



Public Utilities Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITATION FOR VIOLATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE AND GENERAL ORDER

To: Jet with Jaime



File: Unlicensed

Date: October 29, 2026

Citation #: T.2026-10-012

Case #: CSE-000982

VIOLATIONS

You are hereby cited as having violated sections of the Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General Order (G.O.) as described below. These violations occurred during the period from June 3, 2026, through October 26, 2026.

- (1) Advertised charter-party passenger transportation services without Commission operating authority, in violation of Pub. Util. Code Section 5414.5 [**2 counts**]

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The above violations are documented in the attached Investigation Report, which consists of carrier's records and substantiating documents obtained from other sources.

RESPONSE

TEB used the Penalty Assessment Methodology adopted in Resolution M-4846 and considered mitigating and exacerbating factors in setting the fine.

You are hereby called upon to answer this citation on or before November 18, 2026. By way of such answer, you may either:

- (1) Pay a fine of \$2,500 pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 5378. Submit your payment online via TCP Portal (<https://tcpportal.cpuc.ca.gov/s/login/>) using a credit card, ACH or check. Upon payment, the fine will be deposited in the State Treasury to the credit of the General Fund, and the Commission staff will deem the matter closed, **or**
- (2) Contact the Supervisor below to make payment arrangements, **or**
- (3) Contest this Citation by filing an Appeal. See attached document "*How to File an Appeal and Instructions for Filing a Notice of Appeal and Certificate of Service for a Citation Appeal.*"

If you fail to respond by November 18, 2026, you will be in default and will have forfeited your right to appeal the Citation. In addition, your operating authority will be immediately suspended and may be subsequently revoked pursuant to Resolution ALJ-187. The Commission may also act through a civil or criminal proceeding to recover any unpaid fine and ensure compliance with applicable statutes and Commission orders.

Lana Tran Courney

Lana Tran Courney, Program and Project Supervisor
Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division
Transportation Enforcement Branch
Telephone number: (415) 385-5513
E-mail address: Lana.Tran-Courney@cpuc.ca.gov

Attachments



Public Utilities Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITATION COMPLIANCE AGREEMENT

File No.: Unlicensed

Citation #: T.2026-10-012

Date: October 29, 2026

Case #: CSE-000982

I (we) hereby agree to comply with this citation dated October 29, 2026, and herewith pay the fine of \$ 2,500.00.

[Redacted]

Jet with Jaime

[Redacted]

(Signature)

(Title)

(Date)

Payment is to be submitted online via TCP Portal (<https://tcpportal.cpuc.ca.gov/s/login/>) using a credit card, ACH, or check. Payment via credit card is recommended as it provides real-time verification, whereas ACH payments take two days to clear with the bank.

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION



Carrier: Jet with Jaime

File: Unlicensed

Citation #: T.2026-10-012

Case #: CSE-000982

Date: October 29, 2026

AUTO-PAY CREDIT OR DEBIT CARD AUTHORIZATION

I (we), _____, doing business as
Jet with Jaime, hereby authorize the California Public Utilities Commission to deduct
\$ _____ from my VISA or Mastercard in one installment, or each month, on the due
date, until Citation T.2026-10-012 is paid in full.

Card Number _____ Expiration Date _____.

Cardholder Authorized Signature

Date

Attachments:

Photocopy of Credit or Debit Card
Photocopy of Cardholder's Driver's License

INVESTIGATION REPORT

CARRIER: Jet with Jaime
California Secretary of State # N/A

MEMBERS: [REDACTED]

AUTHORITY: Unlicensed

ADDRESS: [REDACTED]

PHONE/EMAIL: (530) 748-5824 / jetwithjaime@gmail.com

VEHICLES: Unknown

EMPLOYEE-DRIVERS: Unknown

PL&PD¹ INSURANCE: Unknown

WKCP² INSURANCE: Unknown

DRUG CONSORTIUM: Unknown

¹ Public Liability and Property Damage (PL&PD)

² Workers' Compensation (WKCP)

INTRODUCTION

On May 22, 2026, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Transportation Enforcement Branch (TEB) received a consumer complaint alleging Jet with Jaime was operating without authority or commercial insurance. On June 3, 2026, I was assigned to investigate the operations and practices of Jet with Jaime.

VIOLATION

The investigation for the period of June 3, 2026, to October 26, 2026, disclosed Jet with Jaime violated the following provision of the Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code.

- **Advertising as a Charter-Party Carrier (TCP) without an active authority, in violation of Pub. Util. Code Section 5414.5 [2 counts].**

On May 22, 2026, TEB received a consumer complaint alleging “Jet with Jaime” was operating without a TCP or commercial insurance.

On July 16, 2026, I called (530) 748-5824, the number listed on Jet with Jaime’s Nextdoor webpage and the consumer complaint and left a voicemail. I followed up with an email via Kiteworks and Outlook introducing myself, explaining the CPUC’s role, the reason for my outreach, and the regulatory requirements related to advertising passenger transportation services without proper TCP authority [**Attachment 1**].

On August 6, 2026, I sent a Cease and Desist (C&D) letter via certified mail to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [**Attachment 2**].

On August 10, 2026, USPS returned the C&D as undelivered, and I opted to reattempt delivery [**Attachment 3**].

On August 13, 2026, I sent the same C&D via Outlook, Kiteworks, and GLS. On the same day, USPS successfully delivered the previously mailed C&D [**Attachment 4 through 6**].

On August 17, 2026, the copy of the C&D sent via GLS was signed for by “[REDACTED]” [**Attachment 7**].

On August 27, 2026, I made a final phone call to Jet with Jaime and left a voicemail requesting that a representative contact me regarding the services offered so that TEB could determine whether they fall under CPUC authority. I advised that failure to respond may result in further enforcement action.

On September 16, 2026, I submitted an inquiry through the El Dorado County government webpage asking whether the county regulates taxicab transportation services via ordinance or resolution under Pub. Util. Code Section 5353, as Jet with Jaime appears to hold a county business license, Lic. 081623, as displayed on its Nextdoor webpage. El Dorado County's Business Search webpage shows that Jet with Jaime's business license is active from September 19, 2025, through September 30, 2026 **[Attachment 8]**.

Between September 21, 2026, and September 23, 2026, I communicated via email with Beverly Jackman of the County Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office. Ms. Jackman stated that although El Dorado County issues general business licenses to individuals operating taxi businesses, the county does not conduct any verification or regulatory oversight of taxi operators **[Attachment 9]**. Thus, Jet with Jaime's county business license is not a taxi license.

The table below identifies the dates on which I observed and saved PDF copies of Jet with Jaime's Nextdoor webpage advertisements. These advertisements include user comments, with recorded dates, that describe and allege the services provided by Jet with Jaime.

TABLE 1 – Dates Jet with Jaime was observed advertising without authority **[Attachment 10]**.

Observation Dates	
July 13, 2026	October 26, 2026

DECLARATION

I have read the foregoing and know the contents thereof and I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, except as to those matters stated on information and belief, and to those matters, I believe to be true.

Executed on October 29, 2026, at Sacramento, California.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JMB', is written above a horizontal line.

James Barbarick, Enforcement Analyst

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1. 7.16.26 Outreach Email to Carrier
- Attachment 2. 8.6.26 Cease and Desist - Jet with Jaime
- Attachment 3. 8.10.26 Attempted C&D Certified Mail Delivery and Reschedule
- Attachment 4. 8.13.26 C&D Email to carrier
- Attachment 5. 8.13.26 C&D Kiteworks to carrier
- Attachment 6. 8.13.26 C&D Certified Mail Receipt
- Attachment 7. 8.17.26 C&D GLS Mail Receipt
- Attachment 8. El Dorado County Business Search
- Attachment 9. 9.23.26 El Dorado County Response
- Attachment 10. Jet with Jaime Advertising

Attachment 1

From: [Barbarick, James](#)
To: ["jetwithjaime@gmail.com"](mailto:jetwithjaime@gmail.com)
Subject: [CPUC]: Inquiry Regarding Passenger Transportation Services
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:55:00 AM

Good morning,

I attempted to reach a representative from Jet with Jamie at 530-748-5824 and left a voicemail. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) received an anonymous complaint involving the advertisement of passenger transportation services on Nextdoor (<https://nextdoor.com/page/jet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca>) without a Charter-Party Carrier (TCP) authority. I am following up as part of our standard investigation process.

Below is information related to the CPUC's regulation of commercial passenger transportation.

The CPUC regulates Charter-party Carriers (TCPs): <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/tcpinfo/>

California Public Utilities Code (PUC) section 5360 defines a Charter-party Carrier: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PUC&sectionNum=5360

PUC section 5371 outlines the requirements for obtaining authority to operate as a TCP: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PUC&sectionNum=5371

PUC section 5353 lists the entities exempt from CPUC licensing requirements: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=5353.&lawCode=PUC

The process for obtaining a license, as well as any questions related to licensing, should be directed to the CPUC Transportation Licensing and Analysis Branch (TLAB): <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/regulatory-services/licensing/transportation-licensing-and-analysis-branch>

If you have any additional questions or need further assistance, please feel free to reach out to me by phone or email using the contact information in my signature.

Please respond by July 30, 2026, in order to ensure we have accurate information for this investigation.

Respectfully,

James Barbarick

Enforcement Analyst

Consumer Protection & Enforcement Division

California Public Utilities Commission

O 916-336-0534

www.cpuc.ca.gov | James.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov

Attachment 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



August 6, 2026

TCP: Unlicensed
Case No.: CSE-982

[REDACTED]
Jet with Jaime

[REDACTED]
jetwithjaime@gmail.com

NOTICE TO CEASE AND DESIST

Dear [REDACTED] /Jet with Jaime:

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has become aware that you are operating without valid authority.

Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code Sections 1031 and 5371 state that it is unlawful for a Passenger Stage Corporation or a Charter-Party Carrier to conduct any operations without valid authority. Pub. Util. Code Sections 1034.5 and 5414.5 state that it is unlawful to publish or advertise without holding a valid operating authority. Advertisements include, but are not limited to, advertising in local directories or Yellow Pages, business cards, social media, internet websites, and any other form of advertisements.

Your company must immediately cease and desist from all unlawful operations, including advertising.

