Wildfire-Affected Customers have Utility Protections

With this year’s wildfire season already off to a devastating start, the California Public Utilities Commission this month put in place interim protections for utility customers affected by such disasters.

Commissioners unanimously voted on Aug. 9, 2018, to expand protections that were ordered after last year’s fire storms to be in effect statewide on an interim basis while an ongoing decision-making process is finished.

The vote extended protections for residential and small business customers that were implemented in the previous resolutions (M-4833 and M-4835) for cases where a state of emergency is declared by the Governor and where the disaster has either: (1) resulted in the loss or disruption of the delivery or receipt of utility service; and/or (2) resulted in the degradation of the quality of utility service.

Among those protections:

- Wildfire-impacted consumers cannot be disconnected for nonpayment and associated fees;
- Utilities are required to discontinue billing customers whose homes are not capable of receiving utility services, and utilities cannot assess a discon-

Continued on page 8

Q&A: Safety is a Top Concern Throughout the CPUC

There are many safety initiatives underway at the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) as it works to assure Californians’ access to safe and reliable utility infrastructure and services. Following is a Q&A with Commissioner Clifford Rechtschaffen discussing some of our actions. Additional safety-related articles will be featured over the next several months.

QUESTION: There are several important safety related proceedings that the CPUC is advancing right now. What are the different issues you’re working on and their status?

Commissioner Rechtschaffen:

The major safety related proceedings currently assigned to me are the Safety Model Assessment Proceeding, which we call SMAP, and the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Phase for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), which is known as RAMP. I am also lead Commissioner on our Emergency Preparedness proceeding.

Let’s take SMAP and RAMP first. These are important, complex proceedings that, at their core, deal with how gas and electric utilities decide the amount of money they spend on reducing risks, and which specific risks they seek to address with those resources. These spending decisions have profound impacts on worker and public safety. Utilities have always made such calculations, but outside the public eye, without transparency about their assumptions, the trade-offs they’re making, and with varying methodologies. This made it difficult for us to evaluate exactly how safety would be improved by utility investments when we consider a General Rate Case, which is where we approve utility spending that gets reflected in customers’ bills.

The goal of SMAP is to allow the CPUC and parties to examine the models that utilities are using — this is now required every three years — to set priorities for risk mitigation and to establish standards and requirements for those models. Importantly, they involve decisions about spending beyond what is mandated by safety regulations.

In a 2016 decision, for example, the CPUC required the utilities to use a decision-making framework that evaluated a range of safety, reliability, and financial consequences associated with a given set of risks. Phase Two of the proceeding is ongoing and in May 2018, the utilities and intervenors filed a settlement agreement that reflected
Taking a Comprehensive and Holistic Look at Affordability and Disconnections

By Commissioners Carla J. Peterman and Martha Guzman Aceves

“California is admittedly becoming a rich person’s state. San Francisco is a stunning example, but Santa Rosa is not far behind. If you cannot afford the outrageous rents, the high costs of water, gas and electricity as well as the high cost of food and just about everything else, you can’t afford to live. The alternatives are to move away somewhere else where the costs are more sensible or to get yourself a tent or live in your car, which seems to be a solution of choice for many people living here.”

The comments above came from Gail Outlaw of Santa Rosa at the CPUC’s July 12, 2018, Voting Meeting in San Francisco, and they were consistent with what we heard from several people who told us about the difficulty they have paying their utility bills.

The challenge of keeping utility rates affordable and the ever-higher numbers of people whose gas and electricity get shut off each year for non-payment go hand-in-hand. That’s why we were gratified when our fellow CPUC Commissioners voted unanimously with us to open two new proceedings on these vital topics.

Let’s consider affordability first. As Commissioners, we are obligated to make sure that charges from regulated utilities are “just and reasonable.” And while it’s not spelled out in statute, we also know that a key component of “just and reasonable” rates are those consumers can afford to pay.

All of the Commissioners are sensitive to the issue of affordability, but right now we approach it on an ad hoc basis, depending on the matter before us. We believe looking at affordability more holistically through our new proceeding will help us in our decision-making as we strive to strike the right balance between what the utilities say they need to provide their services and what customers can afford.

