

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**  
**OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Adopt New Safety and Reliability Regulations for Natural Gas Transmission and Distribution Pipelines and Related Rate-making Mechanisms.

R. 11-02-019  
(Filed February 24, 2011)

**COMMENTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
ON THE TECHNICAL REPORT OF THE  
CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SAFETY DIVISION**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Modifying the Schedule issued on December 21, 2011, the City and County of San Francisco ("CCSF") submits these comments on the Consumer Protection and Safety Division's ("CPSD") Technical Report Regarding PG&E's Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan ("Technical Report"). CCSF appreciates that the Technical Report and the attached Assessment from Jacobs Consultancy provide a summary of PG&E's Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan ("Implementation Plan"), and offer several recommendations for the Commission and PG&E.

CCSF intends to provide a more detailed response to the technical aspects of PG&E's Implementation Plan on January 31, 2012, and may incorporate some discussion of CPSD's Technical Report at that time. In the interim, however, there is one issue presented by PG&E's Implementation Plan that should have been addressed by CPSD. PG&E's Implementation Plan deviates from the prioritization of work ordered by the Commission in Decision ("D.") 11-06-017 by re-scoping the proposed work to be performed in Phase I and re-prioritizing the order in

which the work will be performed. The Technical Report did not address this threshold issue.<sup>1</sup> CPSD's independent analysis of this issue is critical so that parties and the Commission can understand whether PG&E's deviation from the Commission's order is appropriate and how that decision affects the safety of PG&E's pipelines.

## II. DISCUSSION

In D.11-06-017, the Commission ordered PG&E to "file and serve a proposed [Implementation Plan] to comply with the requirement that all in-service natural gas transmission pipeline in California has been pressure tested in accord with 49 CFR 192.619, excluding subsection 619(c)."<sup>2</sup> The Decision specifically directed that "[t]he Plan should start with pipeline segments located in Class 3 and Class 4 locations and Class 1 and Class 2 [HCAs], with pipeline segments in other locations given lower priority for pressure testing."<sup>3</sup>

On August 26, 2011, PG&E filed its Implementation Plan along with supporting testimony and workpapers. PG&E wrote:

"Despite Decision 11-06-017 stating that each Implementation Plan "should start with pipeline segments located in Class 3 and Class 4 locations and Class 1 and Class 2 high consequence areas," this represents far too large of a work scope for PG&E to accomplish in a 4-year period (2011-2014) in Phase 1."<sup>4</sup>

Thus, PG&E proposed to instead;

"prioritize a subset of that broader scope into Phase 1, consisting of the pipe segments in urban areas (Class 2, 3 and 4 and Class 1 HCA) operating at or greater than 30 percent SMYS without strength tests and those segments characterized with a manufacturing threat at or greater than 20 percent SMYS.... The remaining urban pipe (Class 2, 3 and 4 and Class 1 HCA) operating between 20 percent SMYS and 30 percent SMYS characterized with a Fabrication and Construction (F&C) threat construction threat and/or a corrosion and latent mechanical damage

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, CCSF notes that the CPSD Technical Report only addresses the proposed Pipeline Modernization and Valve Automation aspects of the Implementation Plan, while the Jacobs report addresses all four aspects of the Implementation Plan.

<sup>2</sup> D.11-06-017, Ordering Paragraph 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> PG&E Testimony at p. 3-37.

threat, will be addressed at the beginning of Phase 2 commencing in 2015.”<sup>5</sup>

The effect of this deviation is that PG&E has excluded 176 miles of pipeline segments in Class 2, 3, and 4 locations and Class 1 HCAs operating between 20% and 30% SMYS with fabrication & construction defects from Phase I of the Implementation Plan.<sup>6</sup> To the extent this impacts pipeline segments in Class 3 and 4 locations or segments in Class 1 and 2 HCAs, this is directly contrary to the Commission’s directive. Instead of providing proposals to replace, pressure test or retrofit these segments, PG&E proposes to perform these same actions for 499.8 additional miles of pipeline segments in Class 1 and 2 non-HCA locations in Phase I of the Implementation Plan. Below is a table breaking down the proposed work by HCA and class location during Phase I.<sup>7</sup>

	Class 4	Class 3	Class 1 and 2 HCA	Class 1 & 2 non-HCA
Replace	0	137.9	4.5	43.3
Pressure Test	0	473.4	35.2	274.4
Retrofit	1	45.5	6.3	182.1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>656.8</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>499.8</b>

If the proposed justification for changing the priority of work to be performed in Phase I is that the scope as ordered in D.11-06-017 is “far too large of a work scope for PG&E to accomplish in a 4-year period (2011-2014),” then CPSD should have asked PG&E to explain why it made sense to supplement Phase I with nearly 500 miles of additional work while delaying work on 176 miles of pipeline segments in locations with higher population densities.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> PG&E Response to CCSF OIR Data Request 1, Q 6.

