A recently released summary of a consulting firm’s report commissioned by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) concludes that the quality of voice services provided by California’s two largest telecommunications utilities steadily declined from 2010-2017, the time period covered in the report.

As an overview of the analysis posted last month on the CPUC’s website attests, the two providers in question—AT&T California and Frontier California, both before and after Frontier’s acquisition from Verizon in 2016—were “in effect, disinvesting in infrastructure overall, and most pronounced in the more rural and low-income service areas.”

The findings come at a time of growing concern about the resiliency of the state’s telecommunications grid given the increased threat of catastrophic wildfires and other emergencies, as well as the more frequently used pre-empive power shutoffs by electric utilities, known as Public Safety Power Shutoffs, during extreme weather and wind conditions.

“The report confirms that the big telecommunications providers have not been investing in upgraded infrastructure and new technology in the sparser, more rural areas of the state,” CPUC President Michael Picker said. “But that’s where we’ve seen some of the worst wildfire catastrophes that demand durable and resilient communications infrastructure for warning people, for evacuations and for recovery. Clearly, this is an issue that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.”

As first responders, residents and others have noted, the telecommunications grid often fails when the general public and emergency responders need it most during wildfires and other calamities where the ability to communicate can literally be a matter of life or death.

The analysis, conducted by the Boston-based firm Economics and Technology, Inc., or ETI, dates to a CPUC Rulemaking that began in December 2011. That proceeding resulted in a decision to review telecommunications carrier performance in the state to determine whether providers were meeting CPUC goals in protecting California customers and the public interest.

The consultant’s study found the telecommunications providers falling short in a variety of ways:
- **Deteriorating Service Quality:** The quality of service for both carriers “has steadily declined” over the 8-year period analyzed in the report, with the percentage of outages increasing and service restoration times getting longer.
- **Persistent Disinvestment:** The carriers have not put enough capital into maintaining and improving their networks, a problem that has been most pronounced in the more rural and low-income service areas of California.
- **Increased Investment in Broadband Improves Service Quality for POTS:** AT&T and Frontier areas with greater broadband investment have a higher level of POTS service quality and better performance on a variety of service metrics. POTS stands for Plain Old Telephone Service, otherwise known as traditional telephone service.
- **Networks Not Robust Enough:** Carriers have not
made the necessary investments in their infrastructure to withstand varying weather and environmental concerns that often cause service interruptions. “This pattern suggests that the networks of AT&T and Frontier,” the consultant’s summary chapter states, “are not as robust as they need to be. The occurrence of extreme weather events in California certainly can be anticipated to a certain degree and incorporated into the companies’ engineering, design and construction and maintenance practices. These networks must be able to withstand all types of inclement weather and provide safe and reliable service to customers.”

• **Investments are Focused on Higher Income Communities:**
  “There is an inverse relationship between household income and wire center service quality performance,” the report says. “AT&T wire centers that have been upgraded with fiber optic facilities and other broadband-related investments disproportionately serve higher income communities. Consequently, the AT&T wire centers serving areas with the lowest household incomes tend to exhibit the highest trouble report rates, the longest out-of-service durations and the lowest percentages of outages cleared within 24 hours.”

• **Direct Relationship Between Amount of Competition and Service Quality Results:** Areas with limited or no competition experience lower service quality results. Both AT&T and Frontier put more investment and attention in areas with higher rates of competitive offerings.

The report also addressed the financial capability of both carriers, concluding that: “AT&T has the financial resources to maintain and upgrade its wireline network in California but has yet to do so. Frontier has a strong interest in pursuing such upgrades but lacks the financial capacity to make the necessary investments. Both of these conditions—and the commitments of the respective corporate parent companies to maintain and upgrade their California operations—must remain a central focus of CPUC attention.”

