

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

In the Matter of the Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39 E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Authorizing the Construction of the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project.

Application 02-09-043  
(Filed September 30, 2002)

**SCOPING MEMO AND RULING OF ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER**

Pursuant to Rules 6(a)(3) and 6.3 of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure,<sup>1</sup> this ruling establishes the category, sets forth the scope and procedural schedule, and assigns the principal hearing officer for this proceeding following a prehearing conference (PHC) held on January 10, 2003. It also addresses discovery, service, and other procedural issues for the proceeding. This ruling is appealable only as to category of this proceeding under the procedures in Rule 6.4.

Under Rule 6.1, on October 3, 2002, the Commission preliminarily categorized this application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) filed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) as ratesetting as defined in Rule 5(c) and determined that the matter should be set for hearing. (Resolution ALJ 176-3096.) In finalizing this determination and in delineating the

---

<sup>1</sup> All citations to Rules refer to the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, which are codified at Chapter 1, Division 1 of Title 20 of the California Code of Regulations.

scope of this proceeding, I have considered PG&E's application; the protests filed by the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), the Town of Hillsborough (Hillsborough), the 280 Corridor Concerned Citizens Group (280 Citizens Group), Dr. Cheol Hoon Lee, and Dr. Mario Rabinowitz and Laverne Rabinowitz; the numerous informal letters and e-mails<sup>2</sup> received regarding the project; PG&E's consolidated reply to the protests; PHC statements filed by PG&E, Hillsborough, 280 Citizens Group, and the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF); and discussion at the PHC.

### **Background**

PG&E seeks a CPCN authorizing the construction of the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project. The proposed project would be located in San Mateo County. A new transmission line would be constructed in two primary portions: the 14.7-mile Overhead Rebuild Portion, which would extend from the Jefferson Substation north to the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive; and the 12.4-mile Underground Portion, which would extend north from the San Bruno Avenue/Glenview Drive intersection to the Martin Substation. The project would also include modifications at several substations and one switching station, and the installation of fiber optic communications facilities between the Jefferson Substation and the Martin Substation.

PG&E asserts that the proposed project is necessary for four reasons: (1) to reliably meet projected electric demand in the cities of Brisbane, Burlingame, Colma, Daly City, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco, and the City and

---

<sup>2</sup> The Commission has received numerous letters and e-mails regarding the proposed project that do not meet the formal filing requirements in Article 2 of the Rules and which have been placed in the proceeding's correspondence file.

County of San Francisco (the Project Area); (2) to satisfy applicable planning criteria; (3) to diversify the transmission system serving the Project Area; and (4) to implement the California Independent System Operator (ISO) Board of Governors' April 2002 Resolution approving the proposed Jefferson-Martin Project for addition to the ISO-controlled grid. PG&E asserts that the Commission must defer to the ISO's determination of need and that the Commission's authority under Pub. Util. Code § 1001<sup>3</sup> is limited to a determination of the best route for the project.

CCSF supports the proposed project for reliability and economic reasons.

In its protest, ORA contests PG&E's assertion that the Commission has no authority to make findings regarding the need for the project in light of the ISO's determination. ORA raises questions regarding the need for the project, the respective roles of the Commission and the ISO in determining need, and the Commission's role in ratemaking for the project.

The remaining protests and the informal e-mails and letters variously question the need for and timing of the proposed project; raise concerns regarding electric and magnetic fields (EMFs), visual impacts, construction impacts, property values, and community values; and ask for consideration of alternatives such as undergrounding the transmission lines or relocating the transmission towers farther west. The 280 Citizens Group asserts that a five-year planning horizon should be used consistent with Decision (D.) 02-12-066.

In its PHC conference statement, PG&E reiterates its position regarding the scope of Commission jurisdiction and argues that the issue of ratemaking should

---

<sup>3</sup> All citations to Sections refer to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

be excluded on the basis that the Commission has no authority to set transmission rates.

At the PHC, the ISO emphasized its view that the Jefferson-Martin project is very important for maintaining reliability in the area, and stated that it would assist the Commission by presenting the information that was the basis for its determination.

