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	*	
	*	

Telephonic Interview of: LARRY MEDINA

NTSB Headquarters
490 L'Enfant Plaza East, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Monday,
June 27, 2011

The above-captioned matter convened, pursuant to notice.

BEFORE: RAVINDRA M. 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

SUNIL K. SHORI, Engineer
California Public Utilities Commission

PETER J. KATCHMAR, Accident Coordinator
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

GEOFF CALDWELL
City of San Bruno

DEBBIE MAZZANTI, Representative
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local 1245

JOSHUA SPERRY
Engineers and Scientists of California
Local 20

BILL HAYES
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

RICHARD STEFFEN
District Director for Congresswoman Speiers
(On behalf of Mr. Medina)

I N D E X

I N T E R V I E W

MR. MEDINA: I'm Larry Medina.

MR. STEFFEN: This is Richard Steffen.

MR. CHHATRE: Can you please spell your names, please, because we are going to record it. I want to make sure we get the spellings correct.

MR. MEDINA: Yes. My last name is spelled Medina, M-e-d-i-n-a.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

MR. STEFFEN: Richard Steffen, S-t-e-f-f-e-n, Steffen.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. S-t-e-p-f-f-e-n?

MR. STEFFEN: S-t-e-f, as in Frank, f as in --

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

MR. STEFFEN: -- n.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. And you are assisting Mr. Medina?

MR. STEFFEN: I am Congresswoman Speier's district director, and I'm the one who initially talked to Larry.

MR. CHHATRE: Right. But your presence today is not as the representative of -- Mr. Medina told me that he is entitled to have one person with him and he has chosen you. So you really are representing him, then, at this point?

MR. STEFFEN: Yeah, I guess so.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. I just want to make sure because that's a really important factor for us.

MR. KATCHMAR: Richard, can you tell us what your

affiliation is? Congresswoman Speier's what?

MR. STEFFEN: District director.

MR. KATCHMAR: District director. Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. CHHATRE: And that is why, Peter, I was making sure that everybody understand that he is not here as a district director for congresswoman. He is here today --

MR. KATCHMAR: But I wanted to know what his background was.

MR. CHHATRE: No, I understand. I understand. But I just want to make sure that he is here as Mr. Medina's representative.

Okay. Who is next?

MR. KATCHMAR: Peter Katchmar, PHMSA.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay, Peter.

MR. SHORI: Shori, California Public Utilities Commission.

MR. CHHATRE: Well, I'm glad, Sunil, you decided to show up.

MR. SHORI: All right. Thank you.

MS. MAZZANTI: Debbie Mazzanti, IBEW.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

MR. HAYES: PG&E.

MR. CHHATRE: Mr. Hayes (ph.)?

MR. HAYES: Yes.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. And --

MR. CALDWELL: Geoff Caldwell, City of San Bruno.
MR. CHHATRE: Okay. And spell your name, please.
MR. CALDWELL: Ravi, you want me to spell my name?
MR. CHHATRE: Well, for the tape recorder. I don't.
MR. CALDWELL: Okay.
MR. CHHATRE: The transcriber might not know you.
MR. CALDWELL: Okay. It's G-e-o-f-f, C-a-l-d-w-e-l-l.
MR. CHHATRE: Okay. All right. Anybody else?
MR. SHORI: Ravi, did you -- I guess I should go ahead and spell my name, too. It's S-u-n-i-l; last name S-h-o-r-i.
MR. CHHATRE: Yeah. No, I have business card from all you guys, that's why I didn't ask.
MR. SHORI: Okay.
MR. CHHATRE: I didn't have business card with Geoff, so --
MR. CALDWELL: Yes, you do.
MR. CHHATRE: All right.
MR. SPERRY: And this is Joshua Sperry from ESC Local 20, Emerald Heights.
MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Good to hear from you, Joshua.
Any -- tell me, is there anybody else besides the people who identified themselves?
Okay. I guess, Mr. Medina, this interview is in connection with the September 9, 2010 San Bruno fire and explosion natural gas transmission pipeline 132.

Now, for the record, I just want to let you know that this conversation is being recorded and, also for the record, depending upon how we transcribe it, somebody knows (indiscernible) transcript, we will send you a copy. I just want to make sure that everybody's aware that the conversation is being recorded.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW OF LARRY MEDINA

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. And for the record, Mr. Medina, can you please give us some background and your affiliation with PG&E and your current affiliation?

A. Yes. I was employed by PG&E initially as a consultant to perform an analysis of their records system for the gas transmission organization in 1983. I was subsequently hired as a full-time employee at PG&E in 1984 to manage the records and information system for gas transmission and storage records.

I left PG&E in 1993 -- I'm sorry, June of 1993 during a reorganization where positions were eliminated, under a second reorganization that the company had gone through. I subsequently did work with PG&E as a consultant in gas transmission and storage on the completion of the line 401 project, and then also with the pipeline operations group in Walnut Creek.

Q. Okay.

A. Currently I am employed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory as a records and information manager. My time here

today is not at all related to my work with Lawrence Livermore and there has not been an affiliation between Lawrence Livermore and PG&E regarding any of this pipeline work.

Q. Thank you for that. Can you tell us your -- with your PG&E, when you were a consultant and then as an employee, what your actual tasks were, if you can elaborate?

MR. SHORI: Ravi, can we get clarification on one or two --

MR. CHHATRE: Sure.

MR. SHORI: -- things real quick first?

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

MR. SHORI: Mr. Medina mentioned --

MR. CHHATRE: Identify yourself, Sunil.

MR. SHORI: Oh, Sunil Shori, with the California PUC. We didn't get any date beyond 1993 when Mr. Medina left PG&E. So can we -- and he said he came back as a consultant and then he worked in Walnut Creek.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Can we get some dates for those last two items?

A. I left in June of '93. In July of '93, I formed a firm named Advanced Records Management, which is a private consulting firm. I continued doing work on the line 401 transmission project, including managing the as-builts for that project working out of Bechtel's headquarters in San Francisco at 45 Fremont Street. That work continued on until sometime in early 1994. I

do not have an exact date for that.

I began work in spring of '94 with the Walnut Creek pipeline operations organization. Started individually doing work as a consultant and ended up bringing on three other people to work with me through a for-hire contacting firm. And our duties there were to do an inventory and analysis of the pipeline records and facility records for gas pipeline operation, to develop a system that was similar to what was in San Francisco at the time I left PG&E. That work continued on until either late '94 or early '95. I again don't have an exact date for that.

Q. Okay. So again, now, even when you -- so you came back as a consultant July 1993 working on line 401, and then somewhere between '93 and late 1994 you were still as a consultant, but in Walnut Creek?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay.

A. I was under a contract to pipeline operations. The contract was let through a gentleman named Ben Campbell in Walnut Creek and it was managed by a gentleman named Dan Smith.

Q. Can you give the second name again, please?

A. Dan Smith. He was responsible for the mapping of -- and the engineering records at the Walnut Creek facility. But Ben Campbell was coordinating the actual contract.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Anybody has any questions?

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Mr. Medina, can you describe your tasks in a little more detail with PG&E in terms of records keeping?

A. Yes. The gas engineering records system had been managed on a manual basis up until 1983. All records were kept on 3 by 5 file cards in bound logbooks and in binders identifying where the records were within the system. There were chronological and numerical and alphabetic files. Almost everything had always been kept in triplicate. This included all job orders, all estimates, pipeline engineering records, drawings, operating diagrams and maps.

We made a recommendation while I was the consultant that they do some work to modernize that system, to computerize a lot of things and make things easier to locate so they would have a better finding aid for the existing information, which was going to require a full inventory be performed. The recommendation was received by then gases design. The manager was Charles Tateosian. The firm I was working for was TA Engineering in Moraga, California.

Q. Is it T as in Thomas, A as in Apple; or P as in Peter, A as in Apple?

A. T as in Thomas, A as in Apple. It was run by a gentleman named T.A. Lu, last name spelled L-u. He was a former PG&E employee who was a instrumentation and controls engineer at PG&E who had started a consulting firm in Moraga at some time

prior to my association with him.

I performed a full analysis, wrote the report, and made recommendations for improvements. The existing records and information management person was getting close to retirement and decided to retire when they explained to him certain work that was going to have to be done to modernize the system outside of the realm of what he felt comfortable doing, and because he had the option to retire, he elected to.

Q. Okay.

A. Subsequent to his retiring I was offered the position as a permanent employee.

Once on board at PG&E, we started by performing a complete inventory. There was a staff of four people working in records management at that time. The inventory was limited to what was in the headquarters facility at 77 Beale on the 28th floor in San Francisco and some records on the 29th floor in the gas planning -- yeah, the gas planning organization, which is where some of the maps were kept.

Q. Okay.

A. On completion of the inventory, we began developing a index that was done through a VMS terminal, producing punch cards. And the stack of cards was run against a report generator that would generate an index. We ran the index in multiple manners: strictly by drawing number, which listed all the revision information; and then also by facility or line code. And that

information was used to verify the content of what we had inventoried.

Subsequent work involved evaluating the compressor station and other drawings related to the operating system, along with all the vendor documentation and technical reports that existed to support the system.

At some point in time, and I can't remember the exact year, the gas system design organization moved from 77 Beale to 123 Mission Street in San Francisco. It was my responsibility to help design the room where the records -- what we were referring to at that time as the engineering research library -- would be housed. That was ultimately housed on the 10th floor of 123 Mission on the north wall.

We had a room that was about 50 by 20. It was outfitted with rotating file cabinets that were closed on five sides for water and fire protection. The engineering records for the pipelines were all kept in those along with the operating information for the facilities and the stations throughout the system, along with some of the profile documents for the pipelines.

