

From: Florio, Michel Peter
Sent: 12/18/2013 7:14:25 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Line 147 Decision

Brian – this situation is still touch and go given the full court press by San Carlos. I am planning a lengthy explanation in my presentation of the item. It would really help if I had a bit more technically sophisticated explanation of why operating at 240 psi as proposed by San Carlos is no better than operating at 125 as today. I think I understand but want to be sure. Also, San Carlos believes that the valves on Line 147 are automated. I don't think that's true, or if it is, the automation is only shut down and not opening or regulating the flow – is that correct? If someone could get me this information by email prior to the meeting tomorrow it would be really great, but of course I understand the timing problem.

Amazing how I've become “an apologist for PG&E” in just three short years, isn't it? THANKS, Mike

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:13 PM
To: Florio, Michel Peter
Subject: RE: Line 147 Decision

Yes. That's the simple answer. And it is preventing safety work in other communities from being done.

From: Florio, Michel Peter [mailto:MichelPeter.Florio@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:10 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Line 147 Decision

Yeah, I think I get it: in order to function effectively, 147 would have to be at the same pressure as the other interconnected lines – correct? Dana Williamson from the Gov's office may be calling Tony to ask similar questions, so you should probably warn him. Nothing like trying to “fix” things the day before the meeting!! Let sanity prevail.

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Florio, Michel Peter
Subject: RE: Line 147 Decision

If it were only so simple.

From: Florio, Michel Peter [mailto:MichelPeter.Florio@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:59 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Line 147 Decision

We want to go ahead but now the Governor's office is asking if we can somehow "compromise" with the City on 240 psi, which is the number they think they can live with. Mike and I are very leery since we have no basis for that number and don't know the impacts. What would you think if I ask from the dias that PG&E voluntarily limit to 240 unless absolutely necessary to avoid bigger problems? Just trying to find a way to move forward . . .
. Mike

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:56 AM
To: Khosrowjah, Sepideh; Florio, Michel Peter
Subject: Line 147 Decision

Sepideh/Mike – is the decision a go for the Business Meeting or do you expect it to be held ?

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

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

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

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

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