Pub. Util. Code Section 5411 states in part that any TCP carrier which operates without valid authority is guilty of a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine not less than \$1,000.


This letter places your company on notice that continued violations of the law without the required operating authority may result in enforcement actions, including criminal prosecutions. There will be no further warnings.

For information on obtaining a permit or certificate, go to:

<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/transportationlicensing/>

Please contact me within five days of receiving this notice at the telephone number and email address listed below.

Sincerely,



James Barbarick
Enforcement Analyst

Consumer Protection & Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
O 916-336-0534
www.cpuc.ca.gov | James.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov

Attachment 3

8/10/26, 7:52 AM

USPS Tracking® | USPS

ALERT: WILDFIRES IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION OF THE U.S. MAY DELAY FINAL DE...

USPS Tracking®

FAQs >

Tracking Number:

Remove X



Copy

Schedule a Redelivery

Latest Update

We attempted to deliver your item at 11:32 am on August 8, 2026 in SHINGLE SPRINGS, CA 95682 and a notice was left because an authorized recipient was not available. You may arrange redelivery by using the Schedule a Redelivery feature on this page or may pick up the item at the Post Office indicated on the notice beginning August 9, 2026. If this item is unclaimed by August 23, 2026 then it will be returned to sender.

Feedback

Get More Out of USPS Tracking:

USPS Tracking Plus®

Delivery Attempt: Action Needed

Notice Left (No Authorized Recipient Available)



August 8, 2026 11:32 AM

Out for Delivery



August 8, 2026 8:22 AM

See All Tracking History

[What Do USPS Tracking Statuses Mean?](#)

Text & Email Updates



Schedule Redelivery



USPS Tracking Plus®



Product Information



See Less 

Track Another Package

Enter tracking or barcode numbers

Need More Help?

Contact USPS Tracking support for further assistance.

FAQs

USPS.com Redelivery Confirmation

Success! Your Redelivery request has been scheduled.

Please see the details of your Redelivery request below. You may receive multiple confirmation emails depending on the request.

Confirmation email(s) sent to: JETWITHJAIME@GMAIL.COM

Email: JETWITHJAIME@GMAIL.COM

Phone: 530-748-5824

You can modify your Redelivery request by going to [Modify Redelivery Request](#).

Confirmation Number: WER306270044

1 Package

Feedback

Attachment 4

From: [Barbarick, James](#)
To: jetwithjaime@gmail.com
Subject: [CPUC]: CSE-982 - Cease and Desist- Jet with Jamie
Date: Thursday, August 13, 2026 9:19:00 AM
Attachments: [CSE-982 - Cease and Desist- Jet with Jamie.pdf](#)

Good morning,

Please see attached Cease and Desist from the California Public Utilities Commission.

Respectfully,

James Barbarick
Enforcement Analyst

Consumer Protection & Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
O 916-336-0534
www.cpuc.ca.gov | James.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov

Attachment 5

10/6/26, 8:16 AM

[CPUC]: CSE-982 - Cease and Desist- Jet with Jamie.pdf

[CPUC]: CSE-982 - Cease and Desist- Jet with Jamie

 james.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov
Aug 13, 2026, 9:19 AM
To: jetwithjaime@gmail.com
1 attachment - Expires: 1791874799000

Good morning,

Please see attached Cease and Desist from the California Public Utilities Commission.

Respectfully,

James Barbarick
Enforcement Analyst

Consumer Protection & Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
O 916-336-0534
www.cpuc.ca.gov | James.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov

 1 attachment:
Expires: Oct 12, 2026

CSE-982 - Cease and Desist- Jet w
ith Jamie.pdf

  171.0 KB

Attachment 6

8/17/26, 8:04 AM

USPS Tracking® | USPS

ALERT: HURRICANE LALA IN HAWAII, SEVERE WEATHER IN THE UPPER MIDWEST AND OHIO ...

USPS Tracking®

[FAQs](#) >

Tracking Number:

Remove X

Copy

Add to Informed Delivery

Latest Update

Your item was delivered to an individual at the address at 11:06 am on August 13, 2026 in [REDACTED]

Get More Out of USPS Tracking:

USPS Tracking Plus®

Delivered

Delivered, Left with Individual

August 13, 2026 11:06 AM

[See All Tracking History](#)

[What Do USPS Tracking Statuses Mean?](#)

Text & Email Updates



USPS Tracking Plus®



Product Information



See Less ^

Feedback

Attachment 7

8/20/26, 7:54 AM

Track a Parcel | Real-Time Tracking | GLS





Delivered

Tracking details - 564741919

Back

Parcel details

Ship to location
[REDACTED]

Tracking number
[REDACTED]

Current status
Delivered

Reference

Ship date
08/13/2026

Service
CPS

Delivery date
08/17/2026

Signed for by
[REDACTED]

Delivery time
01:17 PM

[View signature](#)

Tracking events

Date/Time	Location	Additional details
08/17/2026 01:17 PM	[REDACTED]	SHIPMENT DELIVERED
08/17/2026 07:21 AM	SACRAMENTO, CA, US	ON ROUTE FOR DELIVERY





08/14/2026 03:09 PM SACRAMENTO, CA, US DEL RESCHED - RCPNT NOT HOME - FROM 08/14/2026 TO 08/17/2026

08/14/2026 01:59 PM SACRAMENTO, CA, US DEL ATTEMPTED - RCPNT NOT HOME - DH# [REDACTED]

08/14/2026 09:39 AM SACRAMENTO, CA, US ON ROUTE FOR DELIVERY

08/14/2026 04:49 AM SACRAMENTO, CA, US SCANNED AT DELIVERY DEPOT

08/13/2026 05:47 PM SACRAMENTO, CA, US ARRIVAL SCAN - DELIVERY SCHED FOR 08/14/2026

08/13/2026 03:03 PM SACRAMENTO, CA, US PICKUP SCAN

08/13/2026 01:41 PM LABEL CREATED

Don't have a tracking number?

Enter the details of the parcel you want to track:



Attachment 8

10/12/26, 1:48 PM

Business Search



Guest

[Home](#) [Report a Problem](#)

Business Search

Search By	Account #
Value	081623

[Specify Start Date Range \(Options\)](#)

Search

Account #	Business Name	Start Date	Expire Date	Address	Phone
081623	JET WITH JAIME [REDACTED]	9/19/2025	9/30/2026	--ON FILE--	(530) 748-5824

Total records found: 1

Attachment 9

From: [Beverly C. Jackman](#)
To: [Barbarick, James](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] FW: New El Dorado County Feedback
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2026 8:15:53 AM
Attachments: [Image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We issue business licenses to taxi drivers operating a business in the county. Business Category #630 is "630 - TRANSPORTATION SERVICE; DRIVERS; RACE CAR/LIMO/ TAXI/BUS/ETC." All businesses operating in the incorporated areas of the county are required to obtain a county business license. This license is in addition to any other permit or license required by the state or professional association. There are many professions that require additional licensure – cosmetologists, contractors, attorneys, medical professionals, CPA's, the list is quite lengthy.

Beverly Collette Jackman, CTP

Accounting Division Manager
Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office
County of El Dorado
360 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
530-621-5823



From: Barbarick, James <James.Barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2026 8:39 AM
To: Beverly C. Jackman <Beverly.Jackman@edcgov.us>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] FW: New El Dorado County Feedback

Good morning,

Thank you so much for the response. As I understand it, El Dorado County does not issue or regulate taxi licenses?

I apologize for pressing on this, I just want to make sure I'm capturing the details correctly for my report.

I appreciate it!

Respectfully,

James Barbarick
Enforcement Analyst

Consumer Protection & Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
O 916-336-0534
www.cpuc.ca.gov | James.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov

From: Beverly C. Jackman <Beverly.Jackman@edcgov.us>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 4:21 PM
To: Barbarick, James <James.Barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: New El Dorado County Feedback

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Mr. Barbarick – We do not conduct any further verification on taxi, Uber or Lyft operators.

Thank you very much for your inquiry.

Feel free to reach out to me directly if you have additional questions. I manage our Business License Division.

Beverly Collette Jackman, CTP

Accounting Division Manager
Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office
County of El Dorado
360 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
530-621-5823



From: Tax Collector <taxcollector@edcgov.us>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 9:56 AM
To: Business License <buslic@edcgov.us>
Cc: Beverly C. Jackman <Beverly.Jackman@edcgov.us>
Subject: Fw: New El Dorado County Feedback

From: Maria D. Carpenter <Maria.Carpenter@edcgov.us>
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2026 4:39 PM
To: Tax Collector <taxcollector@edcgov.us>
Subject: Fw: New El Dorado County Feedback

Good afternoon,

Please see the response received through the county feedback form below. Is this something you're able to assist with? If not, could you please point in the right direction.

Thank you,

Maria Carpenter

Administrative Technician
Chief Administrative Office

County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
Direct Line: (530) 621-6730
maria.carpenter@edcgov.us

From: Forms & Workflow <noreply@openforms.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2026 8:31 AM
To: Maria D. Carpenter <Maria.Carpenter@edcgov.us>
Subject: New El Dorado County Feedback

New El Dorado County Feedback

The general El Dorado County Questions and Comments form has been submitted from a visitor to the El Dorado County website. Below are the response details. Any file uploads will be attached to this email.

Question or Comment	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>My name is James and I am with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Transportation Enforcement Branch (TEB). I am investigating a possible unlicensed passenger carrier advertising without authority. This carrier has a business license with El Dorado County but does not possess a CA state TCP license.</p> <p>Public Utilities Code 5353 (g) grants an exemption to state licensing requirements for taxi services that licensed and regulated by a city or county via ordinance or resolution. Does El Dorado County (to include unincorporated El Dorado) issue and regulate Taxi licenses? After reviewing the county's municipal codes, it does not appear so; however, I am hoping to get confirmation prior to issuing a citation.</p> <p>I appreciate any help you can provide.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>James Barbarick Enforcement Analyst</p> <p>Consumer Protection & Enforcement Division California Public Utilities Commission O 916-336-0534 www.cpuc.ca.gov James.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov</p>
---------------------------	--

Full Name	James Barbarick
Email Address	James.barbarick@cpuc.ca.gov
Phone Number	916-336-0534
Photos and Files	



[Help articles](#) | [Support portal](#)

Forms & Workflow is a [Granicus](#) product.

