

From: [Redacted]  
Sent: 7/22/2011 5:05:06 PM  
To: 'Lee, Dennis M.' (dennis.lee@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: CPUC Data Request 7-13-2011 (CPUC\_139) - Index No. 1827

Dennis,

I left a voice message with you this afternoon regarding our request for an extension on this data request (CPUC\_139/Index1827). Please call me at [Redacted] to discuss further.

Thank you,

[Redacted]

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

[Redacted]

**From:** Lee, Dennis M. [mailto:dennis.lee@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 13, 2011 3:11 PM  
**To:** Reg Rel SB Requests  
**Cc:** San Bruno Gas Safety  
**Subject:** CPUC Data Request 7-13-2011

To Whom It May Concern,

Please provide a response to the following by July 25, 2011:

On June 30, 2011, PG&E notified the Commission that numerous segments of its gas pipeline system were in the incorrect class location designation as a result of either (1) inconsistency between GIS information and the class location without supporting documentation of the pipeline features or documentation of a hydrostatic pressure test or (2) as a result of development that affects the class location. The purpose of this data request is to determine the duration of these problems and the impact of the class location change on PG&E's Integrity Management Program (IMP).

1. Provide a complete list of the transmission pipeline segments for which PG&E will be required to confirm the MAOP due to class location change as a result of the recent class location study. Include the following pipeline specifications and operational details: Line and segment number, start and end MPs, installation date, size, grade, seam type with joint factor, coating type, valve spacing, before and after: MAOP, class location, MOP, % SMYS, dates (month/year) of last two class location studies conducted in the area along with supporting documents which initiated the class location study. Identify specific near term remedial actions taken (e.g., pressure reduction) and long term actions (e.g., more frequent leak surveys, patrols etc.) to achieve compliance and the date this action was taken.
2. When did PG&E conduct its last comprehensive review of class locations designations? Describe the scope of the review and methodology for the review. Provide the report prepared for the last comprehensive review.
3. Provide documentation that PG&E reviewed segments for which it identified discrepancies in or leading up to its June 30, 2011 report (both one and two class discrepancies) during its last comprehensive class review.
4. Was the class designation for any segment identified in or leading up to the June 30, 2011 report (both one and two class discrepancies) modified between the last comprehensive class location designation review and its identification as operating out of class in or leading up to the June 30, 2011 report? Identify which segments and provide documentation of the reason for the change.
5. For segments where the class location change (both one and two class discrepancies) is the result of development, identify the segment, and the date of development resulting in the class change including when permits for the development were requested and granted, groundbreaking, and completion of the development project. Identify any PG&E work (gas or electric) within one mile of the segment including construction, repair, maintenance, or patrols that occurred between the application for the permit and the date that the segment was identified as operating out of class.
6. For segments where the class location change (both one and two class discrepancies) is the result of inconsistencies between GIS information and the class location, identify and provide documentation of the last date that the class location was either modified or reviewed.
7. Did PG&E identify new HCAs which were not previously part of PG&E's IMP and Baseline Assessment Plan (BAP) as a result of PG&E's recent system-wide pipeline class location designation verification? If so, what is the projected completion date to incorporate recently identified HCAs into PG&E's IMP and BAP? Please inform us of the actual completion date when the newly identified HCAs are incorporated into the BAP.
8. If the class location study discovered any new covered segments (per Subpart O), provide a list of transmission lines with segment #, start and end MPs, installation date, size, grade, seam type with joint factor, coating type, MAOP, MOP, % SMYS, test pressure and duration, valve spacing, old and new class locations, dates (month/year) of last two class location studies conducted in the area along with supporting documents which initiated the class location study.
9. What is PG&E's projected completion date to finalize threat identification, data gathering and integration, and risk assessment of the covered segments recently identified as required by 192.917 (a), (b), and (c)? Please inform us of the actual completion date when PG&E completes these tasks.

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thanks.

Regards,

Dennis Lee, P.E.  
Senior Utilities Engineer

office: (415) 703-2214

cell: (415) 806-0493