<sup>7</sup> Mileage derived from PG&E Response to CCSF OIR Data Request 1, Q 6.

<sup>8</sup> The actual amount of mileage delayed into Phase II is likely less than 176 miles as this figure includes pipeline segments in Class 2 locations operating between 20% and 30% SMYS with fabrication & construction defects.

While CCSF notes that this outcome appears to deprioritize pipelines in more densely populated locations and is concerned over the potential safety risks inherent in such a decision, CCSF is most concerned with the Technical Report's lack of discussion and independent analysis on such a fundamental issue. The Technical Report should have highlighted this deviation and provided analysis on why the change is reasonable, if CPSD believes it is. To the extent the Technical Report considers this re-prioritization of the work proposed by PG&E, it simply recommends that the Commission periodically audit PG&E's work "to verify the process results." Because PG&E's proposal fails to comply with the Commission's order, the Technical Report should have provided an analysis regarding the reasonableness and safety implications raised by the proposal's modification in scope for Phase I.

CCSF understands that the Implementation Plan is voluminous and highly technical, but if the Technical Report is to provide any qualitative analysis to assist intervenors or the Commission in assessing the reasonableness of PG&E's request, such analysis must be proactive, independent and vigilant.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

The Commission should require an analysis of whether it is reasonable for PG&E to deviate from the Commission ordered scoping and prioritization of pipeline safety work.

Dated: January 13, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney  
THERESA L. MUELLER  
AUSTIN M. YANG  
Deputy City Attorneys  
By:           /S/            
AUSTIN M. YANG

Attorneys for:  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4682  
Telephone: (415) 554-6761  
Facsimile: (415) 554-4763  
E-Mail: [austin.yang@sfgov.org](mailto:austin.yang@sfgov.org)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, KIANA V. DAVIS, declare that:

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is City Attorney's Office, City Hall, Room 234, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 554-4698.

On January 13, 2012, I served:

**COMMENTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON THE  
TECHNICAL REPORT OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AND SAFETY  
DIVISION**

by electronic mail on all parties on the attached Service list in CPUC Proceeding

No. R.11-02-019 The following addressee(s) without an email address were served:

- BY UNITED STATES MAIL: Following ordinary business practices, I sealed true and correct copies of the above documents in addressed envelope(s) and placed them at my workplace for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service. I am readily familiar with the practices of the San Francisco City Attorney's Office for collecting and processing mail. In the ordinary course of business, the sealed envelope(s) that I placed for collection would be deposited, postage prepaid, with the United States Postal Service that same day.

JIM MCQUISTON  
MCQUISTON ASSOCIATES  
6212 YUCCA STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90028-5223

TRANSMISSION EVALUATION UNIT  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 NINTH STREET, MS-46  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

ROCHELLE ALEXANDER  
445 VALVERDE DRIVE  
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on January 13, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

/S/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KIANA V. DAVIS

EMAIL SERVICE LIST R.11-02-019

StephanieC@greenlining.org  
SLG0@pge.com  
carlwood@uwua.net  
jboehme@nicor.com  
Ethan.Jones@Valero.com  
justin.brown@swgas.com  
STomkins@semprautilities.com  
npedersen@hanmor.com  
bob.gorham@fire.ca.gov  
douglas.porter@sce.com  
rkohut@sandiego.gov  
Faith.Mabuhayalliance@gmail.com  
cjackson@sanbruno.ca.gov  
rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com  
gxh@cpuc.ca.gov  
map@cpuc.ca.gov  
austin.yang@sfgov.org  
marcel@turn.org  
cpj2@pge.com  
sgs@dcbsf.com  
sls@a-klaw.com  
bcragg@goodinmacbride.com  
nformosa@winston.com  
bkc7@pge.com  
smeyers@meyersnave.com  
lencanty@BlackEconomicCouncil.org  
service@cforat.org  
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net  
bmcc@mccarthyllaw.com  
anginc@goldrush.com  
dcarroll@downeybrand.com  
westgas@aol.com  
wwester@smud.org  
ajahns@jahnsatlaw.com  
Dave.Weber@nwnatural.com  
jason.dubchak@niskags.com  
a2mx@pge.com  
AGL9@pge.com  
artfrias@uwua.net  
cassandra.sweet@dowjones.com  
christine.tam@cityofpaloalto.org  
CMM6@pge.com  
cleo.zagrean@macquarie.com  
enriqueg@greenlining.org  
grant.kolling@cityofpaloalto.org  
gclark@lodistorage.com  
jheckler@levincap.com  
j2ti@pge.com  
jleslie@luce.com  
karla.Dailey@CityofPaloAlto.org  
lauren.duke@db.com  
unionnancy@gmail.com  
ray.welch@navigantconsulting.com  
russell@lodistorage.com