As the new proceeding (called a Rulemaking) approved by the Commissioners explains, we want to develop:

A framework and principles to identify and define affordability criteria for all utility services under CPUC jurisdiction; and

Methodologies, data sources, and processes necessary to comprehensively assess the impacts on affordability of individual CPUC proceedings and utility rate requests.

Commissioners consider affordability in everything we do, but a systematic set of criteria and metrics will help us to better determine the impact that our actions have on consumers and access to the utility services we all need to live and work.

We appreciate how complex this will be. A consumer’s energy burden, for instance, is relatively straight-forward and easy to measure. But the true impact this has on individuals, families, and businesses varies from region to region, with many factors coming into play.

Some of the more fundamental considerations include utility service rates, customer demand for services, and customer income and other expenses. Each of these is in turn affected by additional external factors that are continually in flux, such as utility infrastructure procurements, commodity costs, reliability and safety requirements, and other utility operating costs.

Demand is affected by issues that include climate, weather, building technology, income and social status, family size and age, and conservation practices. And incomes are tied to a number of complex socio-economic factors that can change in response to market fluctuations or as individual circumstances change, such as loss of employment or medical disability.

These are real and complex concerns, making affordability a multifaceted issue for us to consider and weigh. Some quantifiable and clear benchmarks that can be applied across the industries we regulate will help us make more equitable decisions for all involved.

Which brings us to the second proceeding we approved July 12 – disconnections.

When we consider all the people living in a household, disconnections affected 2.5 million Californians last year. Loss of utility service can affect many other areas of a person’s life. Without access to electricity or gas, for example, people cannot use their heat or air conditioning, cannot cook food at home, and in some cases, cannot run lifesaving medical equipment.

“We appreciate how complex (making new policies about affordability and disconnections) will be.”
— Commissioners Peterman & Guzman Aceves

The disconnection proceeding will be in two phases. In the first phase, we will work with the utilities and all stakeholders to adopt policies, rules, or regulations aimed at reducing the statewide level of residential gas and electric service disconnections for nonpayment. We also want to find ways to provide fast relief to residential customers who do have their power turned off.

In Phase 2, we will take a more holistic and comprehensive approach to the evaluation of disconnections with the goal of determining if broader reforms and approaches are needed.

We know there are no easy or quick answers to these challenges. We need a fully engaged array of interested parties and utilities to be successful. We have encouraged a broad range of stakeholders to participate in these proceedings. It’s time for us to take a step back and look at both these issues in a comprehensive and holistic way and these two proceedings allow us to do just that.
The Docket: Proceedings Filed at the CPUC in July 2018

PROCEEDING NUMBER • FILED DATE • FILER
A1806016 • 26-JUN-2018 • Port of San Francisco
Application of the PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO for an Order authorizing construction of a new public pedestrian at-grade crossing (CPUC No.002SF-2.02-D;DOT #969 981 X) of tracks of the Port of San Francisco (MP 2.02) between 3rd & Illinois Streets, just north of Cargo Way on Port of San Francisco property within the City and County of San Francisco.

A1806017 • 28-JUN-2018 • California High-Speed Rail Authority
Application of the California High-Speed Rail Authority for approval to Construct two New Underpass Grade Separated Crossings. Under the Proposed High-Speed Rail Tracks at 9th Avenue (215.67) and Cairo Avenue (216.09) located in the County of Kings, State of California.

A1806018 • 29-JUN-2018 • California High-Speed Rail Authority
Application of the California High-Speed Rail Authority for Approval to Construct two New Grade Separated Crossings, one over the Proposed High-Speed Rail Tracks at Avenue 56 (257.16) and one under the Proposed High-Speed Rail Tracks at Avenue 24 (261.17) located in the County of Tulare, State of California.

A1807001 • 02-JUL-2018 • California Water Service Company
In the Matter of the Application of CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY (U60W), a California corporation, for an order (1) authorizing it to increase rates for water service by $51,004,000 or 7.7% in test year 2020, (2) authorizing it to increase rates on January 1, 2021 by $29,853,000 or 4.2% and on January 1, 2022 $31,440,000 or 4.2% and in accordance with the Rate Case Plan, and (3) adopting other related rulings and relief necessary to implement the Commission's ratemaking policies.

