

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

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.

Investigation 11-02-016  
(Filed February 24, 2011)

**RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO  
PG&E'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ALJ'S MARCH 28 RULING OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, DIRECTING OTHER PARTIES TO REFILE THEIR OPENING BRIEFS  
DELETING REFERENCE TO MATERIALS NOT IN THE RECORD OF THIS  
PROCEEDING**

In its Motion for Reconsideration of the ALJ's March 28th Ruling (Motion), PG&E argues that the ALJ should require the City and County of San Francisco (San Francisco) to remove from its Opening Brief citations to the report issued by Independent Review Panel (IRP). PG&E's request is without merit and should be denied.

The IRP was formed by the Commission through Resolution L-403 on September 23, 2010 to "gather facts and make recommendations based on the facts to the Commission as to whether there is a need for the general improvement of the safety of PG&E's natural gas transmission lines, and if so, how these improvements should be made." The IRP issued a report on June 8, 2011. Comments and reply comments on the report were submitted July 15 and July 29, 2011. The IRP is available on the Commission's website and has been referenced numerous times throughout the rulemaking and investigations related to the San Bruno explosion.

In this way, the IRP report is no different from the NTSB report. The ALJ granted official notice of the NTSB report, as requested by PG&E, in her March 28, 2013 e-mail ruling. In granting official notice of the NTSB and CPSD Reports, the ruling notes "[a]ll parties in the proceeding are

familiar with both these reports, and there is no prejudice to CPSD or intervenors in taking notice of them at this late date.” The IRP report is in the record in Investigation 12-01-007, like the NTSB and CPSD reports. In addition, PG&E filed comments and reply comments on the IRP report so there is no basis here for a claim of prejudice by PG&E.

Furthermore, judicial notice of the IRP is proper because CPUC Rule 13.9 provides that the Commission may take official notice of “such matters as may be judicially noticed by the courts of the State of California pursuant to Evidence Code section 450 et seq.” It is well established under Cal. Evid. Code §452(c) that an official act of the state of California may be judicially noticed and that “reports, and orders of administrative agencies are “official acts” of which a court may take judicial notice.” *Rodas v. Spiegel* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 513, 518; *Hogen v. Valley Hospital* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 119, 125.

PG&E’s argument that the Commission should not judicially notice the IRP because it does not meet the requirements of Cal. Evid. Code §452(h)<sup>1</sup> is without merit. The contents of the IRP report are publicly available and not reasonably subject to dispute. If PG&E wants to draw different conclusions from those contents than has San Francisco, it is free to do so in its reply brief. This argument is further undermined by PG&E’s positive statements regarding the report. PG&E’s comments on the IRP stated, “Although our review continues, we agree in full spirit with the panel’s overall conclusions and in principle with its 18 formal recommendations.” (PG&E’s Comments on the Independent Review Panel Report filed July 15, 2011 in R.11-02-019 at p.1)

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial notice may be taken of the following matters to the extent that they are not embraced within Section 451: Facts and propositions that are not reasonably subject to dispute and are capable of immediate and accurate determination by resort to sources of reasonably indisputable accuracy. *Cal. Evid. Code §452(h)*.

For the foregoing reasons, the ALJ should deny PG&E's request to strike the reference to the IRP report from San Francisco's Opening Brief.

Dated: April 10, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney  
THERESA L. MUELLER  
Chief Energy And Telecommunications Deputy  
MARGARITA GUTIERREZ  
Deputy City Attorney

By:                   /S/                    
MARGARITA GUTIERREZ

Attorneys for:  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4682  
Telephone: (415) 554-4632  
Facsimile: (415) 554-4763  
E-Mail: margarita.gutierrez@sfgov.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, KIANA V. DAVIS, declare that:

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is City Attorney's Office, City Hall, Room 234, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 554-4649.

On April 10, 2013, I served:

**RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO  
PG&E'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ALJ'S MARCH 28 RULING OR, IN  
THE ALTERNATIVE, DIRECTING OTHER PARTIES TO REFILE THEIR OPENING  
BRIEFS DELETING REFERENCE TO MATERIALS NOT IN THE RECORD OF THIS  
PROCEEDING**

by electronic mail on all parties in CPUC Proceeding No. I.11-02-016 on the attached list.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on April 10, 2013, at San Francisco, California.

/S/

\_\_\_\_\_  
KIANA V. DAVIS

Email Service List I.11-02-016

StephanieC@greenlining.org  
kdaly@stinson.com  
catherine.mazzeo@swgas.com  
dng@SempraUtilities.com  
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov  
rcc@cpuc.ca.gov  
tbo@cpuc.ca.gov  
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org  
tlong@turn.org  
BKC7@pge.com  
cpj2@pge.com  
lhj2@pge.com  
JMalkin@Orrick.com  
BCragg@GoodinMacbride.com  
smeyers@meyersnave.com  
bmcc@mccarthyllaw.com  
martinhomec@gmail.com  
ESelmon@Jemzar.com  
RegRelCPUCCases@pge.com  
cassandra.sweet@dowjones.com  
enriqueg@greenlining.org  
jheckler@levincap.com  
j7se@pge.com  
lauren.duke@db.com  
mchediak@bloomberg.net  
thnxvm@gmail.com  
dvanhoogstraten@stinson.com  
scott.senchak@decade-llc.com  
mfallon@taloncap.com  
anjani.vedula@db.com  
John.A.Apgar@Citi.com  
andrewgay@arcassetltd.com  
kfallon@sirfunds.com  
ted@PointState.com  
jdangelo@catapult-llc.com  
mgoldenberg@luminusmgmt.com  
sunny.kwak@macquarie.com  
bnaeve@levincap.com  
NStein@LevinCap.com  
randall@nexusamllc.com  
naaz.khumawala@baml.com  
JLsalazar@SempraUtilities.com  
SHruby@SempraUtilities.com  
MFranco@SempraUtilities.com  
RPrince@SempraUtilities.com  
angelica.morales@sce.com  
douglas.porter@sce.com  
Francis.McNulty@sce.com  
gcaldwell@sanbruno.ca.gov  
kfabry@sanbruno.ca.gov  
cjackson@ci.sanbruno.ca.us  
rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
austin.yang@sfgov.org

Email Service List I.11-02-016

nsuetake@turn.org  
bts1@pge.com  
filings@a-klaw.com  
ked6@pge.com  
nes@a-klaw.com  
sgs@dcbsf.com  
gburke@ap.org  
cem@newsdata.com  
grant.kolling@cityofpaloalto.org  
bstrottman@meyersnave.com  
jmullan@meyersnave.com  
service@cforat.org  
pucservice@dralegal.org  
margaret@mfelts.com  
abb@eslawfirm.com  
william.wester@smud.org  
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com  
wmc@a-klaw.com  
rvn@a-klaw.com  
MD7@cpuc.ca.gov  
dbp@cpuc.ca.gov  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov  
michael.colvin@cpuc.ca.gov  
kwt@cpuc.ca.gov  
ayk@cpuc.ca.gov  
ako@cpuc.ca.gov  
caj@cpuc.ca.gov  
djg@cpuc.ca.gov  
edd@cpuc.ca.gov  
cpe@cpuc.ca.gov  
hym@cpuc.ca.gov  
kcl@cpuc.ca.gov  
kab@cpuc.ca.gov  
mwt@cpuc.ca.gov  
mlc@cpuc.ca.gov  
ram@cpuc.ca.gov  
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov  
tcr@cpuc.ca.gov  
tff@cpuc.ca.gov