

From: Cooke, Michelle  
Sent: 7/17/2011 8:46:45 PM  
To: Dowdell, Jennifer (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JKD5)  
Cc: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);  
Redacted]; Berkovitz,  
Trista (GE&O) (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TXB6)  
Bcc:  
Subject: FW: Follow up from our discussion today

Jennifer- as a result of the information shared below, the staff has the following additional questions for PG&E. Obviously answers sooner rather than later are greatly appreciated.

1. Identify which lines are associated with the plants in #3, below (ex: Metcalf = Line 300A).
2. Will PG&E's plan also identify specific backup resources to replace the plants listed below?
3. How will PG&E coordinate the curtailment plan internally? At the CAISO/PG&E workshop, it seemed that perhaps the gas silo had not yet communicated with the resource procurement silo.
4. What makes facilities such as Gateway (PG&E owned & operated 590 MW), Crockett, Los Esteros and other facilities not impacted by the potential gas line pressure reduction?
  1. What contract types, MW, and duration are the potentially impacted facilities?
  2. What is the order of reduced operations for power plants located along impacted lines (e.g. Try and keep Contra Costa at full availability by reducing Pittsburg first, versus limiting inefficient operation points on both power plants).
5. How does coincident gas customer demand correlate with gas demand for electrical production?
6. What is customer tolerance and safety impacts of curtailing non-energy large customers? Are there different contract terms?
7. What potential impacts are there for LSEs in PG&E's natural gas distribution area?
  1. Delivery of natural gas to munis and muni power plants?
  2. Delivery of energy from curtailed power plants to LSEs with contracts?
  3. Transmission/distribution impacts to LSEs?

Please let me know when we should be able to expect a response.

Thanks,

Michelle

**From:** Dowdell, Jennifer [mailto:JKD5@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2011 4:29 PM  
**To:** Cooke, Michelle  
**Cc:** Horner, Trina; [Redacted]; Berkovitz, Trista (GE&O)  
**Subject:** Follow up from our discussion today

Michelle,

This is to respond to the questions you raised earlier today. Please note that we are providing our answer to Question 3 regarding PG&E's plan for curtailment under section 583 of the California Public Utilities Code because it includes a list of specific generators that might be affected if PG&E were forced to curtail customers.

Please do not hesitate to give me a call if you have questions or require further information.

Best regards and have a great rest of your day!

Jennifer

Work: 415-973-2904

Blackberry:

[Redacted]

Personal:

**Question 1:**

**Did PG&E provide the CPUC with the back up information in its June 30 Class Location letter to determine if the pressure reductions taken were, in fact sufficient?**

Answer 1:

Not yet. We provided the old MOP and the revised MOP, but did not provide back-up information such as percent SMYS. We can provide an update next week with that information.

**Question 2:**

**If the CPUC were to determine that it was appropriate to increase pressure rather than curtail customers, how long from the time PG&E initiated the pressure increase would it take before the customer saw the increased pressure?**

Answer 2:

The time to increase the pressure is largely dependent on the miles of pipe involved. While it might take 12-24 hours to reduce or increase the pressure on a single short pipe segment, it could take 1-2 days to bring the pressure back up for significant sections of pipe and 5-10 days for pressure increases on miles of backbone pipe. This is because PG&E must manually reset all overpressure protection when we change the maximum operating pressure. Due to the volume of pipe on our system there may be significant travel times involved in driving to each overpressure regulator. The fact that this work must be performed by Operator-qualified personnel is another limiting factor.

**Question 3:**

**Does PG&E have a curtailment plan?**

Answer 3:

Yes. PG&E has a plan for emergency intraday curtailments, consistent with our phone

discussion; and PG&E is working the ISO staff to refine its planning for extended periods. To evaluate the need for curtailments, PG&E performs a detailed analysis using its gas system balancing models, based on a number of triggers. Some examples of triggers are below:

- Loss of storage
- Loss of compressor station on backbone
- Demand exceeds 3000 mmcf
- High average system temperatures
- Extreme cold day
- Low inventory or pressure in critical parts of system
- Loss of critical supply source

Generally, no single trigger would necessarily imply curtailment, rather these are guidelines that indicate PG&E should carefully assess capacity and flows on its system.

As you are aware, PG&E recently implemented High/Low Operational Flow Orders (OFOs), which consist of two OFOs issued on-going-- one high and one low. These have been key to reducing the potential for curtailments because they have the effect of daily balancing. So, PG&E is only managing fluctuations within the day rather than over longer periods.

Should curtailments be necessary, the specific customers affected would depend on where demand relief is required and the amount of relief needed, but generally PG&E would focus on the largest users. Of course, all efforts would be made to avoid curtailing core customers.

Below are the top 6 power plants around the Bay Area, which could likely be the first customers affected should curtailments be necessary:

Redacted