L/GTD/bjk

EX- 2

5

÷.

	n territor territoria.
Decision 88 05 077 MAY 25 1988	MERINAL
BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION O	F THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
In the Matter of the Application of () SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY to () revise its rates under the () Consolidated Adjustment Mechanism () (U 904 G) ()	Application 86-03-058 (Filed March 28, 1986)
Application of PACIFIC GAS AND) ELECTRIC COMPANY for authority to) revised its gas rates and tariffs) effective April 1, 1986, under the) Gas Adjustment Clause.)	Application 86-03-030 (Filed March 17, 1986)
(Ŭ 39 C) Gas)	
In the Matter of the Application of SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY for authority to decrease its gas rates and charges pursuant to its filed Consolidated Adjustment Mechanism (CAM).	Application 86-04-027 (Filed April 16, *1986)
Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the rates and operations of the Southern California California Gas Company.	I.86-03-035 (Filed March 19, 1986)
Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the rates and operations of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company.)) I.86-03-036) (Filed March 19, 1986))
Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the rates and operations of the San Diego Gas & Electric Company.))) I.86-03-037) (Filed March 19, 1986))

20

1

÷

.

A.86-03-058, A.86-03-030, et al. L/GTD/bjk

ORDER DENYING REHEARING OF DECISION (D.) 88-02-056

Application for rehearing of D. 88-02-056 was filed by Pacific, Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). PG&E in its application asserts that the Commission's policy regarding the granting of fee enhancements for exceptional results in attorney fee cases is too burdensome and vague. PG&E also complains that \$6,716.20 of the attorneys fees approved in D. 88-02-056 were unfairly allocated to PG&E. Toward Utility Rate Normalization filed a response in opposition. Southern California Gas Company filed a response which supported PG&E's claim regarding fee enhancements and opposed PG&E's claim regarding the misallocation of the \$6,716.20. We have reviewed each and every allegation in the application, and are of the opinion that sufficient grounds for granting rehearing have not been shown. Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that rehearing of D.88-02-056 is hereby denied.

This order is effective today. Dated <u>MAY 25 1988</u> at San Francisco, California.

> STANLEY W. HULETT President DONALD VIAL FREDERICK R DUDA C. MITCHELL WILK JOHN B. OHANIAN Commissioners

I CERTIEY. łAT THIS DECISION WAS APPROVED BY THE ABOVE COMMISSIONERS