WARNING: This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.

WARNING: This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.

Attachment 10

7/13/26, 9:11 AM

Jet with Jaime - Nextdoor



(/)

Partners ▾ Businesses ▾

Log in Sign up



Jet with Jaime

Airport (/login/?next=https://nextdoor.com/search/businesses/?query=airport) **Airport Service**

(/login/?next=https://nextdoor.com/search/businesses/?query=airport service) **Airport shuttle** (/login/?next=https://nextdoor.com/search/businesses/?query=airport shuttle)


Fave

Recommend (/choose_address/?next=%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&utm_medium=local_business_public_page&utm_source=local_business_public_page)

Message **Call**

Photo gallery





+2

with Jaime

Activity



JET WITH JAIME
2 Jul

us 4th of July Weekend Specials with Jet with Jaime! 🇺🇸

...

See more...



3

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

J**J. W.** Cameron Park, CA · 2 Jul · Verified in 2019

I've given a couple people your number that want to go to the El Dorado Hills Town Center fireworks tomorrow night. I don't want to deal with the traffic. Happy 4th from Ride with Friends US 🍷

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

**JET WITH JAIME**

2 Jun

Call or text to book

530-748-5824...**See more...****4**

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-

springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)



JET WITH JAIME

27 May

To book your reservation with Jet with Jaime, please call or text

530-748-5824...

See more...

JET 
with Jaime

530-748-5824



6

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

(/choose_address/?utm_seo_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F&next=https%3A%2F%2Fnextdoor.com%2Fpages%2Fjet-with-jaime-shingle-springs-ca%2F)

See more activity posts

Our story

530-748-5824 Jet with Jaime is for clients who want more than just a ride. It's a premium private driver experience created for those who value dependability, convenience, comfort, and a higher level of service from start to finish. Jet with Jaime is designed for clients who prioritize premium service over standard transportation. License # 081623



Don't miss updates from your local businesses

 Continue with Google

 Continue with Apple

 Continue with Email

By continuing with signing up, you agree to our Privacy Policy (/privacy_policy), Cookie Policy (/cookie_policy), and Member Agreement (/member_agreement)

 (530) 748-5824 (tel:+15307485824)

 jetwithjaime@gmail.com (mailto:jetwithjaime@gmail.com)

 Lic. 081623

Don't miss updates from your local businesses

A A A 523,600 neighbors in Sacramento

Create an account

(/rankings/friendliest-places-to-live/shingle-springs--ca/)

#6 friendliest neighborhood to live in Shingle Springs, CA

(/rankings/friendliest-places-to-live/shingle-springs--ca/)

French Creek, Shingle Springs

French Creek is a peaceful, residential neighborhood in Shingle Springs, CA. Known for its spacious homes, beautiful landscapes, and friendly community, it's a great place for families. It's quiet, safe, and has a real small-town feel.

Residents: 1,120

Friendliness: 92

Affordability: 98

Average income: \$92K

Average age: 69

2026
Winner



JET
with Jaime
530-748-5824


Jet with Jaime

✦

Airport shuttle Airport Airport Service ▾

♥ Fave 💬 Message ☎ Call

Photo gallery





Recommendations

M**M.G.** El Dorado Hills

3 days ago · Verified in 2021

I am taking a chance to see if Any one going towards SFO on October 26th AM, I am looking for a ride to SFO from EDH (US50, 2 miles from 30B). I need to be there by Noon. Willing to compensate. Pickup around 9AM drop off SFO or close by, I will take Uber for the last mile. i will have 2 checked bags . Let me know and what you are looking for \$.

**G****G.C.** Shingle Springs, CA · 3 days ago · Verified in 2021
Call or text Jet with Jaime. (530) 748-5824

1



Partners

Businesses

Log in

Sign up

M.G. El Dorado Hills

6 days ago · Verified in 2021

Need a Ride to SFO on Oct 26th, Need to be there by 12.30pm, I live in Serrano close to EDH blvd, 2 miles from US50 exit 30b. Let me know the price. Thanks and [regards.mike](#)



3

**J****J.R.** El Dorado Hills, CA · 6 days ago · Verified in 2016

I recommend it with Jamie. She's fabulous and reliable pricing is reasonable. (530) 748-5824



1



**N**

N.Y. Shingle Springs
6 Oct · Verified in 2017

Looking for shuttle service from SFO after my vacation (3 people in my group)! Any recommendations for a reliable and comfortable shuttle/ride (not Uber)?



5

**S**

S.C. Shingle Springs, CA · 6 Oct · Verified in 2025
Jet with Jaime is excellent and local. 530-748-5824



1

**P**

P.L. Placerville
4 Oct · Verified in 2025

Jaime was very friendly & had great communication. Good price & will definitely use again for airport transport.



5

**G**

G.C. Shingle Springs
1 Oct · Verified in 2021

Our ride to SMF was perfect. Jaime was on time, courteous, fun to talk to & professional. Reasonable priced. Due to a conflict She even arranged for another driver to pickup up upon our return.



14



B

B. M. Cameron Park, CA · 1 Oct · Verified in 2025
Jamie is great! Would highly recommend her

**A**

A. M. Pollock Pines
28 Sep · Verified in 2022

My review will not stop with Nextdoor! I'm gonna tell everybody I know they need to use Jet With Jamie Airport Shuttle! She got us to the airport on time and picked us up in the wee hours of the morning after our flight was delayed for two hours. Thank you, Jamie for your excellent service.



42

**A**

A. M. Pollock Pines, CA · 29 Sep · Verified in 2022
Jaime's contact information is listed above. You can get a quote for what it would cost to go from your house to the airport. I assume it will vary depending on where you live.

**S**

S. S. El Dorado Hills
26 Sep · Verified in 2016

Does anyone have recommendations for a shuttle service that can take my brother and his dog from Sacramento to San Francisco International Airport on Monday, 10/5? The flight is international and leaves at 2:40 pm, so he needs to be at the airport by 10:30 am to get the dog into cargo. Thanks in advance for any suggestions!



3

**S**

S. C. Shingle Springs, CA · 26 Sep · Verified in 2025
Jet with Jaime is excellent! 530-748-5824 Good luck!

**M**

M.E. Fair Oaks
22 Sep · Verified in 2015

Jamie is on time, reliable and has excellent communication. Would use her services again!

**S**

S.J. El Dorado Hills
21 Sep · Verified in 2025

Jamie has helped me with all of my airport transportation needs this year. She is on time, super friendly, follows up to confirm, tracks your flights to make sure they're on time. Clean car, very professional. I highly recommend Jaime!

**J**

J.R. El Dorado Hills, CA · 22 Sep · Verified in 2016
Agreed Jamie is awesome. Trust her with all of my family for rides

**J**

J.H. Rescue
20 Sep · Verified in 2023

Looking for a ride to Sac airport need to be there by noon Thursday Sep 24th



S

S. C. Shingle Springs, CA · 20 Sep · Verified in 2025
Jet with Jaime is excellent! 530-748-5824



1

**S**

S. T. Cameron Park
19 Sep · Verified in 2025

Always on time and reliable.



7

**M**

M. R. El Dorado Hills
18 Sep · Verified in 2015

Hello Neighbors,

Are there any ride-share services from El Dorado Hills to Sacramento International Airport and back? Your suggestions are appreciated. Thank you, Michael



10

**S**

S. C. Shingle Springs, CA · 18 Sep · Verified in 2025
Jet with Jamie is excellent. 530-748-5824



1

**P**

P. H. Diamond Springs
17 Sep · Verified in 2020

Very reliable and so sweet.





[See more recommendations](#)

Activity



JET WITH JAIME

4 days ago

530-748-5825

text to book...

[See more...](#)



JET WITH JAIME

14 Oct

530-748-5824

text to book 📞...

[See more...](#)

JET

with Jaime

530-748-5824



A

A. C.El Dorado Hills, CA · 16 Oct · Verified in 2022

Jaime is fantastic. Highly recommend arranging your next airport transportation with her.



JET WITH JAIME

12 Sep

Text to book

530-748-5824...

See more...

JET

with Jaime

530-748-5824

**L**

L. B. El Dorado Hills, CA · 14 Sep · Verified in 2022

Jaime's the best & so reliable. Used her this past July when she took us to SFO and picked us up as well. We will be using her in a couple of weeks for a drop off at SMF. She's easy to talk to and has a very comfortable car as well. Give Jaime a call. You won't regret it!!



[See more activity posts](#)

Our story

530-748-5824 Jet with Jaime is for clients who want more than just a ride. It's a premium private driver experience created for those who value dependability, convenience, comfort, and a higher level of service from start to finish. Jet with Jaime is designed for clients who prioritize premium service over standard transportation. License # 081623



Don't miss updates from your local businesses

 Continue with Google

 Continue with Apple

 Continue with Email

By continuing with signing up, you agree to our [Privacy Policy](#), [Cookie Policy](#), and [Member Agreement](#)

 [\(530\) 748-5824](tel:(530)748-5824)

 jetwithjaime@gmail.com

 Lic. 081623

Don't miss updates from your local businesses



87,127 neighbors in Citrus Heights

[Create an account](#)

[Nextdoor](#)

[About](#)

[News](#)

[Media Assets](#)

[Investor Relations](#)

[Blog](#)

Careers

Help

Neighbors

Get Started

Events

Neighborhoods

Guidelines

Partners

Small Business

Brands and Media Agencies

Public Agencies

Publishers

Businesses on Nextdoor

For Developers

Agencies on Nextdoor

Industries

Home & Garden

Real Estate

Professional Services

Food & Entertainment

Shopping & Retail

Medical & Dental

Legal

Privacy

Legal & Terms

Cookies

Self-Service Ad Terms

Do Not Sell or Share My Personal Information

Limit the Use of My Sensitive Personal Information

© Nextdoor 2026



Get the app

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Resolution ALJ- 377
Administrative Law Judge Division
April 16, 2020

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION ALJ-377. Modifies and Makes Permanent the Citation Appellate Rules and General Order 156 Appellate Rules

SUMMARY

This Resolution modifies Resolution ALJ-299, which established the Citation Appellate Rules and General Order (GO) 156 Appellate Rules (Citation Appellate Rules), a pilot program that requires all citation appeals, revocation appeals¹ and GO 156 appeals² to be filed with the Commission's Docket Office. This resolution also makes the Citation Appellate Rules permanent, as opposed to a pilot program. Filing these appeals provides that all interested parties, Commission Staff, reviewing courts and the public at large will have a central location from which to access the record of citation appeals and GO 156 appeals.

