

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

PG&E Data Request No.:	ORA_004-16		
PG&E File Name:	PSEP-Update_DR_ORA_004-Q16		
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 16

Section 5.3.3.4 of PG&E's Testimony states that 19 critical field were evaluated, including MAOP and % SMYS at MAOP. However, the data validation tab of the project workbooks does not include these data fields.

- a) Did PwC actually review 19 data fields in this QA step, or a different number of fields?
- b) What data field did PwC use in QA5, determination of DT outcome, to check if the pipe segment was "less than or equal to 30% SMYS," in decision point 1J for example?

Answer 16

- a) Yes, the QA testing team reviewed the following 19 fields:

Data Source - PFL:

- i. SEGMENT_NO, OD, JOB_NO, YR_INSTALL, FOOTAGE, JNTEFF, GIRTH_WELD, LONG_SEAM, JOINT_TYPE, SMYS, W_THICK, TEST_JOB, TEST_DATE, TEST_PRESS, TEST_MEDIUM, TEST_DUR

Data Source GasMap/GasView 2.0:

- ii. Class_Loc
- iii. HCA
- iii. MOP

The QA team checked 18 of the 19 fields as part of the QA4 PFL Feature Attribute accuracy test. The TEST PRESS field was checked as part of the QA 4 Valid Pressure Test check. See attachment "PSEP-Update_DR_ORA_004-Q02Atch02" for a description of the process.

b) QA5 leveraged the SMYS MOP field in the PSEP workbook (Column AU). Please see Note 8 in the annotated Decision Tree file attachment "PSEP-Update_DR_ORA_004-Q02Aтч03."