

From: Horner, Trina
Sent: 3/3/2011 9:32:30 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7);
'pac@cpuc.ca.gov' (pac@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Fwd: Reporter Question

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 to ask PG&E, or we can data request the info (which will take a few days).

Sent from my Windows Mobile® 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>

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