The principal modification to the Citation Appellate Rules made here is to establish an Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure for citation appeals where the total citation amount is at or below the jurisdictional limit of the Small Claims Court in California. Other modifications to these rules: (a) increase the time for Staff to file a compliance filing (increase from seven business days to 14 calendar days); (b) modify the default burden of proof; and (c) update Appendix B to Resolution ALJ-299 with the key

¹ Under some of the citation programs described in Appendix B, the citation may revoke a carrier's license. (*See e.g.*, Resolution TL-19108.) We also refer to these programs in this resolution as "citation programs."

² General Order 156 concerns the rules governing the development of programs to increase participation of women, minority, disabled veteran and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) business enterprises in procurement of contracts from utilities as required by Pub. Util. Code §§ 8281-8286.

appellate provisions for each citation program and GO 156, including those programs enacted since Resolution ALJ-299 issued. The modifications to Appendix B also correct any inadvertent errors in Resolution ALJ-299.

This Resolution supercedes Resolution ALJ-299. The adopted Citation Appellate Rules are set forth in Appendix A to this resolution and are applicable on July 1, 2020. Appendix B to this resolution summarizes the key appellate provisions for each citation program and GO 156. For these key appellate provisions, Appendix B also indicates (for each GO and resolution) which sections of the GOs or resolutions are changed by this program.

1. BACKGROUND

A. Commission Implementation of Citation Programs

The Commission has broad regulatory authority, as set forth in Article XII of the California Constitution and § 701 of the California Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code.³ Section 701 authorizes the Commission to “supervise and regulate every public utility in the State . . . and do all things, whether specifically designated in [the Public Utilities Act] or in addition thereto, which are necessary and convenient in the exercise of such power and jurisdiction.”

As mandated in § 702:

Every public utility shall obey and comply with every order, decision, direction, or rule made or prescribed by the commission in the matters specified in this part, or any other matter in any way relating to or affecting its business as a public utility, and shall do everything necessary or proper to secure compliance therewith by all of its officers, agents, and employees.

Pursuant to § 451 each public utility in California must:

Furnish and maintain such adequate, efficient, just and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment and facilities, ... as are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public.

³ All code citations are to the California Public Utilities Code unless otherwise stated.

Indeed, the Commission has stated that “[t]he duty to furnish and maintain safe equipment and facilities is paramount for all California public utilities.”⁴

Pursuant to § 2101, the Commission is directed “to see that the provisions of the Constitution and statutes of this State affecting public utilities, the enforcement of which is not specifically vested in some other officer or tribunal, are enforced and obeyed, and that violations thereof are promptly prosecuted and penalties due the state therefor recovered and collected . . .”

Existing law, such as § 7, allows the Commission to delegate certain tasks to Commission Staff. The Commission may lawfully delegate to its Staff the performance of certain functions, including the investigation of facts preliminary to agency action and the assessment of specific penalties for certain types of violations.⁵ The primary purpose of an effective enforcement program should be to deter misbehavior or illegal conduct by utilities and other entities subject to Commission jurisdiction, thereby ensuring that both the employees of the utility and the public it serves are properly protected from the inherent hazards of providing utility services.

Our jurisdiction to create citation programs is well-established. We have adopted citation programs in many areas. *See* Commission Resolutions ALJ-187 (appeal procedures for household goods carriers, charter party carriers, and passenger stage corporations); E-4195 (resource adequacy); ROSB-002 (transportation/railroad); UEB-002 (telecommunications); USRB-001 (propane); and W-4799 (water and sewer). More recently, we established additional citation programs in Rulemaking (R.) 14-05-013 (electric and gas citation programs); TL-19102 (household goods carriers); E-4550 (failure to comply with Permits to Construct or Certifications of Public Convenience and Necessity issued pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act); TL-19108 (charter party carriers); SED ST-163 (rail transit); E-4720 (Renewables Portfolio Standard); SED-3 (communications facilities); T-17601 (telecommunications carriers); and UEB-003 (core transport agent). For a complete list of the Commission’s current citation programs and how this appellate program interacts with them, *see* Appendix B attached to this resolution.

B. The Citation Appellate Rules and Request for Comments on Proposed Revisions

In furtherance of due process, each citation program permits the cited entity to appeal the issuance of a particular citation. These citation appeals are heard by an

⁴ Decision (D.) 11-06-017 at 16.

⁵ D.09-05-020 at 8.

Administrative Law Judge (Judge). Prior to the enactment of Resolution ALJ-299, these citation appeals were not filed with the Commission's Docket Office so there was no electronic docket card or central electronic location by which to access the citation appellate record. A similar situation existed with respect to GO 156 appeals, except the Clearinghouse issues the initial decision that is subject to appeal.⁶

Resolution ALJ-299 required all citation appeals and GO 156 appeals to be filed with the Commission's Docket Office so as to establish a docket card and service list for each appeal. Interested parties, Commission Staff, reviewing courts and the public at large will have a central location from which to access the record of citation appeals and GO 156 appeals. These appellate records are now more easily accessible, thus enhancing due process in these expeditious proceedings. Resolution ALJ-299 also enacted several procedural appellate rules and harmonized others to further due process and administrative efficiency in processing citation appeals and GO 156 appeals.

Resolution ALJ-299 stated that the ALJ Division will monitor the success of the pilot program established by Resolution ALJ-299, and depending upon the initial results of the new procedure, and any additional needs that surface, the Commission might consider an expanded program or related rules changes in the future.

Since the enactment of Resolution ALJ-299 in early 2015⁷ until December 31, 2019, the Commission has had 65 citation appeals filed, and has closed 52 of these appeals. The chart below provides useful information for the average time a proceeding has remained open.

	Appeals Filed	Appeals Closed	Range of Days Open	Average Days Open (total cases)
2015	18	18	45-519	163
2016	10	10	83-220	148
2017	6	6	107-287	145
2018	5	3	101-300	300
2019	26	15	50-325	132

⁶ GO 156 § 1.3.22 defines Clearinghouse as “a Commission-supervised program that shall conduct WMLGBTBE verifications and maintain a database of WMDVLGBTBEs [women, minority, disabled veteran, and lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender person-owned businesses] for the use of utilities and the Commission.”

⁷ The Citation Appellate Rules were enacted on June 26, 2014, and became applicable on January 1, 2015.

On February 5, 2019, Chief Judge Simon sent a letter to the preliminary service list for Resolution ALJ-299, as supplemented by other service lists,⁸ soliciting comments on proposed revisions to Resolution ALJ-299. The letter advised that after the initial round of comments, the mailing list of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure would be utilized as the service list for this modification process. Interested persons, both those submitting comments in response to the letter, as well as other interested persons, were advised that if they wished to receive further notice of this process, they should sign up to be on the mailing list for the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/General.aspx?id=1620>

The issues the letter set forth for comment are set out below.

- A. Establish an expedited appeals process for citation appeals where the total citation amount is at or below the jurisdictional limit of the Small Claims Court in California. (New proposed Rule 6.1.)
- B. Modify the amount of time for Staff to file the Compliance Filing from seven business days to 14 calendar days. (Citation Appellate Rule 7.)
- C. Modify the default burden of proof. (Citation Appellate Rule 11.)

⁸ The preliminary service list of this proceeding consisted of those who commented on or requested to be placed on the service list of Resolution ALJ-299, the State Clearinghouse, as well as the service lists of any subsequent citation programs that the Commission has established since the enactment of Resolution ALJ-299, or any citation or revocation programs which Resolution ALJ-299 inadvertently omitted. These service lists include the service lists for R.14-05-013 (the electric and gas citation programs); Resolution SED ST-163 dated December 18, 2014 (rail transit); Resolution E-4720 dated August 27, 2015 (Renewables Portfolio Standard); Resolution SED-3 dated December 1, 2016 (communications facilities); Resolution T-17601 dated June 21, 2018 (telecommunications carriers); and Resolution UEB-003 dated October 25, 2018 (core transport agent). In addition, Resolution ALJ-299 inadvertently omitted citing to updates to the Resource Adequacy Program by means of D.10-06-002 and D.11-06-002 in R.09-10-032, and Resolution TL-18336 dated May 23, 1990 (passenger and property carriers). Therefore, the service lists for these two rulemakings and the resolution were served. Several citation programs which preceded and are cited in Resolution CE 2-92 (CE 1-86, CE 9-86, CE 11-86, and CE 10-90) were also inadvertently omitted, and therefore two industry transportation organizations (the California Bus Association and the Greater California Livery Association) as well as the service list for the TNC (Transportation Network Companies) Rulemaking, R.12-12-011 were served. The letter was also served on the service list for R.12-11-005 concerning Resolution E-4887 (violations of the Self-Generation Incentive Program rules), and the service list for the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

- D. Whether to make any further modifications to Resolution ALJ-299 before making the Citation Appellate Rules permanent.
- E. Miscellaneous: Updating Appendix B with the specifics of the citation programs that have issued since the Commission enacted Resolution ALJ-299, or which were inadvertently omitted. Appendix B will also reflect any modifications to Resolution ALJ-299 which are adopted.

The letter stated that a new draft resolution modifying Resolution ALJ-299 would issue following the receipt of comments, and interested persons also would have an opportunity to comment on that draft resolution before the Commission considered it on its agenda. The following interested persons responded to the proposed modifications in Chief Judge Simon's letter: the Commission's Communications Division Staff and Legal Division (CD); the law firm of Goodin, MacBride, Squeri & Day (MacBride); the Joint Investor Owned Utilities (Joint IOUs)⁹; and the Commission's Transportation and Enforcement Branch (TEB). We integrate interested persons' responses in the discussion set forth below.