The ETI report includes other recommendations it said the CPUC should consider, including:

• Expanding financial penalties for carriers failing to meet minimum quality of service standards required by earlier CPUC orders.
• Noting that customers can take their business elsewhere in parts of the state where companies compete for their business, the report recommends that fines in areas of the state that don’t have competing providers should be “high enough so as to have the same financial consequences as poor service quality under competitive market conditions.”
• Lowering acceptable failure rates for telecommunications networks because the current allowable rates are “far too generous” and carriers have had little difficulty meeting them.
• Unless carriers can offer technically valid explanations as to how and why smaller wire centers experience the poorest service quality, the minimum standards should be applied uniformly for all wire centers.
• Fines for inadequate service should vary based upon the extent of a carrier’s failure to meet any service quality standard, rising in magnitude as the extent of the shortfall increases.
• Establishing a process to proactively examine the alternatives that would be available to maintain adequate service to Frontier California customers if the parent company no longer has the financial resources to provide safe and reliable services in California.

Summing up the importance of the information in the roughly 600-page report, the consultant refers to the CPUC’s Scoping Memo from the proceeding that directed the analysis be done in the first place: “In order to maintain acceptable levels of service quality for California customers,” the Memo said, “it is necessary to ensure that carriers have access to an adequate network of infrastructure. Without infrastructure that is adequately maintained, customers’ services will degrade. In extreme cases, facilities failures will lead to a complete loss of service, including 9-1-1, to customers served by those facilities.”

**Sensible Regulation Needed for Resilient, Reliable Communications System**

*By Martha Guzman Aceves, CPUC Commissioner*

As Californians know too well, wildfires, earthquakes, and other disasters pose an enormous risk to life and property, and nothing is more essential in keeping people safe than a reliable and resilient communications system.

Nevertheless, a bill moving through the Legislature would preclude the state from guaranteeing essential and reliable communications services to all Californians. Assembly Bill (AB) 1366 does this by extending an existing 2012 law scheduled to come off the books next January that prohibits the state from regulating Internet-based phone service.

When that law was passed, its aim was to encourage development of the telecommunications technology known as VOIP, for Voice Over Internet Protocol. The law did its job. VOIP has flourished. It is now the industry’s dominant technology, whether consumers know it or not.

The timing of the bill could not be more ill-advised. Under the Trump Administration, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has abdicated its role of ensuring access to affordable, fair, and reliable Internet and communications services.

Yet here we are in California proposing to eliminate all state jurisdiction on the false assumption that the FCC and free market competition will ensure that all Californians and emergency responders have a communications system they can rely on.

The truth is, hundreds of thousands of our residents have no high-speed broadband access, and a third of Californians—some 4.2 million households—do not benefit from any competition at all. Contrary to what the legislation’s supporters in the telecommunications industry and elsewhere contend, this bill is not about stifling innovation, or popular VOIP apps like Skype or Facetime. This bill gives free reign to telecommunications companies such as AT&T and Comcast and allows them to behave however they choose, even when it’s antithetical to the public’s interest and safety.

If this bill becomes law, it will be these companies alone, rather than responsible government oversight, that determine their sense of social responsibility and decides:

• Whether the companies participate in universal service programs such as LifeLine that help the poor pay their bills. AT&T, for instance—the state’s largest carrier—has decreased participation by 90 percent in the last decade.
• Which communities receive next-generation technology investments like fiber, 5G, and 10G.
• Whether and how quickly infrastructure is repaired or upgraded in poor and rural communities.
• Whether telecommunications providers address complaints from local governments.
• Whether wildfire and disaster resiliency are built into their core infrastructure.
• Whether service is reliable and redundant, so all Californians can reach a 9-1-1 dispatcher whenever they need to.
• Whether they coordinate with utilities such as Pacific Gas &
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Electric Company and local governments to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters.

Fire season is here again, and while the state has scrutinized other utilities for their reliability during increasingly devastating disasters, it’s not doing the same for communications companies. Even though wildfire and other disaster preparedness, response, evacuation, and recovery hinges on a reliable communications grid.

