

From: San Bruno Incident Data Requests
Sent: 12/10/2010 8:36:00 PM
To: Carter, Glen E (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GECJ)
Cc: Garber, Stephen (Law) (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SLG0);
Document Retention San Bruno 9/9/10
(/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DOCUMENTRETENTION;
Bcc:
Subject: FW: Media Inquiry: San Francisco Chronicle - Index No. 956 (updated)
Glen,

Per Steve's request, here is the final answer for Index No 956.01 through 956.04 (956.05 through 956.07 are still open).

From: San Bruno Incident Data Requests
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2010 3:18 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Document Retention San Bruno 9/9/10; San Bruno Incident Data Requests; JIC Chief; Telliano, Steve; 'Harper, Heather'
Subject: RE: Media Inquiry: San Francisco Chronicle - Index No. 956 (updated)

David,

See attached for final answers to Index No 956.01 through 956.04. (956.05 and 956.06 are still open).

Thank you,

San Bruno Incident Data Requests

From: San Bruno Incident Data

Requests

Sent: Thursday, December 09, 2010 12:00 PM

To: Redacted

Cc: JIC Chief; Garber, Stephen (Law); San Bruno Incident Data Requests; Document Retention San Bruno 9/9/10

Subject: RE: Media Inquiry: San Francisco Chronicle - Index No. 956

Your request has been logged.

Index Tracking Number: 956

Regards,

San Bruno Incident Data Requests

From: Redacted

Sent: Thursday, December 09, 2010 11:54 AM

To: San Bruno Incident Data Requests

Cc: JIC Chief; Garber, Stephen (Law)

Subject: Media Inquiry: San Francisco Chronicle

Requestor: Redacted

Outlet: San Francisco Chronicle

Deadline: Friday, 12/10 noon

Questions:

1. Did PG&E keep records of gas overpressurization incidents in its distribution and transmission system between 2002 and the fall of 2008?

2. If not, on what basis could direct assessment be performed on any transmission lines within that system, given that federal law specifies that only lines free of pressure surges over a five year period can be eligible for the direct assessment method to comply with the 2002 law?

3. In a Nov. 30, 2009 regulatory filing, PG&E asserts that there had been four pressure spikes related to Line 132 and other lines fed from the Milpitas terminal between Sept. 2008 and November 2009. Please specify what happened in each of the four incidents. Also, since PG&E had documented pressure spikes on the line as of November 2009, on what basis did it proceed on direct assessment that month of Line 132?

4. The automatic relief valve on Line 132 kicked in at a pressure of 386 psig. That would suggest that MAOP at some place on the line was in fact 350 psig and that with 10 percent allowable, the maximum pressure was 385 (thus triggering relief at 386). PG&E has a history of linking networks in the distribution side with differing MAOPs, (five cases discovered in 2008/09) setting one MAOP for both. Was that the case in Line 132? In other words, was the established MAOP for the 1956 repair done on Line 132 -- based on the quality of pipe and or welds used at the time -- lower than the rest of the line, which had an MAOP of 400 and an MOP of 375?