



ALJ/LFY/abb 11/25/2025

**FILED**

11/25/25

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

11:31 AM

A2401005

Application for a Special Ruling under  
PG&E Electric Rule 15.I.3 Granting an  
Equitable Exemption from the  
Customer Cost Responsibility  
Provisions of Rule 15 for Distribution  
Service Extensions.

Application 24-01-005

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING GRANTING MOTIONS  
FOR PARTY STATUS, ORDERING PARTY DECLARATIONS,  
AND SETTING A 60 NOTICE FOR JOINT STATEMENTS**

**1. Introduction**

Applicants Sarah Anderson and James Halter filed this Application for a special ruling granting an equitable exemption from the customer cost-responsibility requirements for distribution service extensions under the Exceptional Cases provisions section of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) Electric Rule 15.I.3 in accordance with Article 2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. On October 26, 2025, Jesse Held and Robert Davis filed motions for party status in the instant proceeding.

**2. Motions for Party Status**

**2.1. Motion by Jesse Held for Party Status is Granted**

On October 7, 2025, Counsel for Applicants filed a motion for party status on behalf of Mr. Jesse Held. Mr. Held is the owner of 2100 Cherry Creek Road, a parcel at issue in the subject matter suit. Mr. Held was also present for the September 25, 2025, status conference, held virtually through WebEx, and voiced his interest in becoming a party to the suit.

Mr. Held states that he bought the parcel of land in reliance on the then existing WillCo power company and with intent to develop it by building a home with functioning electricity. Mr. Held has never been able to actualize this goal. The parcel is without physical and legal access to power and he cannot build a house without access to electricity. Mr. Held asserts that the de-energization of the power line has lowered the property value and expectations of use on the parcel which he purchased directly in reliance on the knowledge that WillCo was going to continue providing electricity to his and the neighboring lots. The land may have gained value over the course of years, but Mr. held states that he cannot do with it what he intended, which is to build a house. Mr. Held has provided facts sufficient to show a direct interest in the instant proceeding and may join as a Party.

## **2.2. Motion by Robert Davis for Party Status is Granted**

Mr. Robert Davis' situation is more attenuated. Mr. Davis<sup>1</sup> also purchased his parcel during the existence of the WillCo power company's tenure and purchased electricity through that company for a period of time. He too suffered loss when the line was de-energized. If we understand his situation correctly, however, he has since installed solar power in his home. At present Mr. Davis' parcel has electricity. Mr. Davis will have electricity whatever course of action the Commission takes, i.e. do nothing, remote grids with battery backup, order overhead, order underground lines, etc.

Mr. Davis maintains he would be adversely affected by the clear cutting of trees on and adjacent to Cherry Creek Road. Mr. Davis's argument for party

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Davis of 38951 South Fork Road also participated in the hearing. His spouse participated at the June 23, 2025, site visit.

status is based on the idea that if the Commission chooses to act, and if they choose to proceed with either the overhead or underground utility lines that would also need clear cutting of trees, then his property will be implicated, and he will not willingly grant an easement on his property.<sup>2</sup>

The Commission is still in the process of gathering evidence in support or against the suggested options raised in the Parties' September 30, 2025, Response to Order for More Information. While Mr. Davis suffers no immediate harm that needs to be rectified, he could depending on the Commission's decision in this proceeding. Mr. Davis' request for party status is granted.

Mr. Davis is cautioned that this is not a class action suit. He may not advocate for other members of the community who own land in the area<sup>3</sup> although he may inform them of the opportunity to file public comments in this docket, addressed as follows.

### **3. Order for Declarations (Affidavits) by Parties and Comments by Community Members**

As noted, on September 30, 2025, the Parties, through Counsel for PG&E, filed the Response to Order for More Information pursuant to the site visit of June 23, 2025, and subsequent Rulings of August 20 and September 11, 2025; and the Status Conference of September 15, 2025. In that Response PG&E stated, "Generally, PG&E uses eminent domain only as an avenue of last resort. Here, as discussed with the property owners during site visits, PG&E is aware that neither the property owners at 2751 Cherry Creek Road and 2900 Cherry Creek

---

<sup>2</sup> Motion for Party Status of Robert Davis at 4-8.

<sup>3</sup> In his motion, Mr. Davis references over 20 families who have signed a petition.

Road would desire to provide any land rights to PG&E to install an overhead line.”<sup>4</sup>

Both assigned Counsel for Applicants and PG&E have phrased this issue with grace. The site visit of June 23, 2025, and subsequent hearing of September 25, 2025, afforded the Parties and community members ample opportunity to personally voice their bitterness at the suggestion of cutting down several swaths of trees to widen Cherry Creek and other roads sufficient to safely install overhead or underground series of power lines, one idea of many.

Rather than relying on memory<sup>5</sup> to create a record, we now offer the Parties the opportunity to voice their opinions in the form of written Declarations (Affidavits). The Parties are offered the opportunity to voice their thoughts on the issues addressed in the Response of September 30, 2025, and in this ruling. These issues are not limited to the question of clearcutting the trees on both sides of Cherry Creek and other Roads, but Parties are asked to specifically respond to this issue as well, namely:

- a. Will the Parties willingly provide land use or easement rights for tree clearcutting?
- b. Will the Parties willingly allow extensive tree cutting and vegetation management?
- c. Will the Parties agree to the continued vegetation management for the foreseeable future in the form of continued clear cutting of trees and foliage to enable overhead or underground powerlines?