A1807002 • 02-JUL-2018 • Great Oaks Water Company
Application of Great Oaks Water Company (U162W) for an Order authorizing it to increase rate charges for water service by $3,480,305 or 18.18% in 2019, by $1,689,521 or 7.47% in 2020, and by $1,576,419 or 6.48% in 2021.

A1807004 • 06-JUL-2018 • City of Madera • Rail Safety
Application of the City of Madera to Construct a New Grade Separated Crossing Below One Elevated Rail Line Operated by the Union Pacific Railroad Company at the Fresno River Trail Project in the City of Madera, State of California.

R1803011 • 10-Jul-18 • CMMR/PICKER/CPUC
Proposed Decision affirming the provisions of Resolutions M-4833 and M-4835 as interim disaster relief emergency customer protections.

A1807010 • 12-JUL-2018 • Tesloop • Transportation
Application of Tesloop, Inc. for authority to operate a scheduled shuttle service Passenger Stage Corporation between Points in Culver City, Greater Los Angeles, the San Fernando Valley, Orange County, Anaheim, Rosemead, Ontario, and San Diego and the Greater Palm Springs, and San Francisco, the Bay Area, Central Coast, Central Valley, Sacramento Area, and Lake Tahoe Region; and to establish a Zone of Rate Freedom.

I1807007 • 12-JUL-2018 • CPUC •
Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission’s Own Motion into the Planned Merger Between SJW Group, Holding Company of San Jose Water Company (U168W), and Connecticut Water Service, Inc. and its Effect on California Ratepayers and the California Economy.
No link available

I1807008 • 12-JUL-2018 • CPUC
Order Instituting Investigation into Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (U39E) Failure to Provide a 24-hour Notice Prior to Residential Electric Service Disconnections Between July 1 and July 18, 2016 and the Adequacy of its Remedy Going Forward.
No link available

I1807009 • 12-JUL-2018 • CPUC
Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission’s Own Motion into the California’s One Million New Internet Users Coalition’s Misuse of California Advanced Services Fund Grant Funds; and Order to Show Cause Why the Commission Should Not Impose Penalties and/or Other Remedies for Violating Terms of Their Grant and for Refusing to Return Funds Previously Demanded by the Commission’s Division.
No link available

R1807003 • 12-JUL-2018 • CPUC
Order Instituting Rulemaking To Continue Implementation and Administration, and Consider Further Development, of California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program.
No link available

R1807005 • 12-JUL-2018 • CPUC
Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider New Approaches to Disconnections and Reconnections to Improve Energy Access and Contain Costs.
No link available

R1807006 • 12-JUL-2018 • CPUC
Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish a Framework and Processes for Assessing the Affordability of Utility Service.
No link available

Continued on page 7
Rechtschaffen Q&A — Discussing safety at the CPUC: continued from page 1

their negotiated compromise, which is pending before me and my fellow Commissioners for consideration. The framework agreed to in that settlement will allow us to evaluate the relative cost-effectiveness of different risk-mitigation measures. This is a big improvement over prior methodologies used by the utilities and a huge step forward in how we assess and mitigate safety risks.

RAMP is a separate proceeding in which each utility applies the risk-prioritization methodology approved in SMAP to identify top safety risks, measures to reduce those risks, and the costs and benefits of those mitigation measures. For example, the RAMP will consider overhead line failures, workplace incidents, gas transmission pipeline failure, and other risks. Our Safety and Enforcement Division reviews each utility’s RAMP report and those then become part of the record in the utility’s General Rate Case, where the utilities must justify all their requested spending.

Our Emergency Preparedness Proceeding was initiated in 2015 in response to legislation that requires the CPUC to establish standards for electric and water utilities’ disaster and emergency preparedness plans. Among other things, we’re paying very close attention to improving communication and coordination with local governments about utilities’ emergency response activities.

We are also looking at gaps in the existing set of rules that establish standards for utilities to comply with during emergencies and disasters. We are identifying best practices that can be standardized across utilities, and examining the lessons learned from recent emergencies in California. This is obviously extremely timely given all the natural disasters we face and some of the communication difficulties that local governments experienced during last winter’s destructive fires.

It is one of my priorities in this proceeding to make sure we reach a wide range of stakeholders to gather ideas from a diverse set of voices. To accomplish that, we are holding workshops across California to gather stakeholder feedback on these issues. We plan to hold a workshop in Southern California very soon that focuses on communication and coordination between utilities and stakeholders in the context of emergency preparedness. Updates on this workshop can be accessed on the CPUC’s website.

