

From: Clanon, Paul
Sent: 3/4/2011 4:09:02 AM
To: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC)
Cc: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Reporter Question

Thx.

On Mar 4, 2011, at 12:32 AM, "Horner, Trina" <TNHc@pge.com> wrote:

> Paul - here's what info I could quickly gather on this question:
>
> This is based on an NTSB exhibit (obviously now public, attached), and
> we believe the reporter will run a front page story tomorrow and may run
> another on Saturday.
>
> *
> This is a Gas Pipeline Replacement Program project. The GPRP
> started in 1985 as a 25 year program to replace old (cast iron, etc)
> transmission and distribution pipe. I don't know for 100% certainty,
> but I believe the particular project specifically would not have been
> approved by the CPUC at the time. GPRP is now distribution only, and
> the Transmission portion was replaced by the Transmission Integrity
> Management program.
> * The referenced NTSB exhibit is a PG&E Geosciences Department
> letter to San Bruno about doing seismic work in San Bruno. Has some
> broad language about replacing Line 132 in San Bruno. It contains a map
> showing work around the ruptured segment and with a summary description.
> PG&E has confirmed it did do the work in the map.
>
> Sorry to get back to you so late.
> Trina
>
>
>
> From: Clanon, Paul [<mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>]
> Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2011 05:22 PM
> To: Johnson, Kirk; Cherry, Brian K
> Subject: Fwd: Reporter Question
>
>
> What's the deal with this?
>
>
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
>

>
> From: "Prosper, Terrie D." <terrie.prosper@cpuc.ca.gov>
> Date: March 3, 2011 8:18:39 PM EST
> To: "Clark, Richard W." <richard.clark@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Halligan,
> Julie" <julie.halligan@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Stepanian, Raffy" <
> raffy.stepanian@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Lee, Dennis M." <dennis.lee@cpuc.ca.gov>
> Cc: "Clanon, Paul" <paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>
> Subject: Re: Reporter Question

>
>
> The reporter says that PG&E called him back and said they
> completed the project. We wouldn't have had to approve it?

>
> The reporter says PG&E replaced pipe within about 10 houses of
> where it blew up, but didn't go to that spot.

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

> From: Clark, Richard W.
> To: Prosper, Terrie D.; Clark, Richard W.; Halligan, Julie;
> Stepanian, Raffy; Lee, Dennis M.
> Cc: Clanon, Paul
> Sent: Thu Mar 03 16:21:10 2011
> Subject: RE: Reporter Question

>
> Hi Terrie - We would not have approved the project. He'll need
> tool ask PG&E, or we can data request the info (which will take a few
> days).

> Sent from my Windows Mobile(r) phone.

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

> From: Prosper, Terrie D. <terrie.prosper@cpuc.ca.gov>
> Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2011 4:15 PM
> To: Clark, Richard W. <richard.clark@cpuc.ca.gov>; Halligan,
> Julie <julie.halligan@cpuc.ca.gov>; Stepanian, Raffy <
> raffy.stepanian@cpuc.ca.gov>; Lee, Dennis M. <dennis.lee@cpuc.ca.gov>
> Cc: Clanon, Paul <paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>
> Subject: Reporter Question

> Hello,

>
> The Mercury News is trying to find out today some information
> about Document 2-DW on the NTSB docket from the San Bruno pipeline
> accident. It's titled "1992 PG&E Geologic Hazard Evaluations" and it
> outlines plans by PG&E in 1993 to replace sections of line 132 and line
> 109 in San Bruno for seismic safety reasons. It's at:

> <<http://www.nts.gov/Dockets/PipeLine/DCA10MP008/460223.pdf>>
> <http://www.nts.gov/Dockets/PipeLine/DCA10MP008/460223.pdf>

>
> Two questions:

> 1) Did the CPUC ever approve this project? If so, are details in
> documents online?

>
> 2) Did PG&E ever construct it?
>
> Any idea how I'd find out?
>
> Thanks,
>
> Terrie
>
>
> <Ex 2-DW.pdf>