Docket No. SA-534

Exhibit No. 2-BK

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Washington, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF BRIAN DAUBIN, PG&E
(JAN-7-2011)

(35 Pages)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
Investigation of:	*	
	*	
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY	*	
SEPTEMBER 9, 2010 ACCIDENT	*	Docket No. DCA-10-MP-008
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA	*	
	*	
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		

Interview of: BRIAN DAUBIN

Marriott Hotel
San Francisco Airport
1800 Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, California 94010

Friday,
January 7, 2011

The above-captioned matter convened, pursuant to notice.

BEFORE: RAVINDRA CHHATRE
Investigator-in-Charge

APPEARANCES:

RAVINDRA M. CHHATRE, Investigator-in-Charge
National Transportation Safety Board
490 L'EnFant Plaza East, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20594
202-314-6644
ravindra.chhatre@ntsb.gov

MATTHEW R. NICHOLSON, Accident Investigator
Office of Railroad, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Investigations
National Transportation Safety Board
490 L'Enfant Plaza East, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20594
202-314-6468
matthew.nicholson@ntsb.gov

LAWSON F. NARVELL, JR., Investigator
Human Performance Group
National Transportation Safety Board
490 L'EnFant Plaza East, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20594
202-314-6422
narvelr@ntsb.gov

KARL GUNTHER, Pipeline Accident Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board
490 L'EnFant Plaza East, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20594
202-314-6578
karl.gunter@ntsb.gov

GEOFFREY J. CALDWELL, Police Sergeant
City of San Bruno Police Department
Police Plaza
1177 Huntington Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
650-616-7100
gcaldwell@sanbruno.ca.gov

APPEARANCES (Cont.):

ROBERT FASSETT, Director
Integrity Management and Technical Services
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
375 North Wiget Lane
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
925-974-4210
rpf2@pge.com

CONNIE JACKSON, City Manager
City of San Bruno
567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066-4299
650-616-7056
cjackson@ci.sanbruno.ca.us

KLARA FABRY, Public Services Director
City of San Bruno
567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066-424
650-616-7065

SUNIL K. SHORI, Utilities Engineer
State of California Public Utilities Commission
505 VanNess Avenue, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298
415-703-2407
sks@cpuc.ca.gov

PETER J. KATCHMAR, Accident Coordinator
Pipeline Safety Program
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 110
Lakewood, CO 80228
303-807-8458
peter.katchmar@dot.gov

APPEARANCES (Cont.):

DEBBIE MAZZANTI, Business Representative
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local 1245
30 Orange Tree Circle
Vacaville, CA 95687
415-517-0317
djmg@ibew1245.com

JOSHUA SPERRY, Senior Union Representative
Engineers and Scientists of California
Local 20, IFPTE AFL-CIO & CLC
835 Howard Street, 2nd floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
415-543-8320
jsperry@ifpte20.org

DANE B. JAQUES, Esq.
Dombroff, Gilmore, Jaques & French
1676 International Drive, Penthouse
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-336-8709
djaques@dglitigators.com

I N D E X

I N T E R V I E W

MR. CHHATRE: Good afternoon, everyone. Today is Friday, January 7th, 2011. We are currently in Burlingame, California at the San Francisco Airport Marriott. We are meeting in regards to the investigation of the pipeline rupture in San Bruno, California that occurred on September 9th, 2010. The NTSB accident number for this investigation is DCA-10-MP-008.

My name is Ravi Chhatre. I am with the National Transportation Safety Board in Washington, D.C. and I'm the investigator-in-charge of this accident.

I would like to start by notifying everyone present in this room that we are recording this interview for transcription at a later date. All parties will have a chance to review the transcripts when they are completed.

Also, I'd like to inform -- I hope I pronounce your name correctly, Mr. Frank Daubin?

MR. DAUBIN: Brian Daubin.

MR. CHHATRE: I just did that on purpose. Sorry. I just couldn't resist the temptation. Brian, you are permitted to have one other person present with you during this interview. This person can be your supervisor, friend, family member. It's your choice and, if you choose, no one at all.