The CPUC also has a number of other key safety proceedings where I’m not the assigned Commissioner, including a Rulemaking on utility pole safety, which is addressing safety issues related to the estimated 4.2 million utility poles and thousands of miles of underground utility conduits in the state; an investigation into the safety culture of PG&E to promote adoption of a strong, preventative culture of safety that goes beyond just compliance; and a proceeding where we have developed new fire safety regulations and an enhanced fire safety map.

The CPUC’s Office of the Safety Advocate is also taking the lead in exploring whether utilities should be required to adopt safety management systems and “near-miss” reporting systems such as what’s required in air traffic regulation. And, of course, we are working with the Governor’s office and the Legislature as they focus very intently at the end of the session on more effective ways to address wildfire prevention, safety, and liability.

Q: Why are we seeing so much focus on safety right now?
A: It’s a combination of things. We’ve had some searing events that have rightly renewed our attention to safety.
Prime examples are PG&E’s pipeline explosion in San Bruno in 2010 and Southern California Gas Company’s Aliso Canyon Natural Gas Storage Facility leak that began in 2015. We have been critically examining our safety systems to determine where the CPUC could do a better job. The Legislature has also weighed in and mandated additional safety reforms and regulations.

Q: Wildfires are obviously a big focus in the Legislature this year. Do you think the CPUC is doing all it can to minimize the danger wildfires pose for the state?
A: Safety is such a pervasive and important concern; the work never ends. It must be an ongoing process, which means there is always more that can and must be done. But I do feel confident in saying this commission is trying harder and doing more about safety than ever before.

The danger we face in California from wildfires is well-known and becoming more acute. Four of the five most destructive wildfires in the state’s history have occurred in the past 15 years, with last year being the most devastating fire season yet. We had more than 40 fatalities, 10,000 structures burned, thousands of homes lost, and billions of dollars in insurance claims.

As Governor Brown has said, this seems to be the new normal for us in California and we have been experiencing more fire devastation this summer. So, there is a tremendous amount of work for us to do and we are committed to doing it.

In January 2018, we adopted a statewide Fire-Threat Map that includes a broader definition of fire threat, with 44 percent of the state now considered to be in elevated fire hazard areas. We also adopted stronger fire safety rules at the end of last year and enhanced our rules for vegetation management and protecting utility poles and wires in the high-risk fire areas. We have created a new wildfire mitigation section in our Safety and Enforcement Division that is developing requirements for utility wildfire mitigation plans. And we recently adopted a new de-energization plan that specifies protocols utilities must follow when turning power off in certain areas when the fire risks are extreme from the threat of blowing branches hitting powerlines and igniting.

Of course, de-energization is a step that should be taken as a last resort. We know it has serious consequences for communities that lose power. Our new rules specify the notice utilities must provide to their customers, how utilities publicize the location of community assistance centers that will remain open during the events, and a requirement that utilities meet in advance with communities most prone to shut offs. Done thoughtfully and strategically, it’s a policy that can save lives and loss of property.

Q: How did you become the Commissioner assigned to many of the safety proceedings? Is that something you sought?
A: It’s important to work on these cases because safety is at the core of so much of the CPUC’s work. Safety is central to our mission of consumer protection and utility regulation. It’s also at the core of what the public expects from us as utility regulators. When we fell down on the job, as we did in the years before PG&E’s pipeline explosion in San Bruno, the public lost a lot of confidence in us, and this commission is rightly very sensitive to that.

I am also naturally interested in issues relating to safety because of my long background working in environmental enforcement. Before Governor Brown appointed me to the CPUC in January 2017, I worked in the Governor’s office on establishing stronger safety rules for refineries in California, and on safety risks posed by transporting oil by rail in our state. The refinery rules provide a very helpful precedent of establishing strong safety management systems that are preventative and go beyond compliance. The safety work I’m doing now at the CPUC is a logical continuation of that past work and emphasis. I know firsthand that we

Continued on next page
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can make progress, but I also know it is not easy.

Q: Is there disconnect between how much work the CPUC does on safety related issues and the public’s perception of the CPUC’s role related to safety?

