

**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 Ratemaking
Mechanisms

Rulemaking 11-02-019
(Filed February 24, 2011)

PUBLIC VERSION

**MOTION OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING
PG&E TO MAINTAIN REDUCED PRESSURE ON NATURAL GAS PIPELINE
147 AND TO COMPENSATE THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS FOR ALL ITS
COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICIPATION IN R.11-02-019**

GREGORY J. RUBENS
Aaronson, Dickerson, Cohn & Lanzone
939 Laurel Street
San Carlos, CA 94070
Phone: (650) 593-3117
Fax: (650) 637-1401
Email: grubens@adcl.com

Attorney for the CITY OF SAN CARLOS

October 11, 2013

**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 Ratemaking Mechanisms

Rulemaking 11-02-019
(Filed February 24, 2011)

**MOTION OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING
PG&E TO MAINTAIN REDUCED PRESSURE ON NATURAL GAS PIPELINE 147
AND TO COMPENSATE THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS FOR ALL ITS COSTS
ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICIPATION IN R.11-02-019**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Commission Rules"), the City of San Carlos ("San Carlos") respectfully requests that the Commission order Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E") to maintain PG&E Natural Gas Pipeline 147 ("Line 147") at a reduced pressure of 125 pounds per square inch gauge ("psig") until such time as the safety of Line 147 can be independently established, either through full adjudication of the pending order to show cause proceedings concerning Line 147 before the Commission¹ or, in the alternative, with a Commission ruling on a petition to modify D.11-12-048 to be subsequently filed by San Carlos and any other interested Intervenor. Additionally, San Carlos requests that the Commission, pursuant to its equitable powers² and California Public Utilities Code § 6296 direct PG&E to reimburse San Carlos for all costs the City incurs in connection with its participation in R.11-02-019.

¹ *Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Assigned Administrative Law Judge Directing Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Appear and Show Cause Why all Commission Decisions Authorizing Increased Operating Pressure Should Not be Stayed Pending Demonstration That Records are Reliable* (August 19, 2013).

² *See, e.g. Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 701 and Consumers Lobby Against Monopolies v. CPUC*, 25 Cal. 3d 891, 905-907 (1979).

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

PG&E owns and operates Line 147, a high pressure gas transmission line, that traverses through San Carlos from west to east roughly parallel with Brittan Avenue in densely developed areas that include numerous businesses, approximately 3,000 to 5,000 nearby residences, two parks and community facilities. The geography and topography in said neighborhood bears a strong resemblance to those areas devastated by PG&E's high pressure gas line 132 ("Line 132") which exploded in the City of San Bruno on September 9, 2010, resulting in 8 deaths, widespread injuries and the destruction of 38 homes (the "Line 132 Explosion"). It has come to the San Carlos' attention that PG&E is operating Line 147 based upon assumptions concerning the strength of the pipe, its welds, design and fabrication which are incorrect and not consistent with actual field survey, or "as built" information.

On October 31, 2011, PG&E submitted pipeline features data required by Commission decisions³ in support of the utility's request for Commission authorization to increase the pressure on Line 147 and other related natural gas pipelines.⁴ Based on PG&E's representations, the Commission authorized PG&E to increase pressure on Line 147 to as much as 365 psig on December 15, 2011.⁵ As early as October and November of 2012, PG&E determined that the information it had provided the Commission on Line 147 was not correct.⁶

PG&E waited months to bring the Line 147 errors to the Commission's attention.⁷

³ D.11-09-006 at OP 4; D.11-10-010 at OP 3 - 5.

⁴ Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Supporting Information for Lifting Operating Pressure Restrictions on Lines 101, 132A and 147 (October 31, 2011).

⁵ D.11-12-048.

⁶ Verified Statement of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Vice President of Gas Transmission Maintenance and Construction in Response to Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Assigned Administrative Law Judge ("Verified Statement"), p. 6, ¶ 25 and p.7, ¶ 27 and 28 (R.11-02-019, August 30, 2013); *See also*, Verified Statement at p.8, ¶ 33.

⁷ Errata to Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Supporting Information for Lifting Operating Pressure Restrictions on Lines 101 and 147 (July 3, 2013).

