

**Gas Safety Alliance Follow-Up Meeting
PG&E/City of Lafayette/GSTF/CPUC
SEPT 17, 2020 Meeting Notes**

Attendees:

PG&E: Les Putnam, Bennie Barnes, Tom Guarino, Marcos Monte

City of Lafayette Jonathon Fox, Mike Anderson, Susan Candell

Residents/Gas Safety Task Force: Dennis Kuzak, Howard Fuchs, Michael & Gina Dawson

CPUC: Terence Eng, Paul Penney

Meeting Context:

This meeting #8 was held online via Zoom due to Covid-19 restrictions.

Action Items & Next Steps:

- * Follow-up needed to get Lafayette Police Department trained with PG&E.
- * PG&E to provide timeframe of when isolation valves in Lafayette were installed.
- * PG&E will provide in writing where and how quickly transmission lines have been isolated in other communities during actual incidents.
- * PG&E to provide status updates of current or recent gas projects in Lafayette.
- * PG&E to provide the list of prioritized future projects in Lafayette.
- * City to follow up with planning directors in other counties regarding need to do 811 requirements.

Meeting Notes:

1. **Emergency Response Capabilities (Les Putnam)** - Voluntary classes are hosted by PG&E. Meetings held with fire department, police department, and first responders. Also after 2017, “SB Therapeutic Remedy” - fire service: web based training, four flammable/gas trailers to simulate leak situation, 8-hr training class in Winters, CA to “train the trainers” for agencies. Held on annual basis, but not required. CC Fire holds 4-5 classes a year with PG&E. PG&E held Lamorinda CERT training in 2015, and is overdue to do again. Lafayette Police Department has NOT done this voluntary training. Has PG&E done drills with Lafayette? No, they have not been invited, but PG&E has done internal drills; PG&E would be happy to do so, though. Gas Emergency Response Plan available for public? No, it’s confidential for fire & police department. PG&E’s only concern is not coordinating with Lafayette PD – PG&E hopes this will happen before end of year. Resident concerns are around shut-down capabilities for downtown that must be done by PG&E, not fire. Fire personal will convey leak information to PG&E in an incident.
2. **Valve Isolation Plans (Bennie Barnes)** - Post San Bruno, PG&E automating valves in places where there are higher populations. 360 automated valves added across PG&E system since 2011. Two types of valves: 1) automatic shut-off pressure which are sensitive but have reliability problems, 2) remote controlled valves, which are more common. PG&E is not trying to automate every valve, they are trying to do isolation zones for reasonable amount of pipe so not dependent on lots of decision making opportunities. PG&E can manually shut off mainline valves, but don’t usually do it initially – usually after for further refinement and after they do automated valves. For Lafayette & Briones areas, pipeline isolation is planned through three zones: 1) Walnut regulator station -> Reliez Station in Lafayette for line 191-1 and all 3017-01 by closing 20.48 Walnut regulator station and 25.3 Reliez regulator station and can be isolated in minutes. Pressure drop & communication, and after that remote closure happens within minutes. 2) Reliez regulator station & end of 3001-01, 3002-01, and 191-1 (in middle) by closing 25.3 in Reliez station regulator station and Plaza station 26.53 (normally closed). 3) Isolation zone between C-street regulator station in Martinez to Plaza Station regulator station located at Moraga Rd & Mt. Diablo intersection. Would close Martinez station to shuts 191-1 gas from north and also 3003-02 and 191-A and 191-B, closure can occur in “minutes”. There are manual valves in between. “Within minutes of incident, we would close the valves.”

As they work with responders, they may close manual valves but that is not their first response.

