Docket No. SA-534

Exhibit No. 2-BR

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Washington, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF HERMAN LEE HAYNES, III, PG&E
(JAN-7-2011)

(21 Pages)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

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

Interview of: HERMAN LEE HAYNES, III

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.gunther@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.):

BRIAN DAUBIN, Manager
GT&D Gas Engineering
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
375 North Wiget Lane
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
925-974-4210
bmd5@pge.com

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 7, 2011. We are currently in Burlingame, California, in the San Francisco Marriott, San Francisco Airport Marriott. We are meeting in regards to the investigation of pipeline rupture in San Bruno, California, that occurred on September 9, 2010. The NTSB accident number for this investigation is DCA-10-MP-008.

My name is Ravi Chhatre. I'm 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 future date, and all parties will have a chance to review the transcripts once they are completed.

I'd also like to inform Mr. Haynes that you are permitted to have one other person present with you in the interview. That person is of your choice. It can be a friend, family member, supervisor, or if you choose, no one at all. So for the record, please state your full name, spelling of your name, contact information such as phone, email address, mailing address and whom you have chosen to be present with you during this interview.

MR. HAYNES: My name is Herman Lee Haynes, III. It's H E R M A N, L E E, H A Y N E S, III. Email address is

MR. JAQUES: Business address is fine. Your business address is fine.

MR. HAYNES: Okay. 375 North Wiget, W I G E T, Lane, Suite 200, Walnut Creek, California 94598, and I choose Dane as my representative.

MR. CHHATRE: Thank you for that. Now I'd like to go around the room and have each person introduce themselves. Please state your name, spelling, title, organization that you represent, business email and phone number, starting with PG&E.

MR. DAUBIN: Brian Daubin, with PG&E, contact information on the card provided.

MR. FASSETT: Bob Fassett, PG&E, contact information on the card.

MS. JACKSON: Connie Jackson, City of San Bruno. My information's on my card.

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

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

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

MR. GUNTHER: Karl Gunther, NTSB, Operations Group Chairman, karl.gunther@ntsb.gov, phone (202) 314-6478.

MS. MAZZANTI: Debbie Mazzanti, IBEW Local 1245. My info is on the card.

MR. SPERRY: Joshua Sperry, Engineers and Scientists of California, Local 20, IFPTE. My information's been provided.

MR. NICHOLSON: Matthew Nicholson, NTSB, engineer, spelled Matthew, M A T T H E W, Nicholson, N I C H O L S O N. Contact information, matthew.nicholson@ntsb.gov.

MR. CHHATRE: Ravi Chhatre. My email is ravindra.chhatre@ntsb.gov, telephone is (202) 314-6644.

MR. NARVELL: Rick Narvell, Human Performance investigator for NTSB, Washington, D.C., N A R V L L. Telephone us (202) 314-6422, email is narvelr@ntsb.gov.

MR. JAQUES: Dane Jaques on behalf of the witness, and my information is on the business card provided.

MR. CHHATRE: Thanks all. Karl, do you want to go first or should we start at the table?

MR. GUNTHER: Yeah. Karl Gunther, NTSB.

INTERVIEW OF HERMAN LEE HAYNES, III

BY MR. GUNTHER:

Q. Could you give me your job title and affiliation?

A. I'm the project engineer for the ECDA in the integrity management program.

Q. Okay. Can you give me your educational background?

A. I have a bachelor's of science from the University of Davis, California Davis, in mechanical engineering.

Q. Okay. And what are your duties?

A. My duties are to review or perform pre-assessments, review phase 2 data, pig dig locations and review post-assessment data, perform and review post-assessments for the ECDA program.

Q. Could you give me a general overview of what ECDA and what you do?

A. How general? Sorry.

Q. Yeah. I'll tell you what, on an ECDA examination, what do you look for? What do you do?

A. It's a proof method to check the integrity of the pipeline. So we're looking for the most likely locations where we would have integrity issues.

Q. And what data do you use to choose those locations?

A. We use the data found in the pre-assessments as well as the data from the phase 2 to choose the most likely locations that we may have integrity issues.