Specifically, PG&E did not inform the Commission of the errors in the data the utility had used to support increased pressure on Line 147 until July 3, 2013 (the “Line 147 Errata”).⁸ The Commission deemed the facts in PG&E’s Line 147 Errata “profoundly troubling,” and directed PG&E to appear and show cause why all prior Commission decisions authorizing increased pressures on utility gas lines should not be stayed on August 19, 2013.⁹

On October 3, 2013, PG&E provided San Carlos with copies of intra-utility email exchanges that call into question the safety of said Line 147 and PG&E’s representations to the Commission concerning the safety of the line, all of which contradict prior assurances from PG&E to San Carlos that Line 147 is safe (the “PG&E Emails”).¹⁰ In the PG&E Emails obtained by San Carlos, a PG&E employee whose name was redacted with expertise in the gas transmission field went beyond expressing mere concern about Line 147, to raise a horrifyingly real fear that visitors and residents of San Carlos might be “sitting on a San Bruno situation” due to the condition of Line 147.¹¹ According to the PG&E Emails:

- Line 147 consisted of AO Smith seamed pipe that did not conform with PG&E’s records for Line 147.¹²
- Sections of Line 147 were comprised of pipe from 1929, which was only tested by the utility to 1.5 times the Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (“MAOP”) in 2011;¹³

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Assigned Administrative Law Judge Directing Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Appear and Show Cause Why all Commission Decisions Authorizing Increased Operating Pressure Should Not be Stayed Pending Demonstration That Records are Reliable* at 6 (August 19, 2013). PG&E and its legal team also faces sanctions for violation of Commission Rule 1.1 in connection with the utility’s filing of the Line 147 Errata. *See, Chief Administrative Law Judge and Assigned Administrative Law Judges’ Ruling Directing Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Show Cause Why it Should Not be Sanctioned by the Commission for Violation of Rule 1.1 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure* (August 19, 2013).

¹⁰ The PG&E emails are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

¹¹ Exhibit A at A-1.

¹² Exhibit A at A-2.

¹³ Exhibit A at A-1.

- The section of Line 147 pipe in question was a thin wall pipe, with evidence of external corrosion that had been determined to be the cause of a leak that had to be repaired in October 2012;¹⁴ and
- A PG&E employee questioned whether the hydrostatic testing that was performed in 2011 could have contributed to additional cracking in Line 147 and activated a threat of failure.¹⁵

III. SAN CARLOS REQUESTS THAT THE COMMISSION ORDER PG&E TO MAINTAIN LINE 147 AT A REDUCED DISTRIBUTION LINE PRESSURE OF 125 PSIG

San Carlos requests that the Commission order PG&E to keep Line 147 isolated from its high pressure gas transmission network and maintain a lower, distribution level pressure on Line 147 until Commission staff and Intervenors in R.11-02-019 can independently assess whether Line 147 is indeed safe. Specifically, San Carlos requests that Line 147 remain isolated and its pressure remain at 125 psig until:

- *The Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Assigned Administrative Law Judge Directing Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Appear and Show Cause Why all Commission Decisions Authorizing Increased Operating Pressure Should Not be Stayed Pending Demonstration That Records are Reliable* (the “PG&E OSC”) is fully adjudicated, including cross examination of Vice President of Gas Transmission Maintenance and Construction or, in the alternative;
- San Carlos files a petition to modify D.11-12-048 to permanently reduce the pressure on Line 147 until PG&E can conclusively demonstrate to the Commission and Intervenors that Line 147 is completely characterized and safe or the line replaced, and the City’s petition is fully adjudicated before the Commission.

San Carlos is not satisfied that the Commission’s informal conference with CPSD staff prior to issuance of the PG&E OSC is sufficient, on its own, to protect public safety. According to the PG&E OSC,

¹⁴ Exhibit A at A-1.

¹⁵ Exhibit A at A-1.