At the PHC, the United States Department of the Interior (DOI) stated its position that the proposed project is subject to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) because a portion of the project would traverse National Park Service easements on San Francisco watershed land. As the lead federal agency for NEPA, DOI stated its preference that the Commission prepare a joint environmental document, combining NEPA review with the Commission's review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq.*). PG&E and CCSF stated that they do not believe that DOI has approval authority over the project or that NEPA compliance is required.

The Commission has not taken a position regarding whether DOI has federal jurisdiction over the proposed project. However, after meetings with DOI and other parties, both before and after the PHC, Commission staff informed DOI on January 24, 2003 that it would not be feasible for the Commission to undertake the preparation of a joint CEQA/NEPA environmental document for the Jefferson-Martin project. At least three factors contributed to this decision: the ongoing dispute about whether the DOI has any federal jurisdiction related to the proposed project; the fact that DOI has not yet determined the scope or form of a federal NEPA document for the project; and

the fact that expanding the scope of the CEQA document to comply with NEPA requirements would result in substantial delay in this proceeding.

**Categorization, Need for Hearings, Ex Parte Rules, and Designation of Principal Hearing Officer**

No party has disputed the Commission's preliminary categorization of this proceeding, and I affirm the preliminary categorization of ratesetting and the need for hearing. The ex parte rules as set forth in Rule 7(c) and § 1701.3(c) apply.

In a ratesetting proceeding, Rule 5(k)(2) defines the presiding officer as the principal hearing officer designated as such by the assigned Commissioner prior to the first hearing in the proceeding. I have designated Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Charlotte TerKeurst as the principal hearing officer. The provisions of § 1701.3(a) apply.

**Scoping Memo**

Sections 1001 and 1002 provide the basic scope of this proceeding. In addition to the determination of need underlying the grant of a CPCN, § 1002 provides, in pertinent part, that the Commission, as a basis for granting any CPCN pursuant to § 1001, shall give consideration to the following factors: (1) community values, (2) recreational and park areas, (3) historical and aesthetic values, and (4) influence on environment.

General Order (GO) 131-D contains rules relating to the planning and construction of electric facilities. It prescribes that, prior to issuing a CPCN, the Commission must find that the project is necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of the public. Section X of GO 131-D requires additionally that the applicant describe the measures taken or proposed by the utility to reduce the potential exposure to EMFs generated by the proposed facilities. The issues raised by GO 131-D are within the scope of the proceeding.

The scope of this proceeding also encompasses the requirements of CEQA. The environmental impact report (EIR) to be prepared pursuant to CEQA must identify the significant effects on the environment of the project, identify alternatives to the project, and indicate the manner in which significant environmental effects can be mitigated or avoided. CEQA requires that the Commission cannot approve the proposed project or an alternative unless it mitigates or avoids the significant effects on the environment, or finds that economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate those effects or that the agency is willing to accept potential significant effects because of the project benefits.

On January 21, 2003, the Energy Division issued its Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the Jefferson-Martin project. The NOP is available electronically, along with the application, the Proponent's Environment Assessment (PEA), and other information about the environmental review process, at the following address:

[http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/asp/jefferson\\_martin/jeffmartin.htm](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/asp/jefferson_martin/jeffmartin.htm)

The NOP describes potential environmental effects of the proposed project and alternatives that will be evaluated through the EIR process. The areas of environmental review include aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public service and utilities, recreation, transportation and traffic, property values, EMF effects,<sup>4</sup> the location of the transmission line near schools

---

<sup>4</sup> In its response to the protests, PG&E lists EMF concerns as a non-environmental issue. However, EMF issues are properly considered during the environmental review

*Footnote continued on next page*

and residential areas, environmental justice issues, and alternatives including local power generation facilities. In addition to mitigation measures, the EIR will evaluate alternatives to the proposed project including different routes, the “no project” alternative, and “non-wires” alternatives (*e.g.*, generation, distributed generation, and demand side management). The EIR may also evaluate alternatives such as partial undergrounding and tower modifications. All of these issues are within the scope of the proceeding.

