

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

PG&E Data Request No.:	CPUC_100-06		
PG&E File Name:	SanBrunoGT-LineRuptureInvestigation_DR_CPUC_100-Q06		
Request Date:	March 21, 2011	Requester DR No.:	
Date Sent:	April 29, 2011	Requesting Party:	CPUC (ED)
		Requester:	Eugene Cadenasso

**QUESTION 6**

The following items correspond to Job Number 51958719 (Callan Blvd., Daly City) that appears in GPRP Annual Reports for 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 submitted to the CPUC.

- a) Describe in detail the work associated with Job Number 51958719 (Callan Blvd., Daly City) including all work involving Line 132 and/or Line 109 as well as any other work at or near the vicinity of the September 9, 2010 San Bruno pipeline rupture.
- b) Provide a map showing the location of such work which includes pipeline line numbers, milepost numbers, city, and street designations.
- c) Was all the work associated with Job Number 5195817 completed? If not, explain whether any of the unfinished work involved Line 132 and/or Line 109, and, if so, discuss what work was not completed, and why the work was uncompleted.
- d) If the project involved Line 132 and/or Line 109, did PG&E request funding for the project in an application or other filing submitted to the CPUC? If so, specify the amount of the request and the amount approved or denied by the CPUC. Provide CPUC decision number(s) approving or denying the request and all supporting documentation for the request (e.g., application, workpapers, exhibits, etc.). Cite the page numbers that include information relevant to PG&E's request.
- e) If the CPUC approved funds for work on Line 132 and/or Line 109, did PG&E spend the entire amount of the authorization on these pipelines? If not, explain why.

**ANSWER 6**

A) Construction of this gas pipeline replacement project for Line 109 and line 132 in San Bruno occurred in 1992 to 1996. The majority of the project involved the replacement of large portions of Line 109. For Line 132, one segment was replaced

between MP 38.40 and MP 38.93, about one-third of a mile south of the rupture site. A second section was replaced between MP 39.36 and 39.56, which begins approximately one tenth of a mile north of the rupture site.

The segment of Line 132 south of the rupture site was identified for replacement based on seismic studies done along the San Andreas Fault following the Loma Prieta Earthquake. The purpose of these studies was to identify locations where a future earthquake could present a threat to the pipelines that crossed the fault line itself or subsidiary faults along the main fault trace. Those studies reviewed all of Lines 101, 109, and 132 to identify areas with potential seismic hazards associated with the San Andreas Fault.

Prior to this replacement project, Line 132 paralleled the west side of Highway 35 south of the rupture site and crossed the primary trace of the 1906 earthquake on the San Andreas Fault in two locations. The project relocated this segment to the east side of Highway 35 along Skyline Drive south of San Bruno Avenue to eliminate those fault crossings. Line 132 was replaced to MP 38.93, where it was reconnected to a short section of Line 132 (immediately south of San Bruno Avenue) that had been previously relocated in 1961.

The segment of Line 132 to the north of the rupture site, in the vicinity of Plymouth Way and Glenview Drive (MP 39.36 and 39.56), also was replaced based on the same geologic studies. This section was replaced to mitigate concerns of high compressive strains related to possible co-seismic stresses along the Sneath Lane corridor. To mitigate this potential threat, the section of pipeline was relocated into the street area where PG&E could make a more gentle transition to the Sneath Lane elevation using thicker walled pipe.

B) See SanBrunoGT-LineRuptureInvestigation\_DR\_CPUC\_100-Q06Atch01.

C) This multi-phased project was completed in 1996 and closed out. The total cost of the project was \$36.367 million. All work proposed was completed. Following are the costs associated with this project as reported in the annual GPRP reports for 1992 – 1996:

- 1992 - \$1.219 million
- 1993 - \$6.138 million
- 1994 - \$4.730 million
- 1995 - \$10.990 million
- 1996 - \$13.290 million

D) Based on available rate case materials, PG&E did not request funding for specific projects relating to Lines 109 or 132 in its rate case applications, opening testimony or work papers during the 1990s. See PG&E's response to Question 9(a).

E) Based on available rate case materials, PG&E did not request funding for specific projects relating to Lines 109 or 132 in its rate case applications, opening testimony or work papers during the 1990s. Accordingly, the CPUC did not authorize or adopt funding for specific projects relating to Lines 109 and 132. See PG&E's response to Question 9(a) and 9(b).