

From: Redacted  
Sent: 11/10/2011 3:25:21 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: RE: Pressure Restoration Filing - Data Request 3 - (Email 2 or 4)

Email 2 of 4....

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?

A3) An H-form is a comprehensive form that includes a full suite of tests; however, a MPT is not always performed. If there is a potential defect that is identified, then a MPT is triggered which is why it potentially can be included in the scope of the DE. Please refer to "03.Field Assessment Summary Table v2.pdf", the field investigation guide developed for the MAOP validation project (Section 4 addresses the MPT). The wet fluorescent magnetic particle test was not performed during this excavation because the purpose of this direct examination was to confirm the pipe long seam. Based on a visual inspection and extrapolation of the radiograph results from excavations at MP 2.53 and MP 2.57 associated with the same installation job, the pipe long seam was deemed to be Double Submerged Arc Weld (DSAW). A magnetic particle test and macro etching is typically performed to differentiate between "Seamless" and "Electric Resistance Weld (ERW)" long seams. Additionally, magnetic particle inspections are typically performed to measure the flaw size at those locations that indicate potential axial flaws (e.g. Stress Corrosion Cracking) based on a visual inspection.

<<...>>

Q4) 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?

A4) A section of pipe was exposed to perform a RT and confirm the long seam. There were no integrity related issues identified with the exposed section of pipe as included on the H-form. The initial interpretation of the RT was that the long seam was single submerged; hence, a section was cut-out to facilitate the remote internal video camera inspection which identified the long seam as DSAW. The term "corrected" refers to the difference in the interpretation of the RT as compared to the long seam characterized by the camera inspection. There were no "deficiencies" or integrity related issues identified with the exposed section of pipe as included on the H-form.

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?

A5) At this location, there is a 34 x 24 reducer in the pipeline. The common practice is to install the reducer as a pre-fabricated unit with back-welded cans or "pups" attached to each end. This appears to be the case with the tie-in at this spot. Consequently, the small pups were used around the reducer and for the tie-in welds as identified in the H-form below. Please refer to " 04 Line 101 RC report.pdf."

<<...>>

Q6) 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?

A6) As described in the response to Question 3, a MPT is not always performed. If there is a potential defect that is identified, then a MPT is triggered which is why it potentially can be included in the scope of the DE. The wet fluorescent magnetic particle test was not performed during this excavation because the purpose of the direct examination was to verify the pipe long seam as flash-welded pipe. Based on a visual inspection, it was identified that the pipe had a long seam; hence, a RT was performed to verify the type of long seam as "AO Smith" flash weld. A magnetic particle test and macro etching is typically performed to differentiate between "Seamless" and "Electric Resistance Weld (ERW)" long seams. Additionally, magnetic particle inspections are typically performed where weld flaws are suspected to measure the flaw size at those locations that indicate potential axial flaws (e.g. Stress Corrosion Cracking) based on a visual inspection.

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?

A7) As described in the response to Question 3, a MPT is not always performed. If there is a potential defect that is identified, then a MPT is triggered which is why it potentially can be included in the scope of the DE. The wet fluorescent magnetic particle test was not performed during this excavation because the purpose of the direct examination was to verify the pipe long seam as flash-welded pipe. Based on a visual inspection, it was identified that the pipe had a long seam; hence, a RT was performed to verify the type of long seam as "AO Smith" flash weld. A magnetic particle test and macro etching is typically performed to differentiate between "Seamless" and "Electric Resistance Weld (ERW)" long seams. Additionally, magnetic particle inspections are typically performed to measure the flaw size at those locations that indicate potential axial flaws (e.g. Stress Corrosion Cracking) based on a visual inspection.

As stated, the purpose of this examination was to verify the pipe seam. Internal corrosion had not been identified as a potential issue at this location. Therefore, given the results of the

inspections performed at MP 33.13 and MP 33.397, an inspection on a reduced section of the pipe was performed.

Redacted

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

Redacted

Internal: 459.8032 | External: 925.459.8032

*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:** Thursday, November 10, 2011 3:24 PM

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

**Cc:** Horner, Trina; Singh, Sumeet; Medina, Joe A

**Subject:** RE: RE: Pressure Restoration Filing - Data Request 3 - (Email 1 or 4)

Good Afternoon Sunil,

Please find PG&E's data response to the questions you sent yesterday, 11/9/11. I tried to send this earlier, but due to mailbox size restrictions, the response was rejected. I will send this in 4 separate emails.

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

Thank you,

May

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.)?

A1) The attached file "01.Column\_Headings.pdf" is an index for the data headings in the PFL spreadsheets

<< File: 01 Column\_Headings.pdf >>

Q2) 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?

A2) These features were part of a fabricated assembly and in accordance with 49 CFR Section 192.505.e, a test of adequate pressure and for a duration of > 4 hours qualifies these features

to operate at >30% SMYS. The features that were tested under the test described are 1.8 and 2.0 feet in length. Please refer to L101\_STPR108 on page Exh A-649 for the associated test document or by image number MAOP04130876 in ECTS, attached hereto as "02.ExhA-649\_vol2\_CONF.pdf" for reference. Both the L101\_STPR108 and image number MAOP04130876 is readily available by looking up the segment number on the PFL at pages Exh A-206-210. Additionally, L101\_STPR108 is referenced in the STPR index on page Exh A-328.

<< File: 02 ExhA-649\_vol2\_CONF.pdf >>

Redacted

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

Redacted | Internal: 459.8032 | External: 925.459.8032

*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.

-May

Redacted

Principal Regulatory Case Manager | Operations Proceedings | Pacific Gas and Electric Co.  
Redacted | Internal: 459.8032 | External: 925.459.8032

*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

Maybelline,

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**

Line	Begin Mile Point	End Mile Point	MOP	MAOP
Line 101	0	32.17 375	400	
Line 101	32.17	33.68 375	396	
Line 101 Shorts	0	32.17 375	400	
Line 101 Shorts	32.17	33.68 375	396	

Line 132A	0	1.5	400	400
Line 132A Shorts	0	1.5	400	400
Line 147	0	3.57	400	400
Line 147 Shorts	0	3.57	400	400

Original Table included w/ the 10/31 Pleading

<< OLE Object: Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) >>

Redacted

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

Redacted

Internal: 459.8032 | External: 925.459.8032

*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,

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