For the record please state your full name, the spelling, your contact information such as e-mail, mailing address, telephone number, and whom you have chosen to be present

with you during your interview.

MR. DAUBIN: My name is Brian Daubin, spelled B-R-I-A-N. Last name Daubin, D as in David, A-U-B as in boy, I-N. My mailing address is 375 North Wiget. That is W-I-G-E-T, in Walnut Creek, California 94598. My e-mail address is bmd5@pge.com. I have asked Dane Jaques to represent me.

MR. CHHATRE: Thank you. Now I'd like to go around the room and have each person introduce themselves. Please state your name, title, affiliation, organization that you are with and business phone and e-mail address, starting with PG&E.

MR. FASSETT: Bob Fassett, PG&E. Information on the card provided.

MS. FABRY: Klara Fabry, City of San Bruno. The information is on the card provided.

MR. SHORI: Sunil Shori, California Public Utilities Commission. My information is contained on the card provided.

MR. KATCHMAR: Peter Katchmar, United States Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA. My information's on the card.

MR. GUNTHER: Karl Gunther, NTSB, operations chair. karl.gunther@NTSB.gov, 202-314-6478.

MS. MAZZANTI: Debbie Mazzanti, IBEW, Local 1245, and my information is on the card.

MR. SPERRY: Joshua Sperry, ESC, Local 20. My information's on the card provided.

MR. NICHOLSON: Matthew Nicholson, NTSB. Matthew, M-A-T-T-H-E-W, Nicholson, N-I-C-H-O-L-S-O-N. E-mail, matthew.nicholson@NTSB.gov.

MR. CHHATRE: Ravindra Chhatre, NTSB. E-mail, ravindra.chhatre. Telephone, 202-314-6644.

MR. JAQUES: Dane Jaques on behalf of Mr. Daubin. My information is on the business card provided.

MR. CHHATRE: Thank you. Karl, you want to go first or should we start at the beginning?

MR. GUNTHER: Yes, I will.

INTERVIEW OF BRIAN DAUBIN

BY MR. GUNTHER:

Q. Brian, could you please give me your job title and affiliation?

A. I am the manager of Engineering Support Services with Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

Q. And can I get the duties of your job?

A. Sure. I manage all the work activities of those under me. I provide the oversight of budgets associated with those groups. I am the -- provide leadership and mentorship to those first line supervisors as well as the individuals. I have both bargaining unit and management employees under my guidance.

Q. And are you tied in with the GIS system?

A. Yes, sir. One of my areas of responsibility is the Gas Transmission Mapping Group. Their duties require them to use the

GIS tool.

Q. Okay. And I want to get your professional credentials.

A. I have a bachelor's of science in mechanical engineering from California State University at Sacramento. I am a licensed CAD operator with AutoCAD and have been certified through them. I've taken numerous training courses in Micro Station, which is also another design tool, and that's it for the record I guess.

Q. Okay. Are you familiar at least with the way changes are made in the GIS system when -- say -- let me start over again. Say when someone in the field finds something that doesn't match up with the GIS system or the alignment sheets or whatever, are you familiar with the process they go through to straighten that out?

A. Yes.

Q. And is that something, say, that happens frequently or rarely or --

A. I don't know that I'd be able to classify the number of times that it happens, but there are mechanisms to be able to get that information into the Mapping Group.

Q. In the particular case here with this piping, have there been steps taken to at least try to better identify the pipe or are you far enough along to be able to really identify it?

A. Can you specify which pipe we're talking about when you say this pipe?

Q. I'm talking about the X42 seamless that -- at least as

of now I think there's at least -- I'm thinking it's DSAW, and are you looking to maybe straighten out the process, that once you find out what it is that, you know, get GIS right on it?

A. It is -- again, I'm not sure exactly which pipe we're talking about and which we're trying to identify.

Q. The pipe that was in the rupture.

A. The pipe that was in the rupture?

Q. Yeah. On the alignment sheet it's X42 seamless.

A. Correct, and we believe that to be an error.

Q. Right. Have you corrected that or are you still working on determining where the error is and what it is?

A. So we had done a complete validation, a GIS validation, of the peninsula lines. That's lines 100, 101, 109 and line 132. We have done that validation for those lines. We have done a data mining effort to all of the documents of record in the project folder.