There are too many communities in high fire hazard zones with real concerns that they will be the next Santa Rosa or Paradise, where wildfires swept through with deadly results. We need to know and be able to require their communications networks to have adequate backup power, defensible space around cell towers, and redundant signal-moving connections known as “backhaul.”

We need tools to ensure that telecommunications companies have adequate emergency preparedness plans. And we must identify, strengthen, and protect the vulnerable parts of our networks, because employing temporary facilities on wheels or wings when disaster strikes is always too little, too late.

At the CPUC and the California Office of Emergency Services, we have been working on multiple fronts to advance preparedness and public safety. But whether we’re seeking consumer protections for disaster victims, requiring utilities to prepare for emergencies and response, or developing protocols for proactive power shutoffs during extreme weather conditions, this bill ties the state’s hands. AB 1366 makes it much harder for first responders to do their jobs and help keep people safe.

We know telecommunications infrastructure is failing in our state. A CPUC staff analysis also featured in this newsletter, for instance, shows that—deliberate or not—AT&T’s investment policies have favored higher-income communities and have thus had a disproportionate impact upon the state’s lowest income areas.

Network hubs serving areas with the lowest household incomes have the highest trouble report rates, the longest outages, the lowest percentages of outages cleared within 24 hours, and the longest times required to fix 90 percent of service outages. The opposite is true for the highest income communities.

Sensible regulation is necessary to make sure Californians have a reliable and resilient communications system. AB 1366 would continue to prevent the modernization and development of protections all Californians need and should be defeated.

Details Matter: A Key Energy Efficiency Test Revisited

By Liane M. Randolph, CPUC Commissioner

So many of the energy proceedings led by the Commission are complex and highly technical, often making it a challenge to clearly explain what we’re deciding and why. A unanimous vote at our Aug. 1 meeting affecting California’s energy efficiency programs is a perfect example of what I mean.

Our decision modified something known as the “Energy Efficiency Three-Prong Test Related to Fuel Substitution.” I concede, this does not exactly roll effortlessly off one’s tongue.

But the approved decision is important, representing a step forward in our ongoing efforts to reduce California’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and decarbonize homes and other buildings in our state.

In the early 1990s, the CPUC adopted the “three-prong test” to ensure that when a customer changed from an electric to gas or gas to electric appliance, the new appliance would be more efficient—California would save energy, and the environment would not be harmed. These are the two basic principles underlying the test, which are still valid today.

Electricity generation is cleaner now than when the original three-prong test was put in place. Deep in the technical details of that test were barriers to allowing energy efficiency incentives to be used for customers wishing to change from one type of appliance to another, even when it saved energy and had an environmental benefit. As the state seeks to reduce GHG
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emissions and move from fossil fuels to cleaner, sustainable sources of electricity such as solar, wind and battery storage, we ultimately agreed with the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council, the parties who filed a motion seeking to remove those barriers.

So, the three-prong test, modified over the years but still in place, has been laid to rest. To start, we changed the name: it’s now the Fuel Substitution Test.

And we modified several technical elements of the test. For example, we eliminated the cost-effectiveness part of the test at the individual measure level; instead, we will apply cost-effectiveness at the portfolio level, consistent with our approach for all other energy efficiency measures. To cite one application of this idea, if a gas furnace goes out in your home and you replace it with an electric furnace, but the overall costs of making this switch are higher, your utility can now offer you a rebate to help mitigate this increase. The new benchmark for utilities will be whether fuel substitution is cost-effective within the utilities’ overall energy efficiency program portfolio. Once utilities have programs in place that reflect this new model, we will have removed a long-standing obstacle to allowing energy efficiency financial incentives to be used for energy-saving fuel substitution.

We also needed to figure out how to account for GHG emissions reductions across sectors and energy savings across different fuels. We needed to avoid unfairly penalizing the original-fuel utility that loses the opportunity to improve efficiency for customers who switch fuels, but at the same time offer a clearer pathway for customers interested in updating their appliances.

