

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Copy for:

RESOLUTION NO. G-2374

Orig. and Copy  
to Executive Director

R E S O L U T I O N

UTILITIES DIVISION

BRANCH/SECTION: Gas

DATE: October 8, 1980

Director  
Numerical File  
Alphabetical File  
Accounting Officer

RETURN TO GAS BRANCH

SUBJECT: Pacific Gas & Electric Company. Order Authorizing Acceptance of Special Contracts Under Conditions Deviating from Filed Tariffs.

WHEREAS: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E), by Advice Letters Nos. 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108 and 1109, all filed on September 4, 1980, has requested authority to carry out the terms and conditions of six special contracts with:

(1) Pursley Construction Company, Inc. (Pursley) in Fremont, Alameda County; (2) A. D. Seeno Construction Company (Seeno) in Pittsburg, Contra Costa County; (3) McKeller and Associates (McKeller) in Cotati, Sonoma County; (4) Paul W. Bertuccio (Bertuccio) in Hollister, San Benito County; (5) R. C. Industrial Park (R.C.) in Cotati, Sonoma County; and (6) Phoenix Development Company (Phoenix) in Cotati, Sonoma County, all covering gas main extension to provide natural gas service to each of the applicants' commercial and industrial developments under conditions deviating from filed tariffs and resulting in the following:

1. The agreements each deviate from filed tariffs in that each applicant will pay in advance of construction the estimated total cost of construction less specific credits for trenching and backfilling and will also pay a monthly cost-of-ownership charge as listed below:

Applicant	Location	Total Cost of Facilities (\$)	Less Credit to Applicant (\$)	Advance to PG&E (\$)	Cost-of- Ownership (\$/mo.)
Pursley	Fremont	4,184	2,057	2,127	41.84
Seeno	Pittsburg	6,757	3,426	3,331	67.57
McKeller	Cotati	18,530	8,208	10,322	185.30
Bertuccio	Hollister	3,833	1,651	2,182	38.33
R.C.	Cotati	11,509	4,375	7,134	115.09
Phoenix	Cotati	7,552	2,643	4,909	75.52

2. In each case, the monthly cost-of-ownership charge represents 1% of the total cost of the facilities, and such charges will be adjusted accordingly if refunds are made.

3. Each applicant is constructing a commercial and industrial development and wants gas facilities in advance of requests for utility service.

4. None of the applicants are the ultimate consumers of gas service to be provided, and since not all of the ultimate consumers have been determined at this time, exercising the Exceptional Case clause of Rule No. 15 is appropriate in all cases.

RETURN TO GAS BRANCH

5. All agreements are basically similar in content with prior agreements filed by PG&E and authorized by prior Commission Resolutions, notably G-2364 and G-2372, dated July 29, 1980 and September 16, 1980, respectively, and

WHEREAS: We find that these agreements are compensatory and non-discriminatory and will provide service to Applicants in such a manner as not to place a burden on other ratepayers; therefore, good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Authority is granted under Sections X.A. of General Order No. 96-A, and under Sections 454 and 532 of the Public Utilities Code to place each of the above contracts into effect as of this date.

2. Each of the above advice letters and contracts shall be marked to show that they were accepted for filing under Resolution No. G-2374 of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California. The effective date of this resolution is the date hereof.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly introduced, passed and adopted at a regular conference of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, held on October 8, 1980, the following Commissioners voting favorably thereon:

JOHN E. BRYSON  
President  
VERNON L. STURGEON  
RICHARD D. GRAVELLE  
LEONARD M. GRIMES, JR.

  
Executive Director