2. INTERPLAY BETWEEN THIS RESOLUTION AND THE EXISTING AND FUTURE CITATION PROGRAMS OR GO 156

Prior to discussing the modifications to the Citation Appellate Rules, it is useful to understand how these rules interact with existing and future citation programs or GO 156. Many of the existing GOs and resolutions have appellate rules; most address similar topics but not all the rules are consistent in content. The pilot Citation Appellate Rules adopted by Resolution ALJ-299 strove for consistency among the rules to the extent practicable. The pilot program rules also enacted several new procedural appellate rules and harmonized others to further due process and administrative consistency. To the extent the pilot program rules superseded an appellate provision in an existing citation GO or resolution, or in GO 156, Appendix B to the resolution so stated. Resolution ALJ-299 also stated when the Commission was standardizing an appellate rule among all GOs and resolutions or adopting a new rule not present in the existing GOs and resolutions.

The modified Citation Appellate Rules adopted today are to be read together with the existing citation programs and GO 156. Appendix B, which is adopted by this resolution, summarizes key existing appellate provisions for each citation program and GO 156. For these key appellate provisions, Appendix B also indicates (for each GO

⁹ Pursuant to Rule 1.8(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules of Practice and Procedure), Southern California Edison Company (Edison) submitted comments on behalf of itself, Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E).

and resolution) which sections of the GOs or resolutions are changed by the Citation Appellate Rules. If the Commission establishes new citation programs, these Citation Appellate Rules, or their successor, are also applicable to the new citation programs.

We now turn to a discussion of the specific modifications to the Citation Appellate Rules adopted by this resolution.

3. EXPEDITED CITATION APPEAL PROCEDURE

A. The Proposal

The Citation Appellate Rules apply to all citation appeals issued to entities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. However, based on the past several years of experience, some of the smaller entities the Commission regulates appeal the citation not to contest it, but because they wish to make a payment plan. Furthermore, these smaller entities are sometimes unrepresented by counsel, making it challenging for them easily to comply with some of the Citation Appellate Rules.

The proposal adds Rule 6.1 to the Citation Appellate Rules to provide utilities with a more streamlined process by which to appeal the monetarily smaller citations. This procedure would be similar to the Expedited Complaint Procedure currently in place at this Commission¹⁰ and would apply to citations at or below the jurisdictional limit of the California Small Claims Court. Under the proposed expedited procedure, no party to these expedited citation appeals would be represented by counsel, and the expedited procedure would not apply to license revocation proceedings, because these proceedings fundamentally could affect continuation of appellant's operations. A hearing would occur without a court reporter, and separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law would not be made, although the resolution addressing the appeal may set forth a brief summary of the facts. The Judge would have the authority to discontinue the expedited procedure when the public interest so required (such as if appellant wished to opt out of the expedited procedure and proceed under the formal Citation Appellate Rules). Additionally, the notice of appeal would state the amount of the citation.

B. Responses to the Proposal

The Commission's TEB and MacBride commented on this proposed rule. TEB supports an Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure for the smaller citations. TEB notes that in 2018, it issued 106 citations with fines ranging between \$1,000 and \$20,000, the highest fine amount delegated to TEB by Resolution CE 2-92. The median fine was \$3,000 and

¹⁰ See Rule 4.6 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

the bulk of TEB's citations went to passenger carriers. TEB recommends that the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure recognize that the Commission should not hold the same expectations for an appeal filed by a one or two person limousine company as one filed by a billion-dollar utility, and that the expedited procedure should not be so complicated as to discourage a carrier from seeking due process.

TEB recommends clarifying proposed Rule 6.1(a), which refers to "...the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court, as referenced in Public Utilities Code § 1702.1," advocating that the rule be more precise, since § 1702.1 refers to two separate California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) code sections. TEB recommends the Commission use the \$10,000 limit set forth in CCP § 116.221, rather than the \$5,000 limit in CCP § 116.220(a)(1). TEB states that fines above \$10,000 are usually reserved for egregious violators, so that the \$10,000 limit is more appropriate for the Commission's expedited procedure.

TEB also points out that under the proposed Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure, a hearing would be held without a court reporter, no findings of fact or conclusions of law are required, and the parties have the right to apply for rehearing. TEB queries upon what basis an application for rehearing can be made if there is not a full record.

MacBride argues that the proposed Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure rests on somewhat tenuous legal grounds, and urges the Commission to ensure the modifications recognize existing statutory requirements. MacBride states that while the proposed Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure, which embraces many of the features of the Expedited Complaint Procedure enacted by the Legislature, may make sense from a practical perspective, it lacks a comparable statutory mandate. Specifically, MacBride argues that the following proposed Expedited Citation Appeal Procedures are contrary to statute: elimination of findings of fact; participation without an attorney (the comments also question whether the cited authority can be represented by a non-attorney under the expedited procedure); and the lack of transcripts. MacBride recommends that the expedited procedure be "opt-in" for the appellant, but adds that it is unclear if an "opt-in" procedure remedies the perceived statutory deficiencies. MacBride also argues that the \$5,000 limit set forth in CCP § 116.220(a)(1) is the appropriate limit for this expedited procedure.

C. Adopted Rule

In response to comments, we modify proposal for Rule 6.1(a) as follows.

We retain the requirement that citation appeals of a certain dollar value are classified as expedited citation appeals, subject to Rule 6.1 concerning the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure. However, we clarify that appellant may opt out of the expedited procedure at any time up until the first day of evidentiary hearings before the first witness is sworn in. Because of the expedited nature of the process, there may not be a hearing prior to the evidentiary hearings, and an appellant should have adequate time to gain an understanding of the expedited procedure and opt out of it if desired. Furthermore, the Judge will have the discretion to remove the proceeding from the expedited procedure at any time prior to filing a resolution addressing the expedited citation appeal. We believe these two provisions provide an appropriate balance of a timely resolution of the proceeding and due process concerns.

We also modify the proposed rule to require that resolutions resolving the expedited citation appeal contain findings of fact and conclusions of law. Because there is no court reporter in these appeals, the findings and conclusions will assist the parties to more clearly understand the basis of the decision.

We also clarify that parties to the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure cannot be represented by an attorney or other representative. That is, they must be self-represented. If the parties wish to have representation, they should request that the proceeding be removed from the expedited procedure.

We decline to modify the proposed rule to further specify a dollar threshold as suggested by TEB, but clarify how we will apply the rule. Proposed Rules 6.1(a), which language we adopt, states that the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure applies to citation appeals where the total citation amount does not exceed the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court, as referenced by § 1702.1.

Section 1702.1 applies to an analogous procedure to this one, namely the Commission's expedited complaint procedure. In § 1702.1, the Legislature stated that the expedited complaint procedure should apply to the smaller complaints "when the amount of money claimed does not exceed the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court as set forth in subdivision (a) of § 116.220 or § 116.221 of the Code of Civil Procedure [CCP]." [emphasis added.] CCP § 116.220 (a) currently has a dollar limit of \$5,000. CCP § 116.221 currently has a dollar limit of \$10,000 for natural persons (as opposed to corporations) bringing a small claims court case.¹¹

¹¹ The Legislature could change these amounts in the future.

Although we do not modify the proposed rule, we clarify that we will interpret Rule 6.1 as we do in expedited complaints before the Commission. Expedited complaints generally involve natural persons; therefore, the Commission applies the statutory limit set forth in CCP § 116.221 (currently \$10,000) to an expedited complaint. For consistency with the expedited complaint procedure, and to eliminate potential confusion and ambiguity, we will apply a similar limit here. This limit is also appropriate because smaller citations often involve individual persons either on their own or “doing business as” an entity. This interpretation is also reasonable because TEB’s statistics indicate that fines above \$10,000 are usually reserved for the egregious violators, thus making the limit set forth in CCP § 116.221 (currently \$10,000) an appropriate cut off for the Commission’s Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure. However, we modify proposed Rule 2 to better track the language in Rule 6.1(a).

TEB also recommends that Rule 6.1(i) be modified to state the title (instead of only the number) of each applicable/ non-applicable rule to the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure, because the rule numbers could change. We make this modification.

Additionally, Chief Judge Simon’s letter proposed that Rules 3 and 5 be modified so that appellant state the amount of the citation appealed from in the caption and body of the Notice of Appeal. No person filed comments on this proposal and we modify Rules 3 and 5 accordingly.

Rule 6.1 Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure; Rule 2 Definitions; Rule 3 Filing the Notice of Appeal; and Rule 5 Minimum Content of the Notice of Appeal, are modified as follows:

Rule 6.1 Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure, is modified as follows:

- a) This procedure is applicable to citation appeals where the total citation amount does not exceed the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court, as referenced in Public Utilities Code § 1702.1. The Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure does not apply to Citation Appeals which include a license revocation or to General Order 156 appeals.
- b) No representative (attorney at law or other representative) shall represent any party other than himself under the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure. Rule 13 of these Rules, only as to party representative, does not apply.
- c) No pleadings other than the Notice of Appeal (see Rules 3-6 of these Rules) and the Compliance Filing (see Rule 7 of these Rules) are necessary.

- d) A hearing without a court reporter shall be held within the time period specified by Rule 10 of these Rules.
- e) Separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law will be made in the resolution addressing the Expedited Citation Appeal.
- f) A party who is subject to the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure may at any time prior to the swearing in of the first witness at the evidentiary hearing request termination of the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure, and that the matter be recalendared for hearing under the Commission's regular procedure for Citation Appeals. The Commission or the assigned Administrative Law Judge, when the public interest so requires, may at any time prior to the filing of a resolution addressing the Citation Appeal, terminate the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure and recalendar the matter for hearing under the Commission's regular procedure for Citation Appeals.
- g) The parties shall have the right to file applications for rehearing pursuant to Rule 20 of these Rules. If the Commission grants the rehearing, the rehearing shall be conducted under the Commission's regular procedure for Citation Appeals.
- h) Resolutions rendered pursuant to the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure shall not be considered as precedent or binding on the Commission or the courts of this state.
- i) The following Citation Appellate Rules continue to apply to the Expedited Citation Appeal: Rule 1 Applicability; Rule 2 Definitions; Rule 3 Filing the Notice of Appeal; Rule 4 Extension of Time to File the Notice of Appeal; Rule 5 Minimum Content of the Notice of Appeal; Rule 6 Minimum Service Requirements for the Notice of Appeal; Rule 7 Compliance Filing; Rule 8 Service List and Parties to An Appeal; Rule 10 Commencement of Hearing; Rule 11 Burden of Proof; Rule 12 Hearing Venue; Rule 13 Party Representative/Evidence (only as to evidence, not as to party representative); Rule 15 Obtaining an Interpreter; Rule 16 Submission of the Record; Rule 17 Issuance Date of Draft Resolution; Rule 18 Issuance of Draft Resolution for Comment; Rule 19 Ex Parte Communications; Rule 20 Rehearing ; Rule 21 Service of These Rules and Resolution Adopting them With All Citations and Clearinghouse Decisions Concerning General Order 156; and Rule 22 Applicable Procedure When Pilot Program Appellate Rules Are Silent. The following Citation Appellate Rules do not apply to an Expedited Citation Appeal: Rule 9 Exchange of Information; Rule 13 Party Representative/Evidence) (only as to

party representative, not as to evidence); and Rule 14 Obtaining a Transcript.

