

I.12-01-007

PG&E'S REQUEST FOR OFFICIAL NOTICE

EXHIBIT 3

**Records Ex. PG&E-1
(Rebuttal Testimony of Julie Halligan August 20, 2012)
(filed August 20, 2012)**


Investigation: 11-02-016
Exhibit No.: PG&E 1
Date: 8/12

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

**Rebuttal Testimony of Julie Halligan
August 20, 2012**



Docket: : I.11-02-016
Exhibit Number : _____
Commissioner : M. Florio
Admin. Law Judge : A. Yip-Kikugawa
Witness : J. Halligan



**Consumer Protection And Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF JULIE HALLIGAN**

I.11-02-016

San Francisco, California
August 20, 2012

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The purpose of this rebuttal testimony is to provide CPSD's assessment of the
3 June 27 PG&E Response testimony from a regulatory policy perspective. CPSD will
4 explain why certain PG&E arguments do not constitute legitimate defenses to the charges
5 of deficient recordkeeping set out in CPSD's March 2012 testimony and its supplemental
6 testimony. CPSD does not assert additional violations in this testimony.

7 This testimony addresses four defenses that PG&E has raised in its testimony.
8 First, PG&E contends that other operators have deficient recordkeeping practices. This
9 contention is not a valid defense to the alleged violations of law. Second, PG&E argues
10 that there was no regulation requiring it to maintain certain records that are the subject of
11 alleged violations. However, CPSD expects PG&E and all Commission regulated gas
12 utilities to use good engineering practices to promote the safety of their gas system.
13 Natural gas transportation is a hazardous activity, and CPSD expects gas utilities to use
14 best engineering practices available even without specific prescriptive laws or regulations
15 mandating every engineering practice that PG&E must undertake to keep its system safe.
16 Third, PG&E's assertions that it has changed or is changing its recordkeeping practices
17 since the San Bruno tragedy have no bearing on whether PG&E violated the law
18 previously. Fourth, contrary to PG&E's assertions, ASME Standard B31.8 carries the
19 weight of law and CPSD's testimony alleging independent violations of this standard are
20 valid. Each of these topics is discussed below.

21 **II. Other Gas Operators' Record Keeping Practices**

22 PG&E claims that other utilities or gas transporters have also failed to maintain
23 gas transportation records or data.¹

24 PG&E's assertions about others in the industry are both unproven and irrelevant to
25 the issues in this proceeding. PG&E's testimony is insufficient to establish whether the
26 recordkeeping deficiencies of other companies rise to the level of violations of law.

¹. Examples see PG&E Response testimony, pp. 3-28, 3-54, 3-66

1 PG&E's testimony simply asserts that gas transporters face "significant gas transmission
2 records challenges in locating records".² PG&E also provides examples of industry
3 challenges to locate records.³ A record keeping "challenge" to the industry, however,
4 does not establish that prevailing industry practice is to keep records in violation of the
5 law or in an unsafe manner. The Commission's recordkeeping investigation of PG&E is
6 not designed to ascertain whether any other utility in California or the nation has violated
7 the law by its deficient recordkeeping.

8 Second, industry practice is irrelevant to whether PG&E's recordkeeping practices
9 have violated the law. CPSD and the Commission have always determined violations of
10 law based on the actions and omissions of the utility under review.

11 **III. Obligation to Use Safe Engineering Practices**

12 **A. CPSD and the Commission Expect PG&E to Use Appropriate Engineering** 13 **Practice to Promote the Safety of Its System**

14 PG&E asserts or implies in its testimony that it did not violate any regulation
15 where none explicitly required certain record types to be retained or maintained in a
16 particular way or for a specified length of time.⁴ Again, CPSD regulators expect PG&E
17 to keep its gas transmission system safe, regardless of specific directives to maintain
18 data.⁵ CPSD expects all utilities to understand and implement this requirement regardless
19 of whether an explicit recordkeeping or other safety requirement exists.

20 PG&E is a large and established public utility and is responsible for ensuring the
21 safety of its customers, employees, and the public. PG&E can only do so by exercising
22 good engineering practices in compliance with Section 451 of the Public Utilities Code.
23 The transportation of gas through pipes is an activity that is hazardous to life and health if

² PG&E Response Testimony Page 1-12.

