

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 11/10/2011 3:19:30 PM
To: Shori, Sunil (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov) (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Medina, Joe A (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JAMN);
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: Pressure Restoration Filing - Data Request 3

Good Afternoon Sunil,

Please find PG&E's data response to the questions you sent yesterday, 11/9/11. Note that there are 8 attachments. If you do not receive the transmission of all attachments due to mailbox restrictions, please let me know and I will break up our response.

Should you have any additional questions tomorrow or during the weekend, please reach out to Joe Medina on his mobile [Redacted]

Thank you,

[Redacted]

Q1) 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.)?

[Redacted]

<<...>>

Q2) [Redacted]

[Redacted] How many feet did the 1977 test cover and Is there a follow-up test which provides an 8 hour test?

[Redacted]

<<...>>

Q3) 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?

Redacted

Q4) Redacted

Redacted

What is meant by "corrected?" What deficiencies were identified, where are they recorded, and what repairs were performed?

Redacted

Q5) 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?

Redacted

<<...>>

Q6)

Redacted

Redacted

Why was the MPT not performed?

Redacted

Redacted

Q7) 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?

Redacted

Redacted

Q8)

Redacted

Redacted

Confirm if this is an actual reading or data entry error.

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Q9) Redacted
Redacted

Was this repaired following removal? Repair data for the dig does not show if this was repaired, when, how, or who made the repair.

Redacted

<<...>>

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

V21-0211-01, Part 1

Q10) 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?

Redacted

<<...>> <<...>>

V21-0211-01, Part 2

Q11) 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?

Redacted

Redacted

V21-0211-01, Part 3

Q12) 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?

Redacted

Q13) Why are features 66-603 for V21-0211 not included in the data on the spreadsheets?

Redacted

Redacted

Principal Regulatory Case Manager | Operations Proceedings | Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

Redacted

Email communication may contain privileged or confidential information proprietary to Pacific Gas and Electric Co.. If you have received this communication in error, we ask that you advise the sender by reply e-mail and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents.

From: Redacted

Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 2:22 PM

To: 'Shori, Sunil'

Cc: Horner, Trina; Singh, Sumeet

Subject: RE: Pressure Restoration Filing

Thank you Sunil. We will use our best judgment to identify the exhibit page numbers (where applicable) in order to respond to your data request.

Redacted

Redacted

Principal Regulatory Case Manager | Operations Proceedings | Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

Redacted

Email communication may contain privileged or confidential information proprietary to Pacific Gas and Electric Co.. If you have received this communication in error, we ask that you advise the sender by reply e-mail and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents.

From: Shori, Sunil [<mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 2:17 PM
To: Redacted
Cc: Horner, Trina; Singh, Sumeet
Subject: RE: Pressure Restoration Filing

Redacted

I don't have the data with me to be able to review the MAOP shown for M.P. 32.17 to 33.68; however, the corrected table is acceptable. As for the specific pages related to the questions, I can't provide those right now, but they are mostly related to the documentation for the excavations that PG&E provided.

Sunil

From: Redacted
Sent: Wed 11/9/2011 12:44 PM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: Horner, Trina; Singh, Sumeet
Subject: RE: Pressure Restoration Filing

Good Afternoon Sunil,

Per our discussion, please review the table below and kindly let us know if the proposed update is consistent w/ the discussions that you had w/ Sumeet and Shilpa. We would like to file this amendment by tomorrow afternoon. For your reference, I have also included the original table that was presented in our 10/31 filing.

Also, as discussed, we will await your guidance on the exhibit/page numbers for this morning's data request prior to submitting our response. In the meantime, we will continue to compile our answers based on the page numbers we believe you are referring to.

Thank you,

Redacted

Updated Table - Amendment to 10/31 filing

Redacted

Original Table included w/ the 10/31 Pleading

<<...>>

Redacted

Principal Regulatory Case Manager | Operations Proceedings | Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

Redacted

Email communication may contain privileged or confidential information proprietary to Pacific Gas and Electric Co.. If you have received this communication in error, we ask that you advise the sender by reply e-mail and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents.

-----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,

Redacted

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