Q. And if you dig up a location, what would be a typical thing that you would do?

A. We perform a standard bell hole inspection --

Q. All right.

A. -- to determine the condition of the pipe, the actual pipeline condition.

Q. All right. And I assume then you strip the coating off and --

A. Yes.

Q. Do you prepare the pipe in any way?
A. Yes.
Q. Doing?
A. Sandblast it.
Q. All right. And then I assume you examine the pipe. Do you examine the welds?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And if there were any girth welds, I'd assume you would look at those as well?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you find out -- if you find anything, dents, scratches, cracks, whatever, what do you do?
A. Notify the local pipeline engineer.
Q. Okay. And then I assume you would schedule a repair at that point?
A. If required, yes.
Q. Now if everything is okay, then what do you do?
A. We recoat, backfill and we can monitor the location for future.
Q. Okay. And how often do you do ECDA let's say on a typical pipeline, say a 50-mile pipeline?
A. If assigned to us, by the risk management group, within the HCAs.
Q. Okay. So you concentrate in the HCA areas?
A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

MR. GUNTHER: No more questions.

MR. DAUBIN: No questions.

MR. FASSETT: Bob Fassett, no questions.

MS. JACKSON: No questions.

MS. FABRY: Klara Fabry, no questions.

MR. SHORI: Sunil Shori, California PUC.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. When you do your assessment or excuse me, when you do your direct examination, how do you resolve any discrepancies? How do you -- do you do a comparison of what you observed in regard to what is shown for that location as far as what type of pipe, what type of seam, what type of other issues? Do you do a comparison of that when you do the examination of this section as part of the phase 3?

A. Yes.

Q. How do you know how you basically translate those back? How do you take what you see versus what was there and then convey that back so it's properly changed and what else do you do with that information?

A. The information would be given, via mapping requests, to update our GIS system, and it goes from there.

Q. How about -- how would any of those changes impact the operation of the line? Who makes that determination based again on any of that discrepancy that you've noted?

A. I don't know who makes that decision. It's outside of my responsibility. I don't know.

Q. And what would be the process that you use to convey those discrepancies?

A. Mapping request form.

Q. Of the phase 3 type examination that you've done where you've noted discrepancies, can you characterize if there's any kind of more often of a discrepancy that you identify versus others or what kinds of discrepancies have you identified?

A. The only one that I'm familiar with would be coating type.

Q. And you said part of your responsibility is also pre-assessment?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Describe how you use, for missing information, how you use -- how do you handle missing information as part of your pre-assessment process?

A. In the data mining effort, we would review project folders to clarify any missing information, to find missing information.

Q. And if you're not able to find any particular missing information even after that, how would you handle that?

A. We would stay with the engineering assumptions that were given to us.

Q. Through that process, through that pre-assessment

process, have you identified any pipe segments or lines that were based out of class for what you found based on the information that you found?

A. I'm not familiar with that. I don't know.

Q. You don't know that you found that or you don't know how to do that?

A. It's outside of my responsibilities. So I don't know.

Q. Okay. So in essence, you would -- whatever discrepancy you found you'd generate the form but then somebody else would make that determination?

A. Yes.

Q. Who would that be? Who would you expect to make that determination?

A. I believe it would go back to the risk management department.

Q. That's it for me for now.

MR. KATCHMAR: Peter Katchmar, United States Department of Transportation, PHMSA.

BY MR. KATCHMAR:

Q. Lee, do you have anything to do with -- does your job include anything to do with MAOP determinations?

A. No, it does not.

Q. Does your job have anything to do with class location change studies?

A. No, it does not.

Q. Do you -- how long have you been working for PG&E?
A. Since January 2006.
Q. And what did you do before that?
A. I worked at an air quality control company.
Q. Okay. Do you have any NAV (ph.) certifications?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What might those be?
A. I have completed courses for NAV cathodic protection level 1, 2 and 3.
Q. Do you have knowledge of pipe manufacturing methods?
A. No, sir, I don't.
Q. All right. Thank you. That's it.
MR. GUNTHER: No more questions.
MS. MAZZANTI: No questions.
MR. SPERRY: Just one question.
BY MR. SPERRY:
Q. Are you a licensed engineer in the State of California?
A. EIT.
Q. Okay.
BY MR. NICHOLSON:
Q. I'm sorry. Explain what that means for the record.
A. Engineer-in-training.
Q. Very good.
A. For California.
MR. CHHATRE: Ravi Chhatre, NTSB, for the record.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Does that include a written exam of certain duration?

A. Yes.

Q. The EIT?

A. Yes.

Q. In your job description, the pre-assessment, who makes the determination to do digs?

A. I do.

Q. And that is based on what?

A. Review of the pre-assessment data and the phase 2 data.

Q. The same (indiscernible) from EIC or GIS or the mapping group? The mapping group data mining is used for that?

MR. JAQUES: I'm sorry. You need to start that one over again. It didn't make any sense.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. For the pre-assessment dig determination, do you use the data from the mapping department or GIS department?

