

From: Campbell, Ben (NRD)
Sent: 3/20/2012 9:53:39 AM
To: 'Shori, Sunil' (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd)
Bcc:
Subject: RE:

Hi Sunil:

I will call to discuss once we have talked with the engineer installing the valve. We were trying to test the new valve to 1.5 times MAOP even though the pipe is in Class 1. The location and weight of the valve assembly make it difficult to include the valve and insulating flange in the tie-in piece, if it is tested separately. We'll explore how we can achieve a spike test before I call.

Ben

From: Shori, Sunil [mailto:sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 10:29 PM
To: Campbell, Ben (NRD)
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Subject:

Ben,

I have some questions as to why PG&E is proposing to conduct Test 122-12L on Line 300B without a spike test.

First, why is PG&E proposing to conduct the test to 1.5xMAOP in a Class 1 location when a spike test could be accommodated if the 1.5xMAOP was the spike test pressure and then pressure lowered to comply with subpart J for the remainder of the 8-hours? PG&E could obtain 1.4xMAOP and a spike test and still remain within the confines of the ANSI 300 insulating flange;

Second, why can't the ANSI 300 insulating flange and valve, which are limiting the test pressure to 1100 psig, not be installed on the pipe until after it has undergone the 1.5xMAOP + a 5-10% spike test?

I would like to discuss this issue before PG&E proceeds with Test 122-12-L.

Thanks, Ben.

Sunil