



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Operations and Practices of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Determine Violations of Public Utilities Code Section 451, General Order 112, and Other Applicable Standards, Laws, Rules and Regulations in Connection with the San Bruno Explosion and Fire on September 9, 2010.

I.12-01-007
(Filed January 12, 2012)
(Not Consolidated)
10-02-14
04:59 PM

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Operations and Practices of Pacific Gas and Electric Company with Respect to Facilities Records for its Natural Gas Transmission System Pipelines.

I.11-02-016
(Filed February 24, 2011)
(Not Consolidated)

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Operations and Practices of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline System in Locations with High Population Density.

I.11-11-009
(Filed November 10, 2011)
(Not Consolidated)

REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Pursuant to Title 20 of the California Code of Regulation, Rule 14.4(b), I hereby request review of the decision of the presiding officers, mailed September 2, 2014, in these dockets. The specific grounds on which I request review are as follows:

- 1) Whether fines and/or penalties imposed by this Commission under Sections 2107 and 2108 of the Public Utilities Code must be deposited in the state General Fund in all circumstances (POD, pp.25-28);
- 2) Whether the total penalty of \$1.4 billion is appropriate and, if not, whether it should be larger or smaller (POD, pp.75-84);

- 3) Whether the division of the overall penalty among fines, disallowances and other remedies is appropriate or should be altered (POD, pp.75-84);
- 4) Whether there is a difference in the deterrent effect of fines as opposed to shareholder funding of costs that would otherwise be recoverable in rates (POD, pp.28-32);
- 5) Whether the potential tax consequences of any penalties imposed in this proceeding should be taken into account by the Commission and, if so, how (POD, p.83); and
- 6) Whether the "other remedies" addressed in Section 7 of the POD should be adopted or modified.

I am requesting review of these issues because I believe they are of sufficient gravity to merit the attention of the full Commission, and not to indicate how I may eventually decide the merits of such issues.

Dated October 2, 2014, at San Francisco, California.



Michel Peter Florio
Commissioner