

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 10/21/2011 5:52:07 PM
To: Shori, Sunil (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov) (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Reg Rel SB Requests (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=RegRelSBRequests); Dowdell, Jennifer (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JKD5); SanBrunoGasSafetv@cpuc.ca.gov (SanBrunoGasSafetv@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Bcc:
Subject: PG&E's Data Response to CPUC_213/Index 2230

Sunil,

Attached please find PG&E's data response to CPUC 213/Index 2230. If you have any questions please contact [Redacted] or me [Redacted].

Regards,

[Redacted]
Regulatory Analyst
Regulatory Relations – Operations Proceedings
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
[Redacted]

-----Original Message-----

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2011 3:39 PM
To: Dowdell, Jennifer
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Subject:

Jennifer,

Questions related to the meeting this afternoon regarding Line 132:

Please confirm at what locations, along all of Line 132, PG&E has obtained and/or analyzed soil core samples in the last 20 years;

What level of seismic threat was determined as existing during the previous two integrity assessments performed on the segments comprising the section of pipe and how was the threat mitigated?

Please provide copies of all materials related to seismic studies performed for the section of pipe being replaced from Orange and "A"

Streets along Mission Street up to Evergreen. If no studies have been performed, please explain what soil

geologic conditions changed, or events occurred, and when, that prompted PG&E to perform the recent soils studies;

Please provide a listing of all other segments on Line 132 which have potential ground acceleration values of 0.4g or higher and have likelihood of 1/485 or higher?

Please explain the transition differences at the Redacted and why only the north transition is included on the graph in Figure 2;

The Exponent report states: "This groundwater table is below loose deposit that has the potential to liquefy if the groundwater table were at a higher elevation." What this statement appears to imply is that the current level of ground water is at an elevation that does not present potential to liquefy loose deposit. Please confirm if my understanding is correct, or further clarify the statement;

Please explain the term "average rate of return" and what bearing the values of 150 and 260 years have on the section of Line 132 that would

be replaced.

Thanks, Jennifer.

Sunil Shori