A: Perhaps, but I think we’re changing that. The public naturally reacts to salient events and accidents, and quite naturally tends to overlook the more mundane, day-to-day business of ensuring safety when things don’t go wrong. I do think with all the time and effort we’re putting into so many safety proceedings, stakeholders and the public are realizing how deeply committed we are to safety management and improvement.

Q: Is there one aspect of the CPUC’s safety work that you think is most innovative?

A: One unique program is our methane leak detection and repair proceeding. This program builds on leak controls required under the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration’s rules and other CPUC rules. But it also goes further to mandate controls to achieve greater safety benefits as well as environmental gains, since methane is a potent greenhouse gas, over 25 times more potent than CO2. We’re also protecting ratepayers because when there are leaks, they wind up paying for the lost gas.

This is the first program like this in the nation. In a decision in June 2018, we mandated 26 best practices that are state of the art for leak detection, repair, and prevention. We take a new “find it/fix it” approach and require leak surveys in areas of our gas pipeline system known to be particularly vulnerable. And we’re now requiring annual emissions reports from the gas utilities we regulate, and we are already seeing that emissions declined by five percent from 2015 to 2016. The utilities filed their mandatory compliance plans in March and those are currently under review.

So, as you can tell, there is no shortage of things to be done and we are working hard to address every safety issue we can.

‘Commercial Air Operators’ Now Under Local Govt. Jurisdiction

Effective July 1, 2018, the regulation of commercial air operators devolved from the California Public Utilities Commission to local jurisdictions that are a city, county, or city and county.

Now, as a condition of operation, commercial air operators will be required to comply with any requirement of the city or county where the individual or company obtained its business license.

Under Public Utilities Code section 5506, the city or county shall give reasonable notice of this requirement with any business license renewal notification and may charge a reasonable fee for purpose of carrying out this transfer.

A commercial air operator shall provide a certificate of insurance evidencing insurance coverage to the appropriate local government authority at least annually or whenever there is a material change in insurance coverage. (PU Code § 5503).

Liability protection shall be continued in effect so long as the commercial air operator offers services for compensation. The insurance policy or surety bond shall not be cancelable on less than 30 days’ written notice to the city or county, unless the commercial air operator ceases operations. (PU Code § 5508).

Any commercial air operator who knowingly refuses or fails to procure liability protection, as required by PU Code section 5503, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (PU Code § 5510).

A municipality or county can impose a penalty not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), following an administrative hearing, on any commercial air operator who fails to file evidence of liability protection as required by statute. (PU Code § 5512).

Local government entities seeking clarification can contact CPUC Transportation Enforcement Branch Chief Valerie Beck at VJB@cpuc.ca.gov or (415) 703-2665.

A copy of the application for the main merger is available online at: http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=Al&DocID=217574855

The application for the Sprint Wireline portion is available online at http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=Al&DocID=217974028

The merger is also being reviewed separately by the Federal Communication Commission. Filings in that matter are available online at: https://www.fcc.gov/transaction/t-mobile-sprint
CPUC Considers Climate Change Adaptation Strategies

By Commissioner Liane M. Randolph

Last December, Kristin Ralff Douglas of the CPUC’s Policy and Planning Division, put together a sobering slide presentation on climate change with the ominous title, “California in 2050: Some Sizzling Predictions.”

My fellow Commissioners, our Policy and Planning Division, and countless experts throughout the CPUC have been working on the issue of Climate Change for quite some time. We also worked with the California Energy Commission to form the state agencies’ Adaptation Working Group, to meet quarterly to promote high-level coordination on addressing the effects of climate change.

The slide presentation showed that the effects of Climate Change could have a profound impact on our way of life in California.

For example:

• Extreme heat days in cities like Fresno are likely to triple by 2030, with a 60-percent change of at least three heat waves lasting more than six days a year. By 2050, that possibility will be up to 90 percent, according to Cal-adapt, a repository for data and research on climate change.

• There is a 67-percent chance that sea levels in California will rise six inches by 2030 and a foot by 2050. Under current emissions scenarios, by 2100 sea levels could be up 3.5 feet and potentially up to 10 feet, according to the Ocean Protection Council Working Group.

• There is an 80-percent chance of having a 30-year drought in the Southwest under current emission trajectories, NASA has said.