Q. Okay. No more questions for right now.

MR. FASSETT: Bob Fassett, PG&E, no questions.

MS. FABRY: Klara Fabry, one question.

BY MS. FABRY:

Q. You said that you did all of the GIS validation for all of the peninsula lines. Can you tell me the date when that was done?

A. I do not know the exact date completed. I do know that those three lines were not completed on the same exact day, but

the validation effort took some time and they have been completed recently.

Q. Recently? The last three months or so? Recently meaning in the last three --

A. The last three months would be a safe window, yes.

Q. Now one other question. I heard today that -- and I -- not knowing exactly your responsibility -- you mentioned that you were responsible for budget, too. You would know when the improvement project for making lines 132, 109 and 101 (indiscernible) will be included in your budget or CIP recommendation?

A. I'm sorry. I didn't hear the -- if you could speak up just a little bit. I didn't hear the question.

Q. You have information when the CIP will make (indiscernible) line 132, 101 and 109 will be included in your budget proposal?

A. I don't -- you refer to my project proposals. I don't necessarily provide project proposals.

MR. JAQUES: Off the record, please.

MR. CHHATRE: Off the record.

(Off the record.)

(On the record.)

MR. CHHATRE: Back on the record.

MR. DAUBIN: So I am not responsible for the overall budgets for projects and our annual budgets set forth that you're

referring to.

MS. FABRY: Thank you.

MR. SHORI: Sunil Shori, California PUC.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Brian, earlier you indicated you're a manager of groups.

A. Yes.

Q. Which groups -- can you list the specific groups that you are in charge of?

A. Absolutely. I have the Standards Group which reports to me. That is a group that works with other individual groups to write and create standards. I am in charge of the Gas Transmission Mapping Group, Regulatory Support and Analysis, which is a liaison between PG&E and CPUC, the Design Drafting Group, the Estimating Group and the Records Group.

Q. In regard to the --

A. Oh, I'm sorry. For the record, I also have IBEW Clerical. They would be upset if I left them out, so --

Q. Thank you for providing that. In terms of the particular section that failed in this accident, at this point you've determined in terms of where the records in GIS were not correctly reflecting what was in place?

A. Are we -- please ask the question again.

Q. At this point have you determined why GIS was not necessarily reflecting what was actually the pipe in place? Going back to Karl's question, GIS reflected this to be seamless pipe?

A. Correct.

Q. And what was in place was not seamless pipe?

A. Correct.

Q. And at this point you've determined at least what caused that discrepancy for that location?

A. That was provided in a data request to the NTSB. We believe that information to be taken off a journal voucher, an accounting journal voucher, from the project folder. It referenced SML pipe.

Q. Okay. And in regard to the complete validation of lines 109, 101 and 132 that you discussed earlier, how have you used that information that you've learned related to this failed segment and what other information have you utilized to perform those validations for those three lines?

A. So what we have learned is that the document of record for engineering specifications, primarily pipeline specifications, should be coming directly from those material codes listed on billing materials and/or engineering specs. We are not to be utilizing accounting documentation. So we have applied that throughout the validation effort. That's our standard practice now. In fact, the method by which we did the validation for those peninsula lines was very similar to the ECDA process and also to the IOI process by which we validate information for pipeline specs.

Q. Was there any process in place that disallowed the use

of those records in the past for basically have determined what ended up on your Pipeline Survey Sheets and then what ended up on your GIS? In other words, right now the job -- the voucher, the purchase voucher, that you discussed earlier, was there anything that disallowed that use or was there anything that required something different to be utilized?

A. I don't know. I wasn't there in 1956.

Q. I'm talking about on the Pipeline Survey sheets. Essentially that information ended up on the Pipeline Survey Sheets, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. So at this point you're stating that that -- they used the purchase voucher to populate that field?

