

August 19, 2015

April Mulqueen
California Public Utilities Commission
Policy and Planning Division
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.703.1112

Dear Ms. Mulqueen:

The purpose of this letter is to briefly introduce myself; my name is Rene Morales and I am the mother of Jessica Morales who died in the San Bruno PG&E gas pipe explosion on September 9th 2010. Recovery is a long process and no one really finds complete peace when a love one is ripped away in a tragic event such as the explosion that took place at 1701 Earl St. That address was the home of Joseph Ruigomez's family and Jessica's boyfriend. Although we are unable to reverse the hands of time and reclaim what was taken away, I firmly believe there is always a better future.

A wise person once told me we can't do better unless we know better which is why I would like to take the time to introduce GAS PIPE SAFETY FIRST, a nonprofit independent organization.

According to your solicitation email that was sent out from California Public Utility Commission office I would like to take the first step in offering my organization as a safety intervener, and at the same time take the opportunity to briefly submit my response to the specific issues and questions.

I look forward to attending the meeting that is going to be held on September 24, 2015, and offering my input as a Safety intervener.

Sincerely,

Rene L Morales

CC: Kimberly Archie

1. Should the Commission ensure there is an organization specifically dedicated to utility safety issues in Commission proceedings?

The Commissions should ensure there is an organization specifically dedicated to utility safety issues in Commission proceedings.

Safety is important because people can die as a result of inadequate safety measures.

The utilities cannot be relied on to put in place adequate safety measures on their own.

There is history of collusion between the CPUC and the gas utilities.

There should be an independent organization separate from CPUC so there accountability based on objective and unbiased review of the proceeding and their outcomes.

An independent organization would be able to hold both the utilities and the CPUC to some level of accountability based on objective and unbiased review of and their outcomes.

2. What organizations, new or existing, should intervene on utility safety issues?

GPSF a newly created organization would enhance communication and develop a fair and amercible working relationship and in addition would act as the conscience behind the industry.

The Daniella Dawn Smalley foundation has been in existence for 18 yrs.' and has excellent safety, training and advocating program.

I believe with their experience, guidance and agreed to partnership with Gas Pipe Safety First it would be an excellent start to completing some of the key missing components in the pipeline industry.

3. Should ORA or other interveners on behalf of ratepayers be responsible for both safety and rate advocacy?

Rate payer advocacy and safety advocacy should be addressed separately.

It has been established there is a conflict of interest between people trying to keep rates low and people advocating for greater safety measures, so I would recommend that ratepayers advocates for rates and safety interveners advocate for safety.

4. Are there competencies the Commission must require for a safety intervener?

I believe yes, the CPUC should require that the safety intervener have certain competencies but that other organization should not be barred from participation in the proceedings and submission of comments if they fail to meet these competencies. I also believe if CPUC wants Safety intervener they should have to make it clear to exactly what those other expectations are and set up workshops to help develop those interested in becoming a safety intervener.

5. Are there conflicts that should be addressed in intervener safety participation; for example, a ratepayer advocate who also seeks compensation as an advocate for a safety action or expenditure?

6. Are there barriers to safety advocate participation that the Commission must address?

The Commission's intervener compensation program is insufficient to incent participation for the same reason it has always been insufficient: the mechanism supports the participation of existing interveners, but does permit entry of those who are not established. A proceeding often takes 18 months, and in 2012 half of the decisions for intervener compensation were over 6 months late. Only an established intervener organization can work for two years in advance of compensation.

If the Commission wants safety interveners, it needs to support them differently. The San Bruno penalty decision was an opportunity to direct money to develop safety interveners, but that opportunity was missed. We understand that this is not a simple issue, and it will require workshops and perhaps hearings to develop a program to fund safety interveners. If the Commission does not continue to explore new avenues for funding, though, we will continue to get what we have been getting, and the Commission will risk slipping back to the types of decision-making that led to PG&E's explosion in San Bruno.

Enclosing the commission should be looking into how is it best to support or develop a safety advocate or interveners. The assistance in the creation of an organization that is not biased for either PG&E or CPUC can only improve on the success, as the commissions office the only barrier are those who do not want to be transparent.