And on policy questions like whether to include larger upgrade costs—an electrical panel, for instance, in an older building that requires an upgrade—in evaluating cost-effectiveness, I believe the new test provides utilities the necessary flexibility to provide incentives for energy-saving fuel substitution that works best for each individual customer.

CPUC Participating in Wildfire Workshop in Oregon

With the riskiest part of wildfire season bearing down on California and the Western U.S., Public Utility Commissions from California, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia are participating in an all-day public workshop in Portland, OR on Friday Aug. 16, 2019, to share perspectives and best practices on managing and mitigating the growing wildfire threat.

California is coming off back-to-back fire seasons that were the deadliest and most destructive in the state’s history, and the all-day session will focus on impacts to energy utilities, customers, and communities, as well as lessons learned by Western states in dealing with the wildfire risk, which has been heightened by the impacts of climate change.

Information about the workshop in Portland, can be found on the CPUC’s website. Additionally, the following is a description of the workshop:

Climate change, among other factors, is intensifying the severity and frequency of weather events. In the West, we are experiencing dramatic changes in wildfire intensity and severity, which has been exacerbated by increased temperatures, drought, and other environmental changes. Substantial efforts are being undertaken to respond to wildfire risk, including: increasing grid resiliency through the hardening of infrastructure, increasing coordination efforts, and the deployment of new technologies to mitigate wildfire risks and impacts. Similarly, jurisdictions continue to increase adaptation efforts through the assessment of and planning for system vulnerabilities.

Delivering safe, reliable, and reasonably affordable electricity on a universal basis requires new, holistic approaches to these evolving risks. Solutions are wide-ranging - including physical upgrades to the electricity system, changes to operational practices, new monitoring technology, better and more detailed understanding of system inter-dependencies, and financial instruments. The changes in wildfire risk are only just beginning and will be present for decades to come, requiring constant evolution of best practices. Delivering on our missions as public utility regulators - to ensure safe, reliable electricity at just and reasonable rates - requires us to engage fully in this adaptation.

Panel topics scheduled for discussion include:

• Making Risk-Based Changes to the System: How can utilities effectively prioritize risk mitigation efforts, and what issues arise or barriers develop for utilities in that prioritization?

• Managing the Financial Risks: What are the financial tools available to utilities to mitigate ratepayer risk and keep the cost of capital affordable? Are these tools robust enough for the scale of possible losses?
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- Expanding Public Safety Coordination: What factors should be considered to ensure de-energization does not increase public safety risk now that transportation, communications, and other essential services are more reliant on electricity?

The workshop will be held at the Oregon Convention Center at 777 NE Martin Luther King Blvd., Portland, OR from 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and is free and open to the public and news media. To attend in person, please register online at this [link], noting that space is limited. This [link] is for media registration.

To participate by phone or WebEx, interested parties are asked to register online and call-in and WebEx information will be provided. News media is asked to register separately.

Energy Division Staff Selected to Play Leadership Roles in International Energy Conference

Three analysts and one supervisor from the CPUC’s Energy Division are playing prominent roles at the International Energy Program Evaluation Conference in Denver, CO on Aug. 20-22, 2019. Five staff had their submitted abstracts selected from among hundreds of international submissions, and three will go on to present their papers at the conference:

- **Alison LaBonte:** Prizes – Drawing Lessons from Federal Efforts to Drive Innovation
- **Genesis Tang:** The Intersection of Strategies and Lessons Learned in Low-Income Programs
- **Justin Hagler:** Changing Objectives of Energy Efficiency Evaluation in Renewable Energy Driven Grid

A fourth analyst, Paula Grundling, was invited to serve as a panel moderator because of her nationally recognized subject matter expertise. She helped presenters develop their papers for her panel, “The Next Frontier: How Can Protocols and Standardization Help Unlock the Benefits of Normalized Metered Energy Consumption-Based Evaluation Methods.”

