

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Legal Division

San Francisco, California
Date: May 26, 2016
Resolution No. L-500

RESOLUTION

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS OF
THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION SAFETY
AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION'S COMPLETED
INVESTIGATIONS OF INCIDENTS OCCURRING AT RAIL-
CROSSING DOT# 754991G IN CALIFORNIA.**

BACKGROUND

The California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") received a request seeking disclosure of the Commission Safety and Enforcement Division's investigations of incidents occurring at the Ravenswood Avenue rail-crossing DOT# 754991G, Crossing ID# SM-1098, in Menlo Park, California, from January 2000 to present. The Commission staff could not make the investigation records public without the formal approval of the full Commission. The request is treated as an appeal to the full Commission for release of the requested records pursuant to Commission General Order (G.O.) 66-C § 3.4.

DISCUSSION

The requested records are "public records" as defined by the California Public Records Act ("CPRA").¹ The California Constitution, the CPRA, and discovery law favor disclosure of public records. The public has a constitutional right to access most government information.² Statutes, court rules, and other authority limiting access to information must be broadly construed if they further the people's right of access, and narrowly construed if they limit the right of access.³ New statutes, court rules, or other

¹ Cal. Gov't. Code § 6250, *et seq.*

² Cal. Const. Article I, § 3(b)(1).

³ Cal. Const. Article I, § 3(b)(2).

authority that limit the right of access must be adopted with findings demonstrating the interest protected by the limitation and the need to protect that interest.⁴

The CPRA provides that an agency must base a decision to withhold a public record in response to a CPRA request upon the specified exemptions listed in the CPRA, or a showing that, on the facts of a particular case, the public interest in confidentiality clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.⁵

The Commission has exercised its discretion under Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 583, and implemented its responsibility under Cal. Gov't. Code § 6253.4(a), by adopting guidelines for public access to Commission records. These guidelines are embodied in G.O. 66-C. General Order 66-C § 1.1 provides that Commission records are public, except “as otherwise excluded by this General Order, statute, or other order, decision, or rule.” General Order 66-C § 2.2 precludes Commission staff’s disclosure of “[r]ecords or information of a confidential nature furnished to or obtained by the Commission ... including: (a) Records of investigations and audits made by the Commission, except to the extent disclosed at a hearing or by formal Commission action.” General Order 66-C § 2.2(a) covers both records provided by utilities in the course of a Commission investigation and investigation records generated by Commission staff.

Because G.O. 66-C § 2.2(a) limits Commission staff’s ability to disclose Commission investigation records in the absence of disclosure during a hearing or a Commission order authorizing disclosure, Commission staff denies most initial requests and subpoenas for investigation records. Commission staff usually informs requestors that their subpoena or public records request will be treated as an appeal under G.O. 66-C § 3.4 for disclosure of the records.

There is no statute forbidding disclosure of the Commission’s safety investigation records. With certain exceptions for incident reports filed with the Commission, we generally refrain from making most accident investigation records public until Commission staff’s investigation of the incident is complete. Commission staff and management need to be able to engage in confidential deliberations regarding an incident investigation without concern for the litigation interests of plaintiffs or regulated entities.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ The fact that records may fall within a CPRA exemption does not preclude the Commission from authorizing disclosure of the records. Except for records subject to a law prohibiting disclosure, CPRA exemptions are discretionary, rather than mandatory, and the Commission is free to refrain from asserting such exemptions when it finds that disclosure is appropriate. *See* Cal. Gov’t. Code § 6253(e); *Black Panthers v. Kehoe* (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 645, 656.

The Commission has ordered disclosure of records concerning completed safety incident investigations on numerous occasions.⁶ Disclosure of such records does not interfere with its investigations, and may lead to discovery of admissible evidence and aid in the resolution of litigation regarding the accident or incident under investigation.⁷ Most of these resolutions responded to disclosure requests and/or subpoenas from individuals involved in electric or gas utility accidents or incidents, the families of such individuals, the legal representatives of such individuals or families, or the legal representatives of a defendant, or potential defendant, in litigation related to an accident or incident.

Portions of incident investigation records which include personal information may be subject to disclosure limitations in the Information Practices Act of 1977 (“IPA”).⁸ The IPA authorizes disclosure of personal information “[p]ursuant to the [CPRA].”⁹ The CPRA exempts personal information from mandatory disclosure, where disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.¹⁰ Incident investigation records may include information subject to the lawyer-client privilege, official information privilege, or similar disclosure limitations. The CPRA exempts such information from disclosure.¹¹

The Commission has often stated that Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 315, which expressly prohibits the introduction of accident reports filed with the Commission, or orders and recommendations issued by the Commission, “as evidence in any action for damages based on or arising out of such loss of life, or injury to person or property,” offers utilities sufficient protection against injury caused by the release of requested investigation records.

Commission staff determined that the 5 incidents at this crossing occurring on February 22, 2007; March 9, 2012; April 13, 2012; November 18, 2014; and February 23, 2015 were completed. Therefore, the public interest favors disclosure of the requested Commission’s investigation records, with the exception of any personal information, the

⁶ Where appropriate, the Commission has redacted portions of investigation records which contain confidential personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy, and other exempt or privileged information.