A. I do not know. I mean I don't know the process of how the Pipeline Survey Sheets were populated.

Q. Okay. So, again, I'm not sure if I got a clear answer, and if I did I apologize, but I'd like to see if we can ask one more time. In terms of the validations on 109, 101, 132, what records have you used at this stage to perform those validations?

A. We've used all of the records in the project folder, which contain some of those journal vouchers, but we do not take that information. It is a data point by which we evaluate all the data in the project folder to establish the pipeline specs. So we have -- we do not use that information exclusively. However, that information can back up and verify the engineering specifications

that we utilize, but we do not use it as a sole piece of information to populate GIS.

Q. At this stage on lines 101, 109, 132 do you still have any portions of those lines that are still either unknown and pending review or at this point all of them have been confirmed?

A. I believe all of them have been confirmed, although to be on record, I have not seen every single one of those line items with my own eyes. Again, I've been providing support for the NTSB investigation, but we believe that all of those -- I know of no unknowns.

Q. What other changes to the standards are either underway or have already been created in regard to whatever's been learned related to your investigations of this accident and GIS issues that have been noted thus far? Have you revised any standards, have you created any new standards, related to the GIS process?

A. No, none.

Q. All right. Thank you.

MR. KATCHMAR: Peter Katchmar here, U.S. DOT, PHMSA.

BY MR. KATCHMAR:

Q. Brian, during your group's validation of line -- recent validation of lines 101, 109 and 132 have any new discrepancies been noted?

A. Any new -- through the validation effort?

Q. Uh-huh.

A. Yes, there was some discrepancies found.

Q. And can you elaborate on what they were?

A. Those were other sections on line 132 that showed 30 inch seamless. There was also some discrepancies, what we call discrepancies in a general sense, that were values that were more conservative, so those were values that were unconfirmed and assumed values that were the most conservative possible for that time. Those have been since validated and a -- you know, for instance, what we believe to be a smaller wall thickness pipe has now been confirmed and we've identified that it's actually a thicker wall thickness, so there's been those cases as well.

Q. Okay, good. Do you or your group have anything to do with the MAOP determination of line 132?

A. No. My team does not validate the MAOP or establish the MAOP line.

Q. Okay. Does your team -- do you or your team have anything to do with the class location studies or class location changes along line 132?

A. No. No, my group does not handle those.

Q. Okay. Do you have personal knowledge of how to do that?

A. Personal knowledge of how to do the study?

Q. Yes.

A. No. I'm not an expert in that field.

Q. Okay. Okay. Do you know who I could ask about MAOP determination and class location studies that would know?

A. Sure, Pipeline Engineering.

Q. Who might that be that I would ask?
A. The director of Pipeline Engineering would be Todd Hogenson.
Q. Can you spell his name?
A. Todd is T-O-D-D, H-O-G-E-N-S-O-N.
Q. All right. Thank you, sir. I'm done.
MR. GUNTHER: No further questions.
MR. SPERRY: No questions.
MR. NICHOLSON: No questions at this time.
BY MR. CHHATRE:
Q. Brian, Ravi, Chhatre. I have a couple of questions. How does information get into the GIS?
A. Information gets entered into GIS through the Gas Transmission Mapping Department.
Q. And how does the Mapping Department get the information?
A. Mapping gets the information from many different sources. We get information from -- directly from the field. We get information directly within Gas Engineering, which we are a part of. We get information from Distribution engineers. We get information throughout the company.
Q. And how is that -- is that information rated out for its accuracy? Is there any process of making sure the information is accurate when it comes to the Mapping Department?
A. So you're talking about information -- new information that gets put into the system?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. There is a quality control program in place. As we do jobs, projects, that get input into the GIS, whether that's new construction, relocation or information that comes from the Integrity Management Group, we are -- Gas Transmission mappers will input that into GIS. That information goes on to what's called a reconciliation layer. That reconciliation layer is not approved and put onto the default layer until it's gone through a principal mapper's review.