Rule 2 Definitions, is modified as follows so that an additional definition is added to Rule 2:

“Expedited Citation Appeal” means an appeal from a citation issued pursuant to a citation program where the total citation amount does not exceed the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court, as referenced in Public Utilities Code § 1702.1. An Expedited Citation Appeal does not apply to Citation Appeals which include a license revocation or to General Order 156 appeals.

The last line of Rule 3 Filing the Notice of Appeal, is modified as follows so that appellant would state the amount of the citation appealed from in the caption of the appeal:

The caption of the appeal shall read: “Appeal of [who] from [Citation 12345] or [Clearinghouse Decision 12345] in the amount of [\$XXX.XX] issued by [Commission Division which issued the citation] or [the Clearinghouse].”

Rule 5 Minimum Content of the Notice of Appeal, is revised as follows so that appellant would state the amount of the citation appealed from in the text of the Notice of Appeal:

The Notice of Appeal for a Citation Appeal must at a minimum state: (a) the date and dollar amount of the citation that is appealed; and (b) the rationale for the appeal as specifically instructed in the Citation Program.

The Notice of Appeal for a General Order 156 Appeal must set forth (a) the date and dollar amount of the Clearinghouse Decision that is appealed; and (b) the grounds for the appeal as required by General Order 156 § 7.3.1.

4. COMPLIANCE FILING - NEW RULE (RULE 7)

A. The Proposal

The citation appeal process envisions an expeditious hearing and resolution of the appeal. As discussed below, if appellant requests a hearing, and a hearing is appropriate, the hearing occurs promptly. In order for the hearing to be meaningful and for all parties and the Judge to have the appropriate documents, Resolution ALJ-299 established a new requirement for Staff issuing the citations and for the Clearinghouse under GO 156.

Rule 7 established a new requirement that, no later than seven business days after the notice of appeal is filed, Staff issuing the citation must file with the Commission's Docket Office and serve a compliance filing which includes the complete citation, including all attachments. Similarly with respect to GO 156, no later than seven business days after the notice of appeal is filed, the Clearinghouse must file with the Commission's Docket Office and serve a compliance filing which attaches a complete copy of the Clearinghouse's appealed decision, including all attachments. In this way, interested parties and the Judge promptly will have a copy of what is at issue in the proceeding.

The proposed modification is to increase the time for Staff to file the compliance filing from seven business days to 14 calendar days. Based on our experience with Resolution ALJ-299, the time within which Staff currently has to file the compliance filing, seven business days, is short, given that internally it takes some time for the notice of the appeal to reach the interested Staff respondents. It is anticipated that modifying the timeline to 14 calendar days would decrease requests for extensions of time to comply and result in a more streamlined process. We note that we are proposing to add only about two to three extra days to this timeline, as we are proposing to shift from seven business days to 14 calendar days.

B. Responses to the Proposal

MacBride states that the slight increase in time to prepare the compliance filing is appropriate. TEB also supports this modification and seeks clarification that the 14 days is computed from the date the appeal is filed by the Docket Office, and not when the Commission receives the appeal. The Joint Utilities do not address this change of time limit but recommend that the rule addressing compliance filings be modified to require that when appellant files a notice of appeal of a citation, the prosecuting party issuing the citation must include in its compliance filing all documents relevant to the citation, because Staff has the burden of proof in a citation appeal. This recommendation also is made in conjunction with the Joint Utilities' proposed revisions for Rule 11, Exchange of Information, discussed below. The Joint Utilities also believe that this rule should explicitly state that it is not intended to prohibit further discovery of relevant evidence in Staff's possession, whether that request is made prior to or following the filing of the notice of appeal.

C. Adopted Rule

We modify Rule 7 addressing the Compliance Filing to increase the time for Staff to file the compliance filing from seven business days to 14 calendar days. This recommendation was unopposed and as stated above, we anticipate that modifying the timeline to 14 calendar days should decrease requests for extensions of time to comply with Rule 7, and result in a more streamlined appeal process.

We decline to adopt the Joint Utilities' recommendations. The Compliance Filing is not intended to address discovery in general, but to ensure "interested parties and the Judge promptly will have a copy of what is at issue in the proceeding." (See Resolution ALJ-299 at 9.) We therefore do not transform Rule 7 into a rule addressing discovery in general. We note that the Citation Appellate Rules do not reinvent every adopted rule in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Rather, Rule 22 states that if the Citation Appellate Rules are silent on a procedural issue, the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure apply. Rule 10.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure addresses discovery in general. To the extent not superseded by the Citation Appellate Rules, the Judge may refer to Rule 10.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Rule 7 Compliance Filing, is modified as follows:

For a Citation Appeal, no later than 14 days after the Notice of Appeal is filed, Staff issuing the citation must file with the Commission's Docket Office a Compliance Filing which includes a complete copy of the citation, including all attachments, which is appealed. The Compliance Filing must be served on the Chief Administrative Law Judge (with an electronic copy to: [ALJ Div Appeals Coordinator@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:ALJ_Div_Appeals_Coordinator@cpuc.ca.gov)) and appellant on the same day the Compliance Filing is filed. Staff must file a proof of service to this effect at the same time it files the Compliance Filing.

For a General Order 156 Appeal, no later than 14 days after the Notice of Appeal is filed, the Clearinghouse must file with the Commission's Docket Office a Compliance Filing which includes a complete copy of the decision, including all attachments, which is appealed. The Compliance Filing must be served on the Chief Administrative Law Judge (with an electronic copy to: [ALJ Div Appeals Coordinator@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:ALJ_Div_Appeals_Coordinator@cpuc.ca.gov)) and appellant on the same day the Compliance Filing is filed. The Clearinghouse must provide a proof of service to this effect at the same time it files the Compliance Filing.

5. BURDEN OF PROOF

A. The Proposal

Most of the existing citation GOs or resolutions address who has the burden of proof. The Citation Appellate Rules made no modifications in that regard. However, for citation statutes, GOs or resolutions that are silent on this issue, Rule 11 of the pilot program adopts the following language with respect to the burden of proof:

Staff has the burden to prove a *prima facie* case supporting its issuance of the citation for the alleged violation; the burden then shifts to

appellant to demonstrate that a violation did not occur and the citation should not issue or that the amount of the penalty is inappropriate.

Since the enactment of the Citation Appellate Rules, it appears that a burden of proof involving the preponderance of the evidence is used more frequently. Therefore, the Commission proposes to modify the default burden of proof to that used in more of the citation programs. Again, if a citation program uses a different burden of proof, the language in the individual citation program will govern.

B. Responses to the Proposal

MacBride states that the proposed modification to the burden of proof improves the rule. Similarly, the Joint IOUs support the modified rule. TEB objects to the modified default burden of proof insofar as TEB believes that the Judge should not have discretion to alter the order of presentation at hearing, since TEB bears the burden of proof.

C. Adopted Rule

No party objects to the proposed modification of the rule regarding shifting to a preponderance of the evidence standard and we adopt it. With respect to TEB's objections that the Judge should not have the discretion to alter the presentation at hearings, this discretion was present in many of the citation programs existing prior to the adoption of Resolution ALJ-299¹², and is the type of discretion a presiding officer needs to conduct fair and impartial proceedings. We therefore retain the language providing the Judge such discretion.

Rule 11 Burden of Proof, is modified as follows:

The burden of proof in a Citation Appeal or a General Order 156 Appeal is governed by the language in the Citation Program or General Order 156. For Citation Programs which are silent as to which party has the burden of proof, the following rule applies:

Staff has the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence and accordingly shall open and close the hearing. Respondent/ Appellant has the burden to prove affirmative defenses it might raise. The Administrative Law Judge may, in his or her discretion, alter the order of presentation at the hearing.

¹² See e.g. GO 167 (Section 13.3.8.7; Resolution ALJ-187, Section 4.h; Resolution UEB-001, Section 7.h; Resolution USRB-001, Section 11.g.)

6. ADDITIONAL PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

A. Overview

In addition to comments on the above proposed modifications, the Commission requested proposals from interested persons as to whether other modifications to the Citation Appellate Rules should be made before making the Citation Appellate Rules permanent.

CD requests that the Commission consider scheduling the time and location of hearings in clusters to promote efficient use of staff time and traveling costs. CD also suggests that the Citation Appellate Rules permit Staff to use alternative technologies to in person appearances. TEB requests to eliminate the requirement of serving a copy of the Citation Appellate Rules with a citation and makes two other proposals for modifications concerning service of the citation and Docket Office review of the citation. The Joint Utilities propose to modify the rule regarding exchange of information before hearing as well as a modification limiting the application of the *ex parte* rule. We discuss each of these proposals below.

B. Scheduling Hearings in Clusters and Alternatives to In Person Appearances

CD's suggestion to schedule the time and location of citation appeals in clusters is a good one, and the Administrative Law Judge Division has been implementing this process during the pilot program. No change in the Rules is necessary to continue with this efficient process.

CD also proposes the Rules permit Staff to use alternative technologies to in person appearances, such as appearances by telephone or teleconferencing. As an example, CD believes this proposal would be useful to minimize travel costs or to assist Staff who cannot travel for medical reasons.

