

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PSEP Update
Application 13-10-017
Data Response**

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| PG&E Data Request No.: | ORA_004-15 | | |
| PG&E File Name: | PSEP-Update_DR_ORA_004-Q15 | | |
| Request Date: | February 13, 2014 | Requester DR No.: | ORA 4 |
| Date Sent: | February 28, 2014 | Requesting Party: | Office of Ratepayer Advocates |
| PG&E Witness: | Sumeet Singh | Requester: | Tom Roberts/Alaine James |

SUBJECT: PWC QUALITY ASSURANCE: PIPELINE PROGRAM DATA VALIDATION PROCESS

QUESTION 15

Chapter 3 of PG&E's Testimony and PwC's January 21, 2014 presentation indicated that PwC compared 19 "critical" data fields between the Pipeline Features Lists (PFLs) and the project workbooks. The witness and pressure of the hydrostatic test were not included as critical data fields even though they directly impact DT outcomes. Why didn't PwC consider these data to be critical?

ANSWER 15

The QA testing team used the definition of critical fields as defined by PG&E PSEP Engineering, based on the impact an error in one of those fields could have on downstream activities.

For the QA 3 test, these Pressure Test values would not be expected to correlate with the initial PSEP filing because the MAOP project work updated many of these. Instead, these fields were checked as part of QA 4 (PFL data accuracy; please see the response to Question 16a).