EMAIL SERVICE LIST R.11-02-019

tcollier@buckeye.com  
timothyrea@hotmail.com  
ttutt@smud.org  
regrelepuccases@pge.com  
mrw@mrwassoc.com  
dwtcpucdockets@dwt.com  
scott.senchak@decade-llc.com  
andrewgay@arcassetltd.com  
ted@PointState.com  
wschmidt@buckeye.com  
malp@pge.com  
daniel.j.brink@exxonmobil.com  
kirby.bosley@jpmorgan.com  
paul.gendron@JPMorgan.com  
Paul.Tramonte@jpmorgan.com  
kmmj@pge.com  
christy.berger@swgas.com  
jim.mathews@swgas.com  
priscila.castillo@ladwp.com  
robert.pettinato@ladwp.com  
GHealy@semprautilities.com  
JLSalazar@SempraUtilities.com  
Naftab@semprautilities.com  
RCavalleri@SempraUtilities.com  
DNg@semprautilities.com  
RPrince@SempraUtilities.com  
jcorralejo@lbcgla.org  
ellen.isaacs@asm.ca.gov  
rothenergy@sbcglobal.net  
dtorres@sogate.org  
pat.jackson@teaminc.com  
klatt@energyattorney.com  
michael.alexander@sce.com  
sendo@cityofpasadena.net  
eklinkner@cityofpasadena.net  
slins@ci.glendale.ca.us  
douglass@energyattorney.com  
bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us  
rmorillo@ci.burbank.ca.us  
ssc.chrissy@gmail.com  
carneycomic@sbcglobal.net  
case.admin@sce.com  
gloria.ing@sce.com  
janet.combs@sce.com  
Robert.F.Lemoine@sce.com  
patricia.borchmann@yahoo.com  
cadowney@cadowneylaw.com  
marcie.milner@shell.com  
CentralFiles@SempraUtilities.com  
sjkeene@iid.com  
jhunter@riversideca.gov  
waltowaiji@tustinca.org  
cguss@anaheim.net  
ssciortino@anaheim.net

EMAIL SERVICE LIST R.11-02-019

laura@messimer.com  
sswaroop@naacoalition.org  
kfabry@sanbruno.ca.gov  
gcaldwell@sanbruno.ca.gov  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
SanBrunoGasSafety@cpuc.ca.gov  
joc@cpuc.ca.gov  
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org  
bfinkelstein@turn.org  
tlong@turn.org  
C4MU@pge.com  
d1ct@pge.com  
jjdavis@dcbsf.com  
j1pc@pge.com  
jmalkin@orrick.com  
filings@a-klaw.com  
kck5@pge.com  
M1D1@pge.com  
NXKI@pge.com  
oxb4@pge.com  
tnhc@pge.com  
wvm3@pge.com  
jarmstrong@goodinmacbride.com  
mmattes@nossaman.com  
jkarp@winston.com  
aaron.joseph.lewis@gmail.com  
cem@newsdata.com  
RobertGnaizda@gmail.com  
Susan.Durbin@doj.ca.gov  
grant.kolling@cityofpaloalto.org  
Jeff.cardenas@asm.ca.gov  
Service@spurr.org  
sean.beatty@genon.com  
kowalewskia@calpine.com  
bstrottman@meyersnave.com  
ceyap@earthlink.net  
dmarcus2@sbcglobal.net  
rwilliford@dralegal.org  
tomb@crossborderenergy.com  
sberlin@mccarthyllaw.com  
billjulian@sbcglobal.net  
bburns@caiso.com  
gvanpelt@caiso.com  
blake@consumercal.org  
kelder@aspenerg.com  
john@clfp.com  
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com  
wmc@a-klaw.com  
kuprewicz@comcast.net  
MD7@cpuc.ca.gov  
aad@cpuc.ca.gov  
ang@cpuc.ca.gov  
djg@cpuc.ca.gov  
dbp@cpuc.ca.gov



EMAIL SERVICE LIST R.11-02-019

emm@cpuc.ca.gov  
cpe@cpuc.ca.gov  
hym@cpuc.ca.gov  
jzr@cpuc.ca.gov  
alf@cpuc.ca.gov  
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov  
kcl@cpuc.ca.gov  
mpo@cpuc.ca.gov  
mab@cpuc.ca.gov  
mwt@cpuc.ca.gov  
pap@cpuc.ca.gov  
psp@cpuc.ca.gov  
pzs@cpuc.ca.gov  
ram@cpuc.ca.gov  
rmp@cpuc.ca.gov  
srt@cpuc.ca.gov  
skh@cpuc.ca.gov  
sni@cpuc.ca.gov  
tcr@cpuc.ca.gov  
janill.richards@doj.ca.gov  
glesh@energy.state.ca.us  
rkennedy@energy.state.ca.us  
sbender@energy.state.ca.us