Q. And what does the principal mapper's review means? What happens there?

A. Principal mapper is another set of eyes, more experienced in that line of work, and they review project folder information. They review the data associated with the job that's going in. They look at the associated data around that section to ensure that what is in place, one, is in alignment. Remember GIS is a geographical information system, so there is an alignment of that as well as the data associated with the project makes sense. So it's another set of eyes. It's a quality control program.

Q. Okay. And when was that established?

A. That process has been established since GIS has been established back in 1994.

Q. And does the extra set of eyes after the review, do they have to sign off some place saying it went through that rating process?

A. They do. They actually authorize that layer to be put into the default level and their initials go on that.

Q. Now this process, the way you describe it and if I understand it correctly, is internal within the Mapping Department. How do you make sure that the information that's coming to the Mapping Department, does that get rated out somehow for its accuracy? The Mapping Department, the way I understand you described the process, is they take the information, enter into the system. Another set of eyes look at that, make sure what came in and what it entered is correct?

A. I'm not responsible for the quality control programs of other departments. I do know that there are some groups that have quality control programs, but I can't speak to them.

Q. So the Mapping Department, if you copy something that comes in and is erroneous, how do you correct that if it does get through the recheck again? That erroneous information then stays in the Mapping Department?

A. I understand the first part, but then you added something there.

Q. Okay.

A. I don't understand.

Q. Now the information comes to the Mapping Department. They enter it in the system. And if I understand, this witness is telling me that if somebody working in the field --

A. Okay.

Q. -- notices a discrepancy and somehow they call the Mapping Department --

A. Okay. So --

Q. -- that information is entered, is that correct?

A. So you mentioned three different things there and you stuck them into one sentence. There is the -- there is a process by which errors that are identified in the field and/or in any other groups can come into Mapping for an update to GIS. There is project work that comes in as part of our normal relocation and/or pipeline -- new pipeline projects that then goes through a process in Mapping as well. So they're two completely distinct processes and we can talk to those one by one, but there's a different process for -- we can't put those two together so to speak.

Q. So is that how, using those two processes, the way you update any errors in the Mapping Department or there is something else?

A. Okay. So you're talking about the discrepancy process.

Q. Correct.

A. Okay. So there are three methods by which discrepancies -- actually there's four methods by which discrepancies can be brought into Mapping. There is an A Form. We've heard -- well. So there is an A Form. The A Form is sent to Mapping. Mapping inputs the A Forms into GIS and/or another system called IGIS. IGIS is just a leak summary program. It's irrelevant to the Geographical Information System other than it tracks leaks, but

the A Form is generated primarily from a leak or any time the pipe is unearthed.

The A Form would provide any changes or any observances from field personnel. Those are submitted to Mapping. Mapping reviews those A Forms and looks at GIS and notes any discrepancies. If there are any discrepancies between an A Form and what's in GIS, the mapper, the Gas Transmission mapper, will work with the Pipeline engineer to ensure that what the field personnel wrote down on this form should and qualifies to overwrite what's in GIS, okay? So we don't just take the field personnel's word for it. We check with the Pipeline engineer, does this make sense?

The other process would be Gas Engineering folks, folks who have some level of expertise in regards to pipeline characteristics and pipeline specifications, could also send us an e-mail to the lead mapper which is then tracked in a folder, a discrepancies folder, and that would be provided, an update to GIS. Those would be scheduled updates. Some of them are minor. Some of them are more urgent. And the Pipeline engineer would request those changes to be made at that time.

The other way that that would happen is through the IOI project or ECDA. If during an IOI project, when they're going through what they called the Pipeline Features List, they do very similar to the ECDA process where there's a full data mining. They put together what's called a Pipeline Features List. This

denotes every pipeline feature along the section of pipe that's going to be IOI'd. During that time that Pipeline Features List is provided to Mapping. They update and review -- excuse me. They update GIS based upon their review of the Pipeline Features List, if there's any discrepancies at all. And then the other process that I alluded to was ECDA as well.

Q. Okay.

A. That information comes into Mapping through Integrity Management Department and we are to input all of those along with a lot of other stuff that we have to do, but part of that is we check the A Forms to ensure consistency with what's in GIS.

