From:	Singh, Sumeet
Sent:	10/21/2013 8:22:39 PM
To:	sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov (sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:	Medina, Joe A (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JAMN); Yura, Jane (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JKY1); Doll, Laura (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=LRDD)
Bcc:	
Subject:	RE: 2 followup items

Sunil,

As a follow-up to your request from late last week, attached are the updated materials that include in-line inspection data for the "one class-out" features.

Also, below is additional information associated with the segments referenced as "Uprate" within the attachment.

- □□□□□□□□ L-101, Segment 167.2
  - Year of class change = 1952
  - Pre-uprate MAOP of record = 180 psig
  - Pre-uprate % SMYS (@ 180 psig) = 27%

- □□□□□□□□ L-300A, Segments 154 and 156
  - Year of class change = Unknown (pre-1971)
  - Pre-uprate MAOP of record = 573 psig
  - Pre-uprate % SMYS (@ 573 psig) = 60%

Please review and let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Thank you.

Sumeet

From: Singh, Sumeet
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:14 PM
To: 'sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov'
Cc: Doll, Laura; Yura, Jane; Medina, Joe A
Subject: RE: 2 followup items

Sunil,

As a follow-up, I would like to provide additional clarification regarding two items as detailed below:

Curtailment Analysis (Difference in assumptions used for the OSC hearing on 9/6/13 and SED meeting on 8/30/13):

Below are the assumptions associated with the curtailment scenarios discussed during the OSC and the discussion that Jane and I had with you on 8/30. The objective of the OSC hearing was to discuss the system impacts if the pressures were reduced by the CPUC for the pipelines where prior restorations were approved and also included the pipelines where a pressure restoration could be performed associated with the "one class-out" issue consistent with our action after the meeting with you on 8/30.

The objective of the meeting with you on 8/30 was to provide a perspective on the system implications if we performed a pressure reduction for all pipelines impacted by the "one class-out" issue. Subsequent to our discussion, the planning team has continued to further refine the analysis and identified methods to further optimize system operations, resulting in a lower system impact at Milpitas.

Both of these scenarios inherently have different underlying assumptions, as the objectives of these discussions were different and we deemed it was necessary to highlight the specific differences for your reference.

OSC Hearing (9/6/13)	SED Meeting (8/30/13)	
Assumptions	1. CPUC pressure restorations suspended: - L131-30 to 476 psig - Topock suction reduced to 526 psig - Line 101 and 147 reduced to 300 psig) 2. Included flow capacity constraints on Peninsula 3. One class out pressure reductions not included except for those with no curtailment impact	1. All 1 Class Out reductions having significant impact to ability to supply gas to Milpitas 2. Peninsula flow capacity constraints not included
Comments		Subsequent hydraulic analyses identified ways to reduce 1 class out impacts and reduce Milpitas shortfall from 15.0 to 6.3 MMcf/hr

One Class Out Details:

As a follow-up to the initial dataset of issues relating to 192.607 provided in the correspondence below, Segments 168 and 169 of L-101 were identified as operating "one class-out", but are operating within class. A map of the area and the revised dataset is attached.

Regarding Segment 168, an excavation from 2006 identified 20" pipe with 0.281" wall thickness, but the seam type was identified as "Can't Determine" on the excavation form. Hence, applying the associated joint efficiency factor of 0.8 for the seam type determines a design pressure of 370 psig for the Class 3 area (with a design factor of 0.5). It should be noted that while the site of the excavation now (Oct 2013) exists on Segment 168.5, the dig originally resided on Segment 168 before this segment was split. Please refer to the attachment for additional information.

Regarding Segment 169, an STPR demonstrates that it is 20" seamless Grade B pipe (joint efficiency factor of 1) which determines a design pressure of 491 psig for the Class 3 area (design factor of 0.5).

Both segments have been removed from the revised spreadsheet.

In addition, L-021F's strength test documentation was originally shown as 'Uprate', but represents an 'STPR' since the MAOP did not change post-test.

Please review the aforementioned information and let me know if you have any questions, require additional information or would like to discuss further.

Thank you.

Sumeet

From: Singh, Sumeet
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:19 AM
To: sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov
Cc: Doll, Laura; Yura, Jane; Medina, Joe A
Subject: RE: 2 followup items

Sunil,

As referenced in Jane's e-mail below, attached is the detailed information regarding the one class out issues at the pipeline feature level, as requested during the meeting with Jane and I on 8/30. Please note that the attachment includes a total of 9.3 miles which is a reduction of ~1 mile than was discussed with you during that meeting. The primary driver for the reduction in

miles is associated with L-131 (~MP 34) as we were able to confirm that a prior strength test between 1971 – 1974 is indeed valid, thereby meeting the provisions of 192.607.

Please review the attachment and let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Thank you.

Sumeet

From: Yura, Jane
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 4:11 PM
To: sunil.shori@cpuc.ca.gov
Cc: Singh, Sumeet; Doll, Laura
Subject: 2 followup items

Sunil, thank you for the call today --- hope to have the list of possible impacted locations to you Monday; Sumeet is QC'ing the information. I've attached the presentation from our meeting on 9/30.

Thanks

Jane