

From: Clanon, Paul  
Sent: 12/17/2010 12:17:37 PM  
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Re: Update on 101

Ok. Thx.

On Dec 17, 2010, at 12:14 PM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

> I'm out of the office today but can be reached at Redacted You are also welcome to chat with Kirk directly about it. He suspects it will come out in a reply to a question Sunday.

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Clanon, Paul [<mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>]

> Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2010 09:15 PM

> To: Cherry, Brian K; Frank Lindh <[frank.lindh@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:frank.lindh@cpuc.ca.gov)>

> Subject: Re: Update on 101

>

> A discussion item.

>

> On Dec 16, 2010, at 8:30 PM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

>

>> Paul - I want you to be aware of an issue before it surfaces at the Sunday Town Hall. As a result of the failure in line 132 , we reduced the line pressure in 132, 101 and 109 to 80 percent of pressure, from 375 to 300. We did this in all three pipeline because they feed from a common source at Milpitas. Subsequently, we have put in additional valves and equipment that have isolated the three pipelines. Line 101 by itself is rated at 400 MAOP. In theory then, we can increase the pressure from the current 300 psi to 320 psi and still comply with the previous and current order. This increase in pressure would give us additional flexibility should cold weather roll in. We are not seeking authorization to increase the pressure to 320 nor are we considering increasing it unilaterally. You can, however, understand why we might want to increase pressure to give us additional protection for the core. That said, I don't want to appear to be too cute with the rules either. I'd rather you know and offer advice before we tried to do anything at all. I'd appreciate your thoughts on this. Thx.