The results of the environmental review will be considered, along with the other issues identified in this scoping memo, through evidentiary hearings. Most of the issues raised by protestants are within the scope of the CEQA review. Parties should pursue these concerns in that forum. The CEQA process is expected to generate alternatives for the Commission’s consideration based on the purpose and need and CEQA requirements. The EIR will be an informational document, with its analysis available to the Commission and to parties in their preparation of testimony and participation in the evidentiary hearings.

ORA and other protestants question the need for the proposed project, whereas PG&E asserts that the Commission must defer to the ISO regarding need. The Commission has found in several recent proceedings that, separate from the ISO’s responsibility, the Commission has the jurisdiction and responsibility under § 1001 to evaluate whether a transmission project is needed. Consistent with those conclusions, the issue of need for the Jefferson-Martin

---

process. Parties may also address EMF issues, along with all other issues, during the evidentiary hearings.

project, in its proposed form or in alternative forms, is within the scope of the proceeding.

In its PEA, PG&E's evaluation of the need for the proposed project includes descriptions of existing power system facilities and capabilities within the Project Area, new power plants whose construction is under consideration, and customer energy efficiency programs. It analyzes three load growth scenarios: a "High" forecast based on a September 1999 forecast, a "Medium" forecast based on a December 2000 forecast, and a "Low" forecast based on the most recent August 2002 forecast. The 280 Citizens Group raised several concerns with PG&E's evaluation of need.

PG&E is directed to submit comprehensive testimony related to the need for its proposed project. In addition, receiving testimony from the ISO concurrent with PG&E testimony would allow parties to fully understand the ISO's need determination. PG&E and the ISO may choose to prepare joint or separate testimony with respect to need issues.

The 280 Citizens Group asserts that a five-year planning horizon should be used, consistent with the planning horizon adopted in D.02-12-066 for the Valley-Rainbow interconnect project. However, it would be inappropriate to limit parties' showings on need to a five-year horizon. As the Commission stated in D.02-12-066, a five-year planning horizon "should not be mechanistically applied but rather requires the exercise of judgment, based on the facts of each project before us." Therefore, the issue of the appropriate planning horizon is within the scope of the proceeding. In its analysis of need, PG&E should use a planning horizon of at least five years and should justify its planning horizon if longer than five years.

As part of its showing on need, PG&E should clearly describe a current baseline for the Project Area with all current generation resources, including distributed generation, renewable generation, and contracts, and the import/export capability of each transmission facility in the Project Area. For each resource, PG&E should identify ownership, size, and any expected changes in the resource during the planning horizon. PG&E should provide recorded peak load within the Project Area during at least the last ten years (through 2003) and a description of all on-going energy efficiency and demand management programs that may affect demand.

Additionally, PG&E should identify all new generation resources that are approved or under consideration in the Project Area and all approved or planned additions to transmission capability. PG&E should specify the permitting status, expected timing, ownership, and size of each new generation resource and transmission addition identified. PG&E should address how new generation and transmission resources may affect the proposed project's import/export capability. PG&E should include scenario analyses assuming various levels of generation and transmission resources and energy efficiency programs, and should provide an assessment of the likelihood of each scenario coming to fruition.

As a component of its need showing, PG&E should provide load growth scenarios, including at least one load growth scenario that is lower than the August 2002 forecast or more current forecasts, and an assessment of the likelihood of each scenario. PG&E should describe and justify its criteria and assumptions utilized in forecasting demand.

PG&E should address the reason(s) the project is needed. PG&E should describe and justify any reliability requirements that drive the need for the

Jefferson-Martin project as well as its import/export capability under various outage/reliability scenarios. PG&E should explain whether and, if so, to what extent, the project is needed for economic rather than reliability reasons, or to facilitate achievement of the renewable power goals established in § 399.11 *et seq.* PG&E should explain whether the project is needed, or would be used in any way, for export or other competitive purposes. PG&E should explain whether the project is necessary to meet its obligation to serve, and how PG&E will comply with § 625. PG&E should address the project's expected effect on economic development. PG&E should describe its plan of action, should the Jefferson-Martin project not be completed by September 2005.

