

From: Singh, Sumeet
Sent: 11/15/2011 8:27:09 AM
To: 'sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov' (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Medina, Joe A (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JAMN);
Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);
Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); [Redacted]
[Redacted] Campbell, Ben
(NRD) (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BCC3); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted] Malkin, Joseph M
(Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J4M0)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

Below is the detailed response regarding the two questions. Please review and let us know if you have any additional questions or require any additional information. Thank you.

Sumeet

[Redacted]

Redacted

From: Singh, Sumeet

Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2011 7:02 AM

To: 'sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov'

Cc: Redacted Ramaiya, Shilpa R; Horner, Trina; Medina, Joe A; Malkin, Joseph M (Law);
Redacted; Campbell, Ben (NRD); Redacted

Subject: Re: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

We are working on drafting a detailed response; however, you may have been reviewing an

older version of the MAOP report for GCUST7013. The analysis that you have performed below is precisely the reason we performed an excavation for this short in beginning November and identified the seam type to be ERW which changes the JEF and SMYS values. The updated PFL and MAOP report was included in the 11/7 e-mail to the CPUC.

Sumeet

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 11:51 PM
To: Singh, Sumeet
Cc: [Redacted]; Ramaiya, Shilpa R; Horner, Trina; Medina, Joe A; Malkin, Joseph M (Law); [Redacted]; Campbell, Ben (NRD); [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sumeet,

[Redacted]

[Redacted] How is that possible?

Thanks, Sumeet.

Sunil

From: Singh, Sumeet [mailto:S1St@pge.com]
Sent: Mon 11/14/2011 10:00 PM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: [Redacted]; Ramaiya, Shilpa R; Horner, Trina; Medina, Joe A; Malkin, [Redacted]; Harrison, David; Campbell, Ben (NRD); [Redacted]
Subject: Re: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

[Redacted]

[Redacted] Thank you.

Sumeet

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 09:46 PM
To: Singh, Sumeet
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sumeet,

Why was PG&E unable to hydro-test this segment when it was inspected on 11/13/2011? What would prevent PG&E from pressure testing GCUST7013 in the near future, and what's the earliest a pressure test could be performed?

Thanks, Sumeet.

Sunil

From: Singh, Sumeet [mailto:S1St@pge.com]
Sent: Mon 11/14/2011 8:08 PM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: Ramaiva, Shilpa R; "Malkin, Joseph" (jmalkin@orrick.com); Horner, Trina; [Redacted]
[Redacted] Medina, Joe A; Peralta, Sara
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

Below is a response to the transmission definition question. Please review and let us know if you have any additional questions or concerns. This completes the responses to all outstanding questions.

Thank you.

Sumeet

Question: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted] Has PG&E included such facilities (which maybe under 20% SMYS but still considered transmission) in its pressure test verifications?

[Redacted]

Redacted

From: Singh, Sumeet

Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 2:47 PM

To: 'Shori, Sunil'

Cc: Ramaiva, Shilpa R; "Malkin, Joseph" (jmalkin@orrick.com); Horner, Trina; Redacted

Redacted Medina, Joe A; Peralta, Sara

Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

Below is a response to the JEF question. Please review and let us know if you have any additional questions. We are working on preparing the response to the last question. Thank you.

Sumeet

Question: PG&E de-rates the joint efficiency factor (JEF) for SSAW to 0.8 instead of 1.0 as permitted by 49 CFR, Part 192. GCUST7013, reviewed by PG&E on 11/03/2011, applies a joint efficiency factor of 1.0 to a 1945, 4.5-inch OD, ERW pipe. I would believe this is most likely low frequency electric resistance welded (LF-ERW) pipe. I would like to know if PG&E has considered de-rating the joint factor used in the review of GCUST7013, and other instances of LF-ERW pipe used throughout the analysis, to a JEF of 0.8, as it has done for SSAW, and why it has decided to keep the JEF for LF-ERW at 1.0?

Response: The JEF is applied in accordance with PG&E's Standard & Specifications Section A-11 (attached for reference) which includes a 0.8 JEF for SSAW which is more conservative than 49 CFR 192 and 1.0 for all ERW pipe including LF-ERW, consistent with 49 CFR 192 and PG&E's Standard & Specifications. This has been the guidance used for the MAOP validation project. However, PG&E's

Redacted

From: Singh, Sumeet

Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 12:57 PM

To: Shori, Sunil

Cc: Ramaiva, Shilpa R; 'Malkin, Joseph' (jmalkin@orrick.com); Horner, Trina; Redacted

Redacted Medina, Joe A

Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

Below is a response to the OQ question. Please review and let us know if you have any additional questions. We are working on preparing responses to the two remaining questions. Thank you.