Only a few years ago, energy efficiency staff would attend these conferences as members of the audience, or perhaps be mentioned as a co-author of a paper written by a consultant. Having five original papers proposed and accepted is a new high for the energy efficiency branch in Energy Division and demonstrates just some of the deep expertise that exists throughout the CPUC.

“It’s very exciting,” says Jennifer Kalafut, who heads the branch. “It’s a testament to the quality of staff we’ve been able to recruit, and the internal capacity we’ve worked to build. The CPUC is a national leader in energy efficiency policy, so having our staff on stage to share lessons learned with other states and countries can help us all advance in our fight against climate change.”

As the conference website explains, the International Energy Program Evaluation Conference is a professional conference for energy program implementers, evaluators, and academic researchers. Its core product is the documentation of unbiased, peer-reviewed evaluations that establish the basis for accurate information and provide credible evidence of program success or failure. California’s energy efficiency programs alone represent spending of nearly $700 million per year in thousands of homes, businesses, and industries.

Get to Know Us: Ana Maria Johnson

Ana Maria Johnson is described by co-workers as earnest, hardworking, and dogged, as well as an awesome person dedicated to serving the public as a Program Manager in the Public Advocates Office at the CPUC.

She cultivated that ethic at a young age. She left El Salvador at 10-years-old when her grandmother petitioned the Reagan Administration for U.S. entry. She reports it was a hard transition arriving in San Francisco speaking no English, but that education was the priority. Her greatest success, she says, was not giving up, a trait that still drives her actions today.

“My personality and work ethic mean that ‘hard’ is not a barrier to me,” she explains, “but actually provides a big push.”

When she was in high school, she was mesmerized by the introduction of wolves into the Grand Tetons and Yellowstone. As a summer science student there, she was first exposed to the beauty and peace of nature.

“Although my weekends are now consumed with attending my 11-year-old son’s baseball games,” she says, “I still find time for hik-
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Ana Maria attended UC Davis for a bachelor’s degree in Managerial Economics and then University of San Francisco for a master’s in information systems, before going to work at AT&T for seven years as Quality Control Manager. Then in 2008, she and her husband moved to Boston to do much of the same work, but with a consulting firm.

While in Boston, her husband worked on his MBA at MIT and that’s where their son was born. Returning to California was always the goal and Ana Maria was thrilled to learn that the state was promoting universal broadband access. While preparing her thesis on policies surrounding the communications technology known as VOIP, for Voice Over Internet Protocol, she was exposed to the importance of good policies because of the effect those policies had on the public.

She started work at the CPUC in 2011 as a Senior Regulatory Analyst in the Broadband Policy and Analysis Branch, leading a group of analysts in the day-to-day operations of the California Advanced Services Fund, which was then a $315 million program to fund broadband infrastructure deployment and adoption.

Four years later, Ana Maria moved to what was then called the Office of Ratepayer Advocates in its Communications Policy Branch, managing a group reviewing and analyzing proceedings before the CPUC, especially focused on broadband and VOIP. She also led the public interest review of California mergers and acquisitions related to telecommunications companies. She managed numerous proceedings and policy projects, including General Rate Cases for small rural telephone companies.

Ana Maria is proud of the unique role played by the independent organization within the CPUC that advocates solely on behalf of utility ratepayers. Now called the Public Advocates Office, its mission is to obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels.

Today, Ana Maria is a Program Manager in the Communications and Water Policy Branch of the Public Advocates Office, leading more than 20 professionals in policy development, public purpose programs, General Rate Cases, and numerous communications and water policy proceedings. She prefers a matrix approach to management, allowing efficiency and effectiveness to support her team as needed.

“I do have high expectations,” she says. “At the same time, we spend so much time together that I like to foster an environment that makes work fun. It’s important for everyone to know they are respected, appreciated, and valued.”

One of the ways she accomplishes that is by studying the materials for the next day’s briefings and activities, working to be fully prepared.