The impact of this project and proposed alternatives on the transmission grid and other transmission users is a relevant factor in our decision whether to certificate the proposed project, and is within the scope of the proceeding.

Issues surrounding project economics, for example, project cost-effectiveness, cost estimates and tradeoffs for different routes or configurations, right-of-way acquisition costs, mitigation costs, adoption of a cost cap, and cost allocation, are within the scope. Any arguments that the Commission should not consider these issues in this proceeding can be made in briefs.

### **Schedule**

At the PHC, the parties agreed that the direct testimony of project proponents regarding need for the Jefferson-Martin project should be submitted earlier than other direct testimony, in order to facilitate the proceeding. PG&E shall submit its direct testimony on need issues by October 10, 2003. In addition to PG&E, ISO and CCSF support the project based on an assertion of need. If these parties submit any direct testimony regarding need for the project, they

shall do so by October 10, 2003. PG&E shall submit the remainder of its direct testimony by November 12, 2003. All other direct testimony shall be submitted by November 12, 2003.

The following schedule will be adhered to as closely as possible:

Application filed	September 30, 2002
Application deemed complete	January 9, 2003
Prehearing Conference	January 10, 2003
Notice of Preparation issued	January 15, 2003
CEQA scoping meetings	January 29, February 4 and 6, 2003
Scoping Memo issued	March 19, 2003
Draft EIR released	July 2003
Public meetings for DEIR comments during 45 day review period	August 2003
ALJ and parties tour project route and alternatives	August or September 2003
PG&E direct testimony on need	October 10, 2003
ISO and/or CCSF direct testimony on need, if submitted	October 10, 2003
Final EIR release	October 2003
Proposed Decision certifying Final EIR	November 2003
All other direct testimony	November 12, 2003
Concurrent rebuttal testimony	November 26, 2003
Evidentiary hearings	December 4 – 10, 2003

Decision certifying Final EIR <sup>5</sup>	December 2003
Concurrent opening briefs	January 9, 2004
Concurrent reply briefs and submission of record	January 23, 2004
Proposed Decision on CPCN	April 2004
Decision on CPCN	May 2004

Evidentiary hearings will take place in San Francisco. Public Participation Hearings will be held in the affected communities. Details regarding locations for Public Participation Hearings are still under discussion and will be verified in subsequent rulings. The ALJ may schedule a second PHC or require a case management statement prior to the evidentiary hearings.

Pursuant to Rule 8(d), parties requesting final oral argument before the Commission should include that request in their concurrent opening briefs.

In Section 1 of Senate Bill 960 (Ch.96-0856), the Legislature urges the Commission to resolve the issues within the scope of a proceeding categorized as ratesetting, such as this, within 18 months from the date of the filing of the application. Although the ALJ and I strive to meet that goal, we anticipate that the completion of this proceeding will exceed 18 months. The schedule adopted is driven by statutory requirements contained in CEQA while affording interested parties a fair opportunity to participate in the proceeding. These dates

---

<sup>5</sup> Rule 77.7(f)(8) provides that the Commission can waive or reduce the period for public review and comment “for a decision under a federal or California Statute (such as the California Environmental Quality Act or the Administrative Procedure Act) that both makes comprehensive provision for public review and comment in the decision-making process and sets a deadline from initiation of the proceeding within which the Commission must resolve the proceeding.”

are our goal, based on the best information available at this time, but are subject to change. Changes to the schedule will be reflected in subsequent rulings.

### **Discovery**

Parties shall provide responses within 10 days of each discovery request. A party issuing a discovery request shall provide a copy of that request to all other parties at the time it is sent. Parties shall provide a copy of their discovery response to each party that makes a request for that specific response. Electronic copies of discovery requests and discovery responses are sufficient unless the receiving party requests a paper copy.

The parties shall attempt to resolve any discovery disputes with a good faith meet and confer, which may occur telephonically if that is more convenient than an in-person meeting. If that attempt does not resolve the dispute, the parties are to e-mail the assigned ALJ regarding the dispute. The assigned ALJ may schedule a conference call, ask for written motions, refer the discovery dispute to the Law and Motion ALJ, or take other steps as deemed appropriate. The assigned ALJ's e-mail address is [cft@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:cft@cpuc.ca.gov).

### **Filing, Service, and Service List**

In this proceeding, there are several different types of documents that participants may prepare. Each type of document carries with it different obligations with respect to filing and service.

First, many parties will prepare comments for purposes of the environmental review process. Parties submitting comments in the environmental review process must follow the instructions included with the environmental document that is being commented on in order for their comments to be incorporated into the administrative record. Comments on environmental documents should not be addressed to the ALJ, the assigned

Commissioner, or other Commissioners, or filed with the Docket Office. Comments in the environmental review process do not need to be served on other parties in this case. Please adhere to these directions in order to ensure a clear and comprehensive record.

Second, parties must file certain documents as required by the Rules or in response to rulings by either the Assigned Commissioner or the ALJ. These documents must be filed with the Commission's Docket Office and served on all persons on the service list with the status of appearance or state service. Please note that the Docket Office does not appear on the service list. Article 2 of the Rules contains all of the filing requirements.

Finally, other documents including prepared testimony are served on the service list but not filed with the Docket Office.

While documents must be filed with the Docket Office in paper form, they may be served in electronic form, pursuant to Rule 2.3(b), unless specified otherwise. The use of PDF format is encouraged for electronic service, to avoid confusion regarding pagination. Paper format copies, in addition to electronic copies if made available, shall be served on the Assigned Commissioner, the ALJ, and Energy Division representatives. Any party who wishes to receive served documents in a paper format may make such a request by serving a notice to that effect. All parties shall honor such requests. Parties shall e-mail courtesy copies of all served documents to the entire service list, including those appearing on the list as "Information Only."

The official service list for this proceeding is now available on the Commission's web page. Parties should confirm that their information on the service list and the comma-delimited file is correct, and serve notice of any errors on the Commission's Process Office, the service list, and the ALJ.

### **Intervenor Compensation**

The PHC in this matter was held January 10, 2003. Pursuant to § 1804(a)(1), a customer who intended to seek an award of compensation should have filed and served a notice of intent to claim compensation not later than February 10, 2003. A separate ruling will address eligibility to claim compensation.

### **Other Procedural Issues**

The parties shall comply with the Procedural Ground Rules set forth in Appendix A hereto.

Therefore, **IT IS RULED** that:

1. The scope of this proceeding includes the following as to the proposed project using PG&E's preferred route and configuration, alternative routes and configurations, the no project alternative, and non-wires alternatives.
  - Need for the project (Pub. Util. Code § 1001), including consideration of the decision by the ISO that the project is needed to maintain system reliability.
  - Consideration of the following factors contained in Pub. Util. Code § 1002:
    - 1) Community values;
    - 2) Recreational and park areas;
    - 3) Historical and aesthetic values; and
    - 4) Influence on the environment
  - Consideration of whether, pursuant to General Order (GO) 131-D, the project promotes the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of the public.
  - Consideration, pursuant to GO 131-D, of measures to reduce the potential exposure to electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) generated by the proposed facilities.
  - Consideration, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq.*), of significant effects on the environment of the project,

alternatives to the project, the manner in which significant environmental effects can be mitigated or avoided, and whether economic, social or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate significant effects on the environment.

- The appropriate planning horizon to use in evaluating need for the project.
- How PG&E will comply with Pub. Util. Code § 625.
- Effect on economic development.
- Impacts on the transmission grid and other transmission users.
- Cost effectiveness and cost allocation.
- Costs, and advisability and amount of a cap on project cost.