• Wildfires are expected to burn 77 percent more area by 2050, according to UCLA.

As someone who has worked on climate change since being named to the CPUC in January 2015 and before that as Deputy Secretary and General Counsel to the California Department of Natural Resources, I need no convincing that climate change is real and that it’s something policy-makers everywhere should treat as the existential threat the evidence shows it to be. But we don’t have to wait until 2050 to feel its wrath.

From fires to floods, we see the impact of climate change today. Projections tell us that the impacts on public utilities will only become more severe. Higher temperatures will increase demand for electricity and impair transmission capacity. Rising sea levels will threaten coastal power plants. Hydro-electric power will be affected by more serious droughts, and fire season already seems to be a year-round phenomenon.

As utility regulators, so much of the work we do is designed to ensure that everyone in California has safe, reliable, and cost-effective utility services that they need to live and work. My fellow Commissioners and I are deeply concerned about how climate change will affect those obligations.

That’s why we initiated a new proceeding in April (called a Rule-making) that is considering strategies to integrate climate change adaptation in all relevant CPUC proceedings. As the order approved unanimously states at the outset, “Robust climate adaptation planning in a time of worsening climate impacts is a prudent next step to insulate the safety and reliability of all investor-owned public utilities.”

Like all CPUC proceedings, we don’t intend to impose any new rules without significant input from the utilities we regulate, from stakeholders, and from the public. To get things started, we asked the utilities to answer the following questions:

How should climate scenarios, climate-relevant parameters, and resilience metrics be used in electric and natural gas utilities? How should climate scenarios, climate-relevant parameters, and resilience metrics be used in electric and natural gas utilities?

How should climate scenarios, climate-related data sources, scenarios, tools, and other resources be used to inform CPUC activities and utility planning? What climate-related data sources, scenarios, tools, and other resources should be used to inform CPUC activities and utility planning?

What climate parameters should the CPUC use to determine climate-driven risks and resilience for three investor-owned public utilities? We'd like to see the CPUC use some of the key climate parameters that are already reported in the state’s recently released climate planning report: temperature, precipitation, and sea level rise.

“We need to make sure our regulated utilities are dealing with climate change as effectively as possible so we can keep people and property safe and so we can make sure the utilities continue to serve people’s vital needs.”

I look forward to a wide-ranging discussion and fruitful outcome as we dig more deeply into this important issue.
Docket: July Filings, continued from page 3

PROCEEDING NUMBER • FILED DATE • FILER

A1705022 • 13-Jul-18 • ALJ/FITCH/CPUC
Decision Denying California Water Service Company (U60W) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Provide Water Service to Travis Air Force Base

A1807011 • 13-JUL-2018 • T-Mobile USA, Inc.
In the Matter of the Joint Application of Sprint Communications Company L.P. (U-5112) and T-Mobile USA, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, For Approval of Transfer of Control of Sprint Communications Company L.P. Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 854(a).

A1807014 • 13-JUL-2018 • WINERY HOPPER, LLC
Application of Winery Hopper, LLC for authority to operate as a scheduled passenger stage corporation between points in Riverside County; and to establish a Zone of Rate Freedom (ZORF). (HARD COPY FILING)

A1807013 • 16-JUL-2018 • Pacific Gas and Electric Company

A1708016 • 19-Jul-18 • ALJ/BEMESDERFER/CPUC
Proposed Decision establishing opt-out rates and procedures in connection with Advanced Metering Infrastructure Deployment (“Smart Meters”) in Pacificorp service territory.

R1103013 • 19-Jul-18 • CMMR/GUZMAN ACEVES/CPUC
Proposed Decision modifying benefit portability freeze for the California Lifeline Program.

A1807015 • 19-JUL-2018 • California High Speed Rail Authority
Application of the California High-Speed Rail Authority to construct proposed high-speed tracks and underpass grade separations at S. Golden State Blvd (MP 194.91), E. Hardy Ave (MP 195.36), and E. Muscat Ave (MP 195.98) within the City of Fresno, California.

PROCEEDING NUMBER • FILED DATE • FILER

A1807016 • 20-JUL-2018 • Communications Venture Corp.
Application of Communications Venture Corporation d/b/a INdigital for a Certificate of Public Convenience And Necessity to Provide Limited Facilities-Based And Resold Competitive Local Exchange Service And Non-Dominant Interexchange Service.