³ PG&E Response Testimony Pages 1-13 to 1-15.

⁴ PG&E contends this with respect to records Ms Felts has found as inadequate to safely track the location, age, and characteristics of re-used pipe (PG&E response p. 3-28), deficient weld records (Id at 3-54 through 3-37), deficient records needed to establish transmission pipe overpressure before federal integrity management guidelines explicitly required the information (Id at 3-68), and deficient leak records (Id at 3-64 and 3-65).

⁵ California Public Utilities Code Section 451 provides in part, "Every public utility shall 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."

1 good engineering practices are not exercised over the entire system. If safety depends -
2 as it does in some instances here – on maintaining recordkeeping that is not explicitly
3 mandated by regulation – CPSD expects PG&E to maintain the recordkeeping needed to
4 achieve safety. CPSD expects such from all utilities regardless of whether explicit and
5 specific recordkeeping requirements exist.

6 As utility regulators, CPSD also expects PG&E to recognize when a regulation
7 implies a requirement of good recordkeeping, although it may not explicitly mandate it.
8 From a safety perspective, virtually all engineering data on pipelines must be maintained,
9 regardless of whether a regulation explicitly requires it. As examples, engineers need to
10 know the life service history of a pipe and its chemical and weld characteristics before
11 they can make integrity management decisions on whether to replace, repair, or test each
12 pipe. The best and often the only practical means for engineers to assess these matters is
13 by adequate recordkeeping.

14 In PG&E’s response testimony, Mr. De Leon describes historic record keeping
15 requirements.⁶ In his own summary, he states that the GO 112 series record keeping
16 requirements became less prescriptive over time, and that federal regulators have not
17 imposed detailed recordkeeping standards.⁷ Both of these themes support CPSD’s view
18 that PG&E has always had a requirement to promote the safety of its own system,
19 regardless of whether there are specific prescriptive requirements to do so.⁸ Therefore,
20 any explicit prescriptive or detailed record keeping requirements merely added to
21 PG&E’s basic engineering and legal duty to keep and maintain records to promote the
22 safety of its system.

23 Mr. De Leon contends that “federal regulations have dealt pragmatically with the
24 challenge that gas operators may lack complete gas pipeline safety records.”⁹ However,
25 recognizing that some utilities “may lack complete gas pipeline safety records” does not

⁶ PG&E Response Testimony, Chapter 1 Appendix B, June 20, 2011, Testimony of Cesar De Leon.

⁷ Ibid. at Pages 1B-15 and 1B-16.

⁸ For a discussion on the requirements for a utility to generally promote the safety of its own system, see Section II. B.

⁹ PG&E Response Testimony, Chapter 1 Appendix B, June 20, 2011, Testimony of Cesar De Leon, Page 1B-15.

1 excuse the specific violations CPSD has identified.¹⁰ PG&E had and has a duty to
2 promote the safety of its system by properly maintaining and managing its records.

3 **B. The Commission Has Made It Clear that a Utility Must Promote the Safety**
4 **of Its System Regardless of Specific Prescription or Prohibition**

5 In the decision that adopted General Order 112, making the ASME record keeping
6 requirements mandatory, the Commission recognized and articulated the rationale
7 underlying the general requirement that operators keep their systems safe. Specifically,
8 the Commission stated,

9 “It is recognized that no code of safety rules, no matter how
10 carefully and well prepared, can be relied upon to guarantee
11 complete freedom from accidents. Moreover, the promulgation of
12 precautionary safety rules does not remove or minimize the primary
13 obligation and responsibility of respondents to provide safe service
14 and facilities in their gas operations. Officers and employees of the
15 respondents must continue to be ever conscious of the importance of
16 safe operating practices and facilities and of their obligation to the
17 public in that respect.”¹¹ (PG&E was one of the respondents in the
18 GO 112 proceeding.)
19

20 Even though the Commission had the foresight in GO 112 to mandate that PG&E
21 keep its records properly, it also recognized that regulators cannot envision and explicitly
22 prohibit each and every way that utilities might fail to keep their systems safe, and cannot
23 explicitly mandate each and every action that utilities must take to keep their systems
24 safe. As such, the Commission understood that regulators cannot articulate every
25 possible requirement to prevent an operator’s unforeseeable, but unsafe conduct.