So downtown, they would shut down at C-street location in Martinez. Isn't that a lot of gas to release? PG&E said the volume isn't that great. A full blown down is not necessary for emergency response, and it would take 11 minutes. PG&E would go out and further isolate section in order to keep larger number people in service. Isn't 11 minutes a long time? PG&E said it's more like 4-5 minutes that emergency concerns. The community expressed concern that these are unrealistic response times; in SF it took over 2 hours to shut off a 4" line at 75 PSI. There must be data validation process, etc. PG&E said identification of incident is starting point, PG&E is best of the industry. Isolation zones in transmission don't consider # of people being impacted. SF circumstance involved distribution pipelines, was about shutting transmission valve because isolation valves in distribution were too large. PG&E is working on objective to make smaller isolation zones in distribution. They've been doing this in transmission lines since 2011 based on NTSB regulation. How much would it take to shut-off gas downtown, since PG&E said before it would eventually be under an hour? PG&E said it would be minutes, but can't be exact, would be less than 60 minutes.

Line 191-1 goes through Briones. In event of rupture/leak, may be a while before anyone knows without seeing drop in pressure. Dry vegetation, strong winds make it worse, and then it doesn't matter if shutting off gas. PG&E looks for those pressure drops 24/7 and are trained to isolate. Automated valves also add pressure sensing devices, so these can be turned off quickly. PG&E saw that with some wildfires in other areas like Paradise. L191-B runs at 13% of design stress, so PG&E knows it will leak before rupture based on fracture mechanics. They haven't had much 3rd party damage on that line. There is a leak survey program for finding these leaks. Is this "leak before rupture" true with most of the lines in Lafayette? Line 191-1 there are places where is true, but some sections at elevated SMYS (44%), so that section would rupture. San Bruno had seam welds, pup welds - virtually all had weld defects and our line 191-1 is even older.

What is PG&E doing looking at welds installed a long time ago? PG&E has a vintage pipeline replacement program. Girth welds only see 30% of operational stress based on loads, so they're forgiving to anomalies. Outside force putting lateral forces on weld is biggest concern. Vintage pipeline replacement targets not age but types of construction methods at certain times, including oxy-acetylene welds & girth welds (not used on this line). The program looks at external forces & is why PG&E looked at exposed segments at Buckeye Ranch Trail to look at strain analysis to see if stress being put on the welds. Lafayette residents have been concerned with baseline information. Lots of lines are untested, 191-B does have lap & vintage welds, and an anomaly was found recently. Do we really know what's happening? Residents said recent conversations have been helpful, but we want to know what's happening now & on the horizon.

Vice-Mayor Susan Candell questions: are automated valves recent? Yes on Reliez Station, but PG&E didn't know on others. Can you give us examples of where you have shut-down transmission lines, and how you were able to do them? PG&E said they will provide in writing later. To say that pipelines would be leaking instead of rupturing doesn't seem helpful in case of trees overhanging pipelines as in Briones. Should consider it can happen pretty quickly too. PG&E said they were referring to normal circumstances, instead of tree roots ripping pipelines out of ground. Residents clarified tree roots have never ripped transmission lines out of ground, the real risk of a tree falling onto the exposed pipeline spans in Lafayette, and the strong Diablo winds in Tier 2 wildfire zone areas. It's why the emergency response plan is critical, could be catastrophic to Lafayette and the reason why we're trying to clarify the information.

3. **TIMP audit update** (Terrence/Paul) - Commission does TIMP audits, and Task Force asked for TIMP inspection to review methodology for determining threat and mitigating on a local level with Lafayette. Originally, a one-week inspection was scheduled for release for today (Sept 17, 2020). Given additional questions in June by Gina Dawson, CPUC wanted to do best job they could, so they decided to extend audit to a 2nd week. Scheduling of 2nd week is in December. Because audit still pending, not able to give preliminary results today because CPUC gives operator the ability to respond to comments or violations to give that opportunity to clear air and provide evidence to respond to violations. Paul said there were lots of additional concerns and questions, so CPUC sent extensive list of questions based on this letter. Within last week, they sent their response and Paul hasn't looked at it yet. Planning on finishing audit in December and will write letter afterwards. Residents appreciate the work of CPUC for this audit. These questions were from presentation to the City and the letter written by Mayor Anderson asking for answers. The City appreciates the thorough job by CPUC. Task Force hoping this letter Gina sent to CPUC was seen by the PG&E team on this call, and not just compliance since this deals with priorities. Our concerns started right when trees were planned on being removed, but no examination of what's happening to pipes underground. Question: how would remedies be made issues found: would PG&E apply to just local

