

From: Horner, Trina
Sent: 4/18/2011 4:01:54 PM
To: Stock, William (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=WCS3);
'Cooke, Michelle' (michelle.cooke@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: T-40/41, T-96N/96S Customer Hydrostatic Testing Communications Materials

Ok, thanks. I've passed these along and we'll take a look if there is an opportunity to modify materials going forward.
Trina

From: Cooke, Michelle [mailto:michelle.cooke@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Stock, William; Horner, Trina
Subject: FW: T-40/41, T-96N/96S Customer Hydrostatic Testing Communications Materials

Bill and Trina- obviously this is too late for materials for this week, but here are some thoughts from Sunil Shori for your consideration for future rounds.

From: Shori, Sunil
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 2:29 PM
To: Cooke, Michelle; San Bruno Gas Safety
Cc: Enis, Phillip
Subject: RE: T-40/41, T-96N/96S Customer Hydrostatic Testing Communications Materials

Michelle:

An important part of the notification process is the envelope itself. More often than not, the public does not read the contents; however, it's imperative they read this one so they understand what's being done and in order to reduce the number of calls that will eventually be received by PG&E and the CPUC (i.e., smell of gas, PG&E didn't provide the notification, etc.). To that effect, I suggest the outer message on the envelope could be changed to make it more likely that customer's would actually open the envelope and read its contents. The change would be to have the message say "Important information about **gas pipeline** work taking place in your area" instead of just "Important information about work taking place in your area."

In addition, PG&E's literature states: "State standards for hydrostatic testing new pipelines were established in 1961, and federal standards for hydrostatic testing were established in 1970. Pipelines installed after these regulations became effective were hydrostatically tested prior to being put into service." It's correct that pipelines after these regulations were required to be pressure tested; however, as we are already aware of records issues related to pressure testing, it seems a stretch to accept PG&E's statement that its pipelines were hydro-tested. In order to avoid possible issues of public confusion later, PG&E's literature should simply say: "State standards for hydrostatic testing new pipelines were established in 1961, and federal standards for hydrostatic testing were established in 1970. Pipelines installed after these regulations became effective were **required to be** hydrostatically tested prior to being put into service."

Finally, in its Hydrostatic Testing Fact Sheet, I believe the paragraph following Item 8) has the potential to be very confusing or troubling to the average customer. This paragraph states: "If a section does not reach or hold the pressure, that means that the pressure from the hydrostatic test has caused the pipe to either leak or rupture. If that occurs, the leak is located, repaired, and the pipe section is tested again. Sections that don't pass the test are replaced." This paragraph, following Item 8) which essentially highlights the last step of the hydro-testing process and places the line back into service, is unclear in conveying that the leak or rupture it is referring to is part of the hydro-test. I believe someone could reasonably infer that the paragraph is referring to a failure that could occur after the line has been placed back into service carrying gas. Also, the use of the word "rupture" in the paragraph should be reconsidered since the public will most likely equate a possible hydro-test rupture with the rupture that occurred during the incident.

I don't know if it's possible to make any changes to PG&E's communication materials; however, this is the first time I have had an opportunity to review them.

Thanks, Michelle.

Sunil

From: Cooke, Michelle
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 10:59 AM

To: San Bruno Gas Safety
Subject: FW: T-40/41, T-96N/96S Customer Hydrostatic Testing Communications Materials

FYI

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 17, 2011 4:57 PM
To: Cooke, Michelle
Cc: Stock, William
Subject: T-40/41, T-96N/96S Customer Hydrostatic Testing Communications Materials

Michelle,

Following up on your previous conversation w/ Bill, attached are the following final communications documents relating to the Mountainview and Antioch hydrotesting projects:

Customer outreach letter for Mountainview (with correct mail date)

Customer outreach letter for Antioch (with correct mail date)

Hydrostatic Testing fact sheet (which will accompany the letter)

Mailing envelope

Outreach door hanger

The letters are in English with "translation available" wording, which is similar to how PG&E handled other languages in the "2,000 foot proximity" letters. The bulk, but not all, of the door hangers will be both English and Spanish. I am told that English is the primary demographic in these first two project locations.

Let us know if you have any questions,

Trina