

Decision 26-06-014 June 11, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric
Company on Behalf of Customers
Seeking a Gas Line Subsidy (U-39M).

Application 25-07-002

DECISION GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW

Summary

This decision grants Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) motion to withdraw its application without prejudice.

This proceeding is closed.

1. Background

On July 1, 2025, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed this application to seek gas line extension subsidies on behalf of its customers for customer projects that meet the minimum requirements set in Decision (D.) 22-09-026.

On August 4, 2025, the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) and Sierra Club filed timely protests on this application. On August 14, 2025, PG&E filed a reply to Cal Advocates' and Sierra Club's protests.

On September 17, 2025, the assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) was issued. The Scoping Memo directed PG&E to serve supplemental testimony to provide the non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations, as required by D.22-09-026. Ordering Paragraph 2 of D.22-09-026 states in pertinent part:

In its annual filing, each investor-owned utility shall include an update to the non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations based on the current methodology (including all inputs used, *e.g.*, cost of service factor).¹

These calculations are necessary for the Commission to evaluate how much each customer's requested gas line subsidy would cost ratepayers, which is a key issue the Commission must address to determine whether to grant the application. However, PG&E did not provide this information in its application.

On September 26, 2025, PG&E filed a Motion to Withdraw its Application (Motion to Withdraw). In its Motion to Withdraw, PG&E explains that one of the two customers identified in PG&E's application no longer wishes to proceed. PG&E requested to withdraw the application because it does not have the necessary information on the remaining customer project, specifically the non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations required in D.22-06-026.²

On January 21, 2026, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a Ruling (ALJ Ruling) requesting PG&E to provide additional information. The

¹ D.22-09-026 at Ordering Paragraph (OP) 2.

² PG&E's Motion at 2.

ALJ Ruling directed PG&E to explain why PG&E filed the application if it did not have information on the non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations D.22-09-026 required it to include in the filing.

On February 5, 2026, PG&E filed a Response to the ALJ Ruling (Response). In its Response, PG&E explains that, while the customers who requested a customer line extension may in fact meet the criteria to qualify for a line extension allowance, it has had great difficulty in obtaining from its customers detailed information to support its Application and has been making concerted efforts to assist its customers through this process. PG&E stated that it continued to engage in a dialogue with its customers after the Application filing date and attempted to obtain the supporting financial information necessary, but was unsuccessful. Given it was not successful in obtaining the necessary information from its customers to provide the non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations, PG&E filed the Motion to Withdraw to prevent further use of Commission and party resources on this proceeding.³

1.1. Submission Date

This matter was submitted on February 6, 2026, upon PG&E's filing of its Response to the ALJ Ruling.

2. Issues Before the Commission

The issue before the Commission is whether to grant PG&E's Motion to Withdraw.

³ PG&E's Response at 2.

3. Discussion

Although the Commission usually grants motions to withdraw, the Commission may deny motions to withdraw when doing so is in the public interest and may pursue matters of public concern after an applicant has moved to withdraw an application.⁴ The Commission may also deny a motion for withdrawal when the applicant requests withdrawal for the purpose of avoiding an adverse outcome.⁵

PG&E seeks to withdraw this application because it does not have the necessary information, as required in D.22-09-026, to proceed and does not wish to continue using Commission and party resources on this proceeding.⁶

No parties opposed PG&E's Motion to Withdraw.

We foresee no harm to the public interest from allowing PG&E to withdraw its application and find it reasonable to do so. Accordingly, we grant PG&E's Motion to Withdraw.

We appreciate that PG&E recognizes the need to ensure any future applications for a gas line extension allowance, a 10-year refundable payment option, or a 50 percent discount payment option for specific, unique non-residential projects comply with the requirements of D.22-09-026. PG&E stated its intent to "be more aggressive in screening customer applications in advance of future filings and will take steps to ensure that the required non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations are complete and available at the time

⁴ D.20-02-010 at 3.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ PG&E's Response at 2.

of filing” its application.⁷ We expect PG&E to fulfill this intent in future applications.

4. Summary of Public Comment

Rule 1.18 allows any member of the public to submit written comment in any Commission proceeding using the “Public Comment” tab of the online Docket Card for that proceeding on the Commission’s website. Rule 1.18(b) requires that relevant written comment submitted in a proceeding be summarized in the final decision issued in that proceeding.

No written public comments were submitted on this proceeding.

5. Waiver of Comment Period

This is an uncontested matter in which the decision grants the relief requested. Accordingly, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 311(g)(2) and Rule 14.6(c)(2), the otherwise applicable 30-day period for public review and comment is waived.

6. Assignment of Proceeding

Karen Douglas is the assigned Commissioner and Elaine Lau is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. On July 1, 2025, PG&E filed this application to seek gas line extension subsidies on behalf of its customers for customer projects.
2. D.22-09-026 directs PG&E to include an update to the non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations in its application.

⁷ *Ibid.*

3. The non-residential gas line extension allowance calculations are necessary for the Commission to evaluate how much each customer's requested gas line subsidy would cost ratepayers, which is an issue in this proceeding.

4. On September 26, 2025, PG&E filed a Motion to Withdraw, explaining that one of the two customers no longer wishes to proceed and that it does not have the information required by D.22-09-026 for the remaining customer project.

5. No parties opposed PG&E's Motion to Withdraw.

Conclusions of Law

1. There is no foreseeable harm to the public interest in granting PG&E's Motion to Withdraw.

2. Granting PG&E's Motion to Withdraw is reasonable.

3. PG&E's Motion to Withdraw should be granted.

4. This proceeding should be closed.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Motion to Withdraw Application 25-07-002 is granted.

2. Application 25-07-002 is dismissed without prejudice.

3. Application 25-07-002 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 11, 2026, at Sacramento, California.

JOHN REYNOLDS

President
DARCIE L. HOUCK
KAREN DOUGLAS
MATTHEW BAKER
CHRISTINE HARADA
Commissioners