Prior to issuing this ruling, [Commissioner Florio and Administrative Law Judge Bushey] immediately conferred with the Commission's [CPSD] to confirm the representations by PG&E that the lines have been pressure tested and are being operated at reduced MAOP. The Safety and Enforcement Division has confirmed PG&E's representations and agrees that **so long as properly conducted pressure tests were performed as represented, Lines 147 and 101 can be operated consistent with General Order 112-E at the reduced pressures.**¹⁶

As a threshold matter, the assurance concerning safe operations of Line 147 that CPSD provided to Assigned Commissioner Florio and Administrative Law Judge Bushey is contingent on significant, and unconfirmed assumptions – namely that (1) PG&E performed pressure tests as represented; and (2) Line 147 can be operated consistent with Commission General Order 112-E at reduced pressures. Neither CPSD assumption has been tested for truthfulness and accuracy by CPSD or the Intervenors before the Commission in R.11-02-019.

Although the PG&E OSC gives the impression that the Commission is satisfied that Line 147 is safe, other representations made by Commission staff suggest the opposite. It is the City's understanding that on October 7, 2013, CPSD staff directed PG&E to “keep Line 147 shut-in and not above the current pressure of 125 psig until [CPSD] notifies PG&E of the next steps.”¹⁷ According to CPSD that direction was necessary, “[c]onsidering the extent of public concern.”¹⁸

San Carlos shares that “public concern.” On behalf of its residents, San Carlos will not accept the risks associated with continued operation of Line 147 lightly and will not stand by and allow PG&E to operate Line 147 using materials of unknown origin that do not match utility records in close proximity to residents and businesses. In addition to the informal directive to maintain the reduced 125 psig pressure on Line 147 that Commission staff saw fit to issue privately and only amongst PG&E and Commission personnel, rather than all of the participants

¹⁶ PG&E OSC at 3 (August 19, 2013). (emphasis added).

¹⁷ Exhibit B at B-1.

¹⁸ Exhibit B at B-1.

in R.11-02-019, San Carlos requests an immediate and formal order from the Commission, circulated to all parties in R.11-02-019, directing PG&E to retain the “shut in” or isolated status and maintain the reduced 125 psig pressure on Line 147, that can only be lifted by Commission order once Line 147 has been deemed safe.

IV. SAN CARLOS REQUESTS THAT THE COMMISSION ORDER PG&E TO REMIBURSE THE CITY FOR ALL ITS COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICIPATION IN R.11-02-019

Pursuant to Section 1801 *et seq.* of the California Public Utilities Code, certain “customers” are eligible to receive “compensation for reasonable advocate’s fees, reasonable expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs to public utility customers of participation or intervention in any proceeding of the commission.”¹⁹ San Carlos is well aware that the definition of “customers” eligible to receive Intervenor compensation excludes, “any state, federal, or local government agency, any publicly owned public utility, or any entity that, in the commission’s opinion, was established or formed by a local government entity for the purpose of participating in a commission proceeding.”²⁰

San Carlos is also well aware that, notwithstanding the express exclusion of state agencies from the definition of “customer” in the applicable sections of the California Public Utilities Code, Commission staff regularly requests, and indeed is granted reimbursement for its expenses in connection with its participation in Commission proceedings.²¹ As recently as October 1, 2013, CPSD filed a *Motion for PG&E to Reimburse Expenses Incurred Through the Commission’s Order to Show Cause*, to recover “costs accrued by the Commission staff, staff attorneys, and by its consultants for all expenses accrued in the Orders to Show Cause (“OSC”)

¹⁹ Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 1801.

²⁰ Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b)(2).

²¹ See, e.g. D.11-12-021 at 6, OP 3 (affirming settlement that includes reimbursement of CPSD costs).

in R.11-02-019”²² on the grounds that the Commission previously required “PG&E to reimburse the State for staff and consultant related expenses in I.11-02-016.”²³ According to CPSD, “[a]s was the case with the San Bruno Recordkeeping investigation, PG&E’s actions have not justified charging taxpayers, ratepayers, or any utility other than PG&E for the costs incurred in this investigation.”²⁴ San Carlos simply makes the same request for costs that would otherwise be borne by City taxpayers.

