

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, To Increase Revenue Requirements for Electric and Gas Service and to Increase Rates and Charges for Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2003. (U 39 M)

Application 02-11-017
(Filed November 8, 2002)

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, To Increase Revenue Requirements for Electric and Gas Service and to Increase Rates and Charges for Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2003. (U 39 M)

Investigation 03-01-012
(Filed January 16, 2003)

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company Pursuant to Resolution E-3770 for Reimbursement of Costs Associated with Delay in Implementation of PG&E's New Customer Information System Caused by the 2002 20/20 Customer Rebate Program. (U 39 E)

Application 02-09-005
(Filed September 6, 2002)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING
GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
AND RESCHEDULING EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

On July 15, 2005, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and the Consumer Protection and Safety Division (CPSD) filed a Joint Motion for an extension of time, seeking authorization to modify the schedule in this proceeding. On July 27, 2005, the Utility Reform Network filed a response in

support of the Joint Motion. This ruling grants the Joint Motion and modifies the schedule in the proceeding.

The previous schedule adopted in the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and Scoping Memo dated May 26, 2005, required CPSD and Intervenors to serve prepared testimony by September 14, 2005, with evidentiary hearings to begin on January 9, 2006. The moving parties argue that an extension of this schedule is warranted by the length of time necessary to complete discovery in this matter. PG&E has not been able to fully respond to many of CPSD's data requests to date because PG&E's business systems and other business records were not configured to provide much of the information sought by CPSD. The Joint Motion states that PG&E expects to complete its responses to all outstanding CPSD data requests sent prior to July 13, 2005 by the end of July, approximately 15 weeks later than anticipated. CPSD requests that the due date for testimony be extended by approximately the same length of time as the delay in PG&E's full response to CPSD's data requests, or 13 weeks. PG&E does not object to the extension of time for filing testimony, but notes that dates for filing responses and rebuttal testimony must be moved as well. The Joint Motion recommends extending the due date for submitting testimony from September 14, 2005 to December 16, 2005. The Joint Motion further recommends that responsive testimony be due on February 17, 2006, with rebuttal testimony on March 31, 2006 and Evidentiary Hearings beginning on April 17, 2006.

TURN supports the Joint Motion, stating that TURN and other intervenors require access to the kind of business records that PG&E has been unable to produce prior to the end of July. TURN also states that it, like CPSD, will need adequate time to review PG&E's responses, to propound additional data requests as necessary and to prepare testimony.

For good cause shown, the Joint Motion of PG&E and CPSD is granted with one modification. Evidentiary Hearings will begin on April 24, 2006, instead of April 17, 2006. The new schedule is:

December 16, 2005	Staff and Intervenors distribute prepared testimony and exhibits.
February 17, 2006	PG&E submits responsive testimony
March 31, 2006	Staff and Intervenors distribute rebuttal testimony
April 11, 2006	Prehearing Conference
April 24, 2006	Evidentiary hearings begin at 9:30 a.m., in the Commission's Courtroom, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California.
Approx. May 25, 2006	Concurrent initial briefs filed
Approx. June 8, 2006	Concurrent reply briefs filed; case submitted.

Therefore, **IT IS RULED** that:

1. The Joint Motion of Pacific Gas and Electric Company and the Consumer Protection and Safety Division for an extension of the existing schedule in the Commission's Billing Investigation is granted, with one modification.
2. The schedule in this proceeding is revised as set forth in the body of this ruling.

Dated August 11, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Julie M. Halligan
Julie M. Halligan
Administrative Law Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Granting Motion for Extension of Time and Rescheduling Evidentiary Hearing by using the following service:

E-Mail Service: sending the entire document as an attachment to all known parties of record who have provided electronic mail addresses.

U.S. Mail Service: mailing by first-class mail with postage prepaid to all known parties of record who did not provide electronic mail addresses.

Dated August 11, 2005, 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.