⁷ See, e.g., Commission Resolutions L-240 *Re San Diego Gas & Electric Company*, rehearing denied in Decision 93-05-020, (1993) 49 P.U.C. 2d 241; L-309 *Re Corona* (December 18, 2003); L-320 *Re Knutson* (August 25, 2005).

⁸ Cal. Civ. Code § 1798, *et seq.*

⁹ Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.24(g).

¹⁰ Cal. Gov’t. Code § 6254(c).

¹¹ Cal. Gov’t. Code § 6254(k).

disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, or any information which is subject to the Commission's lawyer-client or other privilege.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT RESOLUTION

The Draft Resolution of the Commission's Legal Division in this matter was mailed to the parties in interest on April 26, 2016, in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 311(g). No comments were received.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Commission received a request which seeks disclosure of the Commission Safety and Enforcement Division's investigations of incidents occurring at the Ravenswood Avenue rail-crossing DOT# 754991G, Crossing ID# SM-1098, in Menlo Park, California from January 2000 to present. Commission staff determined that the 5 incidents at issue, namely, those occurring on February 22, 2007; March 9, 2012; April 13, 2012; November 18, 2014; and February 23, 2015 were completed, and deemed those records to be responsive to the records request.
2. Access to the records in the Commission's investigation files was denied in the absence of a Commission order authorizing disclosure.
3. The Commission's investigations of the 5 incidents associated with this request are all completed; therefore, the public interest favors disclosure of the requested Commission's investigation records, with the exception of any personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, or any information which is subject to the Commission's lawyer-client or other privilege.
4. The public interest also favors disclosure of all completed Commission investigations of incidents occurring at rail-crossing DOT# 754991G, with the exception of any personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, or any information which is subject to the Commission's lawyer-client or other privilege.
5. The Commission has, upon receipt of records requests or subpoenas seeking such records, routinely authorized disclosure of Commission records of completed Commission investigations of safety incidents, with the exception of any personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, or any information which is subject to the Commission's lawyer-client or other privilege.
6. The Commission anticipates receiving future records requests and subpoenas seeking Commission records of Commission investigations of incidents occurring at rail-crossing DOT# 754991G.

7. The public interest and principles of administrative efficiency favor treating similar records requests and subpoenas in a similar and uniform manner, and limiting the need for the Commission to address each future records request and subpoena seeking Commission records of completed Commission investigations of incidents involving rail-crossing DOT# 754991G through individual, but almost identical, resolutions authorizing disclosure.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The documents in the requested Commission's investigation file and report are public records as defined by Cal. Gov't. Code § 6250, *et seq.*
2. The California Constitution favors disclosure of governmental records by, among other things, stating that the people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the peoples' business, and therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny. Furthermore, the California Constitution also requires that statutes, court rules, and other authority favoring disclosure be broadly construed, and that statutes, court rules, and other authority limiting disclosure be construed narrowly; and that any new statutes, court rules, or other authority limiting disclosure be supported by findings determining the interest served by keeping information from the public and the need to protect that interest. Cal. Const. Article I, §§ 3(b)(1) and (2).
3. The general policy of the CPRA favors disclosure of records.
4. Justification for withholding a public record in response to a CPRA request must be based on specific exemptions in the CPRA or upon a showing that, on the facts of a particular case, the public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Cal. Gov't. Code § 6255.
5. Cal. Gov't Code § 6254(c) exempts from mandatory disclosure of personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
6. Cal. Gov't Code § 6254(k) exempts from disclosure of records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.
7. The Commission has exercised its discretion under Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 583 to limit Commission staff disclosure of investigation records in the absence of formal action by the Commission or disclosure during the course of a Commission proceeding. General Order 66-C § 2.2 (a).
8. Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 583 does not limit the Commission's ability to order disclosure of records.

9. Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 315 prohibits the introduction of accident reports filed with the Commission, or orders and recommendations issued by the Commission, “as evidence in any action for damages based on or arising out of such loss of life, or injury to person or property.

ORDER

1. The request for disclosure of the Commission records concerning its investigations of 5 incidents occurring at the Ravenswood Avenue rail-crossing DOT# 754991G, Crossing ID# SM-1098, in Menlo Park, California, is granted, with the exception of any personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, or any information which is subject to the Commission’s lawyer-client or other privilege.
2. The disclosure of Commission records concerning all pending and future Commission investigations of incidents occurring at rail-crossing DOT# 754991G is approved, once the investigations have been completed, with the exception of portions of the investigation records that include any personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, or any information which is subject to the Commission’s lawyer-client or other privilege.
3. The effective date of this order is today.

I certify that this Resolution was adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission at its regular meeting of May 26, 2016, and that the following Commissioners approved it:

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN
Executive Director

MICHAEL PICKER
President
MICHEL PETER FLORIO
CATHERINE J.K. SANDOVAL
CARLA J. PETERMAN
LIANE M. RANDOLPH
Commissioners