---

<sup>4</sup> Response, at 11.

<sup>5</sup> The joint Response noted that, “PG&E’s understanding of the discussions around remote grids were to explore the potential of such a solution, not necessarily an agreement to such a solution” during the June 23, 2025, site visit. (Response at 2.)

- d. Do the Parties have a proposed or even preferred solution to the question of how to solve this issue of lack of power given the information obtained in the Response?

**4. Order for Supplemental Information Re Lifecycle Costs by Parties to be included in Joint Statement**

Finally, in their joint statement the Parties are asked to describe, in detail, the life cycle costs for a life cycle of approximately 60-years for each of the discussed alternatives including all related incidental costs (i.e. including but not limited to wildfire costs and wildfire risk assessment, service line costs, eminent domain, litigation, post replacement costs, vegetation management, propane generator costs where necessary, other revenue requirements, costs of ownership of distribution lines, affordability, safety and reliability, etc.) The alternatives suggestion in discussion thus far include but are not limited to:

- a. The Commission does not intercede;
- b. The Commission intercedes and moves forward with re-energizing the de-energized WillCo utility line for all Applicants;
- c. The Commission intercedes and moves forward with underground utility lines for all Applicants;
- d. The Commission intercedes and moves forward with overhead utility lines for all Applicants;
- e. The Commission intercedes and moves forward with remote grids through solar power with back up battery and generators for Applicants;
- f. The Commission intercedes and moves forward with micro grids through solar power with back up battery and generators for Applicants.

In responding, we request that the parties consider that Mr. Held and Mr. Davis have separate needs than Mrs. Anderson and Mr. Halter. Mr. Held does not own a house on his parcel. What options are available to him (alone)

and what options are available to Sarah Anderson and James Halter. Mr. Davis has no immediate need for additional electricity. What are his applicable concerns.

## **5. Instructions Re Filing Public Comments**

The Parties are afforded opportunity at this time to voice their thoughts and opinions as to the proposals addressed in the Response. They are similarly cautioned that these submissions are not binding on the Commission. At this time, we also remind members of the community that they may file “Public Comments” in this docket.<sup>6</sup> Public comments, while not part of the evidentiary record of the proceeding, are the most effective way to allow members of the community to voice their opinions as to the issues raised in this matter. Counsel are encouraged to instruct these members of the community to the docket card for this matter, and provide instructions how to, “Add Public Comment” under the Public Comment tab of this matter A.24-01-005 on the Docket. Counsel may not file on their behalf. These comments are not evidence. They are not binding on the Commission nor on this matter. They are an opportunity to allow members of this community to voice their opinions as to the issues raised.

This Ruling will be supplemented with additional rulings by the assigned Administrative Law Judge as necessary to adjudicate this matter.

## **6. 60-day Notice for Joint Statement**

Per the Response of September 30, 2025, the Parties suggested that:<sup>7</sup>

[T]he parties recommend that within 60-days of the date of this filing, PG&E and Applicants file a joint statement setting forth the relevant facts, the proposed technical solution(s), associated costs, and proposed cost recovery

---

<sup>6</sup> [Providing Public Comments at the CPUC](#).

<sup>7</sup> Response, Question 2 at 3.

mechanism. PG&E and Applicants would simultaneously file a joint motion for said statement to be entered into the evidentiary record, consistent with CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure Rule 13.9 which permits the parties to stipulate to facts and issues in the case and Rule 13.8(c) which allows testimony and exhibits to be received into evidence without direct or cross examination.

This is so ordered in addition to the above-mentioned declarations.

**IT IS ORDERED that:**

1. Jesse Held's motion for party status is granted.
2. Robert Davis motion for party status is granted.
3. Counsel for Applicants Sarah Anderson, James Halter, and Jesse Held is directed to provide declarations from the above Applicants, their residents, and/or families residing with them on the issues raised in the joint Response of September 30, 2025, and this ruling
4. Counsel for Robert Davis is directed to provide declarations from the above Applicant, their residents, and/or families residing with them on the issues raised in the joint Response of September 30, 2025, and this ruling.
5. Counsel for all Parties are encouraged to instruct members of the community, to the best extent possible, to file comments on the issues raised in the joint Response of September 30, 2025, in the public docket associated with this matter, A.24-01-005. Counsel may instruct the community members that such comments are best received if filed by or before Friday, January 30, 2026.
6. Within 60-days or not later than Friday, January 30, 2026, PG&E and counsel for Applicants Sarah Anderson, James Halter, and Jesse Held are ordered to file a joint statement setting forth the relevant facts, the proposed technical solution(s), associated costs, and proposed cost recovery mechanism.

7. Parties are to include 60 lifecycle cost concerns as addressed above. Parties may move for the statements to be entered into the record pursuant to CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure 13.8 through 13.9.

8. Jesse Held and Robert Davis may join in the statement filed by PG&E and Applicants Sarah Anderson and James Halter if relevant to their concerns.

9. Community members may file public comments, as discussed above.

IT IS SO RULED.

Dated November 25, 2025, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ LENA AFARY  
Lena Afary  
Administrative Law Judge