

RECEIVED  
CAB SAN FRANCISCO

13 OCT 11 PM 1:10

#296994

October 10, 2013

Commissioners  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: CNG Vehicles; CPUC Complaint Procedures

Dear President Peevey and Commissioners Sandoval, Florio, Feron, and Peterman:

This is a follow-up to my letter to you of May 3, 2013, regarding PG&E limiting night and weekend access to its CNG pump in San Rafael. I have not been notified of any action on that complaint, so I assume (but do not know for a fact) that it is still under investigation. The only information I have is the phone call I received from PG&E telling me the Commission had denied my complaint for lack of jurisdiction. I have no idea if you have reconsidered your position after my follow up letter of May 3, 2013.

However, *PG&E has now taken a further and far more severe step to cripple the Bay Area's CNG refueling infrastructure.* It has posted a sign at the 425 Folsom Street CNG fueling location informing the public that the location will be **CLOSING PERMANENTLY** as of October 31, 2013.

The Folsom Street location is centrally located near the Bay Bridge and is fairly busy. The only remaining CNG station in San Francisco with evening and weekend access is now the Olympian Oil location at 2690 Third Street, 3 miles to the south in a location that is very inconvenient and out of the way for most drivers.

Not only will the closing cause many drivers to drive 6 miles round-trip out of their way to refuel, but one must assume that 3<sup>rd</sup> street pump as the only CNG pump in San Francisco open nights and weekends will be overcrowded.

With this closure, San Francisco will have gone down from three 24 hour CNG pumps in three different parts of San Francisco (North, Central, and South, the pump in the Presidio closed a few years ago as part of the Doyle Drive widening), to one pump in the far southern end of San Francisco.

While I understand that it might be difficult for the PUC to cause an *expansion* of alternative fuel refueling options, I would think that at a bare minimum the PUC could take steps to prevent the *elimination* of existing alternative fuel refueling options.

I understand that the PUC has a policy of promoting alternative and eco-friendly fuels. However, if the PUC takes no action, that policy would ring rather hollow - the Commission would be presiding over PG&E as it dismantles an extremely important link in the alternative fuel infrastructure. One of the largest cities in the state, and the central city in the state's second largest SMSA, would have only one CNG pump available on nights and weekends.

In fact, I bought my CNG car in reliance upon what I understood was the Commission and the City and County of San Francisco's position in favor of supporting alternative fuel and CNG. It never occurred to me in this age of increasing recognition of the problems of global climate change that the availability of CNG would be contracting rather than expanding.

I request that the PUC order PG&E to keep the 425 Folsom Street refueling station open pending further order of the Commission. Once the station is demolished by PG&E, it is gone forever.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Redacted

cc: Consumer Affairs Branch

Ed Randolph, Director, Energy Division