

**California Underground Facilities Safe Excavation Board**

In the Matter of  
Southern California Gas Company,  
Respondent

Case No. C223470004

**DECISION REGARDING NOTICE OF PROBABLE VIOLATION**

On November 13, 2023, the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety, California Underground Facilities Safe Excavation Board (the Board) considered Case No. C223470004. Board investigative staff issued six separate Notices of Probable Violation (NOPVs) to Southern California Gas Company (Respondent), each dated September 18, 2023, and each alleging a violation of Government Code section 4216.3, subsection (c)(1)(A). Respondent submitted a response of “no contest” to all six NOPVs. This decision, No. 2023\_11\_C223470004-0118-6, is for ticket No. A222840118-00A.

Board members Bianchini, Johns, Johnson, Muñoz, and Voss participated in the decision.

**FINDINGS**

Having considered the investigation report and the Respondents response of “no contest”, the Board finds that a violation of Government Code (Gov. Code) section 4216.3, subsection (c)(1)(A) occurred.

**VIOLATION SUMMARY**

**Respondent failed to provide an electronic positive response.**

Government Code section 4216.3, subsection (c)(1)(A) requires operators to provide an electronic positive response (EPR) through the regional notification center before the legal excavation start date and time. Respondent did not send an EPR through the regional notification center before the legal start date and time.

**JURISDICTION**

When the Board finds a probable violation of the Dig Safe Act (Gov. Code section 4216 et seq.), the Board must transmit the investigation results and any recommended penalty to the appropriate agency identified in Gov. Code section 4216.6, subsection (c) or (d). This matter is subject to the jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission which may accept, amend, or reject this Board’s recommendation.

**SANCTIONS**

The Board RECOMMENDS that the CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION order Respondent to take the Board's education course.

The following factors were considered relevant to this sanction determination:

- Respondent did not send an electronic positive response before the legal start date and time.
- Respondent submitted a response of "no contest."

/s/ Amparo Muñoz  
Amparo Muñoz, Chair

Date: 12/22/2023