



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

FILED

05/29/26

02:50 PM

A2511006

Pacific Gas and Electric Company's
Application for Approval of its 2027 Gas Cost
Allocation and Rate Design Proposals for its
Gas Distribution, Transmission and Storage
System.

Application No. 25-11-006
(Filed November 21, 2025)

(U 39 G)

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S (U 39 G)
MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

JENNIFER C. REYES LAGUNERO
BEN ELLIS
MARY KENASTON

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Law Department, 19th Floor
300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 210
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (925) 786-5113
Facsimile: (510) 898-9696
E-Mail: Jennifer.ReyesLagunero@pge.com

Dated: May 29, 2026

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

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

Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s
Application for Approval of its 2027 Gas Cost
Allocation and Rate Design Proposals for its
Gas Distribution, Transmission and Storage
System.

Application No. 25-11-006
(Filed November 21, 2025)

(U 39 G)

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY’S (U 39 G)
MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Rules 11.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) respectfully requests an order shortening time for responses to the “Motion of Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (U39G) for Modification of the Proceeding Schedule” (Motion to Modify the Schedule), concurrently filed with this Motion on May 29, 2026.

PG&E met and conferred with parties regarding both the Motion to Modify the Schedule^{1/} and this Motion for an Order Shortening Time. The following parties support this Motion for an Order Shortening Time: BP Energy Company (BP), Central Valley Gas Storage, LLC (CVGS), Crockett Cogeneration LLC (Crockett), Indicated Shippers, Moss Landing Power Company LLC (Moss Landing) and NatGas Greenleaf Holdings LLC (NatGas), Northern California Generation Coalition (NCGC), Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA), The Utility Reform Network (TURN), and Western Manufactured Housing Community Association (WMA). The following parties take no position: Calpine Corporation (Calpine) and Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), Wild Goose Storage, LLC (Wild Goose) and Lodi Gas Storage, L.L.C (Lodi). The Public Advocates Office at the CPUC (Cal Advocates) does not oppose this Motion. No party objected.

^{1/} PG&E’s Motion to Modify the Schedule, pp. 2-3.

II. DISCUSSION

Rule 11.1(e) of the Commission’s Rules provides that “[r]esponses to written motions must be filed and served within 15 days of the date that the motion was served, except as otherwise provided in these Rules or unless the Administrative Law Judge sets a different date.” Rule 1.2 provides that the Rules “shall be liberally construed to secure just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of the issues presented. In special cases and for good cause shown, the Commission may permit deviations from the rules.” Responses to the Motion to Modify the Schedule are currently due June 15, 2026.^{2/} By this Motion, PG&E seeks a ruling shortening the time to respond to no more than 5 days, requiring that responses be filed on or before June 3, 2026. This is necessary so that the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) can expeditiously decide the underlying Motion.

The Scoping Memo provides that “The following schedule...may be modified by the ALJ as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the application.”^{3/}

PG&E’s Motion to Modify the Schedule seeks to extend the proceeding schedule pursuant to much collaboration with the parties to arrive at a mutually agreeable schedule (Consensus Schedule No. 2).^{4/} PG&E explains why Consensus Schedule No. 2 is a more adequate deadline for party engagement and development of the record. PG&E proposes modifying the proceeding schedule for three reasons, to: (1) allow up until June 2026 for PG&E to submit CARD supplemental testimony for two new Scoping Memo issues;^{5/} (2) reflect the time for settlement discussions;^{6/} and (3) swap the dates of the status conference and joint case management statement.^{7/}

^{2/} Fifteen days after May 29, 2026 is June 13, 2026, which is a Saturday. The next business day is Monday June 15.

^{3/} Scoping Memo, p. 7.

^{4/} See PG&E’s Motion to Modify the Schedule, pp. 1-3.

^{5/} See PG&E’s Motion to Modify the Schedule, pp. 4-5.

^{6/} See PG&E’s Motion to Modify the Schedule, pp. 5-6.

^{7/} See PG&E’s Motion to Modify the Schedule, p. 6.

In order to further address parties' concerns regarding timing since intervenor testimony is currently set for July 16, 2026,^{8/} PG&E respectfully requests expedited review of this Motion.

In line with the impacts of the above updates, the Consensus Schedule No. 2 affords parties additional weeks after PG&E serves supplemental testimony until their intervenor testimony is due. The Consensus Schedule No. 2 would still allow the proposed decision and final decision to be issued for joint implementation of 2027 Gas CARD with the 2027 GRC 1 in 3rd Quarter 2027 while providing parties participating in both proceedings opportunity to participate in other multiple ongoing proceedings.^{9/}

Good cause exists for an order shortening time. The parties need to understand soon whether the Commission adopts the Consensus Schedule No. 2. The alternative is that parties will have to spend substantial time preparing to submit testimony on two potential schedules – the current July 16, 2026 deadline and Consensus Schedule No. 2 – and that dilution of resources would eventually hinder its ability to prepare the most thoughtful and complete testimony. Additionally, parties may reconsider the timing of their data requests to PG&E if the Consensus Schedule No. 2 is adopted to avoid requesting updates of data requests with responses related to the two new scoping issues that were not included in PG&E's opening direct testimony in preparation for intervenor testimony and hearings.

The Commission's assistance in providing certainty as to the schedule will promote the development of a full record, and this, in turn, will provide parties with a better understanding of PG&E's proposals, settlement, and administrative efficiencies for further engagement in the proceeding.

^{8/} Scoping Memo, p. 7.

^{9/} See PG&E's Motion to Modify the Schedule, pp. 6-7.

III. CONCLUSION

Because time is of the essence, PG&E respectfully requests a ruling shortening time for responses to the Motion to Modify the Schedule from 15 days to no more than 5 days, or June 3, 2026.

Respectfully Submitted,

JENNIFER C. REYES LAGUNERO
BEN ELLIS
MARY KENASTON

By: /s/ Jennifer C. Reyes Lagunero
 JENNIFER C. REYES LAGUNERO

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Law Department, 19th Floor
300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 210
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (925) 786-5113
Facsimile: (510) 898-9696
E-Mail: Jennifer.ReyesLagunero@pge.com

Dated: May 29, 2026

Attorney for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY