

From: Clanon, Paul  
Sent: 9/11/2010 2:25:08 PM  
To: Bottorff, Thomas E (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TEB3)  
Cc: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7);  
Clanon, Paul (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov); frank.lindh@cpuc.ca.gov  
(frank.lindh@cpuc.ca.gov)

Bcc:

Subject: Re: Pipeline replacement plans

Thanks, Tom.

On Sep 11, 2010, at 2:22 PM, "Bottorff, Thomas E" <TEB3@pge.com> wrote:

> 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]  
> [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  
>  
> <Page\_from\_Chapter\_06\_Updated\_Workpapers\_Capital\_Expenditures\_20100326-3[1].pdf>