

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**02-22-12  
01:33 PM

February 22, 2012

Agenda ID #11092  
Adjudicatory

## TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 11-02-019

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Maribeth A. Bushey. It will appear on the Commission's March 22, 2012 agenda. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Pursuant to Rule 14.6(c)(2), comments on the proposed decision must be filed and served no later than March 2, 2012, and reply comments no later than March 9, 2012.

Comments must be filed pursuant to Rule 1.13 either electronically or in hard copy. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Bushey at [mab@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:mab@cpuc.ca.gov) and the assigned Commissioner. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov).

/s/ MARYAM EBKE for  
Karen V. Clopton, Chief  
Administrative Law Judge

KVC:oma

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ BUSHEY** (Mailed 2/22/2012)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Adopt New Safety and Reliability Regulations for Natural Gas Transmission and Distribution Pipelines and Related Ratemaking Mechanisms.

Rulemaking 11-02-019  
(Filed February 24, 2011)

**DECISION RESOLVING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

**1. Summary**

This decision orders Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to pay \$3 million to the General Fund of the State of California, and closes this adjudicatory phase of the proceeding.

**2. Background**

On March 24, 2011, in Decision (D.) 11-03-047, the Commission issued its Order to Show Cause Why Pacific Gas and Electric Company Should Not Be Found in Contempt, and Why Penalties Should Not Be Imposed, For Failure to Company with Commission Order. The Commission found that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) appeared to have failed to comply with Commission Resolution L-410 and Rulemaking (R.) 11-02-019. The Resolution and Rulemaking decision required PG&E to review "traceable, verifiable, and complete" as-built drawings and pipeline system components and, based on the reliable pipeline specifications, calculate the Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (MAOP). The Order to Show Cause set a hearing for PG&E to present

evidence. At the hearing on March 28, 2011, PG&E and the Commission's Consumer Protection and Safety Division (CPSD) announced that they had reached a stipulation that provided for a detailed compliance plan for PG&E as well as an immediate fine of \$3 million, with an additional \$3 million payment for any failure to conform to the compliance plan. On March 30, 2011, PG&E and CPSD filed separate motions for Commission approval of the stipulation.

The Commission categorized the Order to Show Cause as adjudicatory and, consistent with Rules 1.3(a) and 8.2(b), *ex parte* communications regarding the Order to Show Cause were prohibited.

On January 19, 2012, the assigned Commissioner issued a ruling finding that the Commission and the public would benefit from a status report on PG&E's compliance with Resolution L-410 and R.11-02-019 and, based on this status, recommendations from PG&E and CPSD as to next steps in furtherance of the public interest. On February 3, 2012, PG&E and CPSD filed their joint status report and stated that PG&E completed the MAOP validation on the schedule and as set forth in the Compliance Plan attached to the March 24, 2011 Stipulation between CPSD and PG&E. CPSD also stated that it had quality checked some of PG&E's work but planned to do additional such checks.

PG&E and CPSD agreed that PG&E should pay the \$3 million penalty provided for in the Stipulation. PG&E further agreed not to seek recovery of any portion of the penalty in rates, and that this penalty will have no effect on any other penalties the Commission may impose in this proceeding or other proceeding for matters other than PG&E's compliance with the Commission's directives concerning the National Transportation Safety Board urgent safety recommendations.

The Assigned Commissioner's Ruling set February 17, 2012 as the date for the parties to file comments, but no comments were filed.

### **3. Discussion**

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 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." Ensuring that the management of investor-owned gas utility systems fully performs its duty of safe operations is a core obligation of this Commission.

Since initiating this proceeding, our primary efforts have been focused on ensuring that California's natural gas transmission system operators are properly calculating the MAOP for each segment of the natural gas transmission system. Our review caused us, on June 9, 2011, to order all California natural gas transmission pipeline operators to prepare Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline Comprehensive Pressure Testing Implementation Plans to either pressure test or replace all segments of natural gas pipelines which were not pressure tested or lack sufficient details related to performance of any such test.<sup>1</sup> We required that the Plans provide for testing or replacing all such pipeline as soon as practicable, and that at the completion of the implementation period, all California natural

---

<sup>1</sup> The Commission's General Order 112, which became effective on July 1, 1961, mandated pressure test requirements for new transmission pipelines (operating at 20% or more of Specified Minimum Yield Stress (SMYS) installed in California after the effective date. Similar federal regulations followed in 1970, but exempted pipeline installed prior to that time from the pressure test requirement. Such pipeline is often referred to as "grandfathered" pipeline, because pursuant to 47 CFR 192. 619(c), pressure testing was not mandated.

gas transmission pipeline segments would be (1) pressure tested, (2) have traceable, verifiable, and complete records readily available, and (3) where warranted, be capable of accommodating in-line inspection devices. The gas system operators have filed their Implementation Plans which propose multi-year programs with proposed costs of hundreds of millions of dollars. The evidentiary record is being prepared for Commission consideration of these Plans. In addition, the Commission required the operators to implement interim safety enhancement measures, including increased patrols and leak surveys, pressure reductions, prioritization of pressure testing for critical pipelines that must run at or near MAOP values which result in hoop stress levels at or above 30% SMYS, and other such measures that will enhance public safety during the implementation period.