The Judge currently has discretion in conducting the hearings, consistent with the law, to ensure due process. (*See e.g.* Rule 1.2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.)¹³ For example, if it is unnecessary for the appellant (the cited party) to question Staff in person, and Staff is constrained in making an in person appearance, a telephonic appearance may be appropriate. However, if due process requires that the appellant be able to confront the witness in person, an in person appearance would be

¹³ Rule 1.2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Construction, states as follows: "These rules shall be liberally construed to secure just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of the issues presented. In special cases and for good cause shown, and within the extent permitted by statute, the Commission may permit deviation from the rules."

necessary. Maintaining the Judge's discretion in this rule will enhance due process for all parties. We therefore make no further changes to these rules in light of CD's proposal.

C. Modify Information Exchange

Currently, Rule 9 of the Citation Appellate Rules provides that no later than three business days prior to the scheduled hearing, the parties must exchange all information they intend to introduce into the record at the hearing which is not included in the citation or GO 156 decision and the Compliance Filing already filed with the Commission pursuant to Rule 7, unless otherwise directed by the Judge.

As stated above, the Joint Utilities propose that Rule 7 addressing the Compliance Filing be modified to require that when appellant files a notice of appeal of a citation, the prosecuting party issuing the citation must include in its Compliance Filing all documents relevant to the citation. These comments call for early disclosure of all materials supporting the prosecuting party's decision to issue the citation and level of penalty. Similarly, the Joint Utilities propose that Rule 9 concerning Exchange of Information also be modified in light of their suggested modification of Rule 7, so that the exchange of information deals with information appellant intends to introduce at the hearing (because appellant has already received Staff's information pursuant to Rule 7) and any post-appeal information gathered by Staff that it intends to use at the hearing.

For the reason set forth in our discussion above, we decline to modify Rule 7 addressing the Compliance Filing. We also decline to adopt the Joint Utilities' proposed modification to Rule 9. Rule 9 was adopted "to expedite [citation] appeals and to eliminate potential delay." (See Resolution ALJ-299 at 10.) The appellant will obtain all information exchanged in the Compliance Filing quite early in the citation appeal. A subsequent exchange of information closer to the hearing, pursuant to Rule 9, will decrease the element of surprise and ensures that both parties are prepared for the hearing. We decline to adopt further special discovery rules here. We also note that this Joint Utilities' proposal is similar to a proposal made prior to the adoption of Resolution ALJ-299 that there be a staggered, not simultaneous exchange of information with Staff exchanging the information first. (See Resolution ALJ-299 at 19, note 17.) We failed to adopt that proposal then and decline to do so now.

D. Limit Application of Current *Ex Parte* Rule

The Joint Utilities also proposed that the duration of the *ex parte* restrictions should be limited to the time period set forth for formal proceedings in Rule 8 of the Commission's Rules, so that the restrictions commence with the filing of the appeal (not from the date a citation issues) and end either after the period for filing an application

for rehearing has expired or after the Commission has resolved an application for rehearing.

Rule 19 of the Citation Appellate Rules standardizes the rules in the various citation appeal resolutions and limits *ex parte* communications from the date the citation or decision concerning a GO 156 appeal issues through the date a final order is issued on the citation appeal.¹⁴

We see no reason to shorten this period, as once the citation issues, deliberations on whether to appeal the citation are best not addressed in *ex parte* discussions with decisionmakers. Similarly, if a citation appeal decision is being considered by a reviewing court, *ex parte* discussions would be problematic, as the matter could be remanded to the Commission.

In fact, in comments to a draft ALJ resolution that became Resolution ALJ-299, the utilities made a similar proposal, which we denied in Resolution ALJ-299:

Edison, PG&E, and SoCalGas/SDG&E recommend that the period for the *ex parte* prohibition to commence should be the filing of the citation appeal or GO 156 appeal, not the issuance of the citation. We decline to modify Rule 19 which prohibits *ex parte* communications from the date the citation issues through the date a final order issues (either by the Commission or the courts). The triggering event for the appeal is the citation; therefore *ex parte* communications should be prohibited from when the citation is issued. (See e.g. General Order 167 and Resolution ALJ-274 which both contain this provision.) Similarly, the prohibition should continue until a final order is issued, whether by the Commission or the courts. (See Resolution ALJ-299 at 20.)

We therefore make no changes to Rule 19 of the Citation Appellate Rules.

E. Requirement To Serve A Copy of the Citation Appellate Rules With a Citation

¹⁴ Final order means the date when the period to apply for rehearing of the Commission resolution on the appeal has expired and no application for rehearing has been filed, or if an application for rehearing is filed, the date when the period to seek judicial review of the decision finally resolving the application for rehearing has passed without any party seeking judicial review; or if judicial review is sought, the date any court cases are finally resolved.

Rule 21 requires that Commission Staff serve a copy of the Citation Appellate Rules and the resolution adopting them with the citation. A similar provision applies to the Clearinghouse with respect to Clearinghouse decisions concerning GO 156.

TEB states that Resolution ALJ-299 consists of 79 pages (including appendices), and many pages do not apply to TEB's citation program. According to TEB, this service requirement is confusing to many appellants, especially to small transportation carriers for whom English is a second language. TEB states that the requirement is also unwieldy for its agents, especially those issuing many citations for on the spot inspections, for example, at an airport. TEB requests that Rule 21 be modified to give it (and other Commission Divisions) the flexibility to serve a concise summary of appeal instructions with the citation, instead of a complete copy of Citation Appellate Rules and the resolution adopting them.

We adopt this recommendation with the proviso that, if the Division elects not to serve a complete copy these Citation Appellate Rules and the Resolution adopting them with the citations issued, the Division must issue with the citation a concise summary of appeal instructions applicable to the cited entity, reviewed and approved prior to their use by the Commission's Legal Division, and that these instructions contain an electronic link to the complete copy of the Commission's Citation Appellate Rules and the resolution adopting them.

The Clearinghouse did not voice any objections to Pilot Program Rule 21; we therefore make no changes to this rule as it applies to the Clearinghouse.

Rule 21 Service of these Rules and Resolution Adopting Them With All Citations and Clearinghouse Decisions Concerning General Order 156, is modified as follows:

Commission Staff must serve either (a) a copy of these Rules and the Resolution adopting this program with all citations issued; or (b) a concise summary of appeal instructions applicable to the cited entity, provided these instructions have been reviewed and approved prior to their use by the Commission's Legal Division and that the instructions contain an electronic link to the complete copy of the Commission's Citation Appellate Rules and the resolution adopting them.

The Clearinghouse must serve a copy of these Rules and the Resolution adopting this program with all Clearinghouse Decisions concerning General Order 156.

F. Other TEB Proposals

TEB proposes to modify Rule 6 concerning the minimum service requirements for citation appeals. Currently, Rule 6 provides that the Citation Appeal shall be served at

a minimum on the Chief Judge and an e-mail address for the Administrative Law Judge Divisions, as well as the Director of the Division issuing the citation.

TEB states that proper service of citation appeals is a continuous problem for appellants of TEB citations. TEB states it is problematic and ineffective to serve the Division Director and requests that appellants serve the TEB Program Manager, the investigator that served the citation, and the existing TEB citations appeal electronic address. Or alternatively, TEB recommends service on one TEB email address.

Rule 6 provides a minimum service requirement for citation appeals. It is also important to note that TEB is not the only Division at the Commission that issues citations. Therefore, a TEB electronic email address would be insufficient for service of all citation appeals.

However, Rule 6 requires an appellant to also serve other entities if required by the Citation Program, as Rule 6 sets forth the minimum service requirements.¹⁵ Thus, TEB can designate any additional service requirements in its Citation Programs. We therefore make no major changes to Rule 6. We do, however, make minor modifications to Rule 6 in response to TEB's comments that it is now under the Commission's Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division, not under the Commission's Safety and Enforcement Division.

TEB also proposes that the Docket Office review all Citation Appeals pursuant to Rule 5 of the Citation Appeal Rules (which requires appellant to provide the rationale for the appeal as specifically instructed in the citation program), and only accept appeals that demonstrate a just and reasonable rationale for the appeal.

We decline to adopt this proposal. If TEB believes the stated grounds for the Citation Appeal are unreasonable, TEB should formally raise this issue with the Judge who can determine the sufficiency of the appeal. We decline to delegate this determination to the Docket Office, provided the appeal meets the technical requirements of Rule 5.

7. MAKING THE CITATION APPELLATE RULES PERMANENT

A. The Proposal

The Commission also sought comments on whether, with the modifications proposed herein, and any other appropriate modifications suggested by interested persons, the Citation Appellate Rules should be made permanent.

¹⁵ Rule 6, in relevant part, states "The Notice of Appeal must also be served on other entities if required by the Citation Program."

B. Responses to the Proposal

TEB recommends these new rules not be made permanent, but rather than the modified rules be tested for a short finite period (six to 12 months) before the parties again comment on the efficacy of the proposed modifications.

C. Discussion

The pilot Citation Appellate Rules have been operational since January 1, 2015. The modifications we make today are modest. We believe that these rules have been operational for a sufficient period that, with today's modifications, the Citation Appellate Rules can be made permanent. Of course, existing Commission rules regarding specific requests to modify a Commission decision or resolution would permit interested persons to seek clarification or modification in the event of an unforeseen problem.

D. Miscellaneous

Additionally, the proposal stated it would contain an update to Appendix B of Resolution ALJ-299 with the specifics of the citation programs that have issued since the Commission enacted Resolution ALJ-299, or which were inadvertently omitted. Appendix B will also reflect any modifications to Resolution ALJ-299 which are adopted in this resolution. Appendix B attached hereto reflects these changes.

NOTICE OF COMMENT

A draft of this Resolution was served on the mailing list for the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were allowed under Rule 14.5 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

On April 1, 2020, MacBride served timely comments on the draft Resolution. On April 2, 2020, Edison served timely comments on the draft Resolution.