We had appended to that room a 15 by 40 fire resistant room that had automatic closing doors for greater protection. All drawings had been moved from flat files, which we had at the 28th floor of 77 Beale into vertical files that were equipped with compression springs to hold the drawings. They were six-sided

files that were fire rated and were sealed to the point where they would become buoyant in the event of an excessive exposure to water from the fire system within that vault that they were housed in.

In addition to that, we had tambour door cabinets for microfilm. We had 35-millimeter aperture cards representing every drawing and map that was in the system, and we had revisions going back to 1963 in the microfilm. So all versions of all drawings had been microfilmed.

Microfilm is generated in two manners. We had aperture cards, punched aperture cards that carried information across the top that was information that was in the drawing index, and mounted in that holerif (ph.) card was a 35-millimeter silver film image. There was a second silver film image that was made, also mounted card that was sent to Walnut Creek. There was a diazo duplicate that was made, a lower value duplicate that was made and housed in another area at 123 Mission for vital records protection in the event that the silver was ever damaged. You could always regenerate silver from that diazo duplicate.

So we had set up a system that allowed us to ensure that we had the information in more than one location in the event of a fire or other disaster, which we did go through in 1989 with the earthquake where the cabinet all got turned over and contents spilled out on the floor and we had to go through and re-sort everything. So we relied on the duplicate that had not been

disturbed at that time.

In addition to that, one additional set of the film was made and that set of film was turned over to the records center out on Bayshore. Two times a year it was given to Lou Badet, who is the supervisor of the records center. Lou took that silver set that was sent to him twice annually down to Kern County and it was stored underground in a vault that PG&E had for records. Lou had worked for the corporate secretary. So this deep storage option that was in Kern County, and I believe it was somewhere near Helm, was kept in an area that was not protected with desiccates or other humidity protection; it was in a low humidity, low temperature setting to ensure the longevity of the film.

I operated this system and ran the engineering drawing control organization for the duration of my time with PG&E until late 1992, when the line 401 project began and I was assigned responsibilities for working with the Bechtel staff and the contractors in Houston, who were generating drawings for PG&E, to ensure that the drawings would be able to be integrated into PG&E's system on completion of the project. So I was 50/50 of my time on the project and working at 123 Mission for the first about 6 months, and then it went to about 70/30 during the high phase of the line 401 project.

Q. Okay.

BY MR. KATCHMAR:

Q. Mr. Medina, this is Peter Katchmar with PHMSA. All

those records that you were discussing, you know, the maps and the alignment sheets and all that, would that include all the details on all of the projects like 132 that was built in 1948?

A. The files that we had, Mr. Katchmar, were the -- there were line files, were part of our files for the pipelines. Each line file was set up numerically by the pipeline number. It had every document in it, starting with the original work order and PO to begin construction of a project. Job estimates were written, work orders were written that initiated a project. That was the first document that would go into the line file. And then subsequent to that, all job orders that were written or estimates that were performed went into -- a copy of them went into this line file. The --

Q. If you may -- or if I may. I guess what I'm really, really concerned with is if everything you said here is correct, then these records should be down there somewhere.

A. Well, the records were there in 1993. And the information that was on these job estimates and work orders was also transferred to the pipeline plat sheet. The plat sheet was a depiction of a section of the pipeline, and depending upon the scale or the placement of the pipe, it was anywhere from maybe a half a mile of pipe to a 10-mile segment of pipe in a low populated area, based on scale. And it would show what the pipe was and then below that there was a table, and in that table all changes or additions or conditions of pipe were documented onto

those plat sheets. And those plat sheets were microfilmed when they were revised.

So line 132, for example, would have had multiple sheets, depicting various segments of the pipeline and the conditions of that. And those were kept up-to-date, I would say probably -- this may not be a real great word to use, but I would say religiously, up until 1986 when the first reorganization happened at PG&E. And after that reorganization, things changed.

Q. Okay. And would that mean the things that changed, all the historical records are gone now?

A. No, the historical records still were retained. Nothing was discarded after the reorganization in 1986. It was all moved to 123 Mission. So those files existed when I left PG&E in 1993. What changed was they stopped transferring the information to the pipeline plat sheets and depicting it on the plat sheet.

Q. Okay. But, anyway, when you left, there were historical documents such as -- they have provided us a lot of information on the original 132 project, including like a Moody engineering report and the report from Consolidated Western on the pipe. Actually, that was probably for line 153.

A. That type of information resided in those line files.

Q. Okay. But there was microfiche made of all that?

A. No. There was not microfiche made of the documents. Microfilm was made of the drawings. The only documents that were ever microfilmed were the operating diagrams and the maps, as far

as anything outside of an engineering drawing.

Q. I got you. Okay.

A. But those drawings were microfilmed.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Mr. Medina, can I get -- this Sunil Shori with the California PUC -- just get a little clarification on the last statement you had made? So the 1963 microfilm revisions you said that were available, that had only the operating diagrams and maps, not necessarily everything that one would expect to find in the line file folder?

A. The documents in the line file were not microfilmed, that is correct. However, the plat sheets were microfilmed and the information that was in the documents -- that was reflected in the documents in the line file, was transferred to the plat sheets.

Q. And you said after 1993 that stopped happening, that it would be --

A. After 1986 that stopped happening.

Q. Okay. And what -- and I guess, the pipeline plat sheets and pipeline survey sheets, are we -- you're referring to two different things on that or is that the same item?

A. Plats and surveys are similar, but they're not identical.

Q. Can you define the differences on both, please?

A. I cannot. I cannot tell you what's on a survey sheet and what went on a plat sheet. I do remember that the plat sheets, however, did carry this chart of information that represented the positions of the pipeline that were depicted on that drawing. But I cannot tell you on a pipeline survey sheet what level of information was there.

Q. Okay. But for everything generally, as-built and other things before 1986, you would have -- that would have been transferred to the plat sheets and the plat sheets were somehow, either the hard copy or microfilm, are stored?

A. They were both.

Q. Okay.

A. And they were also printed in reduced-size print that were sent to the divisions who operated the pipeline.

Q. Okay. And then you also mentioned that you had -- you said Bayshore. Is that referring to Brisbane, a facility in Brisbane?

A. That's correct. It was on Bayshore. They used to refer -- they used to call it the Sugar House.

Q. And then you said you would send two or three copies, and correct me if I'm wrong, but you would send copies to Brisbane, and you gave a gentleman's name there.

A. Yes. We sent one copy of the microfilm --

Q. Okay.

A. -- generated to Lou Badet. His last name was spelled B-

a-d-e-t. And I can't remember if his first name was L-o-u or L-e-w.

Q. Okay.

A. And Lou was the supervisor at the records center. And we would send out a box that was basically the size of a check box to Lou periodically and then he took those down to Southern California twice a year.

Q. Okay. So he would get one copy of the microfilm and then -- but what would be kept continuously then at Brisbane and what is it that he would take down to -- you said Kern County earlier, but then you also said Helm, and I'm thinking those are two different places.

A. He took it down to Southern California. He retained nothing at Brisbane.

Q. Okay.

A. All he retained at Brisbane was this set until he took it south. It was somewhere in Kern County, but I thought it might have been Helm tap where it was. I may be wrong about that. He never told me directly where it was. That was one of those pearls of wisdom that was never shared.

Q. Okay. But it was an underground storage facility?

A. That's correct. And I remember one of the guys he used to meet with down there, who has since retired and I believe he's passed away, was a gentleman named Whitney Johns, who was a mapping and drafting guy down in Southern California. And I

believe he was in Kern. And the reason I remember that so strongly is Whitney and I had locked horns a few times and Lou would always joke at me and say, hey, I'm going to see your friend Whitney, do you have any other microfilm for me?

Q. And you might be right on that. I mean, there's a Helms pumping station and then there's a Helm tap, and I'm glad that you clarified that you're referring to Helm tap.

All right. Well, that's it for me for now. Thank you.

BY MR. NICHOLSON:

Q. Mr. Medina, this is Matt with NTSB. I thought I heard you say when you started this records project for PG&E you microfilmed everything back to 1963?

A. No. Microfilm had been generated over time prior to my joining the project. We did not keep back revisions of the drawings, but there was microfilm going back that far.

Q. So I guess I'm trying to figure out, projects from 1948 up to '63, they were also microfilmed?

A. Not that I'm aware of. As far as I know, the microfilming -- you know, based on the revisions that we had gone through when we did the inventory --

Q. Uh-huh.

A. -- and created the index -- because the index reflected all the revisions of the drawings that we were able to find a record on. The microfilm that I found started in about 1963. And it was all generated in-house by PG&E until -- I'm thinking it was

about 1989 when they got pressed for staff to be able to do that work and then we had it being done by Alpha Graphics in San Francisco. But they were producing it to our standards: three sets of silver microfilm -- I'm sorry, four sets of silver microfilm, one set of diazo microfilm.

Q. Okay. So documentation prior to '63 was just paper copy?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. Paper copy and all records that were kept in any form of indexing were in bound logbooks or in 3 by 5 file cards.

MR. SHORI: Did you say '63 or '83?

MR. CHHATRE: Please identify.

MR. SHORI: Oh, this is Sunil Shori.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. I think earlier I got records were kept by paper until 1983.

A. Records were kept by paper until the day I left. They never stopped producing paper.

Q. Okay. The records kept in triplicate, what time period were you referring to on that?

A. Well, I know that they had a line file that had everything by pipeline number that was filed chronologically within that file. There was a job order set of files that were filed numerically by job order number that were kept in binders.

And then the third set was the set that we sent to Walnut Creek for the operations group.

MR. CHHATRE: This is Ravi.

Let me just maybe put some order here. What we will do, instead of people jumping in and out, kind of creates a problem here, we with NTSB, we will go first. Then we'll hand it over to CPUC. Then CPUC can hand it over to PHMSA, then the unions and -- then the city, the unions, and lastly we'll give the floor to Mr. Hayes so he can ask any clarification questions. So let's just try to stick to that and see how that works, but this going back and forth is creating problem for peoples chain of thought.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Now, Mr. Medina, I have a few questions for you. This is Ravi Chhatre.

You said the records were kept in triplicate, and is this true also for the paper documents?

A. Well, they were filed in different ways so we made copies of them and we placed them into the line file and then into then numerical file, that was the job orders by number, and then a set of those was sent to operations.

Q. Right. I mean, is it enough to said all paper documents were triplicate copies, or it is not true?

A. Yes.

Q. And so -- and they were at three different locations; is that correct?

A. No, the job estimate file was kept in the same room as the line file. And then the operations' copy was sent to Walnut Creek. It used to be sent to Antioch when they were out in Antioch, on Roly Road. And then they moved to 375 Wiget Lane in Walnut Creek at some point in time.

Q. Okay. And you said the operating practice changed in 1986 and you are still with PG&E at that time; were you not?

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. And do you know why it was changed and how it was changed?

A. One of the two reports that I produced detailed what actually happened and why. It was a decision that was made organizationally to switch how pipelines below and above 60-pound operating pressure were managed, whether they were going to be managed by transmission or by distribution, and then who had responsibility for what function. And at the time that happened a memorandum of understanding was written between transmission and distribution identifying what work had been done up until that point in time and stating that the responsibility for that work was being transferred to that other organization who was going to be managing those pipelines.

And my understanding was they decided to discontinue doing that work because they felt it was repetitive and that it didn't add any benefit because they had it in paper form in the line files. If they ever needed to look for it, they could go to

the line file, so they didn't see the value in continuing to transfer the information to the plat sheet.

Q. And who is they?

A. The distribution organization who took over control of that function.

Q. Okay. So until that point you were keeping copies and making triplicate for distribution and transmission?

A. We kept copies for all of the pipeline files for jobs that were over a certain dollar value.

Q. And do you recall the dollar value?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Okay.

A. There was work that was done directly at the division level that was, I guess, smaller volume work or less consequential work that didn't require engineering intervention from San Francisco, from the pipeline engineering or controls group.

Q. And do you recall seeing any drawings, any documentation, paper or microfiche, for line 132, 101, and 109?

A. All the pipelines, we had documentation for all the pipeline.

Q. Now --

A. 5, 300, 400, line 115, 117, everything on the system.

Q. Okay. Now, how was the quality control check was done during your tenure at PG&E when the information came to you?

A. Information came to us and we assumed it to be accurate

when we put it into the files. When we converted certain things from paper into a database, when we generated a database of all -- when we did the drawing index for the inventory, we actually edited directly off of the microfilm aperture card or the title block and revision block from the drawing. So we would enter the information, ran the report and then re-verified it to make sure that the drawing index was accurate.

The databases that were created, they actually took the logbooks and the line file information and they would physically enter it into a database that was using the application Condor. The information was stored on Bernoulli cartridges and then a printout would get done on a weekly basis and then information would get checked back against the manual logs that it was entered in from.

Initially when we started doing this it was a record-for-record verification. Over time when we became satisfied of the quality of the entry, we went down to a 1 to 10 ratio on the verification. So we would check every 10th entry.

Q. Okay. Now, you said the information was assumed accurate. Who sent you the information to put in the --

A. Whoever was actually performing the strength test and pressure reports or the inspections of the pipeline. Generally, this would have been GC staff, general construction staff, or division staff that was involved in the project. The engineers would go out -- the engineers from gas transmission and storage or

-- depending on the name of the organization at the time. It went from gas system design to gas transmission and storage to gas engineering and construction. The pipeline and system engineers would go out to review and evaluate certain work when it was performed, but they weren't signing off on the work specifically. It was whoever was actually performing the strength test, pressure reports, and performing the inspections that would sign off on the documents.

Q. So the documents you got, did they have a series of signature that somebody verified this information?

A. Certain documents were signed. I don't remember that there was an actual signature block that we had to verify that there were, you know, two signatures or three signatures on them. We received them, we knew that they were -- when they sent them to us, it was assumed that they were complete and that they were accurate. We had no way to verify that information.

Q. So what kind of guidance you were given before you entered a system? Was it -- were you told to verify with somebody or this had to come from a certain level in the organization?

A. We did it on receipt. The information was sent to the manager of our department and then it would be routed to us administratively to do the data entry or to do the filing, one or the other. So we were receiving it administratively through the department manager.

Q. And during your tenure, do you remember who the manager

was?

A. The manager at the initial stages of my employment were -- was Charlie Tateosian. Following Charlie --

Q. Can you spell the last name, please?

A. Pardon me?

Q. Can you spell the last name?

A. T-a-t-e-o-s-i-a-n, I believe Charles J. Following Charlie's tenure it was Paul Heilmann, H-e-i-l-m-a-n-n. Following Paul's tenure, which I think ended in 1993 with the last reorganization, was Jerry Wong, W-o-n-g. And it was Jerry with a J.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

And did any of your supervisors or, whatever the title, department managers, did they explain what the process was, either -- I guess, I'm looking for a document, whether a document existed for a vetting process that the information that you are entering is accurate.

A. Not that I'm aware of. I had been informed by my predecessor and staff that worked for my predecessor how the documentation was received and where we filed it and what we did with it. So it was a process that had gone back for many years and had been done in the same manner.

When we did the data entry, we met with the pipeline engineering department head and we asked him what information they wanted to see in the database. And so we got guidance from him in

terms of what fields of information would be captured in the database. So there were certain fields of information we looked for, obviously, to make sure they were there. If we had a zero entry in a field, then we would take it back to somebody and ask for verification of that. But no, the names were not entered into the database in terms of who performed the work, but the -- it was data that was entered in.

Q. Okay. Now, when you said you were told which fields are important. Now, when you say you, does that mean your department manager was told or you were told? I mean, I thought everything came to you through department managers. I'm just trying to clarify that.

A. All the documents that were subsequently put into the files and then entered into the database came to us through the department manager. They were sent to the department manager. His secretary would handle those and then turn them over to us. The people who were always looking for the information were the pipeline engineers within gas system design and the subsequent department names. So it was the head of the pipeline group in gas system design who, when we decided we were going to put this information into a database, determined what fields of information they were going to want in to the database.

Q. And that was communicated to you directly?

A. Yes, that's correct. Because generation of the database was done in the records management group.

Q. And was it your responsibility to check if there is any missing documents, you know, for a particular file?

A. No. Because we had no way of knowing what all the documents consisted of. We weren't made aware of every project that went on or all work that was done. All we knew is that when a document came to us it would go into the file based on what line number it belonged to.

We had these files -- these were controlled files. People couldn't go into the files and take things out themselves. If they wanted information that was in the file, they would have to see one of the people in records management. We would remove the information from the file for them. We would provide them a copy of it, or they would review it there within the records management area, but they didn't walk away with anything.

Q. Okay. Now, any changes made in a document, with the triplicate files, if somebody makes a change in Walnut Creek or (indiscernible) people, how would that change get transmitted to you for your record?

A. They were only receiving information for reference. So there would have been no changes that I could I think of they would make. They may have filed them in a different manner, but there was no reason for them to make any changes to the content that I could understand.

Q. Okay.

A. But any changes to the drawings, they would mark up a

print and that print would get sent in to the drafting group, and then the drafting group would have to get an engineer to approve the revision of the drawing and then those revisions had to be signed off every time a formal revision was made.

BY MR. NICHOLSON:

Q. Yeah, Mr. Medina, this is Matt again with NTSB. I've got some follow-up questions.

The database you're speaking of, when was that put in place?

A. We started working on that in about 1986.

Q. Okay.

A. And there was one person that did the data entry.

Q. And was this database the precursor to the GIS system that's in place now?

A. Now, the GIS system was done through another organization. They started working on GIS -- we actually attended the AE&C conference in Denver, Colorado. In fact, it was the first one of those conferences that was held, and I don't remember the year, and that's when PG&E first started looking at GIS. And then we had a couple of vendors come out and they did some test work where they put the pack in a jeep and they followed a pipeline and it sent information into us and then it was depicting it on a screen so that we were seeing how they were going to gather information along pipelines to try to make a determination if this was something that they thought that was viable.

They were considering things as far as going to an AM/FM GIS, automated mapping and facility management. And the intent was to tag all valves, then get a GIS location for all valves in a compressor station or along the pipelines. I think they did some of that with major pipeline valves, but all of the pipeline valves. And I know they did not do that with any of the stations, not during my tenure.

Q. But the database you created, did it remain independent then?

A. Yes, it did.

Q. Oh, okay.

A. Yeah, as far as I know, none of the information -- well, until 1993, none of the information in that database was converted into the GIS system. If they elected to convert it afterwards, I'm unaware of that.

Q. How did the -- you said that it was up to operations or construction to bring you the documentation that you would file. How did those departments know they had to bring documentation to you? Was there an internal standard or --

A. I think it was a recognized practice. All the standards -- we had a standards manual, but the standards manual did not determine that type of procedural information. This was done by practice over years. Now, there may have been procedures that were written within the division organization telling them how they had to document this information to maps and when they had to

convert information from one form to another, but I'm unaware of that. I did not work with the divisions that much. I had a little bit of exposure to a couple of the divisions during cases where they were converting or moving their drawing filing systems, but other than that, not very much. My primary interaction was with the gas system design organization in San Francisco and the operations group in Antioch and Walnut Creek.

Q. So, I'm trying to understand, was there a difference when construction was done maybe in-house versus under a capital project as far as how you received documentation or quality of documentation?

A. No. The information would have been sent the same way and gathered the same way. I think the capital projects, if they were using contractors to do that work, they would turn that work over to the project coordinator, which was typically somebody in division or general construction, and then the information would still get to us the same way, up until 1986.

Q. Okay. I'm looking at a summary document in front of me, which you say -- or you had mentioned that some records were thrown out because the information wasn't recognizable. Can you elaborate on that, what documentation was thrown out and --

A. Okay. That was a statement that was made to me by a person currently working in the Walnut Creek operations office for PG&E. That's not my statement.

Q. Okay.

A. When I heard about some of the things that were going on with this explosion and was following the stories in the news and hearing reports about what information did and did not exist, I tried to reach people at PG&E operations in October and then subsequently in November, and finally in December I got a call back from someone. And that's the gentleman who told me that.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. And do you know the name of the gentleman?

A. Yes. His name was Luano Nomellini.

Q. Can you spell it for me?

A. L-u-a-n-o, I believe his first name was spelled. His last name was N-o-m-e-l-l-i-n-i. I believe there's a double L, but not a double N in his last name.

Q. Okay. N-a-m-e-l-l-i-n-i?

A. N-o-m-e-l-l-i-n-i.

Q. Okay, great. Do you know his title in Walnut Creek?

A. He was -- he identified himself as being responsible for pipeline engineering.

Q. Okay. And can you summarize the conversation?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. Can you summarize the conversation?

A. Well, yes, I had initially tried to get ahold of M. Kirk Johnson, because Kirk and I had worked together when I was there. He as a junior engineer in San Francisco and then I had seen his name listed as a vice president out in Walnut Creek. And I had

left a couple of messages and not received calls back. So I contacted a friend of mine who had been working in the Walnut Creek office and had subsequently left PG&E, and I asked him who was responsible for pipeline engineering, and he gave me Luano's name.

Q. Okay. I really -- well, you said you called Mr. Kirk Johnson or left voice mail. Do you recall the time frame?

A. October and November.

Q. Okay. And your voice mail, do you elaborate what it contained?

A. Yeah, I -- basically, I said, "Kirk, this is Larry Medina. I don't know if you remember me. I used to run the records management system in PG&E's gas transmission and storage group in San Francisco, and I did some work with the operations group out in Walnut Creek. I've been hearing the reports regarding the San Bruno incident and sorry to hear what's happened, wanted to ask some questions or provide some information about the engineering documents and drawings that were under my control when I was there. Could you please give me a call back?" And I left my number. That was the voice mail the first time.

he second voice mail was just, "Kirk, this is Larry calling you back again. I hadn't heard from you, thought I'd give you another try."

And then after I received Luano's name from this other individual, I called PG&E's general information number in San

Francisco and I asked if they could connect me to him. They transferred the call out to Walnut Creek. Obviously, they don't give people's numbers out any longer, and I got his voice mail. It said that he was on vacation. So I left him a similar voice mail to the one that I had originally left for Kirk, stating that I used to run the record's system and I had some information and some questions and wanted to know whether there was any possibility I could help them find some of this information.

I did not hear back from him until December, somewhere between -- somewhere in the first half of December. I don't know the exact date. And when he called me back he apologized for not getting back, said he was on vacation and things. And I told him that I had tried to call Kirk and that I wanted to share some information with him about the system that we managed and asked why if we had this thing filed three different ways in three different locations that all the records (indiscernible). And he asked me where they were and I --

Q. I'm sorry, you broke up. Can you repeat that?

A. -- told him that they were in 123 Mission on the 10th floor. And he said, gee, we haven't been in the 123 Mission building for quite a while. And I explained the size of the room to him, as I had described it earlier: 20 feet by 50 feet and everything set up by line number. And I said, so what happened to all of that stuff? And he says, well, he says, all -- he says, all I can tell you, because I was never in that room; I don't know

what it was, but some of that stuff did come out to Walnut Creek. Some of it probably just got boxed and sent to the records center, and I don't know how accurately it was labeled, and the rest of it, if they couldn't identify what it was, it probably just got [redacted] canned.

Q. I'm sorry, say that again? Probably what?

A. Probably got [redacted] canned.

Q. Okay.

A. A little colloquialism.

Q. No, I understand. I understand. No, you were breaking up in the conversation, so I just want to make sure.

And I have one more question and then I'll pass it on to somebody. But you say you left a message for Mr. Kirk Johnson. Did you say that you had information for him or you said you have questions for him?

A. No, I said I had information on the records for the pipeline system.

Q. Okay.

A. And when I finished the call with Nomellini, he said that he was going to try to talk to some people, see what he could find out about what had happened to the stuff that was in 123 and he might get back to me. So I gave him my number at that time.

Q. And did he ever?

A. No, he never did.

Q. Okay.

MR. CHHATRE: Any questions, NTSB?

MR. NICHOLSON: Yeah, there's more questions here.

BY MR. NICHOLSON:

Q. I wanted to review a couple of these -- I've got two memos from you, Mr. Medina, one dated '92 and the other, I think, actually has no date. But the one in '92, entitled, "Maintaining accurate gas transmission and storage facility drawings"?

A. Yes.

Q. Who was that memo directed to? Who did you send it off to?

A. That memo was given to the then-manager of gas engineering and construction and the manager of pipeline operations, northern pipeline operations. Pipeline operations was under Marvin Bennett, B-e-n-n-e-t-t. Gas engineering and construction at that time was under Paul Heilmann.

So the reason this document was produced, after this first reorganization there were certain things that had been transferred in terms of the responsibility of who was going to do what work. And meetings were held in mid to late '92 to discuss this. And so we had input from people from northern pipeline operations, gas production and storage, gas engineering and construction, southern pipeline operations, general construction, engineering and construction, and the distribution business unit. They were all involved to get their perspective, the type of work that was being done. We wanted to ensure that there was

sufficient funding in these larger projects and facility modifications that were being done to allow us to maintain the project management manual, to maintain the microfilming of the drawings, to replace drawings that were missing when we identified them in the 1991 inventory that was performed, the generation of as-builts, and as it says in this table down here at the bottom, to discuss how future (indiscernible) who was going to be responsible for it.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Can you repeat that again? You broke up.

A. Sorry. It says that we were going to discuss how future work would be performed and who would be performing it. And there's a table of five items that we had greatest concern about. And then there was a continuous improvement process method that had been written up as a project. And that was going to be done during 1993. So this document was written highlighting concerns about things that had not been getting done, things that needed to get done, establishing the responsibilities for who would do what, and how it would be done. That was -- it was hoped that this would be the basis for developing the next steps for the continuous improvement process for the facility records.

Q. Any follow-up feedback to those memos from anybody? I mean, you sent it to people.

A. There was nothing that was direct follow-up or feedback, but it was -- the second memo, the one that's titled, "Potential

effects on basic workload from addition of former DBU transmission facilities", as they made final decisions following these meetings that we held in late '92, certain decisions had been made (indiscernible) transfer to who and how work was going to be done. And the second memo was written as a result of that. And this was written when we had been requested -- all the employees in this organization had been asked do you have any input, do you have any feedback, do you have any recommendations or suggestions as we're entering this reorganization phase that might help us or that might identify areas of concern that we should be considering when we go through this reorganization.

And I was working on the pipeline project at the time this request was made, so I wrote this from that perspective, although it was related to how the work had been done and how the records had been maintained during the time I was there. It was -- you know, the basis for how things would continue to be done after I retired from this project. So that's why I wanted to make sure that this got into the system before they started making hard decisions and deciding how things were funded, because I knew we had some gaps that had occurred since the reorganization in '86 and '87 when they split gas operations and I wanted to make sure that as they went through this reorganization they went back and they looked through the memorandum of understanding that had been written that said this portion of gas operations is going to do this, this portion of gas operations is going to do that, but

things weren't getting done. So I was hoping that they would reopen that MOU and look at these things to ensure that these things weren't going to continue to go undone.

BY MR. NICHOLSON:

Q. Yeah, in the second paragraph in the '92 it says, "One of the most notable effects of this change has been that construction modifications are many times not being reflected on a large number of existing facility drawings." What exactly -- what kind of construction modifications are we talking about?

A. Well, these are the work orders and the strength test and pressure reports and everything else that I mentioned that used to get sent in to gas system design by the (indiscernible) construction. They stopped sending this stuff in when they made the split for responsibility on certain work. So in this second memo it talks about maintaining operating records and mapping for as-built and pipeline history files, and then down below it talks a little bit about, you know, what wasn't getting done and how it possibly could get resolved.

Q. And that was the 1986 reorg?

A. It was following the 1986/'87 reorg, yes.

Q. Okay. I'm just curious, what was the reception to this memo in '92? Did you get any feedback from it?

A. Well, I think -- the feedback that I got from pipeline operations (indiscernible) depicted the situation, the people that I spoke to in operations. And that would have been Marv Bennett,

Dan Smith. There was a guy named Scott Clapp, C-l-a-p-p, who was (indiscernible) pipeline engineer at the time. Ben Campbell, because Ben had been in these meetings and Ben was very receptive to the fact that he knew this stuff wasn't getting documented, because Ben was responsible -- one of his responsibilities was the mapping unit in Walnut Creek, and he knew that they weren't doing this stuff and he said that the mapping unit there had never done that stuff before and it really wasn't anticipated that they were going to do that stuff. But he understood the value of it and he was receptive to the fact that it had been identified as a potential gap and that the information really did have value.

Q. Was that the disconnect between engineering and operations you referred to?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. CPUC, Sunil?

MR. SHORI: Thank you, Ravi.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Mr. Medina, I'm reading from issue here that says you had stated belief that some of the records that were transferred to PG&E's Walnut Creek office were not maintained. And forgive me, if we're repeating a couple of things. It's hard to keep track of everything that gets said on a teleconference. But can you elaborate on what -- if that was your statement and what you meant by that?

A. Where is that statement coming from?

Q. It's in a -- I'm reading from a response from somewhere. And it stated -- and I'll read the exact quote and you can tell me if it's correct or not. "Mr. Medina stated his belief that some of the records that were transferred to PG&E's Walnut Creek office were not maintained." Is that your statement?

A. That sounds like it's something that might have been paraphrased.

Q. Okay. Is there anything that you can lend to that in terms of what that might mean, if that's something you might have stated?

A. Well, I -- yeah, I think my statements are reflected in these two reports, the potential effects and maintaining accurate drawings. Basically, everything is reflected in there in terms of that's documented fact what I know was not taking place. So I think if someone was to read those, they could make an assumption that drawings transferred to certain facilities, whether it was Walnut Creek or somewhere else, were not being accurately maintained.

And I don't know that accurate is the word to use here. I think maybe maintained, period, was the issue. It wasn't necessarily they were putting inaccurate information onto the drawings; it's that they were not transferring the information onto the drawings at all.

Q. Okay. And that then leads into the next question.

Earlier on in regards to the question --

MR. CHHATRE: Sunil, you are breaking up.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Okay. Let me ask again. Earlier you had indicated in regard to quality control as far as when you folks would receive the records in San Francisco and then you were basically storing them or copying them or to -- you know, from your job. You indicated your concern was making sure that the data was properly being transferred. So as far as quality control in terms of what you got is what you were actually, you know, storing -- and this may have been in reference to the database, but that your quality control was mainly to assure that whatever you were storing or whatever you were entering was correctly being done, not necessarily the accuracy of the data or what you were receiving?

A. That is correct. Because we had no way of (indiscernible). We were not present when the tests were taken. We were not present when the documents were completed. We were not present when the information was placed from pen to paper. So there was no way we could determine the accuracy of that information. We had to assume that what we were receiving was accurate. It's just like reading something in the newspaper or reading a book or a magazine; you have to take, you know, at face value what you're getting as being accurate.

Q. Okay. But again, there is the issue of what's in the records you get and then there's the issue of what records you

should receive. And so on that basis, the 1992 memo we were just discussing, what the issue there -- would some of the concerns there from your end be that (indiscernible) not necessarily what should be in those records, but what, you know, what you were getting records-wise?

A. That's correct. We were not getting the records. We stopped receiving things on certain pipelines and on certain facilities. And the --

Q. And was the understanding there that that information then is being kept at the division level?

A. Yes. Anything that was not the responsibility of operations or engineering and construction is what we stopped getting.

Q. And again, that's kind of a cutoff there, too, in terms of what would exactly -- because you mentioned something about lower cost or lower complexity type work that's done at the division level you wouldn't get?

A. Right. So when they were connecting a house, we didn't get any of that information. When they were connecting a business, unless it was an extremely high volume flow, we didn't get that information. But as it says at the top of this one memo, it's: Recent reorganization decisions made which result in the transfer of 60-pound and over gas transmission to gas supply have certain ripple effects related to existing reporting and documentation practices.

So when this reorganization was going to happen, even the stuff that we had been getting, we weren't going to be getting any longer in San Francisco. It was going to go only to Walnut Creek. So --

Q. And this included -- I'm sorry to cut you off. This included everything 60 pounds and over, not necessarily just things under 60 pounds that would generally be considered divisional responsibility, but everything 60 pounds over and to basically backbone line or anything else?

A. Right. That was going to be now going to the operations group, not coming through engineering and construction. So the only thing engineering and construction was going to see were records being generated on (indiscernible) were designed out of the engineering and construction organization in San Francisco. The responsibility for all of this was transferring.

And then subsequently, after I left, because this memo was written, this second memo -- I know you said that the one is -- says December '92 on the bottom. On the second one, if you look at the very last paragraph, it says that I would be out the week of March 8th, back on March 15th. So this was written somewhere in early March of '93.

Q. And ENCON again is basically certain drawings or certain design features were left with them and did they become a different group or did they get renamed or merged into something else? By the time you left.

A. No. When I left it was still DBU and -- DBU ENCON. Engineering and construction is what used to be called general construction. We used to call them GC.

Q. Okay. (indiscernible) DBU and ENCON?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. (indiscernible) construction, but they would also be engineering construction and the DBU?

A. Right.

Q. And they would -- but they would generally be involved with just transmission level work but -- or would they also perform distribution work?

A. They did distribution (indiscernible).

Q. I'm sorry, you cut out.

A. They did distribution work as well. And that was coordinated through the regional facilities.

Q. Okay. Bear with me one minute.

On the copies -- when you would receive revisions, you earlier said you would get revisions of maps or revisions of records, what was the process for keeping the older records? Would the revised copies replace whatever was there for you folks, or did you keep everything continuously?

A. Markups would come to us to make revisions to existing mylars or the CAD files when we started generating drawings in CAD. Those markups would get incorporated either into the CAD file or by pen and ink into the mylars that reflected the

facilities.

After everything had been accurately transferred over from these markups, that information would get signed off by the registered engineer in San Francisco and then we would microfilm those documents. So the -- either the CAD file would get upgraded and a plot would get made and we make a microfilm from the plot with a wet signature and a seal on the drawing, the plot, or the actual mylar would get upgraded and revised and then a revision line would get signed off on that. On completion of those revisions, the documents would be microfilmed, the documents would have half-size prints made of them. Typically these were 11 by 17 prints. And then the prints would get distributed to the operating organizations, the microfilm would be retained in-house in San Francisco, and then the mylar would get filed in the drawing files.

So the microfilm, we kept all past revisions of microfilm. We moved the earlier revision to a second cabinet so that the one cabinet only carried the current revisions of the drawings and then the older revisions were in a second cabinet that was kept closed and locked so that nobody went into it accidentally and pulled inaccurate information. And the way they would know what was current is they would go to the drawing index, look up the drawing, find the current revision number, and then when they pulled the microfilm, they would verify that was accurate. They would then make a print from the microfilm on a

printer we had there in the office. It printed 17 by 22 prints. And then they would put the microfilm into a separate box for us to re-file because we didn't want the microfilm being filed inaccurately.

Q. And again, reading from a different line item again, there's a statement here: "Mr. Medina offered his opinion that this sometimes created issues." And this was in reference to recollection of multiple sets of plat sheets were kept in various PG&E facilities and that as a result of the '87 organization the company local transmission records were sent to the local divisions. And it stated here that "Mr. Medina offered his opinion that this sometimes created issues." And can you elaborate one more time, please, on what those issues might have been or what you would have meant by that?

A. Well, when I -- what I would have meant by that, if those were my actual words, it wouldn't have been done following the same practices that had been used for decades. (indiscernible) organization and they would be making the determination what information they would put onto the drawings. And they wouldn't be getting microfilm necessarily, because I don't believe the divisions ever did any microfilm once those drawings were transferred to their control, and we would not be getting updates. So the last record in our cabinet would be the last record we had of what happened to a facility. It would then be the responsibility of someone else. So if somebody wanted

accurate information on those systems, they would have had to have gone to the division or the region office to get that.

Q. Thank you. And then there's also a mention, and this may have been covered earlier, but that minutes were issued for the meeting that you referred to in early November in Walnut Creek.

A. Yes.

Q. Any chance you still have those available?

A. I never had those. I know that minutes were generated. I never got the minutes. I wasn't at a high enough pay grade to get that stuff.

Q. Okay. There's a couple more questions, but the main one, and I think of concern to most on this call, is records related to the 1956 work on line 132, and based on what we received thus far and what we would hope to have. At this stage, based on the records process as you understood it and what's in place, as those drawings -- as they were generated for that project, because I can't imagine they weren't generated, but assuming they were generated, would those have ended up in the line files and would they have been available in those files by the time you started work on those or were involved with that, with those files?

A. Yes. All the documents related to the construction and testing and work performed on those projects would have been in the line files and everything would have been reflected on the

pipeline plat sheet.

Q. And at any stage, by '92, by '93, whenever there was any recognition that certain records were missing -- again, not the accuracy of the records, but records missing, if any of those as-builts weren't there in the files, in the line files, is that around '92, '93 that that kind of information would have been identified?

A. The as-builts themselves were not retained in the line file. The documents for work that was done was retained in the line file and the as-built (indiscernible) they had been transferred to the drawings, the as-builts were destroyed.

MR. CHHATRE: Can you please repeat that? You broke up in the last three sentences.

MR. MEDINA: The as-builts, the actual as-built markups were not retained in the line files. The documents that resulted in the changes that were reflected on the drawing would have been in the line files, but once the as-built drawings that were received, the redlines of the drawings were received, had been transferred to the -- either the CAD file or the mylar, those as-builts were destroyed, those markups were destroyed. The documents were never destroyed, but the as-built markups would have been destroyed. And that was in the normal course of business once the work had been performed.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Okay. So the marked-upped as-builts?

A. Right.

Q. Okay. And I guess I'm trying to understand the difference between an as-built and a marked-upped as-built. I would imagine an as-built is the final product, but what would be the marked-upped as-builts?

A. (indiscernible) refer to in construction as a redline. A print is made of existing conditions and also that indicates what work is to go on during the course of construction. So a construction drawing will be generated.

There is a static condition drawing that exists. When a construction (indiscernible) approved, a document will be issued to use for performing the construction. That would be your construction set drawings. That set of construction drawings is used during the course of construction and any changes that occur that differentiate or that differ from the construction as designed are marked onto those prints in red as an as-built markup. A redline is what it's referred to.

Those redlines at the end of the construction project are generally signed off by the engineer on site who's responsible for the work, indicating that they accurately reflect what happened during the course of construction. Those markups were transferred to San Francisco to the drafting group. And then the drafting group in San Francisco would take those redlines and transfer the information onto either the construction mylar or the CAD file and then produce a new plot or produce a new drawing that

would be signed off by the registered engineer on staff in San Francisco.

Q. And I'm sure you're most likely aware, having read the NTSB's preliminary report as far as the information related to the small short sections of pipe involved in the construction of 132 that failed. Would you have expected those to have been included on the as-builts and then essentially that would then go from the as-built markup to the final, and then I guess would it be transferred to the plat sheets then? Is that the way the process would work?

A. Yes. And if the plat sheet was of such a great scale that they would not be able reflect all the changes on it, what they would do is they would do what's called a cut section. They would take that plat sheet if it was -- let's say it was sheet 27 of 52. They would draw cut lines on the pipe and then say "see 27A". And then they would create a greater scale drawing on 27A where the cut line starts and where the cut line ends to depict what happened in between on that section.

Q. Okay. So kind of a -- forgive my use of the term, but a blowup or a blowout of --

A. Yes.

Q. -- a blowup of that portion, a magnified portion?

A. That's correct. They would basically just, you know, essentially say, it stops here and it starts here for accurate information on this section. But if you want to see what happened

between those two points, go to this cut-away and then you'll see in greater detail what happened there. So these nine segments that had been added in there (indiscernible). And then after that, the other sections that were added could have been reflected on that A sheet or they may have created a B or a C or a D if it went into such great detail that they couldn't reflect it on the A.

Q. But in either case, but at least the final map or some sort of a map reflecting those additions or that particular construction, you would expect to basically be on a plat sheet by the time it's all said and done?

A. Yeah. And the reason I say that -- and this is something we never took lightly. The way I kept funding for the records management organization is in General Order 112-D. It said that "the utilities shall maintain the necessary records to ensure (indiscernible) with the rules and the federal pipeline safety regulations that are applicable. Such records shall be available for inspection at all times by the Commission or Commission staff."

So every time they wanted to cut our budget, I would press the play button on the side of my neck and state that to remind people that we had an obligation to maintain drawings of all facilities that were in operation that accurately depicted the condition.

Q. So based on that line of reasoning, if a portion of pipe

was cut out as a repair, and basically and you again -- and you testified (indiscernible). Would you expect that, that that would be the kind of record that would then come back to you folks as a reflected change on the pipeline itself and you would -- you know, as an ongoing permanent record of a change on that pipeline?

A. Yes. I would expect that along with the tests for the section of pipe following the installation, and the radiographs from any welds that were taken, if they took radiographs as well.

Q. And that's regardless of the length of section replaced or anything? I mean, that's --

A. Yes.

Q. -- basically any change?

A. Yes. Because if we didn't get that, when someone pulled a drawing they wouldn't know what was actually there. The only way they'd be able to do it would be to, you know, green field dig or pot hole to find out what was in the ground.

Q. And any materials reports and things, would those end up with you folks as part of the records as well, or as part of the file?

A. That's correct. That would be in the line file as well. Material inspection reports, generally procurement was involved in that because they would write the purchase order. And then the material inspection reports would come into procurement. Procurement would send them to the manager of gas system design and then through his secretary, administratively we'd get those

for the line file.

Q. Okay. Let me clarify. You're referring to material procurement in terms of pipeline purchase for installation. I'm referring to like a material failures report.

A. Oh.

Q. So would a material failures report also be part of the file, been part of the types of records that you would have received?

A. I do recall seeing material failure reports in the line files. I don't know that we received them at all times. I don't know if (indiscernible) times just directly onto the drawing and a material failure report wouldn't be written, because I don't know what the requirements were for when they had to write a material failure report.

Q. And I'm kind of on my end of questions here. Bear with me. Were you involved in any way with PG&E's pipeline replacement program?

A. Yeah, I was for a brief period of time. The gentleman who was running that at the time was Tom Benson, B-e-n-s-o-n. He was one of the engineers that was in our organization and he had a young man named Danny Gee, G-e-e, who was an engineer that worked for him that maintained the database on the pipeline replacement program. So Danny would work with the gal in my area who was generating the database for the drawings and estimates and other information because sometimes he would want to take excerpts from

that database to use in his database.

Q. Okay. You kind of cut out toward the end. Just make sure you got everything in.

A. He would take excerpts of information from our database on job histories.

Q. Okay.

A. The information that we had converted from paper to the Condor database. He would take excerpts of that information to use that in (indiscernible) rather than reentering it.

Q. And --

MR. CHHATRE: Mr. Medina, please repeat the last sentence and a half. You broke up.

MR. MEDINA: Yes. Information was excerpted from the database that we retained in records management on the pipeline data files and it was taken and used to populate the pipeline replacement program database rather than reentering the data directly.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Okay. And so your group -- is that the extent of your involvement or your group's involvement was basically the Condor database that you folks had being utilized or extracted, data extracted from that to populate the GPRP database?

A. Yeah. The only other involvement we would have had is if drawings were generated through work done on the pipeline replacement program, then those would go into the drawings file.

Q. And then they would come back to you?

A. Right. Right.

Q. And then earlier you had said that as far as the -- the Condor database was a standalone and not incorporated in the GIS. Can you clarify that a little bit?

A. Well, the GIS didn't exist prior to 1993. They were investigating the use of the GIS system. They had been working with the mapping supervisor who was in gas transmission and storage at that time or it had been gas engineering and construction. His name was Caesar Formoso, F-o-r-m-o-s-o. And also the mapping supervisor who was Steve Niemann, N-i-e-m-a-n-n. And Steve and I are the ones that went to the GIS conference in Denver to see what types of applications were being offered at that time and what types of utilities they had.

So the GIS had not been implemented fully at the time I left. I do not know that the database we had was converted the content was consumed into GIS. I have no way of knowing that.

Q. Okay. So as far as whether or not Condor data directly went into GIS or it got reestablished, you really don't know how any of that came to be?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Were you aware or were you involved at all in the transmission pipeline risk assessment program for PG&E?

A. No. The information I saw about that, actually was a document that I found on PUC's FTP server. And there was some

information in that that I found kind of interesting. This is the procedure for risk management, procedure number RMP08, Identification, Location and Documentation of High Consequence Areas.

Q. Okay.

A. And that was first issued in 2004 and last revised, the copy that was on the server in December of '09. And I actually provided a copy of that to Lise Jordan, who had (indiscernible) I spoke to in June. And she said it was the first time she had seen the document.

MR. CHHATRE: I'm sorry, can you repeat the last two sentences, please? You broke.

MR. MEDINA: Yes. Sure. In June of this year I provided information to Lise Jordan, L-i-s-e, J-o-r-d-a-n, who is an attorney at PG&E who contacted me June 3rd and set up a conference call for June 7th we communicated on. I informed her of the existence of this document, this RMP08, and she told me that was the first time she had seen (indiscernible). And there is a section in here about records and records retention. And I asked her, and I guess it was more of a rhetorical question than anything else: How could this documentation be in this that was revised as recently as December of '09 saying that you have to gather all this information when you do these assessments and that all HCAs, you have to maintain the documents for the lifetime of that pipeline, and it's not being followed?

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Okay. So this was in reference to the RMP08 that you had looked at current -- or recently?

A. Yes.

Q. But as far as in the development or anything, the first division or anything as far as '04, you had no involvement in that?

A. No. I was gone in '93, so I would have had no reason to have involvement in that.

Q. Okay. So this is really just more or less in reference to questions or discussions you had with Ms. Jordan --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- related to what you saw on the PUC website?

A. Well, yes, and it was based on the fact that she and I had a lengthy discussion about pipeline plat sheets and what they contained and what they looked like and what they reflected. And I was searching for information about plat sheets to see if I could find an example to show her one. And when I was going through this Google search, I turned up this RMP08 and also Utility Procedure PD4125P, both on the CPUC FTP server, that made reference to plat sheets. But both of these documents clearly state what has to be retained when upgrades are made to (indiscernible).

MR. CHHATRE: Sunil, one more question for you and I want to let everybody go, and if time remains then you can ask

more questions.

BY MR. SHORI:

Q. Okay. Last one, it sounded like earlier you said you worked for Bechtel at various times and capacity. Are you aware of any other consultants or any other organizations that did any kind of reviews or audits of PG&E's records and perhaps what you know of any of their findings and when those were done.

A. I worked for TA Engineering in 1983 and we did an assessment of the records. Bechtel, as far as I know, never performed an assessment of the records. During the time frame 1983 to 1993, no one performed an assessment of records in the operations office in Walnut Creek or the San Francisco headquarters, gas transmission and storage organization, other than myself. When I worked for Bechtel that was at the end of my tenure with PG&E, but that's because Bechtel was the managing partner for the pipeline -- the line 401 transmission project. So they had no involvement in performing inspections of anything with relationship to the record system. So no one else did. Prior to 1983 and I don't know subsequent to my tenure there ending in '93.