26 The Commission has confirmed that the Public Utilities Code Section 451
27 requirement to make utilities keep their systems safe is constitutional. The Commission
28 specifically said,

29 “. . . it would be virtually impossible to draft Section 451 to
30 specifically set forth every conceivable service, instrumentality and
31 facility which might be defined as ‘reasonable’ and necessary to

¹⁰ Specific violations are identified in CPSD’s supplemental testimony, Dated March 30, 2012.

¹¹ California Public Utilities Decision Number 61269, “Investigation into the Need of a General Order Governing Design, Construction, Testing, Maintenance and Operation of Gas Transmission Pipeline Systems.”, Page 12, Finding and Conclusion Number 8, December 28, 1960.

1 promote the public safety. That the terms are incapable of precise
2 definition given the variety of circumstances likewise does not make
3 Section 451 void for vagueness, either on its face or in application to
4 the instant case. The terms ‘reasonable service, instrumentalities,
5 equipment and facilities’ are not without a definition, standard or
6 common understanding among utilities. . . Accordingly, Section
7 451's mandate that a utility provide "reasonable service,
8 instrumentalities, equipment and facilities" is not an
9 unconstitutionally vague standard with which to assess a fine or
10 penalty.”

11 **IV. PG&E’s Future Recordkeeping**

12 Much of PG&E’s response testimony is devoted to its proposals and plans to improve its
13 records management practices.¹² CPSD welcomes changes to improve PG&E’s
14 recordkeeping and safety.¹³ However, CPSD urges the Commission to recognize that
15 PG&E’s proposals for improvement are not a defense to previous PG&E violations of the
16 law.

17 Further, CPSD has not conducted discovery, analyzed or taken a position on
18 PG&E’s statements about improving its record management practices. Determining the
19 manner in which each record keeping system should be revised or improved is not within
20 the scope of this proceeding.

21 **V. ASME STANDARD B31.8 CARRIES THE WEIGHT OF LAW AND** 22 **ALLEGING INDEPENDENT VIOLATIONS OF THIS STANDARD IS** 23 **VALID**

24 The American Standards of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) is a set of industry
25 standards that have been followed by the gas industry since long before 1956. The
26 testimony of CPSD consultants has asserted PG&E violations of these standards.
27 Through several witnesses, PG&E asserts that ASME Standard B31.8
28 does not set a legal requirement for PG&E to follow. One PG&E witness asserts,
29 “ASME does not carry the weight of law.”¹⁴ Another PG&E witness states “Using
30 ASME Standard B31.8 as an independent basis for asserting a regulatory violation does

¹² CPSD does not concede that any of these efforts are proper remedial actions.

¹³ I.11-02-016 Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Memo and Ruling, 11/21/2011, Page 2.

¹⁴ PG&E Testimony of Maura L. Dunn at Page MD-39.

1 not make any sense.”¹⁵ To the contrary, as discussed below, CPSD believes ASME
2 Standard B31.8 does carry the weight of law and can be violated.

3 First, PG&E represented to the Commission that the company followed ASME
4 standards for gas transmission and distribution piping systems (ASME B31.8). PG&E
5 represented this in 1956¹⁶ and again in 1960.¹⁷ PG&E now states it is aware of no
6 representations made to the Commission since those times that PG&E no longer followed
7 the American Standards Association Code for gas transmission and distribution piping
8 systems (ASME standard B31.8.)¹⁸ Regulators should be able to expect that when PG&E
9 and other utilities make representations that they follow certain engineering standards,
10 those utilities will not simply abandon those standards without notice to regulators. In
11 short, PG&E’s representation - and the importance to PG&E safety of compliance with
12 ASME standards – requires it to follow ASME standards.

13 Second, since 1970, the Code of Federal Regulations has required each operator to
14 follow its own procedures and programs that apply to its regulated pipelines.¹⁹ PG&E’s
15 representation that it voluntarily followed the ASME B31.8 standards in 1956 and 1960
16 gave those standards the force of law. Of course, these are matters to be addressed in
17 briefs, but we comment here because PG&E’s response has asserted the argument. In
18 short, CPSD believes it is appropriate to identify violations of ASME B31.8.

