

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company Proposing Cost of Service and Rates for Gas Transmission and Storage Services for the Period of 2015-2017.

(U 39 G)

And Related Matter.

Application 13-12-012
(Filed December 19, 2013)

Investigation 14-06-016
(Filed June 26, 2014)

RULING REGARDING JUNE 27, 2014 MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSE TO DATA REQUESTS

On June 27, 2014, Commercial Energy of California (Commercial Energy) submitted for filing a “Motion to Compel Response to Data Requests” (motion). The motion requests that an order be issued to compel Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to answer four questions in Commercial Energy’s Data Request Number 3.

Responses to the motion were separately submitted by PG&E and the Core Transport Agent Consortium on July 7, 2014. Permission was then granted to Commercial Energy to submit a reply, which it did on July 8, 2014.

Commercial Energy contends that the four questions that it seeks to compel responses on address “operational issues related to PG&E’s practice of granting payment extensions to Core Transport Agent (‘CTA’) customers without providing notice to the CTA, and customer service representative training practices with respect to core and noncore service options.” (Motion, Attachment A.) Three of the four questions that Commercial Energy seeks responses to “seek information about the number of customers to whom PG&E granted extensions, PG&E’s practices regarding verification of the customer’s

need for the requested extension, and how the payment extension process is administered internally.” (Motion, at 4.) The fourth question seeks information about the educational or training materials that “PG&E provided to its customer service representatives regarding the factors that customers should consider (i.e., pros and cons) when deciding between using Core and Non-core service?” All four questions are set forth in Attachment B of the motion.

Commercial Energy and the Core Transport Agent Consortium contend that the data requests seek information that is within the scope of this proceeding because of the inclusion of issue number 23 in the April 17, 2014 scoping memo and ruling (scoping memo), and the opening of the Order Instituting Investigation 14-06-016 (OII). Issue number 23 in the scoping memo refers to “Are there other operational issues concerning PG&E’s GT&S services that need to be considered...” The OII states at 2 that “The purpose of this OII is to allow the Commission to consider proposals other than PG&E’s revenue requirement, cost allocation, and rate design of its GT&S operations and to enable the Commission to enter orders on matters for which the utility may not be the proponent.”

PG&E contends in part that the information sought in Commercial Energy’s data request is not within the scope of PG&E’s application or the companion OII.

I have reviewed the motion, responses, and reply. In addition, I have also reviewed portions of PG&E’s testimony and application, as well as the scoping memo, OII, and the transcript of the prehearing conference. I have also reviewed the CTA settlement that was adopted as part of the settlement in PG&E’s prior gas transmission and storage proceeding in Decision (D.) 11-04-031.

Based on a consideration of all those documents, the information sought in Commercial Energy’s data request is relevant to issues related to the operations,

practices, services, and facilities of PG&E's gas transmission operations. Accordingly, Commercial Energy's motion should be granted, and PG&E should be ordered to provide answers to Questions 8, 22, 23, and 24 of Commercial Energy's Data Request Number 3 no later than close of business on August 1, 2014.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The June 27, 2014 Motion to Compel Response to Data Requests that was submitted by Commercial Energy of California is granted.
2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall provide responses to Questions 8, 22, 23, and 24 of Commercial Energy's Data Request Number 3 no later than close of business on August 1, 2014.

John S. Wong
Administrative Law Judge