Q. Okay. So between '83 and '93, if you were to find out or if somebody told you Bechtel had done any kind of audits of the records, that would be a surprise to you?

A. Yes, it would.

Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. SHORI: Thanks, Ravi, for that additional question.

MR. CHHATRE: Hey, Peter, PHMSA?

BY MR. KATCHMAR:

Q. Okay. Mr. Medina, thank you very much. Your memory is remarkable. Just a couple of clarifications on things that you've stated already. You were telling Sunil that as-built, the redlining of this -- of the as-builts would come back in to you guys. Would that be on a girth weld level basis or some greater distance?

A. It would be on any changes that needed to be reflected in the pipeline plat sheets that happened during construction.

Q. Well, if I was going to replace 10 feet of pipe, you know, I might have two girth welds, you know, two tie-in welds.

A. Right.

Q. And those today would have to be x-rayed so they would be identified. But if I was going to replace, you know, 1800 feet of pipe, there would be a number of girth welds in there and I'm just wondering would that information have been per -- you know, on a girth weld level basis, would that have been supplied to you or would it just have been the PIs?

A. If you were going to do modifications to 1800 feet of pipe, the construction set of drawings would indicate where that was going to happen, I would assume. And so all of that would be reflected on the markups following construction.

Q. Okay. Now, also, would there be a tally of perhaps where the pipe came from for that 1800 feet?

A. That depends whether it came out of the yard or if it came out of a manufacturer directly.

Q. Okay. I'm going to jump to a global question here. After you did your 1983 assessment on the records, did you create a report on any discrepancies or missing information?

A. No. The report that was generated after the '83 assessment identified how things were currently being done (indiscernible) talk to the engineering staff and asked them how do you look for information, are you able to find the information you look for, what would make it easier for you to find the information if you are having difficulty, and then is there information you cannot locate? We asked them how do you use the information, how would you be able to more efficiently and effectively use the information, and then there were gross estimates of the information that existed, where it was physically located, form and format that it was in --

Q. Okay, I get it. So it's a process -- it was a process review?

A. That's correct.

Q. So not an actual history of what information was there?

A. No, at that time we were just assessing what was there in gross volume, cubic feet, lineal feet, what it reflected, and how it was stored.

Q. Okay. Now, when -- going back to specific projects. If you did receive this 1800 feet of replacement, would your people

actually check versus two or three different documents to say was it 1802 feet or 1798 feet? Would they check things like that and look for discrepancies or not?

A. Things of that nature were not checked by the records management staff. When redlines came in, the redlines would come into the department head the same way all documents came in. The redlines would go from the department manager to the pipeline engineering manager. The pipeline engineering manager would transfer those to the pipeline engineer who was responsible for that construction project. He would review the redlines. He might make an assessment as to whether or not he had received everything he should have had, and then after he had made that assessment, he would pass those markups on to the drafting squad. The drafting squad, if these were hardcopy drawings, would come to us to pull the drawings. They would be signed out to their custody for modification. And if they were CAD drawings, they would just call them up on the server and they would come to us and request the current plots. But the plots would be removed from the file so that someone would know those plots were being revised.

Q. Gotcha. No, I understand. I think we all get that. And I've seen these redline drawings, you know, and -- and in the distribution system it's really not that critical to come off of a main to a new house with a single redline --

A. Right.

Q. -- you know, and a distance of a 45 feet or 100 feet because, you know, it's a half inch, you know -- or a 3/4-inch steel pipe or a --

A. Or DWV and they might have an O-hub fitting or something like that.

Q. Yeah. Yeah. But, I mean, on a transmission line you would think that, you know, they would want more detailed records and I would think it would be at a girth weld level. But, you know, anyway, maybe not.

A. Yeah. That I can't tell you. I think one of the pipeline engineers would have to tell you what they would anticipate receiving to consider it a complete set.

Q. Okay. Now, is there anybody (indiscernible) yourself (indiscernible) when you received these records that would have been able to identify a piece of pipe that never could have existed? And I'm talking about a certain size and manufacturing such as 30-inch seamless pipe.

A. Well, there were -- the old timers that were there when I was there only went back to the '60s. But there were people in PG&E that could answer that. My father could have answered that question. My father was the division welding instructor in the East Bay for PG&E. He's the one who qualified all the welders in the system in Northern California. And he would have been able to tell you whether or not a certain grade of pipe at a certain diameter existed and a certain wall thickness in seamless or not.

Q. Right. Right. But not -- normally the people that were there when you started probably wouldn't?

A. Well, they were -- you know, these engineers were, you know, they were top notch engineers and they knew what was in the yard at Decoto, the (indiscernible) pipe yard. If somebody said, hey, what do we have in 30-inch, I'm sure they could answer the question. But if somebody said, hey, what did we have 30-inch in 1956, probably the two guys that were there when I was there that could have answered that were either Bill Beriesa (ph.) or Charlie Tateosian. Maybe Norm Bryan (ph.) (indiscernible) moved to distribution unit by then. I mean, those are the only three guys that I know that had that lengthy of a history that could have answered that question.

Q. Okay. One other question was brought to mind there. You know, 30-inch pipe looks like 30-inch pipe.

A. Right.

Q. How do you know -- or do you know if PG&E had any methodology for discerning the strength of a piece of pipe? Like, you know, we're going to paint all our X52 purple and we're going to paint all of our grade B, you know, put a green stripe on it.

A. Well, I know that in -- when it was in the yard they had it in different areas. I mean, they stored different wall thicknesses and types of pipe in different areas. And I'm sure they had some way of marking it that indicated what it was.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Peter, this gentleman is not a

welding engineer and (indiscernible) mechanic. He's a records keeping person. So how -- you know, if you can just maybe fine tune your questions, we all can save some time.

MR. KATCHMAR: I'm not looking to save time; I'm looking to pick his brain.

MR. CHHATRE: Right. But, I mean, you're asking him questions about something that he may not be even aware.

MR. KATCHMAR: Okay. If he doesn't know, I'm sure he will say, "I don't know." Thank you, though. I think I'm about done.

BY MR. KATCHMAR:

Q. Oh, specifically, do you have any recollection during your tenure there or prior to, perhaps, of an interpretation that anything that was -- anything on a gas transmission pipeline, any piece of pipe that was replaced because of a leak or anything, that it was considered a pipe replacement and not a pipe repair so perhaps the records would not be kept?

A. I don't know that they actually made that distinction before the pipeline replacement program because the accounting wasn't any different. Whether they replaced or repaired a section of pipe it was a capital project. A chunk of pipe went into the ground; a chunk of pipe came out of the ground. I don't think they made a distinction whether it was repair or replace because they didn't use independent accounting for the various types of jobs.

Q. Okay. Interestingly enough, that's where we found the information was the accounting department.

A. Yeah, that's something that I can't speak to.

Q. Okay.

MR. KATCHMAR: Thank you very much, Ravi. I'm done.

MR. CHHATRE: All right. City of San Bruno?

MR. CALDWELL: Yeah, Geoff Caldwell, City of San Bruno.

BY MR. CALDWELL:

Q. Oh, about an hour and 20 minutes ago, Mr. Medina, you mentioned that (indiscernible) contacted (indiscernible) this event because you wanted to provide information to them, and I wasn't clear on what that information was. And to include that you had some questions of them. What information did you want to provide to them at that time?

A. Well, what I wanted to tell them was what existed in 1993 and where it existed and that if it was still where it was, I could walk in that room, turn a cabinet around, stick my hand out and touch the line 132 pipeline files. I wanted to let them know that I know all of the stuff that they had been talking about, strength test and pressure reports and weld inspections and types of pipe in the ground was (indiscernible), and that the plat sheets had been maintained up until 1986 had all the information that they were looking for from the '50s would be on those plat sheets unless those sections of pipe had been replaced and then the more current information would have been reflected up until

1986.

I wanted to let them know that there was microfilm of that. I wanted to let them know that the stuff existed in multiple sets. I wanted to make sure that they understood that there was -- that this stuff did exist at one point in time and that they might still be able to put their hands on it, they just didn't know where to find it.

Q. Okay. And then (indiscernible) more to the point, was there something that you had heard -- by the time that you had first reached out to them, was there something that you heard that they might not have had access or immediate access to that -- those records or might not have known where to look?

A. In October and November there was plenty of stuff in the media saying that PG&E is having difficulty locating the records.

Q. Um-hum.

A. So at that point it was just they were having difficulty.

Q. Okay. Just -- that's all I have. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Mr. Sperry?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry, Ravi, who are you calling?

MR. CHHATRE: I'm calling union, scientists. Joshua. Are you around, Joshua, or are you dropped off?

I guess, Debbie -- we'll go to Debbie.

BY MS. MAZZANTI:

Q. The one question I still am -- Debbie Mazzanti, IBEW

1245. The question that I still have is, in your earlier statement when you talk about leaving a message for Kirk Johnson and the other gentleman, the first time you made the statement you said, I left a message and told them that I had questions and I had additional information. Then Ravi asked you the question: Did you say you had questions? And then you said no. So I just want to make sure that I'm really clear. When you left a message in the midst of everything that was going on, did you indicate to them that you had questions of them?

A. No, I -- I guess I should clarify that. I said I had questions (indiscernible) --

MR. CHHATRE: You broke up.

BY MS. MAZZANTI:

Q. Okay. But I'm not asking -- okay, so --

MR. CHHATRE: Go ahead (indiscernible) --

MS. MAZZANTI: I'm sorry.

