

BEFORE THE

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CA

RESOLUTION ALJ-274.

Establishes Citation Procedures for the Enforcement of Safety Regulations the Consumer Protection and Safety Draft Resolution 274 of the CPD Staff for Violations by Gas Corporations of General Order 112 and Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49, Parts 190, 191, 192, 193 and 199.

REPLY COMMENTS of the UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA ON PROPOSED RESOLUTION ALJ DELEGATING CERTAIN ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY to the CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SAFETY DIVISION (CPSD)

Carl Wood, Regulatory Affairs Director, Utility Workers Union of America, 10103 Live Oak Ave., Cherry Valley, CA 92223. Phone: (951) 110-9670. E-mail: carl.wood@verizon.net  
William Julian II, 43556 Almond Lane, Davis, CA 95618. Phone: (530) 836-2119. E-mail: billjulian@sbcglobal.net

October 25, 2011

□đ

□đ

**REPLY TO COMMENTS OF UAW**  
**ON PROPOSED RESOLUTION ALJ**  
**DELEGATING CERTAIN ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY TO THE**  
**CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SAFETY DIVISION (CPSD)**

TO  
FROM

The National Transportation Safety Board's devastating observation in its Report on San Bruno Pipeline Rupture

Because of the lapses of oversight seen in this case, I am concerned and have strong doubts about the quality and enforcement at both the Federal and state levels. Although PHMSA has authority to enforce pipeline safety regulations, organizational failures of PG&E seen in this accident suggest operators are able to ignore certain standards without meaningful enforcement action.

Therefore, the NTSB concludes that the ineffective enforcement posture of the CPUC permitted PG&E's organizational failure over many years. The NTSB recommends that the Governor of California expeditiously evaluate the ability of the pipeline safety division within the CPUC to effectively enforce its regulations, and, based on the results of this evaluation, the safety division within the CPUC the direct authority, including assessment of fines and penalties, to correct non-compliance regulated pipeline operators.

TO

Accident Report on the Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline Rupture and Fire in Bruno, California September 9, 2010, 11700, NTSB/PAR-10-115G1 (August 30, 2011), at page 123

TO

The Utility Workers Union of America supports the objectives of proposed Resolution 277. Goals and to this observation, to procedural complexities that create practical barriers to securing compliance by gas utilities with the Commission's and gas recorders to provide meaningful incentives for compliance objectives advocated by the Independent Review Panel (IRP) in pages 10-11 as well as the NTSB.

TO

TO

In these Reply Comments UWUA seeks to assure that the pursuit of these objectives is fully consistent with the new response to the San Bruno explosion, particularly Chapter 522 705 (c)(1). Improving on the Commission's exercise of its fully consistent with the safety plan process enacted by C how to deploy those powers in a way that maximizes the elimination of hazards, including identification by employees and operator and thus maximizes incident prevention for the utility route section 961(d). Although not all hazards are regulations, the basis of punitive in response to asserted violat could create obstacles to the systematic identification and elimination of hazards before they cause injury and damage.

CPSD and its predecessors have for some time carried powers of investigation concerning operating and maintenance practices, condition of facilities, service adequacy, reporting, including the identification of violations from General Orders the recommendation of CPUC Investigation of Maintenance Practices of PS&G 04-06 Sec. [http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/FINAL\\_DECISION/36914.htm](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/FINAL_DECISION/36914.htm)

The apparent innovation proposed ALJ 2746 focuses on the enforcement process following identification of violations during the course of with the objective of expediting compliance. It provides two primary delegations to CPSD staff to (1) require remediation of identified violations within seven (7) business days of (with citation option to extend the correction period to a total of seven and (7) days, and (2) impose a maximum fine (after January 1, 2012) of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000.00) per day. In 2011, it explicitly recognized in its rules.

<sup>1</sup> The Commission has rejected the distinction among degrees with GO standards, labeling them as violations. D.04

2011, § 19 Ch.) for each violation, § 19. The effect of these measures is to raise the standards and metrics and to create real incentives when violations are uncovered.

Chapter 522 creates the requirement of a safety plan and other things, for identification of safety hazards. U.W.U. has advocated (in both the Southern California Gas General A.10-12 and the Gas Safety Rulemaking) the creation of a safety culture that promotes transparent communication among utility employees and their representatives. Approval of this should not deter this open communication.

The Commission's practice of graduated enforcement proposals by the IRP and for NTSB strengthening generally consistent with the safety plan now state (Chapter 522) the safety culture proposal. The law with a program of prevention that is outside and formal may be broader in its approach to elimination of based formal enforcement approaches. Commences where the existence of formal standards is insufficient by itself to correct a violation of the formal standard. The "fix it" element of 274(c) that requires immediate correction of a violation of the formal standard is the first enforcement. This "fix it" or addressed is appropriate to the operator has proved unwilling to address an identified hazard. The disagreement between the operator (utility) and enforcer (committee) the existence of the violation is resolved by Chapter 522, absolute priority for Safety Util. Code section 963(b) added to

The "fix it" requirement does not create a barrier to open and transparent communication about safety hazards including

with GO 112 (Discussion of the hazard including that remedial action can take place without coercion so long as all parties resolving the problem eliminate the hazard with the Commission staff the final say as the arbiter. The Commission may also limit the amount of the fine for which the utility may number of days during which would accumulate. The case of geographically extensive hazards, a remediation plan should be an element of the investigation it represents in a public utility.

However, the fine provision proposed in Resolution may create a barrier to the open communication essential both for the Chapter 5 safety culture. For this policy reason the Commission should show them. The drastic nature of the fine provision, particularly discretion at the initial investigative phase, and the legal under current law and statute inject an element of obstructive communication and undermine cooperation necessary to achieve an approach to hazard identification and elimination.

The Commission should consider modifying the fine requirement providing some discretion, and providing standards of guidance of that discretion in the imposition of fines. Fines should be reduced in cases of violations that are identified and corrected and where no injury or damage has resulted from the violation would provide additional to the open communication between Commission staff, utility employees management needed to implement the safety culture and safe-

Gas utilities including Southwest Southern California Gas have questioned the lawfulness of the proposal, focusing particularly on the provision. These legal arguments are not the well-founded Resolution has provided the state law underpinning for its proposals, including preliminary impositions for fines. The Resolution provides for an

expedited appeal process that will result in a decision on the  
Deposit of the fine at the Commission prevents dilatory  
remediation; it is not a taking of property. The Commission  
remains the ultimate finder of the facts concerning the  
Edison Maintenance Practices, 0047065, Supra.

The existing regulatory framework for collecting fines through a  
proceeding, which Proposed Resolution 276 does not discuss, because it does  
not need to remain in provides sufficient opportunity to be heard  
and to adjust or compromise an appeal process can move the forward to add  
the legal and due process arguments raised by Southwest  
California Gas. C.f., Pub. Util. Code sections 2104.5 (aut  
fines), 2104.5 (procedure and venue) to collect 2104.5 (no  
fines assessed prior to suit for gas corporations

For the foregoing reasons, UWUA respectfully supports the  
Resolution ALP as modified to provide discretion in the ex  
fine where violations have been committed and no damage  
has resulted from the violation.

/s/ Carl Wood /s/ William Julian II  
Regulatory Affairs Director 43556 Almond Lane  
Utility Workers Union of America Davis CA 95618  
10103 Live Oak Ave. Phone: (530) 333-2119  
Cherry Valley CA 95922 Phone: (951) 110967  
E-mail: carl.wood@verizon.net  
E-mail: billjulian@sbcglobal.net

October 25, 2011