2. The schedule of this proceeding is as set forth above in this ruling.

3. This ruling confirms the Commission's preliminary finding in

Resolution ALJ-76-3096, issued on October 3, 2002, that the category for this proceeding is ratesetting and that hearings are necessary. This ruling, only as to category, is appealable under the procedures in Rule 6.4.

4. The ex parte rules as set forth in Rule 7(c) of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure and Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c) apply to this proceeding.

5. Administrative Law Judge TerKeurst is the principal hearing officer.

6. Parties shall follow the discovery, filing, service, and service list rules as set forth herein.

7. Parties shall comply with the Procedural Ground Rules set forth in Appendix A hereto.

Dated March 19, 2003, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ LORETTA M. LYNCH  
Loretta M. Lynch  
Assigned Commissioner

/s/ Charlotte F. TerKeurst  
Charlotte F. TerKeurst  
Administrative Law Judge

**APPENDIX A  
PROCEDURAL GROUND RULES**

**Exhibit Format**

See Rule 70 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. Parties often fail to include a blank space two inches high by four inches wide to accommodate the ALJ's exhibit stamp. If necessary, add a cover sheet to the front of the exhibit. The common practice of pre-printing the docket number, a blank line for the exhibit number, and witness name(s) is not a substitute for the required two by four inch blank space to accommodate the exhibit stamp. If the docket number and related information is pre-printed, it should be below or to the left of the required two by four inch blank space.

Exhibits should be bound on the left side or upper left-hand corner. Rubber bands and paper clips are unacceptable.

Excerpts from lengthy documents should include the title page and, if necessary for context, the table of contents of the document.

**Exhibit Copies**

See Rule 71. The original and one copy of each exhibit shall be furnished to the presiding officer and a copy shall be furnished to the reporter. The copy furnished to the presiding officer may be the mailed copy. Except for exhibits that are served prior to the hearing, parties are responsible for having sufficient copies available in the hearing room for each party in attendance.

**Cross-Examination Exhibits**

Requiring witnesses to review new or unfamiliar documents during the hearing can waste hearing time. The general rule is that a party who intends to introduce an exhibit in the course of cross-examination should provide a copy to the witness and the witness' counsel before the witness takes the stand on the day the exhibit is to be introduced. Documents in excess of two pages should be

provided the day before. Generally, parties need not provide advance copies of documents to be used for impeachment or to obtain the witness' spontaneous reaction.

### **Corrections**

Generally, corrections to an exhibit should be made in advance and not orally from the witness stand. If revised exhibit pages are prepared, the original text to be deleted should be lined out with the substitute or added text shown above or inserted. If a separate correction exhibit describing the needed corrections is prepared, it should indicate both deletions and insertions. Revised exhibit pages or separate correction exhibits should indicate the revision date.

### **Hearing Hours**

Hearings will generally run from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. with one morning break and from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. with one afternoon break. On Mondays, hearings will begin at 10:00 a.m. unless scheduled otherwise. If hearings appear to be on schedule, hearings may run from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Fridays.

### **Cross-Examination Time**

Parties are placed on notice that it may be necessary to limit and allocate cross-examination time as well as time for redirect and recross-examination.

### **Rebuttal Testimony**

Prepared rebuttal testimony should include appropriate references to the testimony being rebutted. It is inappropriate, and potential grounds for striking, for any party to hold back direct presentations for introduction in rebuttal testimony.

### **Court Reporters**

Common courtesy should always be extended to the reporters. Counsel should wait for witnesses to finish their answers, and witnesses should likewise

wait for the whole question to be asked before answering. Counsel shall refrain from simultaneous arguments on motions and objections. Conversations at the counsel table or in the audience can be distracting to the reporter and other participants. Such distractions should be avoided.

**(END OF APPENDIX A)**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have by mail this day served a true copy of the original attached Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated March 19, 2003, at San Francisco, California.

/s Antonina V. Swansen  
Antonina V. Swansen

**N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, *e.g.*, sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at (415) 703-2074, TTY 1-866-836-7825 or (415) 703-5282 at least three working days in advance of the event.