BY MS. MAZZANTI:

Q. I'm not asking what your questions were. I'm more interested in the actual message that you were leaving for people, you know, that -- did you just leave the message saying I have some information but I also have questions?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. But you didn't indicate what those questions were nor did you indicate what your -- the information that you felt could help, you didn't leave those messages on your voice mail; is

that correct?

A. On the voice mail to Kirk Johnson, no, I did not.

Q. Okay.

A. Because I wanted to speak to him directly rather than try to provide him information in a voice mail.

Q. Okay. All right.

MS. MAZZANTI: That's all I have, Ravi. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Mr. Medina, I know it's a long time and I'll just keep limited -- my questions limited to maybe three or four here. You mentioned that you want to tell them where the records are; you want to tell them where they can find it. Who is they?

A. The public presence was Kirk Johnson, and then later the public presence was Chris Johns. So it was whoever from PG&E that was speaking for the company that said they couldn't find this stuff. And what caused me to come to Congresswoman Speiers (indiscernible) February --

Q. I'm sorry, you broke up. Can you repeat that?

A. What caused me to come to Congresswoman Spear with this was in February there was a comment made on the news where a PG&E spokesperson said -- this is after they had gone through all the inspection at the CAL palace (ph.) where there were these pallets and pallets of records being taken into the CAL palace, and the great theater of the hundreds of employees going there to look at

things. They said, well, we are convinced that we cannot find the information and that it probably never existed. And my blood boiled when I heard that because I knew it existed. I was being paid for 10 years to manage it.

Q. Okay. And you also mentioned that -- our question for you, you said some responsibility were given to divisions. Would transmission lines be given to division or they would still remain with the records management?

A. I think that depended on the pressure level of those transmission lines. Certain lines stayed within gas operations; others were transferred to the divisions. I don't know which were transferred and when they were transferred. I know that while I was in San Francisco, the San Francisco division, the Golden Gate Division, did not have mapping people so we were doing the mapping for them at headquarters.

Q. Okay.

A. That would have been line 109 definitely, but I do not know if line 132 was maintained by operations.

Q. Okay. And you said -- did divisions when they took over from you, did they ever request any past information from you guys in the records management?

A. They never requested the pipeline history files nor did they request copies of information out of the history files, but they did request the drawings, the mylars. And what we did in most of those cases, we would make a -- either a sepia or some

other type of a copy that we can still make prints from and then we revved up the drawing to state mylar or original transfer to X division on X date.

Q. Okay.

A. And then we would transfer to them what was referred to as the original, which would have been a mylar or a vellum and then a copy would have been retained in operations.

Q. Now, there are a couple of (indiscernible) questions we didn't ask you earlier. Can you give us your educational background, training, any formal --

A. I'm a high school graduate with some college.

Q. I'm sorry, you broke up again. Please repeat.

A. I'm a high school graduate with some college.

Q. Okay.

A. I worked for various engineering firms, plumbing firms, and architectural firms over the years in a variety of capacities. I've taken mechanical drafting courses and blueprint interpretation courses. Some of my responsibilities involved material take off and computer sciences. So I've worked with drawings quite a bit over my career. I've worked around engineering since 1976. I have worked with the conversion of information from hardcopy format to electronic format since 1986. Some of that work was at PG&E. A substantial amount of information is done -- has been done since that time. My current -- in my current role one of the responsibilities I have is

ensuring that persistent access is available for information in electronic formats on documentation and drawings that has a minimum retention period of 75 years.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Mr. Hayes, your turn.

MR. HAYES: No, actually, I think I've -- I think it's pretty well covered. I can't think of anything else, so I'm good.

MR. CHHATRE: You're good? Okay. Then in that case we'll give each party that maybe one or two questions each. Sunil?

MR. SHORI: I'm sorry, I don't have anything additional right now, Ravi. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Thank you.

Okay. Peter? PHMSA?

MR. KATCHMAR: Yup, I'm good. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. City?

MR. CALDWELL: No, thank you, Ravi.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Debbie? Union?

MS. MAZZANTI: No, thanks. Thank you very much for --

MR. CHHATRE: Matt?

MS. MAZZANTI: -- the opportunity to interview you, Mr. Medina.

MR. CHHATRE: Matt Nicholson?

BY MR. NICHOLSON:

Q. Well, I think I need some clarification, Mr. Medina. It sounded like when you took over, the records department was a

centralized facility; is that correct?

A. Who is this?

Q. This is Matt with NTSB.

A. Oh, yes. Matt, yes, it was a centralized facility in San Francisco.

Q. And then in 1986 that split based on line pressure?

A. Let me clarify my first statement. It was a centralized facility for the great majority of the information. There was a satellite facility in Antioch that maintained all the Stan Pac pipeline documentation. That was out in the Roly Road office. Because the Stan Pac lines fell under the operations organization directly.

Q. Okay. But you -- all the transmission, distribution lines call came through San Francisco?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And then that changed in 1986 with the reorg?

A. Yes. Responsibility for certain numbered lines were no longer with San Francisco.

Q. Okay. So going -- if I'm looking for a document now, I actually have to look in two places: I would have to look in wherever records is now and the division that that pipeline resides in?

A. In 1993, I would say that the answer is yes. As of today, I can't answer that question because I have had limited interaction with PG&E since that time.

Q. And when you were there, records was under what -- what were you under, operations and engineering?

A. I was under gas transmission and storage under James Stoudemore (ph.).

Q. Okay.

A. And then our function was actually under what was then gas system design under Charles Tateosian. I reported directly to Jane Yura. And then the mapping group reported to gas planning, Ivan Odin, and the gas mapping supervisor, Steve Niemann reported to Trista Burkovitz. So that's how our organization was at that time.

And then certain records were maintained out in operations in Walnut Creek when they moved from Antioch to Walnut Creek -- when they moved the pipeline operations group to Walnut Creek, they started maintaining some of the major (indiscernible) information, line 300 and 400 along with the Stan Pac lines. But the rest of it stayed in San Francisco. We had all the compressor station drawings. We had Bernie (ph.), Gerber, Tionesta, Kettleman, Delavan. All the main compressor stations were with us.

Q. But no Milpitas would have been within its division headquarters?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. Milpitas operating diagram would have been maintained at the division level?

A. No. Milpitas was with us.

Q. Okay.

A. Milpitas was a major transmission facility. That was one -- Panoche Junction, Milpitas -- there's a PY there that I can't think of right now -- Delavan Tap, Springtown PLS, all of that stuff was with us.

Q. Okay. And lastly, what -- the plat sheets you were talking about, that would be -- you would have a plan view of the pipeline itself and did you say there was a table beneath that?

A. Actually, it depended on the way the project was performed. Matt, what they did is some of those there was a plan view and then the table and then up above that in some of them they had a mosaic photograph where they actually took overhead, flyover photographs and they photographed the terrain under which it was placed.

Q. But a plat sheet from the 1950s would just simply be the drawing and a table on mylar?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. Especially the ones that were in rural areas.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: This is Ravi from NTSB.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. You mentioned sand -- I didn't get the quite word, Stand Pac lines? What are those?

A. Standard Pacific --

Q. Oh, Standard Pacific. I'm sorry, okay.

A. -- (indiscernible) Company.

Q. Okay. Now I know. Okay. I didn't quite hear you.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Does anybody have any questions? Last go-around.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No (indiscernible). Thank you, Mr. Medina, for this interview.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Medina. Thank you so much for staying with us so long. I appreciate your help.

Is there anything that we didn't ask you or you want to add that will help our investigation? (indiscernible) everything that you know or you want to tell us. So this is your chance to tell us anything that you we should know, in your opinion.

MR. MEDINA: The only thing I'll say, and, Ravi, I think I mentioned this to you when I spoke to you, and I also said this to Lise Jordan when I spoke to her, my intent on coming forward with this information was to assist PG&E to attempt to find the information that they were after. I have no intent to harm PG&E in any way. I explained to Lise that I'm in a relatively awkward position being a former employee, a third-generation PG&E person. I'm a future pensioner and I'm a stockholder and a rate payer.

So given that entwined relationship that I have with PG&E, I have no intent to harm PG&E. I want to see this come to a resolution. I feel very sorry for the people who were harmed when

this incident occurred and any others that may be harmed from the lack of accurate information being available. But I know this information did exist and I have a feeling that it may still exist.

I think if somebody could find that deep set of microfilm and possibly find the pipeline plat sheets for some of these lines, PG&E could save an awful lot of money and not have to go through what they're being told they have to go through for a lack of information.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Thank you so much and, again, if something comes to your mind that probably slipped right now or we didn't ask or you remember, feel free to get ahold of me.

MR. MEDINA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: With that, thank you very much. I just want to make sure that everybody, all the parties, and both of you, that this is an NTSB investigation interview and I want to keep everything we discussed confidential until to the point that we will need the transcripts.

MR. MEDINA: Ravi, on that note, will we be getting a copy of the transcript at some point or how long will that be?

MR. CHHATRE: Well, the transcripts will be made. I'm not sure if we will go through the -- well, we'll go to the official outside transcriber or we'll do it internally or we'll just have some of the transcripts. So whichever format it is, it will be in the next 7 to 15 days.

MR. MEDINA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: And all parties will get it. And again, the same protocol will be followed, maintain the confidentiality.

With that, thank you all for participating.

MR. KATCHMAR: Thank you.

MS. MAZZANTI: Thank you. Bye-bye.

MR. CHHATRE: Bye-bye.

(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 SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA Interview of Larry Medina
DOCKET NUMBER:	DCA-10-MP-008
PLACE:	Washington, D.C.
DATE:	June 27, 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.

_____

Kay Maurer
Transcriber