

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
San Bruno GT Line Rupture Investigation
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	CPUC_096-01		
PG&E File Name:	SanBrunoGT-LineRuptureInvestigation_DR_CPUC_096-Q01		
Request Date:	March 8, 2011	Requester DR No.:	
Date Sent:	March 14, 2011	Requesting Party:	CPUC (CPSD)
		Requester:	Michael Robertson

QUESTION 1

Did PG&E exhaust all PUC-approved funds for its 1985 pipeline replacement program designated for San Bruno? How were portions of pipe determined to be replaced? What portions of pipe were replaced including mile point numbers?

ANSWER 1

PG&E began the Gas Pipeline Replacement Program (GPRP) in 1985 to replace certain aging gas distribution and transmission pipe throughout its system. The distribution portion of the original program targeted the replacement of cast iron main and pre-1931 steel distribution main. The transmission portion of the GPRP was to replace pipe with girth weld types known to experience high stress failure. This included segments containing oxy-acetylene gas welds or unshielded electric arc welds. The program has evolved over the years in terms of scope (which pipe was included) and the methodology for prioritizing pipe replacement. Transmission pipe remaining in GPRP was transferred to the transmission risk management program in 2000. Information about PG&E's spending on GPRP, and the work completed under the program, can be found in PG&E's annual GPRP reports provided to the Commission.

PG&E typically has not requested funds for GPRP based on specifically identified projects (in San Bruno or elsewhere). PG&E is continuing to review work papers from older General Rate Cases to confirm this. Furthermore, the funding that the Commission has approved in PG&E's General Rate Cases for GPRP was not designated for specific locations or projects.

The two segments discussed in the media that were replaced north and south of the segment that ruptured were identified for replacement based on studies done at the time, which identified geologic hazards associated with the San Andreas Fault (see below in the response to question 2). All of the pipe in these two segments that were identified in the geological hazard studies were replaced. The mile point numbers of the two sections of Line 132 replaced are shown below in the response to question 2.