R1503010 • 23-Jul-18 • ALJ/HOUCK/CPUC
Decision approving data gathering plan in San Joaquin Valley disadvantaged communities, adopting process for updating the list of San Joaquin Valley disadvantaged communities, and adding eight communities to this list.

A1502001; A1502002; A1502003; A1502013; A1502024; A1503004 • 23-Jul-18 • ALJ/FOGEL/CPUC
Decision on small and multi-jurisdictional utilities’ 2018-2020 energy savings assistance program and California Alternate Rates for Energy program applications.

A1807019 • 25-JUL-2018 • Gas
Joint Application of Gill Ranch Storage, LLC (U914G), Northwest Natural Gas Company, NW Natural Energy, LLC, NW Natural Gas Storage, LLC, SENSA Holdings LLC, Scienς eCORP Natural Gas Storage Holdings LLC, eCORP Storage LLC, and Scienς Natural Gas Holdings LLC for Authorization to Transfer Natural Gas Storage Holdings

R1807017 • 26-JUL-2018 • CPUC
Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Continued Implementation of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act and Related Matters. (PURPA)
http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?docformat=ALL&docid=217782886

A1808002 • 27-JUL-2018 • PABLITO INCORPORATED]
Application of Pablito Incorporated for authority to operate as a scheduled Passenger Stage Corporation between points in Los Angeles and Long Beach, Irvine, San Diego and Santa Monica and to establish a Zone of Rate Freedom.
HARD COPY FILING

A1807020 • 30-JUL-2018 • PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Application for Approval of Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s Electric Vehicle Charging Pilots for Schools and Parks Pursuant to Assembly Bills 1082 and 1083. (U39E)

A1807021 • 30-JUL-2018 • Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Application for Approval of Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s
Continued on next page
Wildfire customer protections, continued from page 1

Features Rulemaking: R.18-03-011

The ruling also includes specific requirements for customers of energy, water/sewer, and telecommunications utilities, such as waiving the fee for one jack and associated wiring at a temporary location regardless of whether the affected customer has an Inside Wire Plan.

Finally, the interim decision requires utilities that suffer loss, disruption, or degradation of service due to declared disasters to report their compliance with the terms of Resolutions M-4833 and M-4835 to the State.

A proposed decision on permanent disaster protection rules is expected in the coming months as part of ongoing Proceeding R.18-03-011.

If you are a consumer in need of assistance, please contact the CPUC’s Consumer Affairs Branch at 1-800-649-7570 or submit an online complaint.

The order instituting rulemaking for the ongoing proceeding (R.18-03-011) is available at: http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M217/K581/217581186.PDF.

Docket: July Filings, continued from page 6

PROCEEDING NUMBER • FILED DATE • FILER

Empower Electric Vehicle Charger Incentive and Education Program to Support Low and Moderate Income Customers. (U39E)

A1807022 • 30-JUL-2018 • Southern California Edison Company
Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of Electric Vehicle Charging at Schools, State Parks and Beaches (AB 1082 & 1083).

A1807023 • 30-JUL-2018 • SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) For Approval of Senate Bill 350 Transportation Electrification Proposals Regarding Medium and Heavy-Duty Electric Vehicles and a Vehicle-To-Grid Pilot.

A1807025 • 30-JUL-2018 • LIBERTY UTILITIES
Application of Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC (U933E) for Approval of Electric Vehicle Charging at Schools, State Parks and Beaches (AB 1082 & 1083).

A1807024 • 31-JUL-2018 • Southern California Gas Company
Application of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY (U904G) and SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U902G) for authority to revise their natural gas rates and implement storage proposals effective January 1, 2020 in this Triennial Cost Allocation Proceeding.

About this publication

This monthly newsletter is to keep you informed of proposals by the CPUC’s Commissioners and Administrative Law Judges, as well as utility applications, and other issues and work of note. We also include a list summarizing the filings at the CPUC in the previous month.

We want to hear from you! If you have topics you’d like us to cover or if you’d like to make comment on our proceedings or work, please contact us at outreach@cpuc.ca.gov or call (855) 421-0400. You can find information about events we are having at www.cpuc.ca.gov/Events.