

From: Malashenko, Elizaveta I.
Sent: 7/16/2014 10:43:44 AM
To: Prusnek, Brian C (BPrusnek@semprautilities.com)
Cc: Doll, Laura (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=LRDD);
Malashenko, Elizaveta I. (elizaveta.malashenko@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: EDF Leak Tracking Website

Your involvement and thoughts for the path forward

> On Jul 16, 2014, at 9:57 AM, "Prusnek, Brian C" <BPrusnek@semprautilities.com> wrote:

>

> The details of the EDF report? Or our involvement?

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Malashenko, Elizaveta I. [<mailto:elizaveta.malashenko@cpuc.ca.gov>]

> Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:17 AM

> To: Prusnek, Brian C

> Cc: Doll, Laura; Malashenko, Elizaveta I.

> Subject: Re: EDF Leak Tracking Website

>

> Brian - Thank you for the information. Please set something up for me - I want to talk through the details.

>

> Laura - if possible, I'd like PG&E on the same call.

>

>

>> On Jul 16, 2014, at 8:28 AM, "Prusnek, Brian C" <BPrusnek@semprautilities.com> wrote:

>>

>> We have been working with EDF and we will have similar maps released in the future. That being said, we have a lot of issues with what they're doing. Here are a few concerns. Do you wanna chat about this?

>>

>> 1. Methane leakage maps will cause customer confusion and unnecessary panic - their site seems to rank the emissions in terms of "low, medium and high" levels of leakage

>> 2. Although EDF focus is on methane leakage and climate change, customers may not differentiate and associate with safety concerns

>> 3. Although those on the call agreed that safety is the first priority, and acknowledged the utilities already handle any potentially hazardous leaks -- the mapping information may actually divert utility resources away from true safety issues to address customer concerns about non-hazardous methane leaks

>> 4. "120 times more potent than Carbon Dioxide" claim is not the standard being used and causes more inconsistency and confusion

>>

>> Brian Prusnek

>>

>>

>>> On Jul 15, 2014, at 8:02 PM, "Doll, Laura" <LRDD@pge.com> wrote:

>>>

>>> I just heard (here at NARUC) that this is controversial. Apparently they used Picarro. Criticism is that it was done in an uncontrolled way that is misleading, greatly overstating gas leaks. As you know picarro picks up anything and it needs to be analyzed. I guess edf will do some press thing tmrw. Don't know more yet.

>>>

>>> Sent from my iPhone

>>>

>>> On Jul 15, 2014, at 7:35 PM, "Malashenko, Elizaveta I."

<elizaveta.malashenko@cpuc.ca.gov<<mailto:elizaveta.malashenko@cpuc.ca.gov>>> wrote:

>>>

>>> Hi,

>>>

>>> I've heard that Environmental Defense Fund has created a website that tracks pipeline leaks in a few big cities - NYC, Boston, and Indianapolis. Are you aware of EDF expanding this project into California? Have you had any conversations with them on that?

>>>

>>> Thanks in advance,

>>>

>>> Liza

>>>

>>> _____

>>> Elizaveta Malashenko

>>> Deputy Director

>>> Office of Utility Safety and Reliability Safety and Enforcement

>>> Division California Public Utilities Commission

>>> Phone: 415-703-2274

>>> E-mail:

>>> elizaveta.malashenko@cpuc.ca.gov<<mailto:elizaveta.malashenko@cpuc.ca.gov>

>>> gov>

>>>

>>>

>>>

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

>>> To learn more, please visit

>>> <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

>>>

>>> -----

>>> - This email originated outside of Sempra Energy. Be cautious of

>>> attachments, web links, or requests for information.

>

> -----

> This email originated outside of Sempra Energy. Be cautious of attachments, web links, or requests for information.