

From: Bottorff, Thomas E
Sent: 9/11/2010 2:21:44 PM
To: 'Clanon, Paul' (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov); 'frank.lindh@cpuc.ca.gov'
(frank.lindh@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Bcc:
Subject: FW: Pipeline replacement plans

Paul and Frank,

We just learned that the New York Times received a copy of the attached workpaper from our most recent Gas Transmission and Storage Rate case (most likely from TURN).

The workpaper identifies a segment of Line 132 that needs to be replaced because it has a "high risk and likelihood of failure." The segment referred to in the workpaper is not the segment that ruptured, but the NYT may draw that conclusion. The workpaper also notes that miles 42.13 to 43.55 of Line 132 "ranks in the top 100 highest risk line sections..." There is likely to be interest in identifying the other 99 transmission segments that may be at risk.

I'm told that a story could come out tomorrow. We're still developing our response.
Tom

From: Marre, Charles
Sent: Friday, September 10, 2010 9:53 PM
To: Bottorff, Thomas E
Subject: Fw: Pipeline replacement plans

Fyi. The note from Florio.

From: Mike Florio <mflorio@turn.org>
To: Stock, William; [Redacted]; Patrizio, Mark (Law); [Redacted]; Whelan, Steve (GT&D); [Redacted]; Marre, Charles; [Redacted]
Sent: Fri Sep 10 20:12:01 2010
Subject: Pipeline replacement plans

PG&E folks -- Tom Beach found the attached page in the GT&S workpapers at WP 6-56. It sure sounds like the area of the explosion, or something very close to it (I was wrong about Line 109, which I attribute to my bad old eyes as well as a severely faded map). Can anyone confirm whether or not it was this segment? This is not for litigation purposes, of course, but we are being inundated with press calls and I would like to be able to provide accurate information. Risk assessment suddenly seems a lot more real than it did just a short while ago .

. . . Mike

At 03:53 PM 9/10/2010, Mike Florio wrote:

Thanks, Bill -- I'll look these over and get you any comments. And, since we're sure to get questions on the subject of the day, I'm awfully glad that the settlement gives the company pretty much everything it asked for on pipeline integrity management! Does anyone happen to know the number of the line that exploded? From my very old system map with the very tiny print (and my old eyes) it looks like it might have been Line 109, but I'm really not sure.
What a horrible situation! Mike

At 03:46 PM 9/10/2010, Stock, William wrote:

<<2010 09 02 Gas Accord V - Simon_v3.PPT>>

Gentlemen:

Attached for your review and comment are some draft slides for Commissioner/Advisor briefings. Given that we will Brief Comm. Simon next Thursday it would be helpful if you could return your comments by mid day next Tuesday.

I will try to set up a brief call to discuss who should cover what material.

Thanks.

Bill