Sumeet

Question: What OQ reviews and/or OQ QA/QC has PG&E performed to confirm that all covered tasks included in, and applicable to, work done as part of the restoration request, are being performed by individuals OQ'd on the covered tasks?

Redacted

From: Singh, Sumeet
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 11:59 AM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: Medina, Joe A; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

No later than end of day today. The responses will be provided as they become available.

Sumeet

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 11:57 AM
To: Singh, Sumeet
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sumeet,

Any idea when we can expect PG&E's response to the three questions? As you know, we are working to prepare our response related to tomorrow's PG&E filing.

Thanks, Sumeet.

Sunil

From: Singh, Sumeet [mailto:S1St@pge.com]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 10:21 AM
To: Shori, Sunil
Cc: Medina, Joe A
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil,

I will review and provide you with a response. Thank you.

Sumeet

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 9:49 AM
To: Singh, Sumeet
Subject: FW: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sumeet,

I just got an e-mail reply indicating that Joe is at jury duty today.

Sunil

From: Shori, Sunil
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 9:47 AM
To: Medina, Joe A
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Joe,

This is a third question stemming from last night's review:

Redacted

Redacted I would like to know if PG&E has considered de-rating the joint factor used in the review of GCUST7013, and other instances of LF-ERW pipe used throughout the analysis, to a JEF of 0.8, as it has done for SSAW, and why it has decided to keep the JEF for LF-ERW at 1.0?

Thanks, Joe.

Sunil

From: Shori, Sunil
Sent: Sun 11/13/2011 2:47 PM
To: Medina, Joe A
Subject: RE: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Joe,

Thanks, for the earlier responses. I have two more questions

Redacted

Redacted Has PG&E included such facilities (which may be under 20% SMYS but still considered transmission) in its pressure test verifications?

A second question is what OQ reviews and/or OQ QA/QC has PG&E performed to confirm that all covered tasks included in, and applicable to, work done as part of the restoration request, are being performed by individuals OQ'd on the covered tasks?

Thanks, Joe.

Sunil

From: Medina, Joe A [mailto:JAMn@pge.com]

Sent: Sun 11/13/2011 10:49 AM

To: Shori, Sunil

Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R; 'Malkin, Joseph' (jmalkin@orrick.com); Horner, Trina; Singh, Sumeet; Redacted

Redacted Medina, Joe A

Subject: FW: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil

Here is the answer to question number 4 that I mentioned in my previous e-mail message that I would get back to you on.

=====

4. On L-101, segment 155.3 you say that the features that were tested for 4 hours account for 3.8 feet of the job. How were the other sections of pipe on that job tested?

Redacted

=====

I will be out and about today, but if you have any further questions, do not hesitate to call or send me an e-mail message.

Regards,

Joe Medina

Manager

Technical Advisory Team

MAOP Validation Project

jamn@pge.com

925.324.6461

Go Green!

Do not print this e-mail unless it is extremely necessary.

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: Medina, Joe A

Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 9:52 AM

To: 'Sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov'

Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R; 'Malkin, Joseph' (jmalkin@orrick.com); Horner, Trina; Singh, Sumeet; Redacted

Redacted Medina, Joe A

Subject: Q&A for CPUC - Saturday 11-12-11

Sunil

Here are answers to your questions that we discussed on the phone Saturday evening:

1. At the L-132A and 147 taps off of L-101 is there any regulation?

Redacted

=====

2. How is it understood when assumptions are used in the MAOP validation?

Redacted

=====

3. When a pipeline is operating one-class-out, how is this indicated on the MAOP Validation Report?

Redacted

=====

4. On L-101, segment 155.3 you say that the features that were tested for 4 hours account for 3.8 feet of the job. How were the other sections of pipe on that job tested?

Answer: This will take me more research and I will get back to you shortly.

I believe that I captured your questions accurately. If I did not, please let me know.

Thanks,

Joe Medina

Manager

Technical Advisory Team

MAOP Validation Project

jamn@pge.com

925.324.6461

Go Green!

Do not print this e-mail unless it is extremely necessary.

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.