



ALJ/PPE/cg7 02/12/2026

FILED

02/12/26

10:38 AM

A2512019

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California
Gas Company (U904G) for
Authorization to Implement Revenue
Requirement for Advanced Meter
Infrastructure Replacement.

Application 25-12-019

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING DENYING UTILITY WORKERS
UNION OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, LOCAL 132 MOTION FOR PARTY STATUS**

This Ruling denies the Motion of Utility Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, Local 132 (Union) for Party Status (Motion) without prejudice.

On January 9, 2026, Union filed the Motion pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice and Procedures (Rules) 1.4. The Union represents several employee groups at Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). The Motion states that their members have specialized knowledge about SoCalGas' work force capabilities related to the Application's Advanced Meter Infrastructure Replacement (AMIR).¹

Pursuant to Rule 1.4(b)(1), the Union must describe their role and interests in the proceeding to obtain party status. The Application is a ratesetting proceeding that requests the Commission to authorize rates and set the scope of the AMIR project. Here, the Motion states the Union's interest in the proceeding is because their members perform the AMIR work for SoCal Gas. The Motion

¹ Motion at 1.

does not describe what types of work the members would perform on the AMIR. As stated in the Motion, the Union's interest is based on the labor relationship between SoCal Gas and Union regarding future AMIR work that the Commission may authorize in a decision. The Union's interest in this proceeding requires further development to meet the requirement of Rule 1.4(b)(1).

Also, the Motion's cursory reference to its members' specialized knowledge in the AMIR is vague and ambiguous. The Union should provide ample specific examples linking this specialized knowledge to the Application and AMIR. The Union failed to make a sufficient showing of their role in this proceeding as required by Rule 1.4(b)(1).

Rule 1.4(b)(2) requires the Motion to state with specificity the factual and legal contentions the person intends to make and show that the contentions are reasonably pertinent to the issues presented. The Motion failed to make any showing as required by Rule 1.4(b)(2) but rather relied on general references to subject matter knowledge. This raises concern whether the Union is familiar with the Commission's Rules and can meaningfully contribute to the proceeding as a party. The Motion failed to meet the requirements of Rule 1.4(b)(2).

The Motion is denied without prejudice because it failed to comport with the requirements of Rule 1.4 to obtain party status.

IT IS RULED that:

1. Good cause does not exist to grant Union's Motion.
2. The Motion is denied without prejudice.

Dated February 12, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ PATRICK PETERSEN

Patrick Petersen
Administrative Law Judge