defendant would install a service line and meter. He estimated the cost to be $3000. He said if a serviceable line were found on the property the cost should be less than the estimate and that, in any event, complainant would be entitled to an allowance depending upon the load to be served (Tariff Rule 21, E.2.).

There is no evidence that there is an active gas service line to complainant's residence. Further, before defendant can activate a service line

complainant must have her home plumbed for gas and pass a city inspection. Under the circumstances, we have no reason to believe that defendant's estimate of $3000 to install a new service line is unreasonable.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that the relief requested by complainant is denied.

This case is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated May 16, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

LORETTA M. LYNCH
President
HENRY M. DUQUE
CARL W. WOOD
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
Commissioners