From: Shori, Sunil
Sent: 11/5/2011 11:12:19 AM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Pressure Restoration Filing

Thanks, Shilpa.

Monday will work by teleconference. I can also then congratulate Sumeet.

Sunil

----- Original Message -----
From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R [mailto:SRRd@pge.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2011 10:53 AM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: Halligan, Julie; Dizon, Maybelline <M1D1@pge.com>
Subject: Re: Pressure Restoration Filing

Sunil,

I spoke to the team earlier this morning and they will go ahead and add the columns you've requested. We'll provide a set later today and another set by the end of Tuesday (your Wed morning).

As far as the other question regarding L101 historic MAOP, there seems to be some confusion. The MAOP of record is on the MAOP summary report and it is 396 psi. It may best for us to discuss this over the phone with Sumeet so I don't get the facts wrong and we understand each other. Does Monday at 11 am work? I would offer this weekend, but Sumeet actually decided to get married during this craziness.

Thanks
Shilpa

----- Original Message -----
From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 07:52 PM
To: 'sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov' <sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov>
Cc: 'julie.halligan@cpuc.ca.gov' <julie.halligan@cpuc.ca.gov>; Dizon, Maybelline
Subject: Re: Pressure Restoration Filing

Sunil,

I'll ask the team to re-look at this issue and will get back to you.

Shilpa

----- Original Message -----
From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 06:53 PM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Cc: Halligan, Julie <julie.halligan@cpuc.ca.gov>; Dizon, Maybelline
Subject: RE: Pressure Restoration Filing

Shilpa,

In regard to the MAOP issue, what the MAOP should have been, what it was indicated as being, and what the facilities were actually operated at, all have different values. Isolated, and based on testing, Line 101 should have had an MAOP of 396 psig. However, PG&E's drawing 086868 Rev. 20 indicates an MAOP for Lines 101, 132A, and 147 as being 400 psig before the incident. In 2003, PG&E operated Line 101 at 400 psig.

As for the issue of resources being stretched thin, I think it is an issue we are all familiar with; however, is PG&E indicating that it simply complied and then filed the supporting documentation for each segment without someone at the company having first confirmed that the mile-point, PFL, and actual pressure test data for each segment complies with regulations and sufficiently supports the company's pressure restoration request? Believing, that such a review has been performed, I would expect the information I am seeking would have to have been put into some sort of manageable format (i.e., SAP, Excel, etc.) from which it should be readily retractable without significant resources having to be further stretched to obtain it and compile it.

Since we are all working feverishly to allow for the pressure restoration on Line 101, 132A and 147 to take place in a timely manner, I suggest the company perform another review to see who conducted the review discussed in the above paragraph and should have the requested data already available.

Thanks, Shilpa.

Sunil

-----Original Message-----
From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R [mailto:SRRd@pge.com]
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 5:27 PM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: Halligan, Julie; Dizon, Maybelline
Subject: Pressure Restoration Filing

Sunil,

Below and attached are our responses to your questions from yesterday regarding the Pressure Restoration Filing.

Q1) PG&E's October 31, 2011 filing notes that MAOP on Lines 101, 132A and 147 was 396 psig before the ordered pressure reduction following the San Bruno Incident. However, I believe this is incorrect for Line 101 and possibly Lines 132A and 147. In the case of Line 101, I believe PG&E had specified the MAOP to be 400 psig up to Lomita Park Station. PG&E needs to confirm the MAOPs for all three lines and provide necessary corrections in its next filing. If PG&E does not agree with my assessment, please let me know.

A1) The MAOP for Line 101 from Mile Point 32.17 to 33.68 is 396 psig. Consequently this limits the MAOP for all of the connected lines in our pressure restoration area to this pressure of 396 psig.

Q2) Also, I would like to request the data included in Attachment B, to the October 31, 2011 filing, to be provided in an Excel Format, with the addition of columns which provide: the pressure test duration and the start and end mile-point for each segment.

A2) PG&E has attached the excel version of Attachment B. The pressure test duration and approximation of mile points for each segment can be found in the STPR, PFL or MAOP documents provided as Exhibits in our 10/31/11 filing. Providing this information in a summary format with the existing excel files will take a significant amount of time with our already stretched resources.

Thanks.
Shilpa

-----Original Message-----
From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Cc: Halligan, Julie
Subject:

Shilpa,

PG&E's October 31, 2011 filing notes that MAOP on Lines 101, 132A and 147 was 396 psig before the ordered pressure reduction following the San Bruno Incident. However, I believe this is incorrect for Line 101 and

possibly Lines 132A and 147. In the case of Line 101, I believe PG&E had specified the MAOP to be 400 psig up to Lomita Park Station. PG&E needs to confirm the MAOPs for all three lines and provide necessary corrections in its next filing. If PG&E does not agree with my assessment, please let me know.

Also, I would like to request the data included in Attachment B, to the October 31, 2011 filing, to be provided in an Excel Format, with the addition of columns which provide: the pressure test duration and the start and end mile-point for each segment.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Thanks, Shilpa.

Sunil