pipelines or system wide? PG&E said it would depend, if it's procedures then it would be how they are identified. If they're not mitigating at local level, then something needs to be handled as well. Timing of response & public distribution: CPUC submits letter within 30 days of inspection (Dec 15). There may be back & forth that would delay it. Then operator given 30 days to respond. If CPUC satisfied, they could issue closure letter. So goal is 90 days total. So late March, early April for release of information. If PG&E disagrees with findings, they will say why in letter & then CPUC makes evaluation based on what PG&E sent & send out final letter. Paul said it's actually 120 days, since CPUC has 60 days to issue letter. (So: late April, beginning of May). Residents said this determination of minimum safety standards, work of residents to determine threats. CPUC said there is a standard set of threats in B318S, a standard incorporated by GO 192. PG&E must consider all threats, and what CPUC looks at during audit in Lafayette. Minimum standards apply to all operators, so PG&E may consider their other threats like wildfire. CPUC will view how they will address and mitigate these threats and hold them to these standards. Terrance said they do have 120 days timeframe to finalize. Susan: do we have visibility to letters? CPUC puts audit letters online & CPUC will send it to the City of Lafayette for distribution & posting on City website.

4. **Overview of gas safety projects in Lafayette** - Marcos was going to give overview of status update on each project, but they can send that in writing. Residents want to start talking about strength testing downtown. PG&E will be done end October. Why is this being done now? PG&E integrity management group identified the need in March of 2020. End of July a letter was sent to the Mayor. Lafayette public works staff contacted in April to start talking about how to execute. Hydrotest & ILI review. PG&E wasn't prepared in this meeting to talk about why this project is being done in Lafayette now. Non-traditional ILI (2nd part of this project) scheduled for November 16th. PG&E not aware of any threat, doing this for compliance reasons. Why this pipeline for testing over others in Lafayette? PG&E not prepared to answer. Residents understand PG&E not prepared, but our questions are a continuation of identifying local concerns.

It's concerning, we need to be more transparent with communications. How do we set up mechanism for this? Marcos said written questions can be given to Julien Lacson to get more information with timing as a community outreach specialist with access to specialists. Residents said this is part of the problem, information comes back generic and often doesn't answer the questions; would much prefer to reach directly to people like Lanthy Lee who are local engineers for direct communication. We're not looking for language for newsletter in town, we're trying to get a better understanding of local threats and work being done to addresses. Marcos said if they're looking for more technical information. Marcos thought we were looking for status updates of projects, and to tell him ahead of time if we're looking for more information ahead of the meetings. Residents said PG&E seems to be gatekeeping. Tom said before they do any work, the first stop is with City staff months ahead of work. Perhaps City should start a PG&E projects page that is kept updated. Mayor Mike Anderson said residents don't want a project list, but more an understanding of PG&E's prioritization of projects in town, and that's a conversation we should have. Glad there's work being done in Lafayette, but how are certain projects popping up. Marcos said please respond to this group for specific questions and provide outside of the meeting, and have available in writing. Tom said it's twofold: project rationale for notification. Jonathan knows months ahead of public of these projects. Tom said sometimes the timing is dependent upon teams being freed up. For example, many strength tests going on all the time & there are scheduling issues. Residents agree the need for both things: rationale for projects and notification of such, but that was the original reason for the Alliance meetings, to answer the questions for Lafayette on what are local risks, and how are they prioritizing it. We appreciate Bennie's participation because he has the policies & engineering perspective. Maybe this is new, looking at risk from the micro-level, so maybe writing down the question & getting answer is not workable. PG&E said if they had known they would have come more prepared, and if residents want more of the description of the programs, they can give more information about these programs in future meetings. Residents said we already did this with Bennie in person, and we did provide what we were looking for previously and haven't received it. Difficult to do this over email, perhaps we have a monthly staff/resident review with PG&E to talk rationale and scheduling. Residents said they appreciate PG&E coming prepared to talk about project status, but frustrating to be working 2 years asking for local risks, integrity management, how prioritize, etc. CPUC said risks are always same, standard set every time they do analysis & risk ranking of each segments and consider other unique circumstances if there. As for as integrity assessment techniques, could hydrate static test pipeline segments & 7 yrs do the entire thing over again as approved integrity assessment techniques for threats (int corrosion, ext corrosion). Approved sets of testing techniques & need to do test periodically & we'd see it done over & over again. Residents said that was our original concern: up to 60% of the pipeline in Lafayette is untested, no baseline with 70