¹⁵ PG&E Response Testimony of Mr. Cesar de Leon at Page 1-5, lines 31-32.

¹⁶ In its response to CPSD Data Request 15, Question 6 PG&E stated, “PG&E believes that, in 1956, its practice was to follow ASA B31.1.8-1955.” According to that same data response, today, ASA B31.1.8-1955 is known as ASME B31.8.

¹⁷ See D.61269, “Investigation into the Need of a General Order (GO 112) Governing Design, Construction, Testing, Maintenance and Operation of Gas Transmission Pipeline Systems,” December 28, 1960, P. 4, in which PG&E and other gas operators asserted that General Order 112 was not necessary. They were quoted by this decision as claiming, “[T]here is no evidence to show that public health or safety has suffered from the lack of a general order; that the safety record of California gas utilities has been excellent; that there have been no major pipeline failures in the State resulting in either loss of life or major interruption of service; that there is nothing to indicate this good record will not continue; and that the gas utilities in California voluntarily follow the American Standards Association (ASA) code for gas transmission and distribution piping systems.” (ASME Standard B31.8).

¹⁸ PG&E Response to CPSD Data Request 71 Question 1c.

¹⁹ 49 CFR Section 192.13(c), August 19, 1970.

I.12-01-007

PG&E'S REQUEST FOR OFFICIAL NOTICE

EXHIBIT 4

**Records Ex. PG&E-2
(PG&E's Redline Comparison of Original and Revised
Rebuttal Testimony of Julie Halligan)**

Investigation: 11-02-016
Exhibit No.: PG&E 2
Date: 9/5/12

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

**Redline Comparison of Original and Revised
Rebuttal Testimony of Julie Halligan**



Docket: : I.11-02-016
Exhibit Number : _____
Commissioner : M. Florio
Admin. Law Judge : A. Yip-Kikugawa
Witness : J. Halligan

~~Consumer Protection And Safety Division~~
~~California Public Utilities Commission~~ **CONSUMER**
PROTECTION AND SAFETY DIVISION CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

REVISED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF JULIE HALLIGAN

I.11-02-016

San Francisco, California
August 20, 2012

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this rebuttal testimony is to provide CPSD's assessment of the June 27 PG&E Response testimony from a regulatory policy perspective. CPSD will explain why certain PG&E arguments do not constitute legitimate defenses to the charges of deficient recordkeeping set out in CPSD's March 2012 testimony and its supplemental testimony. CPSD does not assert additional violations in this testimony.

This testimony addresses four defenses that PG&E has raised in its testimony. First, PG&E contends that other operators have deficient recordkeeping practices. This contention is not a valid defense to the alleged violations of law. Second, PG&E argues that there was no regulation requiring it to maintain certain records that are the subject of alleged violations. However, under section 451 of the California Public Utilities Code, CPSD expects PG&E and all Commission regulated gas utilities to use goodthe best engineering practices to promote the safety of their gas system. Natural gas transportation is a hazardous activity, and CPSD expects gas utilities to use best engineering practices available even without specific prescriptive laws or regulations mandating every engineering practice that PG&E must undertake to keep its system safe. Third, PG&E's assertions that it has changed or is changing its recordkeeping practices since the San Bruno tragedy have no bearing on whether PG&E violated the law previously. Fourth, contrary to PG&E's assertions, ASME Standard B31.8 carries the weight of law and CPSD's testimony alleging independent violations of this standard are valid PG&E's representations to the Commission were that PG&E had complied with ASME Standard B31.8, which included a record retention provision. Each of these topics is discussed below.

II. OTHER GAS OPERATORS' RECORD KEEPING PRACTICES

PG&E claims that other utilities or gas transporters have also failed to maintain gas transportation records or data.¹

PG&E's assertions about others in the industry having as deficient recordkeeping practices as PG&E are both unproven and irrelevant to beyond the issues in scope of this proceeding. PG&E's testimony is insufficient to establish whether the recordkeeping deficiencies

¹ Examples see PG&E Response testimony, pp. 3-28, 3-54, 3-66

of other companies rise to the level of violations of law. PG&E's testimony simply asserts that gas transporters face "significant gas transmission records challenges in locating records"² PG&E also provides examples of industry challenges to locate records.³ A record keeping "challenge" to the industry, however, does not establish that prevailing industry practice is to keep records in violation of the law or in an unsafe manner. The Commission's recordkeeping investigation of PG&E is not designed to ascertain whether any other utility in California or the nation has violated the law by its deficient recordkeeping.