A. The digs aren't selected in the pre-assessment phase.

Q. They're not?

A. No.

Q. What is selected in the pre-assessment phase?

A. The data mining and feasibility to a selection and region determination for the ECAD.

Q. Are you involved in any of the inline inspection technology besides the pre-assessment part of the (indiscernible)?

A. No, I'm not.
Q. So when you do the digs, do you know what you're looking for?
A. Pipeline condition.
Q. Is that a general condition or you're trying to verify something that came from ILI inspection?
A. Not anything from the ILI.
Q. Okay. Have you done any, have you done any direct assessment on line 132?
A. Yes.
Q. And where that would be and what year?
A. Various locations, various years. I couldn't tell you the exactly locations off the top of my head.
Q. Okay. Was that anywhere near the rupture on line 132?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember where that was?
A. It was through that section of pipeline in 2009.
Q. Do you remember roughly the timeframe for 2009?
A. That project was complete I believe it was the fourth quarter of 2009. The fall timeframe.
Q. Okay. The direct assessment, how big a bell hole you dig and how much pipe you expose?
A. We inspect 10 feet of pipe.
Q. Okay. And is that 100 percent inspection for damage like (indiscernible)?

A. Yes.

Q. In 2009, what comes out of that inspection? Do you do some kind of a report of the lines, what you observe?

A. Yes.

Q. And what happens to that report?

A. It's part of the LTIMP, long-term integrity management plan, that gets written for that survey.

Q. And how long that stays in files?

A. I believe forever.

Q. Okay. Did you see any (indiscernible), circumferential or (indiscernible), during your 2009 inspection of line 132?

A. I don't know off the top of my head.

Q. Would that be noted in your report?

A. Yes, it would be noted with the bell hole inspection reports.

MR. CHHATRE: I'll send an email, Bob, but can we get a copy of the report?

MR. FASSETT: You already have it.

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR. FASSETT: It was sent to you two months ago. Would you like it again?

MR. CHHATRE: No.

MR. FASSETT: Okay.

MR. CHHATRE: I'm good if you already send it.

MR. FASSETT: You have it in your office. We discussed

that two days ago.

MR. CHHATRE: The problem with the data submission, it takes me a whole lot of long process to dig where I'm going. Sometimes I don't even get there.

MR. FASSETT: I was in your office in the middle of October, and it was on your desk then.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Did you see any longitudinal girth welds during the inspection on line 132 (indiscernible) if you remember?

A. No, that I remember, but again it would be in the report.

Q. That's all for me. Thank you much.

MR. DAUBIN: I have no questions.

MR. FASSETT: No questions.

MS. JACKSON: No questions.

MS. FABRY: No questions.

MR. SHORI: Sunil Shori, California PUC.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Just one follow up. What would be the extent of what you contribute based on your role in the ECDA process into the LTIMP? What is it that ends up in the final product versus what is it you contribute towards the final LTIMP?

A. What I contribute to the final LTIMP for any given survey would be a list of mitigation items and then attend LTIMP meetings that are held by the risk management group.

Q. And as far as the determination of any conditions that are considered stable defects, as part of the assessment process, would that be anything you contribute towards or is that not something you contribute towards?

A. It's not really something that I contribute.

Q. Okay. To your knowledge, who would be making that determination?

A. It would be the risk management group.

Q. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: LTIMP is actually long-term integrity management plan.

MS. MAZZANTI: I have no questions.

MR. SPERRY: No questions.

MR. NICHOLSON: This is Matt Nicholson, NTSB.

BY MR. NICHOLSON:

Q. These pre-assessment forms that are filled out, they're kept, right?

A. Yes.

Q. Are they saved by job number or --

A. They're saved by survey and year.

Q. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

MR. CHHATRE: I have no more questions. Anybody have any questions? Okay. Go ahead.

MR. SHORI: This is Sunil Shori, California PUC.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. One more question. In terms of if you use a conservative considered value for missing data, and you end up with a MOP or MAOP on a given segment that's out of class or basically let's just say let's assume class 3 and it's more than 50 percent, how do you designate that on the pre-assessment?

A. There's fields for operating stress. It would be designated in those fields.

Q. But based on the assumed value, it's higher than the percentage for the given class, what would you -- as the person doing the pre-assessment, how would you handle that?

A. A discussion with risk management to let them know.

Q. Thank you. On line 132, you were involved on the last assessment of line 132?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you identify any locations that based on those kinds of values or out of class?

A. I don't remember. I did not perform the pre-assessment for that survey.

Q. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Any more questions? No question? No. Thank you for coming and helping with the 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 Herman Lee Haynes, III
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.

_____

Kathryn A. Mirfin
Transcriber