

From: Horner, Trina
Sent: 4/15/2011 8:08:28 AM
To: 'michelle.cooke@cpuc.ca.gov' (michelle.cooke@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Hydro Testing: Response to Julie Halligan's Letter to Kirk Johnson

Ok, I will pass these on and get answers.

On the first question, we should discuss. I haven't been involved in detail but I think they are briefing legislators and communities individually so they can review the individual circumstances and details of each test. I am thinking If this list gets to a legislator who has a test in his or her district, in advance of PGE sitting there to answer questions, there could be concern. And remember this schedule is subject to revision as permitting, etc issues come up. Maybe there is some other form of the info the folks here could put together for sharing? Or maybe I am off base and it is fine. Let me check.
Trina

From: Cooke, Michelle [mailto:michelle.cooke@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2011 10:47 PM
To: Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Hydro Testing: Response to Julie Halligan's Letter to Kirk Johnson

Trina- would you guys feel comfortable with us using this list, understanding it remains a tentative schedule, with local gov't and legislators as needed?

A few other items related to the hydro test stuff that came up in some discussions I had today that we did not ask but we'd like to see more definitively described when the info in response to the Halligan 4/13/11 letter is done are:

1. What type of weld will be done for the replacement pipe segments (i.e., the replacements for the cans cut out for the hydrotesting)?

2. In a meeting that I had today someone asked, lets say the explosion had happened somewhere else on the system but with similar characteristics to San Bruno (i.e, those segments that fit into the 152 miles scheduled for hydro testing), are PG&E's records such that the San Bruno segment would have been identified in culling the records? I think the point of the questions boils down to, given the state of PG&E's records, how can we be confident that the list we plan to test would have captured San Bruno? I think the disconnect for some people is if the records are bad, how can you say these segments are similar to the one that blew. We need a short on point answer to that and I'm not yet able to respond adequately.

3. What languages with the communications materials be done in? I seem to recall Spanish, but have the languages needed been matched to demographics?

4. As part of the communication plan, it indicates that PG&E intends to send a follow up letter to customers describing the results of the test. There is definitely some interest in us (CPUC) having some

involvement in that letter, so we should discuss and explore this.

It would be good to have 1 & 2 incorporated into any subsequent response to CPSD. 3 & 4 can just come to me informally.

Thanks Trina.

Michelle

From: Stock, William [mailto:WCS3@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2011 11:05 AM
To: Halligan, Julie
Cc: Cooke, Michelle; Clark, Richard W.; Prosper, Terrie D.
Subject: Hydro Testing: Response to Julie Halligan's Letter to Kirk Johnson

<<Response to Halligan Letter_final.doc>> <<Hydrotest Segments Response to CPUC Letter to Kirk Johnson.xls>>

Julie:

Attached is our response to your April 8 Letter to Kirk Johnson. I am sending you this electronically to expedite your review of our answers to your questions.

The letter references additional enclosures which are maps of the test sites. Those files are massive and I have had them copied to data CDs. I will be coming to the Commission this morning to hand deliver those to you and the CCs to this e-mail along with hard copies of the attached letter.

Please let me know as soon as possible if you need any more information on this as we need to start our customer communications as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Bill