Second, stating examples of others in the industry practice is irrelevant to whether PG&E's recordkeeping practices have violated the law. CPSD and the Commission have always determined violations of law based on the actions and omissions of the utility under review based upon the specific facts involving the utility.

III. OBLIGATION TO USE SAFE ENGINEERING PRACTICES

A. CPSD and the Commission Expect PG&E to Use Appropriate the Best Engineering Practices to Promote the Safety of Its System

PG&E asserts or implies in its testimony that it did not violate any regulation where none explicitly required certain record types to be retained or maintained in a particular way or for a specified length of time.⁴ Again, CPSD regulators expect PG&E to However, assuming for the sake of argument, there were no regulations, PG&E must keep its gas transmission system safe, regardless of specific directives to maintain data.⁵ CPSD expects all utilities to understand and implement this requirement regardless of whether an explicit recordkeeping or other safety requirement exists.

PG&E is a large and established public utility and is responsible for ensuring the safety of its customers, employees, and the public. PG&E can only do so by exercising good the best engineering practices in compliance with Section 451 of the Public Utilities Code. The

² PG&E Response Testimony Page 1-12.

³ PG&E Response Testimony Pages 1-13 to 1-15.

⁴ PG&E contends this with respect to records Ms Felts has found as inadequate to safely track the location, age, and characteristics of re-used pipe (PG&E response p. 3-28), deficient weld records (Id at 3- 54 through 3-37), deficient records needed to establish transmission pipe overpressure before federal integrity management guidelines explicitly required the information (Id at 3-68), and deficient leak records (Id at 3-64 and 3-65).

⁵ California Public Utilities Code Section 451 provides in part, "Every public utility shall 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."

transportation of gas through pipes is an activity that is hazardous to life and health if good engineering practices are not exercised over the entire system. If safety depends - as it does in some instances here – on maintaining recordkeeping that is not explicitly mandated by regulation – CPSD expects PG&E to maintain the recordkeeping needed to achieve safety. CPSD expects such from all utilities regardless of whether explicit and specific recordkeeping requirements exist.

As utility regulators, CPSD also expects PG&E to recognize when a regulation implies a requirement of good recordkeeping, although it may not explicitly mandate it. From a safety perspective, virtually all engineering data ~~on relevant to the safety of the~~ pipelines must be maintained, regardless of whether a regulation explicitly requires it. As examples, engineers need to know the life service history of a pipe and its chemical and weld characteristics before they can make integrity management decisions on whether to replace, repair, or test each pipe. The best and often the only practical means for engineers to assess these matters is by adequate recordkeeping.

In PG&E's response testimony, Mr. De Leon describes historic record keeping requirements.⁶ In his own summary, he ~~states/alleges~~ that the GO 112 series record keeping requirements became less prescriptive over time, and that federal regulators have not imposed detailed recordkeeping standards.⁷ ~~Both of these themes support~~ Assuming for the sake of argument, his allegations were true, they would not negate CPSD's view that PG&E has always had a requirement to promote the safety of its own system, regardless of whether there are specific prescriptive requirements to do so.⁸ Therefore, any explicit prescriptive or detailed record keeping requirements merely added to PG&E's basic engineering and legal duty to keep and maintain records to promote the safety of its system.

Mr. De Leon contends that "federal regulations have dealt pragmatically with the challenge that gas operators may lack complete gas pipeline safety records."⁹ However, recognizing that some utilities "may lack complete gas pipeline safety records" does not excuse the specific

⁶ PG&E Response Testimony, Chapter 1 Appendix B, June 20, 2011, Testimony of Cesar De Leon.

⁷ Ibid. at Pages 1B-15 and 1B-16.

⁸ For a discussion on the requirements for a utility to generally promote the safety of its own system, see Section II. B.

⁹ PG&E Response Testimony, Chapter 1 Appendix B, June 20, 2011, Testimony of Cesar De Leon, Page 1B-15.

violations CPSD has identified.¹⁰ PG&E had and has a duty to promote the safety of its system by properly maintaining and managing its records, so that it can make the proper decision to protect the integrity of its pipelines.