Apart from the comprehensive Implementation Plan, PG&E also brought forward specific requests necessary to prepare for the winter heating season. PG&E requested Commission authorization to lift operating pressure restrictions that had been imposed on certain lines following the San Bruno rupture. To consider such requests, the Commission adopted a public process for PG&E to make its demonstration that the line could be safely operated at a higher pressure. The Commission required that PG&E provide documentation showing that it had gone beyond a rote pressure test of the line in question, and include a responsible engineer's review of the pipeline construction and assessment of the results in a Safety Certification. Specifically, the PG&E officer responsible for gas system engineering was required to provide a verified statement showing the following information:

- a. that PG&E has validated the pipeline engineering and construction;

- b. that PG&E has reviewed pressure tests results and can confirm that a strength test was preformed on the segment in accord with federal regulations; and
- c. in the professional judgment of the engineering officer, the system it safe to operate at the proposed pressure levels.<sup>2</sup>

As the subsequent history summarized above shows, during the year since issuing the Order to Show Cause, this Commission has been resolutely focused on improving PG&E's operating performance of its natural gas transmission system. We have taken significant actions already, and anticipate further long-term measures to improve safety. We are also well underway with three separate Investigations of PG&E's operations of its natural gas transmission system.<sup>3</sup>

As set forth above, we have ordered pressure testing or replacement of all natural gas transmission pipelines that have not been tested in California and have instituted a public process for PG&E to publicly take responsibility for safe natural gas transmission system operations. We are pursuing penalties and ratemaking consequences in several proceedings.

In light of the subsequent and on-going regulatory and enforcement proceedings, we find that the public interest would be best served by concluding this portion of this proceeding and allowing PG&E, the parties, and the Commission to focus on the other efforts. This outcome is also reasonable in

---

<sup>2</sup> D.11-09-006 at 18.

<sup>3</sup> Where the Commission finds good cause to believe that a public utility has violated a Commission order or California law, the Commission may open an investigation to consider imposing fines or other penalties for any such violations. The Commission has opened investigations into PG&E's operations regarding the San Bruno rupture,

*Footnote continued on next page*

light of the record in this proceeding and consistent with the law, as required by Rule 12.1(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Therefore, we find that PG&E should be fined \$3 million for its actions prior to March 24, 2011, regarding compliance with Commission Resolution L-410, and that all allegations put forth in the Commission's Order to Show Cause issued on March 24, 2011, should be considered resolved.

#### **4. Reduction of Comment Period**

Because this is now an uncontested matter granting the relief requested, the proposed decision of the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and the parties were allowed to file and serve comments and reply comments on a shortened schedule as provided in Rule 14.6(c)(2).

#### **5. Assignment of Proceeding**

Michel Peter Florio is the assigned Commissioner and Maribeth A. Bushey is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

#### **Findings of Fact**

1. On March 24, 2011, the Commission issued its Order to Show Cause regarding potential penalties against PG&E for its response to Commission Resolution L-410 and R.11-02-019.

2. Also on March 24, 2011, PG&E and CPSD filed and served their stipulation regarding the Order to Show Cause which included a compliance plan for PG&E to complete its MAOP validation efforts with a timetable and project milestones,

---

Investigation (I.) 12-01-007, PG&E's recordkeeping, I.11-02-106, and the High Consequence Areas, I.11-11-009.

as well as PG&E's agreement to pay a fine of \$3 million to the General Fund of the State of California.

3. On February 2, 2012, PG&E and CPSD filed and served a joint status report which confirmed that PG&E had met the timeline and project milestones set forth in the compliance plan.

4. No party currently opposes the resolution of this matter proposed in the March 24, 2011, stipulation.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. It is reasonable in light of the record, consistent with law, and in the public interest to accept the March 24, 2011, stipulation as resolving the issues raised in the Order to Show Cause.

2. PG&E should pay a fine of \$3 million to the General Fund of the State of California.

3. The March 24, 2011, stipulation should be accepted.

4. The Order to Show Cause Portion of this proceeding should be completed.

5. Today's decision resolves an uncontested matter by granting the relief requested and, pursuant to Rule 14.6(c)(2), the Commission may reduce the comment period on the proposed decision.

## **O R D E R**

### **THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:**

1. The March 24, 2011, stipulation between Pacific Gas and Electric Company and the Commission's Consumer Protection and Safety Division is adopted and the parties shall comply with the terms of the stipulation.

2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company must pay a fine of \$3 million by check or money order payable to the California Public Utilities Commission and mailed or delivered to the Commission's Fiscal Office at 505 Van Ness Ave., Room 3000, San Francisco, CA 94102, within 10 days of the effective date of this order. Write on the face of the check or money order "For deposit to the General Fund per Decision 12-XX-XXX."

3. The Order to Show Cause portion of this proceeding is closed.
4. The Rulemaking portion of this proceeding shall remain open.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.