Gas Transmission 2012 Direct Inspections & Hydrostatic Testing - Proposed Program Modifications

January 2012

Objective:

- As a follow-up to the comments CPSD included in response to the Peninsula Pressure Restoration filing in late 2011, PG&E would like to coordinate with the CPSD to ensure that there is alignment in how pipeline direct inspection data is documented.

Direct Inspections Matrix

Legend:
X - Required
IN - If Needed
FA - Failure Analysis

		Excavation Reason											
		Design Need / Third Party Request		Hydrostatic Test		Records Verification: MAOP Validation		Records Verification: GIS Data		Class Location Verification		IM Analysis	
		Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
H-Form Section	Header			X	FA	X	IN	X	IN		IN	X	X
	1 - Data Before Coating Removal			X	FA	X		X				X	X
	2 - Data After Coating Removal			X	FA	X		X				X	X
	Excavation Drawing			X	FA	X		X				X	X
	External Corrosion Grid			IN	FA	IN		IN				IN	IN
	Internal Corrosion Grid			X	FA	X		X				X	X
	Coating Damage Details			IN	FA	IN		IN				IN	IN
	Corrosion Log			IN	FA	IN		IN				IN	IN
	Photo Log			X	FA	X		X				X	X
	3 - Recoat Information			X	FA	X		X				X	X
	4 - Repair Data			IN	FA	IN		IN				IN	IN
	Site Map			X	FA	X		X				X	X
ABI Report	ABI Report	IN	IN	X	IN	X	IN	X	IN	IN	IN	X	IN
A Form	Header Data	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
	Initial Leak Data												
	Mapping Data												
	HCA Data												
	Pipe Data	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
	Repair Data	IN	IN	IN	IN		IN		IN	IN	IN		
	General Inspection Data	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
	Cathodic Protection Condition												
	Metallic Pipe Condition	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
	Plastic Pipe Condition												
	Gas Quarterly Incident Data												
	Location Sketch	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
ATS	Specific Requested Report			IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN
	Long Seam Validation (DSAW vs. SSAW)			IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN
	Macro Etching				IN		IN		IN	IN	IN		
	Destructive Testing			X	IN	IN	IN						

Proposed Approach

PG&E is proposing direct inspection logic based on findings rather than prescription. Following are examples that would trigger a more in depth inspection:

- ✓ Any evidence of missing or disbonded wrap
- ✓ Isolated or clustered corrosion pitting
- ✓ Seam defect (e.g., missing weld, mis-alignment, cracking)
- ✓ Seam placement in 5 to 7 pm position
- ✓ Downstream of and within 20 miles of compressor station
- ✓ Visible dents, laminations or other anomalies
- ✓ Any gouges, scrapes or signs of third-party damage
- ✓ Hydrostatic test rupture or leak

Hydrostatic Testing - Proposed Program Modifications

	2011 Program	Proposed Modification for 2012	Notes
Hydrostatic Test Operator	Use State Fire Marshall certified hydrostatic test operators	Allow PG&E crews to conduct some hydrostatic tests with certification provided by RCP; Use State Fire Marshall certified hydrostatic test operators when using a contractor	PG&E crews have significant experience conducting hydrostatic tests and could lower the costs for some tests
Test Pressure Verification	Confirmed recommended target max test pressures for each test based on mil test pressures provided from Kiefner and Associates	Engage Kiefner and Associates for subject matter expertise input in unique test situations	Kiefner and Associates has provided PG&E with mill test pressure data for most expected pipe types and vintages. Consult Kiefner on exceptions only.
Test Procedure Certification	Engage Bureau Veritas to certify that every test is conducted according to hydrostatic test plan	Do not engage Bureau Veritas for 2012 work	RCP certification is sufficient for third party verification