Q. Again, the process you describes it what, I guess, looks like an official form is the form the leaks (indiscernible, that Form A, you said?

A. The A Form? That is correct.

Q. The other three input information --

A. Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot one vital process. That was the fourth process. There is within our -- we have a program called Map Guide. Map Guide is an electronic online view of GIS. Those who have access to Map Guide cannot edit GIS, but they can view our system on GIS. There is an electronic dropdown menu that allows an individual to pinpoint an area in Map Guide and send to that our principal mapper and say there's a discrepancy in this area and describe what the discrepancy is. That, in turn, would also get us to get Pipeline engineers involved in the process to

vet out what the issue would be.

Q. Okay.

MR. CHHATRE: Rick, do you want to get on the record because you came in late.

MR. NARVELL: Rick Narvell from NTSB. I have no questions.

MR. CHHATRE: Also, City, do you want to get on the record?

MS. JACKSON: Connie Jackson, City of San Bruno.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Tell me, if somebody in the field sends that mapping process that they can enter information in GIS, it comes directly to the Mapping Department?

A. It comes directly to the principal mapper in Gas Transmission Mapping.

Q. And did I hear you say that in the piping of Gas Engineering, who inputs saying that it is right or if it looks correct and then it should or should not go into Mapping? Did I say that correctly or I did not?

A. No. The principal mapper will first filter the request. Okay. If it's viewed -- if the request is viewed and there is no discrepancy, there's nothing for the mapper to do. If there is a discrepancy, we do not change and update GIS until we get the Pipeline engineer's approval to do so through the discrepancy process.

Q. And do you know if the Pipeline Engineer Group that's within your umbrella assists with that or it does not?

A. No, they are not. As I pointed out to Mr. Katchmar, they report to Todd Hogenson as the director.

Q. Okay. So the Pipeline engineer places the request. Then you just enter that into the system?

A. They are the experts on pipe specifications and, therefore, they authorize the change in GIS.

Q. Now -- and I'm trying to find out who the person was, but there was a bell hole digging down on line 132 many times at different locations prior to the incident.

A. Oh, okay. I'm unaware of how many times or how many.

Q. Yeah, and that is not really the focus of it. The focus is when they do that, they access the GIS, do they not or you do not know that?

A. During the -- as established earlier in earlier testimony, during the pre-assessment phase they go through a data mining process.

Q. There is one, I think, that was discussed where they actually go and dig bell holes.

A. Not in Phase 1.

Q. No, I didn't say Phase 1. Phase 2, I think, is it (indiscernible)?

A. That I would have to defer --

Q. What's the correct terminology?

A. I would have to defer to the expert on that.
Q. Okay.
MR. CHHATRE: All right. Bob?
MR. FASSETT: Direct examinations are done in Phase 3 of the ECDA process.
MR. CHHATRE: Okay.
BY MR. CHHATRE:
Q. So Phase 3. Whenever they do the bell hole digging, do they use the GIS or they don't use GIS for that?
A. Typically they use backhoes and shovels to dig the bell holes.
Q. No, but do they need GIS to make the decision where they are digging, the actual location, or they don't? That's what I'm asking.
A. No.
Q. I'm not saying they do. I'm just saying do they need the actual location, and to do that do they need GIS information?
A. The answer is no.
Q. Okay.
A. They use the data that's provided to them.
Q. Okay. Now when they find something would they be -- so they really would not know what information is in GIS for that particular location for the pipeline?
A. No, they will because they've done a full pre-assessment, as we covered earlier, under Phase 1.

Q. Okay. So when they do that and they make the change, they send it to GIS or they would not?

A. That is correct.

Q. Do you recall if any such information came prior to the accident for line 132?

A. I do not recall.

Q. Okay. And that's all for me. Thank you so much.

MR. FASSETT: Bob Fassett, PG&E. Just a couple of follow-up.

BY MR. FASSETT:

Q. You mentioned earlier that -- I believe you mentioned earlier or maybe Sunil mentioned earlier that this initial information, this 30 inch SML, was on a Pipeline Survey Sheet, is that correct?