B. The Commission Has Made It Clear that a Utility Must Promote the Safety of Its System Regardless of Specific Prescription or Prohibition

In the decision that adopted General Order 112, making the ASME record keeping requirements mandatory, the Commission recognized and articulated the rationale underlying the general requirement that operators keep their systems safe. Specifically, the Commission stated,

“It is recognized that no code of safety rules, no matter how carefully and well prepared, can be relied upon to guarantee complete freedom from accidents. Moreover, the promulgation of precautionary safety rules does not remove or minimize the primary obligation and responsibility of respondents to provide safe service and facilities in their gas operations. Officers and employees of the respondents must continue to be ever conscious of the importance of safe operating practices and facilities and of their obligation to the public in that respect.”¹¹ (PG&E was one of the respondents in the GO 112 proceeding.)

Even though the Commission had the foresight in GO 112 to mandate that PG&E keep its records properly, it also recognized that regulators cannot envision and explicitly prohibit each and every way that utilities might fail to keep their systems safe, and cannot explicitly mandate each and every action that utilities must take to keep their systems safe. As such, the Commission understood that regulators cannot articulate every possible requirement to prevent an operator’s unforeseeable, but unsafe conduct.

The Commission has confirmed that the Public Utilities Code Section 451 requirement to make utilities keep their systems safe is constitutional. In *Carey v. Pacific Gas and Electric Company*, D.99-04-029 (1999), 85 CPUC 2d 682, 689, the Commission specifically said:

“...it would be virtually impossible to draft Section 451 to specifically set forth every conceivable service, instrumentality and facility which might be defined as ‘reasonable’ and necessary to promote the public safety. That the terms are incapable of precise

¹⁰ Specific violations are identified in CPSD’s supplemental testimony, Dated March 30, 2012.

¹¹ California Public Utilities Commission Decision Number 61269, “Investigation into the Need of a General Order Governing Design, Construction, Testing, Maintenance and Operation of Gas Transmission Pipeline Systems.” Page 12, Finding and Conclusion Number 8, December 28, 1960.

definition given the variety of circumstances likewise does not make Section 451 void for vagueness, either on its face or in application to the instant case. The terms "reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment and facilities" are not without a definition, standard or common understanding among utilities. . . . Accordingly, Section 451's mandate that a utility provide "reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment and facilities" is not an unconstitutionally vague standard with which to assess a fine or penalty."

IV. PG&E'S FUTURE RECORDKEEPING

Much of PG&E's response testimony is devoted to its proposals and plans to improve its records management practices.¹² CPSD welcomes changes to improve PG&E's recordkeeping and safety.¹³ However, CPSD urges the Commission to recognize that PG&E's proposals for improvement are not a defense to previous PG&E violations of the law.

Further, CPSD has not conducted discovery, analyzed or taken a position on PG&E's statements about improving its record management practices. Determining the manner in which each record keeping system should be revised or improved is not within the scope of this proceeding.

V. ASME STANDARD B31.8 CARRIES THE WEIGHT OF LAW AND ALLEGING INDEPENDENT VIOLATIONS OF THIS STANDARD IS VALID PG&E SHOULD HAVE COMPLIED WITH ASME STANDARD B31.8 AS IT REPRESENTED THE BEST INDUSTRY STANDARDS UNTIL IT WAS MANDATED IN THE COMMISSION'S GENERAL ORDER NO. 112 IN DECISION 61269

The American Standards of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) is a set of industry standards that have been followed by certain companies in the natural gas industry since long before 1956. The testimony of CPSD consultants has asserted PG&E violations of did not follow these standards. Through several witnesses, PG&E asserts that ASME Standard B31.8 does not set a legal requirement for PG&E to follow. One PG&E witness asserts, "ASME does not carry the weight of law."¹⁴ Another PG&E witness states "Using ASME Standard B31.8 as an independent basis for asserting a regulatory violation does not make any sense."¹⁵ To the contrary, as discussed below, CPSD believes ASME Standard B31.8 does carry the weight of law and can be

¹² CPSD does not concede that any of these efforts are proper remedial actions.