Edison makes similar arguments to those made by the Joint Utilities (of which Edison is a part) concerning Section 4 (regarding the Compliance Filing); Section 6.C (regarding the Information Exchange); and Section 6.D (regarding limiting the application of the current *ex parte* rule). MacBride sets forth in more detail his arguments set forth in Section 3.B above that the Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure rests on somewhat tenuous legal grounds, and also questions the statutory authority for citation programs in general. For the reasons set forth above in Sections 1, 3, 4 and 6, we make no changes to the draft Resolution in response to comments.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Pub. Util. Code § 701 authorizes the Commission to supervise and regulate every public utility in the State.
2. Pub. Util. Code § 702 mandates every public utility to obey and promptly comply with every Commission order, decision, direction, or rule.
3. California law, including Pub. Util. Code § 7, authorizes the commission to delegate certain powers to its Staff, including the investigation of acts preliminary to agency action, and the issuance of citations for certain types of violations in specified amounts.
4. The Commission's citation programs permit the cited entity to appeal the issuance of a particular citation. These citation appeals are heard by an Administrative Law Judge. A similar situation exists with respect to Clearinghouse decisions issued pursuant to GO 156.
5. Based upon the past several years of experience, some smaller utility appellants appeal the citation not to contest it, but because they wish to make a payment plan. Some of these utilities are also unrepresented by counsel, making it challenging for them easily to comply with some of the Citation Appellate Rules.
6. It is reasonable to adopt an Expedited Citation Appeal Procedure for citations where the total dollar amount does not exceed the amount specified in § 1702.1.
7. It is reasonable to modify Rule 7 addressing the Compliance Filing to modestly increase the time for Staff to make such filing. This proposal was unopposed and should streamline the citation appellate process by decreasing requests for extension to comply with Rule 7.
8. It is reasonable to modify the default burden of proof in Rule 11 to that used the most frequently in the resolutions establishing the various citation programs.
9. It is reasonable to adopt several other procedural modifications to the Citation Appellate Rules and harmonize others to further due process and administrative efficiency in processing citation appeals and GO 156 appeals.
10. Appendix B summarizes key existing appellate provisions for each citation program and GO 156. For these key appellate provisions, Appendix B also indicates (for each GO and resolution) which sections of the GOs or resolutions are changed by these rules. It is reasonable to adopt the changes to the various GOs and resolutions set

forth in Appendix B in order to implement the Citation Appellate Rules and this resolution.

11. If the Commission establishes new citation programs, the Citation Appellate Rules, or their successor, are also applicable to the new citation programs.
12. The Citation Appellate Rules and GO 156 Appellate Rules, attached to this resolution as Appendix A, are reasonable and should be adopted. The Citation Appellate Rules and GO 156 Appellate Rules attached to this resolution shall be applicable on July 1, 2020.
13. Any changes to the existing citation GOs and resolutions and to GO 156 are to the appeal process. No other portion of these GOs or resolutions is intended to be modified by this resolution.
14. This resolution should be effective today so that the modifications to, and implementation of these modified Citation Appellate Rules can become effective by July 1, 2020.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Citation Appellate Rules and General Order (GO) 156 Appellate Rules, attached hereto as Appendix A, are adopted and apply to all Commission citations issued and to all decisions of the Clearinghouse issued pursuant to GO 156 as of July 1, 2020.
2. Appendix B to this resolution is adopted. The citation General Orders (GO) and resolutions listed in Appendix B, and GO 156, are changed as set forth in Appendix B and this decision in order to implement this program. Appendix B summarizes key existing appellate provisions for each citation program and for GO 156. For these key appellate provisions, Appendix B also indicates (for each GO and resolution) which sections of the GOs or resolutions are changed by these rules.
3. Any changes to the existing citation General Orders (GO) and resolutions and to GO 156 are to the appeal process. No other portion of these GOs or resolutions is intended to be modified by this resolution.

This resolution is effective today.

I hereby certify that this Resolution was duly introduced, passed, and adopted by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California at its regular business meeting held on April 16, 2020. The following Commissioners approved it:

/s/ ALICE STEBBINS

Alice Stebbins
Executive Director

MARYBEL BATJER

President

LIANE M. RANDOLPH

MARTHA GUZMAN ACEVES

CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN

GENEVIEVE SHIROMA

Commissioners

Appendix A: Citation Appellate Rules and General Order 156 Appellate Rules (Revised Rules Applicable on July 1, 2020)

Appendix B: Citation Programs and General Order 156 and How These Programs Interact with the Rules Adopted in Appendix A

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Resolution ALJ-187
Administrative Law Judge Division
September 22, 2005

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION ALJ-187. Adopts Procedures for Appeal of Citations Issued to Household Goods Carriers, Charter Party Carriers, and Passenger Stage Corporations.

By a series of previous resolutions, the Commission has developed a program under which the Consumer Protection and Safety Division (CPSD) is authorized to issue citations to various classes of carriers for violation of the Public Utilities Code or Commission orders. In turn, a carrier issued such a citation may accept the fine imposed or contest it through a process of appeal. Now, in an effort to make this program more comprehensive and this process more efficient, the Commission has prepared new procedures to govern the appeal of these citations.

A draft of this resolution was issued on August 19, 2005, for public review and comment. No one filed comments. The resolution is adopted as originally proposed with minor clarifications.

IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED that the following procedures shall govern appeals of citations for violation of statutes or Commission orders relating to household goods carriers, charter party carriers, and passenger stage corporations:

1. *Citation: Contents.* The citation served upon the respondent by the investigator shall include:
 - (a) A specification of each statute or Commission order allegedly violated;
 - (b) A statement of the facts upon which each alleged violation is based;
 - (c) A statement that the respondent may either pay the amount of the fine set forth in the citation or appeal the citation, as set forth herein, and that the respondent will forfeit the right to appeal the citation by failing to do either of these things within the allowable period;

- (d) An explanation of how to file an appeal, including an explanation of the respondent's right to have a hearing, to have a representative at the hearing, to request a transcript, and to request an interpreter; and
 - (e) A form of Notice of Appeal, and the form for requesting an interpreter.
- 2. *Citation: Response.* The respondent, within 20 days after the date of service of the citation, shall either remit payment of the full amount of the fine to CPSD, agree with CPSD on conditions for payment, or serve a Notice of Appeal upon CPSD. Upon request made to CPSD before the expiration of this deadline, the time to pay the fine or serve a Notice of Appeal may be extended by CPSD for a reasonable period not to exceed 30 days. CPSD may, in its discretion, grant one additional extension at the request of the respondent.
- 3. *Citation: Payment of fine; default.* If the respondent pays the full amount of the fine within the time allowed hereunder, the citation shall become final. If the respondent, within the time allowed pursuant to Paragraph 2, fails to pay the full amount of the fine or to file a Notice of Appeal, or if the respondent, having entered into an agreement with CPSD, fails to comply with any provision of that agreement, the respondent shall be in default, and the citation shall become final. In this event, the respondent shall have forfeited its right to appeal the citation, and CPSD shall immediately suspend the respondent's license. If the respondent fails to pay the full amount of the fine within 30 days thereafter, CPSD shall revoke the respondent's license, and may take any other action provided by law to recover any unpaid fine and ensure compliance with applicable statutes and Commission orders.
- 4. *Citation: Appeal.*
 - (a) The Chief Administrative Law Judge shall designate an Administrative Law Judge to hear appeals of citations.
 - (b) Appeals of citations shall be heard in the Commission's San Francisco or Los Angeles courtrooms on regularly scheduled days. Appeals shall be calendared accordingly, except that a particular matter may be recalendared at the direction of the designated Administrative Law Judge.
 - (c) The appeal shall be brought by serving a Notice of Appeal upon CPSD, and the respondent shall indicate the grounds for the appeal in the notice. CPSD shall promptly advise the Chief Administrative Law Judge upon receipt of a timely Notice of Appeal.
 - (d) Upon advice from CPSD that a citation has been appealed, the Chief Administrative Law Judge shall promptly forward the matter to the

designated Administrative Law Judge, who shall set the matter for hearing on the first Citation Calendar not less than 10 days after advice of the appeal is received from CPSD. The Administrative Law Judge may, for good cause shown or upon agreement of the parties, grant a reasonable continuance of the hearing.

- (e) The respondent may order a transcript of the hearing, and shall pay the cost of the transcript in accordance with the Commission's usual procedures.
 - (f) The respondent shall be entitled to the services of an interpreter at the Commission's expense upon written request to the Chief Administrative Law Judge not less than three business days prior to the date of the hearing.
 - (g) The respondent may be represented at the hearing by an attorney or other representative, but such representation shall be at the respondent's sole expense.
 - (h) At the hearing, CPSD shall open and close. The Administrative Law Judge may, in his or her discretion, alter the order of presentation. Formal rules of evidence do not apply, and all relevant and reliable evidence may be received in the discretion of the Administrative Law Judge.
 - (i) Ordinarily, the appeal shall be submitted at the close of the hearing. In the discretion of the Administrative Law Judge upon a showing of good cause, the record may be kept open for a reasonable period to permit a party to submit additional evidence or argument.
 - (j) The Administrative Law Judge shall issue an order resolving the appeal not later than 30 days after the appeal is submitted, and the order shall be placed on the first available agenda, consistent with the Commission's applicable rules.
 - (k) From the date that CPSD receives a Notice of Appeal to and including the date when the final order is issued, neither the respondent nor the investigator, or agent or other person on behalf of the respondent or investigator, may communicate regarding the appeal, orally or in writing, with a Commissioner, Commissioner's advisor, or Administrative Law Judge, except as expressly permitted under these procedures.
5. *New Operating Authority.* A carrier whose license has been revoked hereunder may apply for new operating authority upon paying the fine in full. The application shall document (1) full payment of the fine, (2) correction of all violations for which the carrier was cited, (3) actions the carrier proposes in

order to prevent future violations, and (4) any other evidence demonstrating the carrier's ability and commitment to conducting its proposed operations in compliance with statutes and Commission orders.

This resolution becomes effective today.

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its regular meeting on September 22, 2005, the following Commissioners approving it:

/s/ STEVE LARSON

STEVE LARSON
Executive Director


MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
President
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
SUSAN P. KENNEDY
DIAN M. GRUENEICH
JOHN A. BOHN
Commissioners

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have this day served the following documents on Jet with Jaime.

1. Administrative Citation T.2026-10-012 dated October 29, 2026
2. Investigation report and Attachments
3. Citation Compliance Agreement
4. Credit/Debit Card Authorization Form
5. How to File an Appeal
6. *Notice of Appeal Form* and *Certificates of Service Form* (from Resolution ALJ-377)
7. Resolution ALJ-187
8. Certificate of Service

Date: October 29 2026



James Barbarick
Enforcement Analyst