The Commission’s broad equitable powers²⁵ afford it sufficient flexibility to grant both CPSD and San Carlos’ request for reimbursement. Equitable remedies are “cognate and germane” to the Commission’s authority when they are designed to redress harm committed by a violation.²⁶ As a guardian of public welfare and safety of its residents and visitors, PG&E’s mismanagement, misrepresentations and the very real threat posed by Line 147 compel San Carlos to participate in R.11-02-019. Becoming a party is not optional for the City. As a result, the costs associated with City staff time, City attorneys and special counsel, and necessary consultants and experts will not be incurred by San Carlos voluntarily, but out of necessity in order to participate fully in R.11-02-019. But for PG&E’s inaccurate records and utilization of

²² *Motion for PG&E to Reimburse Expenses Incurred Through the Commission’s Order to Show Cause* at 1 (October 1, 2013).

²³ *Motion for PG&E to Reimburse Expenses Incurred Through the Commission’s Order to Show Cause* at 2 (October 1, 2013).

²⁴ *Motion for PG&E to Reimburse Expenses Incurred Through the Commission’s Order to Show Cause* at 3 (October 1, 2013).

²⁵ See, e.g. Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 701.

²⁶ *Consumers Lobby Against Monopolies v. CPUC*, 25 Cal. 3d 891, 905-907 (1979) (recognizing the breadth of Commission authority, “[t]he commission often exercises equitable jurisdiction as an incident to its express duties and authority. For example, the commission may issue injunctions in aid of jurisdiction specifically conferred upon it. [Citations omitted] It may direct that a trust fund be created to conserve potential refunds during a stay of an order lowering rates. [Citations omitted] Its power to reform contracts of public utilities to make them conform to the public interest has been recognized. [Citations omitted] And the commission itself has relied on equitable precedent in implementing its authority to issue cease and desist orders. [Citations omitted].”

faulty materials in Line 147, San Carlos would not be compelled to participate in R.11-02-019, and therefore suffer harm in the form of additional, otherwise unnecessary expense.

Beyond the Commission's broad equitable power to compel reimbursement of San Carlos costs, the California Public Utilities Code makes clear that PG&E, as the franchise holder operating within City limits, "shall indemnify and hold harmless the municipality and its officers from all liability for damages proximately resulting from any operations under the franchise."²⁷ As noted above, City staff time, City attorneys and special counsel, and necessary consultants and experts are damages San Carlos will incur as a result of PG&E's impermissible and unsafe operations under its franchise with the City.

For these reasons, it should be PG&E shareholders that bear the costs associated with San Carlos' participation R.11-02-019, not the innocent City residents and businesses PG&E has placed at risk.

V. CONCLUSION

PG&E has been aware of another round of deficiencies in its records and pipeline materials since October and November 2012. PG&E continued to insist that Line 147 and the remainder of its system is safe. PG&E continued to operate Line 147 at roughly 300 psig. PG&E refused requests from San Carlos to shut down Line 147 pending review by the Commission.

The Commission issued two orders to show cause against PG&E in connection with PG&E's erroneous data on Line 147 on August 19, 2013. At the time of issuance of those orders, the Commission took PG&E at its word that Line 147 is safe. The Commission did so in the wake of yet more evidence that PG&E lacks fundamental information concerning the

²⁷ Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 6296.

makeup and operation of its system. The Commission did so after discovering PG&E's efforts to shade the truth, minimize responsibility and delay disclosure of damaging information about Line 147. Since July 3, 2013, the Commission has allowed PG&E to continue to operate Line 147 at high pressure based on inaccurate information. While it was business as usual on PG&E transmission lines, both the utility and the Commission in reliance on PG&E, effectively crossed their fingers and hoped there wouldn't be another explosion.

In the wake of the Commission's and PG&E's *inaction* with respect to Line 147, San Carlos took matters into its own hands. The City took the extraordinary step of Proclaiming the Existence of a Local Emergency on October 4, 2013. San Carlos sought and obtained a temporary injunction to shut down Line 147 on the same day. The City did so in order to protect San Carlos residents, homes, churches, parks, businesses, and major thoroughfares. San Carlos did so because it was clear that no one else, neither PG&E nor the Commission, was willing to step up and do so on the City's behalf.