yr old pipeline downtown 3002-01. Now it's suddenly being tested, although we were told by PG&E it wasn't going to be tested until year 2026. It raises a red flag. There's a need for a baseline, and that's why residents asked for a TIMP audit so we're starting from good place & getting better by working with fellow stakeholders. PG&E: 3002-01 HCA in region downtown did have prior integrity assessment doing external corrosion direct assessment (ECDA) in 2013, but PG&E not sure why in 7 yr interval they switched to hydrostatic pressure testing. Residents appreciate hydrostatic testing because it seems a better view than ECDA, the line is concerning 3-inch pipeline goes to Orinda through Lafayette Reservoir. Residents have received disparate information from beginning, we appreciate information being given. But how do we get consistent information? Maybe with Alliance that is on the horizon. PG&E said utility coordination meetings happen in other cities for all utilities to talk how to coordinate projects together for timing to improve efficiencies. Residents agree, but said concern is about safety and not coordination. PG&E asked if utility community meetings are of interest to the City, but City said this is done already by the public works group as internal process. Mayor Anderson said Lafayette is asking: what is the priority and why? Residents want to know, have the information to help look at safety. Is it simply scheduling, funding opportunities, or safety reason? PG&E will take as an action item: PG&E to provide prioritized projects with City of Lafayette, and include electrical, vegetation management, gas, etc.

5. Question asked about timing & prioritization of projects. PG&E said integrity management is to reduce risk, but first go through system to identify 9 threats that could exist, then use those threats to inform type of integrity assessment, monitoring. Some spelled out in regulations, others PG&E-specific programs. For those, PG&E overlays likelihood of that threat turning to failure & looking at consequence if that occurred. CA code for typical transmission IM program is geared toward HCAs. There are specific requirements. But PG&E also applies integrity management principles outside of these areas too. Sometimes we get mixed up in our conversations about this. Example: 3002-01 assessment had 2013 integrity assessment, now required to come back 7 years later by code to do it again. External corrosion is time dependent threat, so is always considered a threat. Need to use one of three methods. Compliance requirement, but also looking at total risk across the system. And every 3-4 years, PG&E goes through rate case process to forecast what will be done, given limited resources to be spread across the entire system. That's why risk prioritization plays a big role when and where PG&E does integrity work. Example, doing the vintage pipeline replacement program, that's done not because of compliance, but because they understand the risk out there and learning from incidents across the industry. Residents said that makes sense, and why residents want to know rationale of why projects are being done, either for compliance or to address identified risks in our neighborhoods. Gives public ability to advocate for those works.
6. **City Requirement Call Before You Dig? (Jonathan Fox)** - Reviewed with planning staff. Benefit: confirmation of contractors contacted utilities. Downside: possible more staff time, another checklist item, and contractor jumping through one more hoop for building permit. Not required at this time, instead 811 signs & flyers in the office. Next step: Planning Director Gregg Wolf checking with other planning directors in CC County to see if those jurisdictions have this requirement.
7. **Next meeting** - to be held in spring, after CPUC audit report. Questions can be sent to PG&E via email and they are happy to oblige.