¹³ I.11-02-016 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling, 11/21/2011, Page 2.

¹⁴ PG&E Testimony of Maura L. Dunn at Page MD-39.

¹⁵ PG&E Response Testimony of Mr. Cesar de Leon at Page 1-5, lines 31-32.

violated. First, until the Commission's Decision 61269 mandated that California natural gas utilities shall comply with ASME Standard B31.8 in the CPUC's General Order No. 112 (effective 1961), PG&E should have complied with ASME Standard B31.8 as it represented the best industry standards prior to that time. In fact, PG&E represented to the Commission that the company followed ASME standards for gas transmission and distribution piping systems (ASME Standard B31.8). PG&E represented this in 1956¹⁶ and again in 1960: all of the California natural gas utilities, including PG&E, represented to the Commission in 1960 that they voluntarily complied with ASME Standard B31.8.¹⁷ PG&E now states it is aware of no representations made to the Commission since those times that PG&E no longer followed the American Standards Association Code for gas transmission and distribution piping systems (ASME standard B31.8).¹⁸ Regulators should be able to expect that when PG&E and other utilities make representations that they follow certain engineering standards, those utilities will not simply abandon those standards without notice to regulators. In short, PG&E's representation and the importance to PG&E safety of compliance with ASME standards requires it to follow ASME standards. Consequently, since the ASME Standard B31.8 represented the best accepted industry standards at that time, for violations prior to 1961, the Commission should find that PG&E violated section 451 of the California Public Utilities Code.

Second, since 1970, the Code of Federal Regulations has required each operator to follow its own procedures and programs that apply to its regulated pipelines.¹⁹ PG&E's representation that it voluntarily followed the ASME B31.8 standards in 1956 and 1960 gave those standards the force of law. Of course, these are matters to be addressed in briefs, but we comment here because

¹⁶ In its response to CPSD Data Request 15, Question 6 PG&E stated, "PG&E believes that, in 1956, its practice was to follow ASA B31.1.8-1955." According to that same data response, today, ASA B31.1.8- 1955 is known as ASME B31.8.

¹⁷ See D.61269, "Investigation into the Need of a General Order (GO 112) Governing Design, Construction, Testing, Maintenance and Operation of Gas Transmission Pipeline Systems.", December 28, 1960, P. 4, in which PG&E and other gas operators asserted that General Order 112 was not necessary. They were quoted by this decision as claiming, "[T]here is no evidence to show that public health or safety has suffered from the lack of a general order; that the safety record of California gas utilities has been excellent; that there have been no major pipeline failures in the State resulting in either loss of life or major interruption of service; that there is nothing to indicate this good record will not continue; and that the gas utilities in California voluntarily follow the American Standards Association (ASA) code for gas transmission and distribution piping systems." (ASME Standard B31.8).

¹⁸ PG&E Response to CPSD Data Request 71 Question 1e.

¹⁹ 10 CFR Section 102.17(c), August 10, 1970.

PG&E's response has asserted the argument. In short, CPSD believes it is appropriate to identify violations of ASME B31.8.

CPSD agrees that since the compliance with ASME Standard B31.8 was mandated in the Commission's General Order No. 112, that any *new* violation thereafter should only count as a violation of the General Order, which may be a continuing violation. This is true whether reference in CPSD's testimony is made to a violation of the ASME Standard B31.8 or to General Order 112 through General Order 112-E.

Document comparison by Workshare Compare on Wednesday, September 05, 2012 10:29:59 AM

Input:	
Document 1 ID	interwovenSite://US_LIBRARIES/USA/751525841/1
Description	#751525841v1<USA> - I1102016 Julie Halligan Testimony Draft
Document 2 ID	interwovenSite://US_LIBRARIES/USA/751525838/1
Description	#751525838v1<USA> - Revised Halligan Rebuttal Testimony
Rendering set	OHS Strikethrough No Moves No DV Footer

Legend:	
Insertion	
Deletion	
Moved from	
Moved to	
Style change	
Format change	
Manual deletion	
Inserted cell	
Deleted cell	
Moved cell	
Split/Merged cell	
Padding cell	

Statistics:	
	Count
Insertions	31
Deletions	42
Moved from	0
Moved to	0
Style change	0
Format changed	0
Total changes	73