San Carlos will not sit idly by while PG&E defends its inaccurate and incomplete recordkeeping before the Commission or its staff, continues to proclaim "we would not operate Line 147 if it was not safe" or wait until PG&E properly identifies reconditioned and flimsy pipe. The Line 147 experience is enough for the City. PG&E has no idea what is underneath the ground in San Carlos. In response to the City's actions, the Commission ordered PG&E to update its prior Safety Certification for Line 147 in advance of a scheduled prehearing conference on October 21, 2013,²⁸ but other than insisting on additional paperwork from the utility, the Commission is apparently willing to ultimately allow PG&E to operate as normal.

²⁸ Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Assigned Administrative Law Judge Directing Pacific Gas and Electric Company to File and Serve Updated Safety Certification for Line 147 and Setting Prehearing (October 8, 2013).

Between now and the prehearing conference on October 21, 2013, there is no formal Commission order preventing PG&E from increasing the pressure on Line 147. San Carlos will not stand by and hope the line is safe while PG&E and the Commission try, once again, to figure out whether the line is “safe”.

If PG&E cannot affirmatively demonstrate that it can operate safely in San Carlos, it cannot continue to operate Line 147. San Carlos cannot and will not abide by business as usual with respect to Line 147 or tolerate lax regulatory oversight, continuing utility gamesmanship, public relations campaigns and obfuscation that run afoul of San Carlos’ solemn duty to protect the health and welfare of City residents, businesses and visitors.

For the reasons set forth herein, San Carlos respectfully requests that the Commission issue an immediate order directing PG&E to maintain the isolated status and reduced 125 psig pressure on Line 147 until the PG&E OSC is adjudicated fully or, in the alternative until San Carlos has submitted a petition to modify D.11-12-048 and the Commission has ruled thereon. San Carlos also requests that the Commission direct PG&E to compensate the City for all costs incurred in associated with its participation in R.11-02-019.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gregory J. Rubens

Gregory J. Rubens

GREGORY J. RUBENS

Aaronson, Dickerson, Cohn & Lanzone

939 Laurel Street

San Carlos, CA 94070

Phone: (650) 593-3117

Fax: (650) 637-1401

Email: grubens@adcl.com

Attorney for the CITY OF SAN CARLOS

October 11, 2013

EXHIBIT A

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 17, 2012 11:17 AM
To: Singh, Sumeet
Subject: FW: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy

Sumeet,
More emails around Line 147. [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 17, 2012 11:05 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy

[REDACTED]
I'm guessing that you did not x-ray anything on this pipe? Did you look for cracks in any way other than visual? Is this hole backfilled?

After thinking about this some more, I have concerns about this pipe. My thought pattern is like this: We are still searching records, but we now believe this is 1929 pipe that was recently tested to just 1.5 times the MAOP in 2011. It is thin wall pipe and now we have found external corrosion on it. Could the recent hydro test contributed to additional cracking in this pipe and essentially activated a threat? Are we sitting on a San Bruno situation? With fatigue crack growth over many years? Is the pipe cracked and near failure? I don't want to panic people but seems like we should consider this and probably move this pipe up the PSEP priority for replacement.

I know there is industry evidence and discussion of how the hydro testing can activate the cracks and cause failures soon after the hydro testing. I know in theory the 1.5 times the MAOP test pressure should be sufficient, but I believe there is industry evidence that this is not always true.

Let me know your thoughts on this.

Thanks
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 11:23 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy

[REDACTED],
Yes, we confirmed the wall thickness to be [REDACTED] with an 8-point UT in the area of the fillet weld that was done to install the PLIDCO repair cap. The cause of the leak appeared to be external corrosion from our visual inspection. There was an area of corrosion that appeared to have been repaired in the past with fill-weld metal, I attached two additional photos of that area along with the Preliminary copy of the A-Form, and the ArcMet analysis that ATS performed to produce the In-Service Weld Procedure.

What is your opinion on trying to perform ABI testing to confirm SMYS value on this pipe? Even if the SMYS was determined to be slightly higher than the RUPF value of 33K psi, would that significantly affect any decision making?

