

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

PG&E Data Request No.:	CPUC_100-14		
PG&E File Name:	SanBrunoGT-LineRuptureInvestigation_DR_CPUC_100-Q14		
Request Date:	March 21, 2011	Requester DR No.:	
Date Sent:	April 29, 2011	Requesting Party:	CPUC (ED)
		Requester:	Eugene Cadenasso

**QUESTION 14**

Did PG&E postpone, discontinue or decide not to undertake any projects or work related to Line 132 and/or Line 109 that it proposed in an application or workpaper(s) to do? If so, describe the projects and explain why.

**ANSWER 14**

As noted in response to Questions 9 and 10 of this data request, based on a review of the available rate case materials, PG&E only forecast one project associated with Line 109 or Line 132 for 1987-2010. PG&E did not replace the segment of Line 132 referenced in the response to Question 10 in 2008 and 2009 as originally forecast in the 2008 GT&S case. In early 2008, the pipeline engineer responsible for this area re-analyzed the available information concerning the segment in question, including data from the External Corrosion Direct Assessment (ECDA) conducted on Line 132. Based on this information and his own field investigation, and knowing that PG&E would be performing another ECDA on the segment later in 2008 or 2009, the responsible pipeline engineer decided that the segment did not need to be replaced on the schedule as originally proposed in the 2008 GT&S case. The direct assessment PG&E conducted on this segment of Line 132 in March 2009 confirmed that the segment did not need to be replaced at that time. Nonetheless, PG&E plans to replace this segment in 2012. For further information, see also PG&E's letter of September 20, 2010, to Paul Clanon, Executive Director, CPUC, at pages 5-6.