

From: Redacted
Sent: 7/14/2011 9:17:32 PM
To: 'Shori, Sunil' (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Carter, Glen E (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GECJ);
'jmh@cpuc.ca.gov' (jmh@cpuc.ca.gov); 'psb@cpuc.ca.gov' (psb@cpuc.ca.gov);
'rst@cpuc.ca.gov' (rst@cpuc.ca.gov); Campbell, Ben (NRD)
(/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BCC3)
Bcc:
Subject: PG&E's Response to CPUC Data Request CPUC_136/Index1796, Questions 3-4-5 (
1 of 4 e-mails)

1st of 4 e-mails (due to the size of the attachments)

-

Sunil,

Attached is PG&E's response to your request to Glen Carter and Ben Campbell of PG&E , dated July 13, 2011. Due to the large size of the attachments (25 MB), I am sending the attachments in **four separate e-mails**.

If you have any questions, please call me at Redacted

Thanks,

Redacted

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 10:39 AM
To: Campbell, Ben (NRD); Carter, Glen E
Cc: Halligan, Julie; Stepanian, Raffy; Berdge, Patrick S.
Subject: FW: PG&E's Response to CPUC Data Request CPUC_136/Index1796, Questions 1-3

Ben and Glen:

Last Thursday, I verbally requested data from PG&E related to pipeline sections removed from pipelines. Specifically, I requested information on pipeline sections removed due to visual indications (camera or other NDT). The request specifically excluded sections removed to facilitate the hydro-test itself or insertion of the camera into the pipeline. Since PG&E is to have implemented a regimented process to catalog and track any sections of pipe removed from the pipelines, especially in the case where the removed sections contain indications that are to be further evaluated through lab testing, I did not expect that it would take PG&E a great deal of time and effort to provide the requested data. However, that doesn't appear to be the case.

In PG&E Response CPUC_136, Q3, PG&E noted: "This response does not list cut-outs performed after internal camera inspections or in connection with video inspections (such as on TV-36), but only those that are directly related to the hydrostatic test program." However, this response does not address the request, which stated: ***"Also, for the cut-outs, I just need the number of sections removed due to visual indications, and not those cut-out to facilitate the camera insertion. The removed sections need to be referenced to the segment from which they were removed"***

The same holds true for information, in connection with Line 132 samples to be tested by EWI, which we requested on July 1, 2011 from Brian Daubin:

"We request PG&E provide details on why it selected the six samples, from among all of those visually noted as being deficient, for removal and testing. In addition, we request PG&E provide copies of the chain of custody forms for the six samples, verified by PG&E's independent quality control consultants, along with all photographs of the samples."

I believe in both instances, the information request was quite clear, so the question is why is PG&E unable to readily provide the requested information? This in turn raises concerns about PG&E's process for documenting, through records and photographs, the pipelines, segment numbers, the reasons, locations, pipe specifications, and chain-of-custody for all pipeline sections being removed from PG&E's pipelines as a part of its MAOP Validation efforts, its hydro-testing program, or other efforts at confirming data related to its pipeline facilities.

Please provide a response, by July 14, 2011, or earlier, to the concerns expressed above.

Thank you.

Sunil Shori

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 2:58 PM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: Reg Rel SB Requests
Subject: RE: PG&E's Response to CPUC Data Request CPUC_136/Index1796, Questions 1-3

Sunil,

We receive your request below and forward to our team to work on it.

Thanks,

Lisa

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 2:37 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Reg Rel SB Requests
Subject: RE: PG&E's Response to CPUC Data Request CPUC_136/Index1796, Questions 1-3

Lisa:

I appreciate PG&E's efforts to provide a response to my request by noon; however, data for the cut-outs from Line 132 are not included in the response. Data for cut-outs due to visual indications, observed/removed either before or after the hydro-test, was specifically requested. The segment from which the cut-out was removed was also to be referenced for each cut-out. The following is from our communication from Friday:

Also, for the cut-outs, I just need the number of sections removed due to visual indications, and not those cut-out to facilitate the camera insertion. The removed sections need to be referenced to the segment from which they were removed.

I would appreciate PG&E providing the missing data by 5:00 PM tonight.

Thanks, Lisa.

Sunil

From: Redacted
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 1:04 PM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: San Bruno Gas Safety; Reg Rel SB Requests
Subject: PG&E's Response to CPUC Data Request CPUC_136/Index1796, Questions 1-3

Sunil,

Attached is PG&E's response to your verbal data request to Angela Sanford, dated July 7, 2011.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks,

Redacted