Thanks
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 11:08 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy

Two other things. Since our records were wrong on SMYS and seam type, did you happen to confirm the wall thickness? What caused the leak? Thanks [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] is trying to track down if there are any pics from the Hydrotest. If they have them and I get them, I'll forward them.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 7:37 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy

[REDACTED], I zoomed in and only see one seam.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 7:17 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy

I just meant the pipe in the lower right corner of the picture.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 6:57 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy

[REDACTED], in the foreground of one of the pix, it appears there are two seams on the pipe. Is that right?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2012 7:27 PM
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Gas Ops Support; [REDACTED]; Raymundo, William; [REDACTED]; Hogenson, Todd (GT&D); Campbell, Ben (Hydrotest); Brown, Rick (GSO)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: L-147 MP 2.2 Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave, San Carlos--Pipe Specification Discrepancy
Importance: High

All,

A recent leak repair effort on L-147 at MP 2.2 near the intersection of Brittan Ave & Rogers Ave in San Carlos has revealed pipe specification that are inconsistent with the current data in the PG&E system. The current PFL for L-147 (dated May 2012) and the GIS database currently show the 20" pipeline in this area as 20"OD x [REDACTED] WT DSAW with a SMYS value of 42,000 psi and a JE = 1.0. We now have visual confirmation that this is AO Smith Type 1 seamed pipe, per the attached photos.

This segment of 20" pipeline was installed and hydrotested in 1957 under GM 136776, and was recently hydrotested with the PSEP effort in October of 2011 under T-43B. L-147 was released from the post-San Bruno "CROP" (Conditional Reduced Operating Pressure) last winter as part of the L-101 restoration effort and pressure was increased to an MOP of 365 psig. L-147 is currently operating at an MOP of 300 psig to allow more operational flexibility on the Peninsula GT System due to the abundance of clearances this construction season.

Utilizing currently accepted SMYS (33,000 psi) and JE (0.8) values for AO Smith pipe, per the latest version of the "Resolving of Unknown Pipeline Features" document, L-147 will be operating at 55.3% SMYS in a Class 3 HCA at its current MOP of 365 psig. In addition, this pipeline segment was tested to near 600 psig during T-43B, which would have put this segment of the pipeline at greater than 90% SMYS depending on the elevation.

I am unsure of the implications of this discovery, but wanted to be sure all affected groups were notified – MAOP Validation, PFL Build, Integrity Management, Regulatory Compliance, PSEP Pipe Replacement, and Planning. Please contact me for any additional information or questions on this, I'd like to set up a conference call discussion to determine any next steps in addressing the above.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Pipeline Engineer | Gas Operations - Pacific Gas and Electric Co. | 6121 Bollinger Canyon Rd, San Ramon

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

EXHIBIT B

From: Malashenko, Elizaveta I.
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 8:16 PM
To: Doll, Laura
Cc: Turner, Brian; Hagan, Jack (Brigadier General – CA); Prosper, Terrie D.; Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Status of Line 147

Laura,

Thank you for the update.

Considering the extent of public concern, SED directs PG&E to keep Line 147 shut-in and not above the current pressure of 125 psig until SED notifies PG&E of the next steps.

In case of emergency conditions, PG&E is expected to operate the line, as well as the rest of the system, in a manner compliant with any applicable rules, regulations, procedures and in a manner that's needed to maintain the safety of the public and of the system. If emergency conditions were to arise, or PG&E becomes aware that an emergency condition is imminent, PG&E must notify the Commission and SED immediately.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Elizaveta

From: Doll, Laura [LRDD@pge.com]
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2013 7:48 PM
To: Malashenko, Elizaveta I.
Cc: Turner, Brian; Hagan, Jack (Brigadier General – CA); Prosper, Terrie D.; Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Status of Line 147

Liza

Our Gas Control group has notified us that Line 147 is now at 125 psig.

Thanks

Laura

EXHIBIT B-1

SB_GT&S_0695320

Laura Doll

Director, Regulatory Relations

lrdd@pge.com

office: 415.973.8663

mobile: 415.828.3739

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

EXHIBIT B-2

SB_GT&S_0695321