A. I don't know that to be true. I believe that is the case. I have not seen that Pipeline Survey Sheet with my own eyes.

Q. Because as I recall Pipeline Survey Sheets became a requirement when the Federal Government created Part 192 for gas -- natural gas operators in 1970 -- 1969, '68, somewhere between '68 and '70, and the requirement in that code was operators need to have documentation of the pipelines. They got to know what it is, diameter, wall thickness, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Prior to that there wasn't any code requirement for operators to have that kind of information. Is that your understanding?

A. That is correct.

Q. Where were you in 1968?

A. A gleam in my mother's eye, I guess. I was not born in '68.

Q. Okay. And to clarify, this project was installed in 1956, is that --

A. That is correct. Installation date for this particular section of pipe on line 132 was 1956.

Q. So you discussed the change when you did this validation for 109, 101, 132, as that we no longer will use the information on a journal voucher, but will use the information on a material procurement, job pipe spec, something like that, is that correct?

A. Correct. So what I actually stated was the fact that it is currently in our procedures not to take that information. Those procedures only existed when we started to IOI program and we started to -- we started what's called a Pipe Features List. Mr. Shori asked if we had changed our procedures as a result of the findings and we have not. Those procedures already exist. We do not take the information, that accounting information, from information in a project folder.

The Pipeline Features List and how we devised the Pipeline Features List has been written in its early inceptions of IOI when we started doing the Pipeline Features List. I don't know the exact date. So that's why we have not changed anything in that regard. So we do not take that accounting information.

We use pipe specification or pipe material information off of either billing materials and/or engineering specs.

Q. And you repeated accounting information a few times and I want to clarify that, that these were jobs that were done pre-code?

A. Correct.

Q. So typically as I understand it what is preserved from those jobs may be a plan view of the project, especially when it's a new business job, somebody paid us to put this in. It may be the plan view of the project and then the accounting associated with it, so that it can be correctly shown in the tax franchise documentation so we know the value of it and how much the State and the Federal Government are going to tax us on an annual basis, among other things, is that correct?

A. Maybe because, as you alluded to, it was not a requirement at the time, so most of that information associated with that would be -- the typical information associated with pipelines of that vintage would be that materials you specified, yes.

Q. Right. So this is an accounting document prepared typically by Accounting, not a pipeline design documents prepared by engineers and design draftsmen who are trained on the material codes and know specifically what they are?

A. That is absolutely correct.

Q. You also mentioned Map Guide. You said Map Guide is

something people can look at kind of locally. I think if I understand it Map Guide is a PG&E intranet item and is, therefore, open to anybody in the company to address.

A. That is correct. Anybody who has an Internet connection within the company has the availability to view Map Guide.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. JACKSON: No questions.

MS. FABRY: No questions.

MR. SHORI: Sunil Shori, California PUC.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. For the location in question, the information as far as the 30 inch seamless pipe came from an accounting voucher, is that correct?

A. I don't have personal knowledge. Again, I was not there at the time that that information was transposed, but we believe that that's where the information came from.

Q. So, as Mr. Fassett pointed out, you don't do that, but it was done here for this segment?

A. Again, I can't verify if it was or was not. The information that was -- the information that fed GIS came from the Pipeline Survey Sheets.

Q. Second question, as far as the validations for line 109, 101, 132, earlier you said there were some locations where you identified the wall thickness to be thicker than what your records or what your assumptions had shown earlier.

A. That is correct.

Q. In reverse, did you find any locations where a wall or conditions were less than what you showed earlier?

A. We did. I do not recall how many, and we verified if that took us out of class location and it did not.

Q. Okay. So you jumped me to my next question. So at this point --

A. That's all right.

Q. -- do you have any portions on lines 101, 109, 132 that are out of class for the pipe specifications at those locations?

A. Not to my knowledge, no.

Q. Thank you.

MR. KATCHMAR: Peter Katchmar, U.S. DOT, PHMSA.

BY MR. KATCHMAR:

Q. The one document, I guess, that was the alignment sheet or the plan drawing that PG&E showed us when we were here the first time that had the big X through it, are you familiar with the one I'm talking about?