The Docket: Proceedings Filed at the CPUC in July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEEDING NUMBER • FILED DATE • FILER</th>
<th>PROCEEDING NUMBER • FILED DATE • FILER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0712026 • 05-June-2019 • ALJs/COLBERT/MCKENZIE/CPUC</td>
<td>A1907007 • 01-July-2019 • Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Officers’ Decision regarding alleged violations by certain independent small local exchange carriers. [link]</td>
<td>Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for Authorization to Increase its Revenues for Water Service by $25,999,900 or 10.60% in the year 2021, by $9,752,500 or 3.59% in the year 2022, and by $10,754,500 or 3.82% in the year 2023. [link]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1311005 • 28-June-2019 • ALJ/FITCH/CPUC</td>
<td>A1907007 • 01-July-2019 • Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision modifying the energy efficiency three-prong test related to fuel substitution. [link]</td>
<td>Application of Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC (U933E) for authority to update rates pursuant to its energy cost adjustment clause and its California Climate Credit, Effective January</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on page 7
Docket: July Filings, continued from page 6

1, 2020. [link]

A1907005 • 02-July-2019 • California-American Water Company
Application of Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC (U933E) for authority to update rates pursuant to its energy cost adjustment clause and its California Climate Credit, Effective January 1, 2020. [link]

R1807003 • 02-July-2019 • ALJ/THOMAS/CPUC
Proposed Decision on enforcement of California Renewables Portfolio Standard program rules (Southern California Edison territory). [link]

A1701013, A1701014, A1701015, A1701016, A1701017 • 02-July-2019 • ALJ/KAO/CPUC
Proposed Decision adopting standard contract for energy efficiency local government partnerships. [link]

R1709020 • 02-July-2019 • ALJ/CHIV/CPUC
Proposed Decision denying the Petition for Modification of Shell Energy North America (US), L.P. [link]

A1907006 • 03-July-2019 • San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) for Approval of Electric Vehicle High Power Charging Rate. [link]

A1907011 • 03-July-2019 • USA Digital Communications, Inc.
Application of USA Digital Communications, Inc. (USAD) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity in order to Provide Resold Competitive Local Exchange in the State of California. Hard Copy Filing [link]

A0712026 • 05-June-2019 • ALJs/COLBERT/MCKENZIE/CPUC
Presiding Officers’ Decision regarding alleged violations by certain independent small local exchange carriers. [link]

R1501008 • 05-July-2019 • CMMR/RECHTSCHAFFEN/CPUC
Second phase proposed decision approving Natural Gas Leak Abasement Program consistent with Senate Bills 1371 and 1383. [link]

A1907010 • 09-July-2019 • California High-Speed Rail Authority
Application of the California High-Speed Rail Authority for approval to construct one underpass grade-separated crossing at Lacey Boulevard (MP 223.92). Under two proposed high-speed rail tracks as part of the proposed high-speed rail underpass grade-separated structure at SP198 (MP 223.94) located in Kings County. [link]

I1106009 • 10-July-2019 • ALJ/HYMES/CPUC
Proposed Decision on remand granting intervenor compensation to The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and ordering TURN to return any funds received in excess of the award. [link]

A1605001 • 12-July-2019 • ALJ/LIANG-UEJIO/CPUC/ALJ/TSEN/CPUC
Proposed Decision resolving the issues of Power Charge Indifference Adjustment for pre-2009 vintage Direct Access customers in Southern California Edison Company's and San Diego Gas & Electric Company's territories. [link]

A1509001 • 12-July-2019 • ALJ/ROSCOW/CPUC

R1311005 • 15-July-2019 • ALJ/KAO/CPUC
Proposed Decision adopting energy efficiency goals for 2020-2030. Opening comments, which shall not exceed 15 pages, are due no later than August 4, 2019. Reply comments, which shall not exceed 5 pages, are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. [link]

