From: Redacted

Sent: 11/9/2011 8:19:40 AM

To: Shori, Sunil (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov)

Cc: Medina, Joe A (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JAMN); Redacted; Singh, Sumeet (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=S1ST56905772); Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC)

Bcc:

Subject: RE: Line 101 and 101 shorts pressure restoration

Good Morning Sunil,

For the questions you list below, can you please provide us with the specific exhibit page #s that can be found at the bottom of each page from the 10/31 filing so that we can ensure that we are responding to your question appropriately?

Thank you,

Redacted

Redacted

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunii.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 12:49 AM
To: Singh, Sumeet
Cc: Redacted; Medina, Joe A
Subject: Line 101 and 101 shorts pressure restoration

Sumeet,

Per our teleconference on November 7th, the following are some of the questions/concerns arising from supporting documentation for pressure restoration in

Lines 101, 132A, 147, and related shorts:

1) Is there an index which defines the data headings in the spreadsheets (i.e., Q4 for STPR quality, O.D. 1, O.D. 2, W.T. 1, W.T. 2, etc.)?

2) Line 101 Segment 155.3, tested on 6/9/1977 (from M.P. 0.35—28.20) -- has a 4.1 hour test for a line that is at 34.76% SMYS. How many feet did the 1977 test cover and Is there a follow-up test which provides an 8 hour test?

3) Why was WFMT not performed on all locations (i.e., page 7 of 148 -- M.P. 2.51) even though it is part of the scope of H-Forms and the validation digs?

4) M.P. 10.45 indicates "Seam weld identified with RT and corrected with cut out of a 4-foot long stick." What is meant by "corrected?" What deficiencies were identified, where are they recorded, and what repairs were performed?

5) Considering there are no tie-in welds, fittings, or differences in pipe wall thicknesses, why were small pups (Pups 1 and 2) used at Line 101 M.P.19.99?

6) M.P. 33.13 (page 70) states: "Mag Particle Testing was part of the scope for DE on this Dig, but was not done." Why was the MPT not performed?

7) As in the case of M.P. 33.13, MPT was part of the scope for the dig at M.P. 33.308, but was not done. Why was the MPT not performed? Also, why was the internal corrosion grid size reduced, by PG&E's field engineer, to cover only the 5:30 to 6:30 clock-face on the pipe?

8) For 2011 dig at M.P. 10.3985, Reading I-7 on page 111/148 (internal corrosion grid) shows sleeve thickness to be .252-inch. Confirm if this is an actual reading or data entry error.

9) For 2011 dig at M.P. 16.6409 states: "4" of outside weld removed to examine inside weld per Chad Mosier's Request." Was this repaired following removal? Repair data for the dig does not show if this was repaired, when, how, or who made the repair.

The following are related to Line 101 short V21-0211-01:

V21-0211-01, Part 1

10) Almost no STPR for any of the listed features. Explain feature 15 and what is assumed, and why. Also, what happened to features 16-20 which are missing from the spreadsheet?

V21-0211-01, Part 2

11) Several lengths of 8.625 dia pipe missing STPR. Also, what happened to features 33-36 and 40-45 which are missing from the spreadsheet?

V21-0211-01, Part 3

12) All lengths of 1945 and 1974 8.625-inch pipe and other features missing STPR. Why is the pressure test data missing for the 1974 sections since pressure testing would have been required for all facilities, including any operating under 20% SMYS?

13) Why are features 66-603 for V21-0211 not included in the data on the spreadsheets?

Please call me on my cell Redacted if there are any questions

Thanks, Sumeet.

Sunil