A. No. I'd have to see that.

Q. I don't have it with me. It's here. It's in the dish somewhere, but it was an alignment sheet that showed --

A. So alignment sheets mean many different things to many different people and that's why I hesitate to answer the question. We have Pipeline Survey Sheets. I'm not sure if that was it. I don't know if it was a design drawing.

MR. KATCHMAR: Mr. Fassett, can you clarify what this sheet is that I'm talking about, the one that we talked to the gentleman earlier who had put it into the GIS, that had crossed it out.

MR. GUNTHER: Bob, what is the sheet?

MR. FASSETT: I --

MR. KATCHMAR: You don't know either? Okay.

MR. FASSETT: I recall a plan drawing of this job, and I recall that we provided you a Pipeline Survey Sheet.

MR. KATCHMAR: Okay. This is the one that on the bottom it had the actual drawing with the footages and the alignment of the pipe, and --

MR. FASSETT: I don't recall a profile. Is that what you're saying?

MR. KATCHMAR: It's not the profile. It was an alignment, and then up above it had this part was hydro-tested and this is this designation of pipe, and then the next one, this is --

MR. FASSETT: I believe that's a Pipeline Survey Sheet you're referring to.

MR. KATCHMAR: Okay, and it had that big X in it that the guy told us meant that he had put it in the GIS.

MR. FASSETT: Oh, okay. I don't remember the big X. I remember the Pipeline Survey Sheet, but --

MR. KATCHMAR: Okay.

MR. FASSETT: -- I'll believe you.

MR. KATCHMAR: All right.

BY MR. KATCHMAR:

Q. Is that the document that you're saying that they are using to populate the GIS?

A. I can't answer that.

Q. You don't know. Anyway, also --

A. If we're certain of what document we're talking about.

Q. That's fine. Okay. So you also -- you, PG&E, showed us the purchase order for some X42 pipe that had the designation SML on it, but it's also been stated -- an accounting code sheet?

MR. FASSETT: There's a journal voucher.

BYMR. KATCHMAR:

Q. A journal voucher --

A. Okay.

Q. -- that said SML X42, API 5L X42, but then there's supposedly an accounting code on that sheet as well, that if you look up that accounting code for the project it comes back as X52 DSAW pipe.

A. Within that project folder for line 132 the specified material for that job, the material codes associated with that job, were DSAW pipe.

Q. Was it X42 DSAW pipe, X52 DSAW pipe?

A. I can't speak to that. I'm not a pipeline engineer and I don't recall offhand what grade the material was.

Q. Okay. I guess you won't stop me on this question, but if you had a journal voucher that said X42 API X42 30 inch SML pipe, and there was an accounting code on there that if you went to that and looked it up said X52 DSAW pipe, what would you think would go into the GIS?

MR. JAQUES: I'm going object. That calls for speculation.

MR. KATCHMAR: All right. Is there a way I can ask that and get it on the record that's --

MR. JAQUES: Not that I'm going to help you do.

MR. KATCHMAR: Alrighty. It doesn't matter one way or the other because facts are facts, so --

MR. JAQUES: I appreciate you trying, though, Peter. Thank you.

MR. KATCHMAR: Yeah. Brian knows about it. That doesn't matter. Thank you, sir.

MR. GUNTHER: I have no more questions.

MR. NICHOLSON: Nothing.

MR. CHHATRE: No questions.

MR. CHHATRE: If --

MR. GUNTHER: I have a question.

BY MR. GUNTHER:

Q. Are you the last one?

A. Yes, sir, I am.

Q. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Any more questions? If not, thank you so much, Brian, for helping us in this investigation. Off the record.

(Whereupon, the interview was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:	PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY SEPTEMBER 9, 2010 ACCIDENT SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA Interview of Brian Daubin
DOCKET NUMBER:	DCA-10-MP-008
PLACE:	Burlingame, California
DATE:	January 7, 2011

was held according to the record, and that this is the original, complete, true and accurate transcript which has been compared to the recording accomplished at the hearing.

_____

Cheryl L. Phipps
Transcriber