A1312012, I1406016 • 15-July-2019 • ALJ/ALLEN/CPUC
Proposed Decision granting Petition for Modification of Decision 16-06-056 to reflect tax reductions for Pacific Gas and Electric Company. Opening comments, which shall not exceed 15 pages, are due no later than August 4, 2019. Reply comments, which shall not exceed 5 pages, are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. [link]

A1705004 • 16-July-2019 • ALJ/AYOADE/CPUC
Proposed Decision resolving 2018 General Rate Case Application for Golden State Water Company, on behalf of its Bear Valley Electric Service Division. Opening comments, which shall not exceed 25 pages, are due no later than August 5, 2019. Reply comments, which shall not exceed 5 pages, are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. [link]
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A1801012 • 16-July-2019 • ALJ/HYMES/CPUC/ALJ/GOLDBERG/CPUC
Proposed Decision approving settlement on Application. Opening comments, which shall not exceed 15 pages, are due no later than August 5, 2019. Reply comments, which shall not exceed 5 pages, are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=All&DocID=309725359

R1803011 • 16-July-2019 • CMMR/PICKER/CPUC
Proposed Decision adopting an emergency disaster relief program for communications service provider customers. Opening comments, which shall not exceed 15 pages, are due no later than August 5, 2019. Reply comments, which shall not exceed 5 pages, are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=All&DocID=309755387

A1711009 • 16-July-2019 • ALJ/POWELL/CPUC
Proposed Decision authorizing Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s 2019-2022 revenue requirement for gas transmission and storage service. Opening comments, which shall not exceed 15 pages, are due no later than August 5, 2019. Reply comments, which shall not exceed 5 pages, are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=All&DocID=309725360

A1907015 • 17-July-2019 • Southern California Edison Company

A1907016 • 19-July-2019 • AMCS LLC
Application of AMCS LLC for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to provide full facilities-based and resale competitive local exchange service and interexchange services on a statewide basis. http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=All&DocID=309790803

A1609001 • 01-Sep-2016 (Application for rehearing filed week of July 22) • Southern California Edison Company

A1801009 • 04-Jan-2018 (Application for rehearing filed week of July 22) • Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
Petition to Modify Decision 19-02-009 • Application of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority for an order authorizing construction of two light rail tracks and one freight track at six (6) highway-rail crossings at (1) Baranca Avenue, (2) Foothill Blvd & Grand Avenue, (3) Vermont Avenue, (4) Glendora Avenue, (5) Pasadena Avenue, and (6) Loraine Avenue in the City of Glendora in Los Angeles County, California. http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=All&DocID=309758016

R1907017 • 26-July-2019 • CPUC

A1907022 • 26-July-2019 • Fusion Connect, Inc. debtor-in-possession

A1907019 • 29-July-2019 • Pacific Gas and Electric Company
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R1206013 • 30-July-2019 • ALJ/PARK/CPUC
Proposed Decision addressing Phase 4 issues of this proceeding including: (1) Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s request to recover 2015-2016 costs recorded in its Residential Rate Reform Memorandum Account; (2) proposals for restructuring the California Alternate Rates for Energy program; and (3) issues related to the Working Groups established pursuant to Decision 15-07-001 and reporting requirements for residential rate reform. Opening comments are due no later than August 19, 2019. Reply comments are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=All&DocID=310022756

A1907020 • 31-July-2019 • Southern California Edison Company

A1907021 • 31-July-2019 • Southern California Edison Company

A1803009 • 1-Aug-2019 • ALJ/HOUCK/CPUC
Proposed Decision on Phase 1 of the Joint Application of Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company for the 2018 Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding addressing: 1) nuclear fuel cancellation costs (deferred from A.16-03-004); and 2) form of revised 2016 Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station decommissioning cost estimate. Opening comments are due no later than August 21, 2019. Reply comments are due 5 days after the last day for filing opening comments. http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=All&DocID=310111982

A1908001 • 01-Aug-2019 • John Grier

A1710003 • 02-Oct-2017 (reopened week of July 29) • Ducor Telephone Company
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