

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Safety and Enforcement Division
Gas Safety and Reliability Branch
Gas Engineering and Compliance Section

Incident Investigation Report

Report Date: 05/07/2023

Incident Number: G 20221116-3460

Utility: Pacific Gas and Electric PG&E

Date and Time of the Incident: 11/16/2022, 11:45:00 AM

Location of the Incident: [REDACTED] Grant Street Concord, Contra Costa County
Concord ,CA
County: Contra Costa

Summary of Incident:

On November 16, 2022, a third-party struck and damaged PG&E's gas main facilities on [REDACTED] Grant Street in Concord, CA. There were no fatalities or injuries. Media, Fire and Police were on site. This incident was reported to DOT and CPUC due to media coverage and the estimated property damage of at least \$129,300. CPUC determined that PG&E did not violate General order 112-F or Reference Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 192 in this incident.

Casualties: *Fatalities:* 0 *Injuries:* 0

Property Damage: \$415,072.00

Utility Facilities involved:

Pipe Material = Steel, Pipe Size = 4 (inches), MAOP = 60 (psi), Operating Pressure = 54 (psi)

Witnesses:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Phone</i>
1 Yi Yang	CPUC Investigator	N/A

- [REDACTED] Superintendent (Bay Cities P (925) 766-4149
- [REDACTED] PG&E Damage Prevention (925) 428-1001
- [REDACTED] Equipment Operator (Griffin (925) 862-2260

Evidence:

<i>Source</i>	<i>Description</i>
1 PG&E	Initial & Final 420 Report
2 Bay Cities Paving & Grading	Interview Statement
3 Griffin Soil	Interview Statement
4 PG&E	USA Ticket

Observations and Findings:

On November 16, 2022, PG&E's "incident on-call personnel" confirmed that a third-party construction equipment struck a buried 4" steel distribution main and caused a release of natural gas that subsequently ignited. The dig-in incident was located at the East side of Grant Street, across the street from the residence of [REDACTED] Grant Street, Concord, CA. PG&E personnel responded and stopped the gas flow at approximately 1227 hours. There were no injuries or fatalities. News Media, Fire Department and Police were on scene. No customer interruption was reported because the damaged main pipeline was a feeder pipeline. This incident was reported to the DOT #1352705 once it was confirmed that a release of gas and the estimated cost of property damage exceeded (\$129,300) the reportable limit.

CPUC arrived at the incident site on about 1444 hours on November 16, 2022. CPUC engineer spoke with Mr. [REDACTED], the superintendent of the third-party company; Bay Cities Paving & Grading, Inc. The superintendent provided a valid USA ticket (X227900054) which expired at the midnight of November 16, 2022, but he declined to answer more questions. From the observation of CPUC's engineer, the asphalt was removed before the excavation activity and there was no visible line locate-markings. The involved equipment was a Wirtgen 250i soil stabilizer that belonged to the sub-contractor Griffin Soil. The equipment operator [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said he did not observe any facility markings at the damage location and was completely unaware that a gas main was within the area of excavation. [REDACTED] said the depth of the mixer blades were set at 8 inches below grade (this measurement was post asphalt removal which added 10 inches). According to [REDACTED], Bay Cities was responsible for potholing all marked facilities within the path of excavation but did not explain how pothole communications were shared.

CPUC spoke to PG&E's locator, [REDACTED] who marked the area in which the dig-

in occurred. He indicated that he located and marked the damaged pipeline pursuant to the ticket submitted by Griffin Soils on 10/19/22 (USA ticket #X229201521). █████ █████ed and marked the damaged 4-inch steel gas main with yellow paint on the roadway surface on Oct 22, 2022. He photographed the marks and attached them to the USA ticket submitted by Griffin Soils. CPUC reviewed the before and after photographs of the facility markings at the area where the incident occurred and determined that the gas main was marked correctly. Bay Cities removed the asphalt together with the markings, thus Griffin Soil was not aware of the gas main during excavation.

Bay Cities was the general contractor hired to replace the roadway for the City of Concord. Griffin Soil was a sub-contractor of the Bay Cities Paving & Grading. Griffin Soil had a valid ticket at the time of the incident. PG&E's Locate and Mark responded and marked its facilities correctly.

Preliminary Statement of Pertinent General Order, Public Utilities Code Requirements, and/or Federal Requirements:

None

Conclusion:

Based on the information from investigation, PG&E did not violation the General order 112-F Reference Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 192 in this incident. Griffin Soil failed to hand dig and pothole within the delineated area prior to the use of power operated equipment within the tolerance zone. Griffin Soil failed to maintain and/or request remarkings prior to excavation and it conflicts with California Government Code (CGC) Section 4216.4 and CGC Section 4216.3.

REQUIREMENT TO HAND DIG AND VERIFY MARKS

(a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), if an excavation is within the tolerance zone of a subsurface installation, the excavator shall determine the exact location of the subsurface installations in conflict with the excavation using hand tools before using any power-driven excavation or boring equipment within the tolerance zone of the subsurface installations. In all cases the excavator shall use reasonable care to prevent damaging subsurface installations.
4216.3.

REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN MARKS OR REQUEST RE-MARKS

(b) If the field marks are no longer reasonably visible, an excavator shall renotify the regional notification center with a request for remarks that can be for all or a portion of the excavation. Excavation shall cease in the area to be remarked. If the delineation markings are no longer reasonably visible, the excavator shall re-delineate the area to be remarked. If remarks are requested, the operator shall have two working days, not including the date of request, to remark the subsurface installation. If the area to be remarked is not the full extent of the original excavation, the excavator shall delineate the portion to be remarked and provide a description of the area requested to be remarked on the ticket. The excavator shall

provide a description for the area to be remarked that falls within the area of the original location request.