

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**CC:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 2/24/2021 5:29:11 PM  
**Subject:** RE: O8W-PM [REDACTED] - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting  
**Importance:** High

Hi [REDACTED] and Team,

I had thought that we had reached agreement on the process flow. I know that [REDACTED] is working hard to keep things flowing in the correct direction and so I will not say too much here, but I would like to reiterate that just a couple of weeks ago, [REDACTED] and I were all on the same page as far as process flow. "Here is another one on Land" doesn't feel like the partnership that we're all striving for this year, it feels like blame is already starting to happen.

Land didn't start receiving clear priorities and clear SOWs for these Basemaps until last week, and some of those have already changed. I truly don't want to get into the "us vs. them" mentality, but I do feel the need to speak up on this.

Thank you, [REDACTED]



---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 5:14 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: O8W-PM [REDACTED] - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting  
**Importance:** High

Here is another one on Land. We are going to adjust our process to not get ahead of Land/PM assignment. I am not sure where this project falls on the priority list but it was brought up to my attention by my team.


---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 1:34 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: O8W-PM [REDACTED] - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting  
**Importance:** High

For Bucks Creek there is quite a bit of work surrounding Hwy 70 and we will need a Land Department

Base Maps prepared for all 3 Orders. This will delay the EOD dates until these can be developed and provided to the Vendor... We will also need answers to the questions outlined by Travis below...

# Bucks Creek 1101- PM# 35217268 Overview Map




Thxs,

[Redacted]

[Redacted] - Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
[Redacted]

Some of the measures included in this email are contemplated as additional precautionary measures intended to further reduce the risk of wildfires.



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 11:29 AM

To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: O8W-PM [REDACTED] - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

All,

Good meeting yesterday...I feel its best to get everything 'on the table' as soon as possible in the 'life cycle' of any project, here is that attempt.

I will set up a virtual 'follow up' meeting next week to discuss who is taking what action items below....first I need confirmation that we can even change scope, and what the process looks like.

Here are my notes/action items:

PM [REDACTED] Phase 1)

1. We learned the following:
  - a. Sub-Station (per [REDACTED]) is undergoing its own project under PM [REDACTED] of which is in UNSC status, and the following locations have 'overlap' scope:
    - i. Location 1, pole is being replaced under Sub PM
    - ii. Location3, pole is being replaced under Sub PM
    - iii. It appears that PM [REDACTED] will be completed before our O8W project begins, so it is imperative that we work to have their scope match our needs...ASAP. I will take this action with the help of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to supply the details.
2. Location 2 has a bank of three transformers not indicated in any of our scoping documents...do we really need to replace this steel pole?



3. 'Underground' scope between locations 102 and 101 doesn't make sense when the following are considered:
  - a. How does this scope reduce risk?
  - b. Is 'undergrounding this small section 'constructible' when you consider the following:
    - i. Stairway, creek crossing, and proximity to sub-station
  - c. See picture



3. All parties had the same burning question regarding the 'river crossing';
  - a. Why couldn't we move Location 4 to the east side of CA-70 and remove Locations 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the OH-Hardening scope? This would require an increase in OH-UG scope on PM [REDACTED] of about the same distance of OH-Hardening scope begin removed from PM 35217268.
  - b. Here is the basic idea in RED.....the dashed line is proposing UG:

PM [REDACTED] (Phase 2)

1. Preliminary Drawing was not provided

2. Trench Location:

- a. We determined that landing the trench ~2' into the lane from the ETW (fog-line) was probably the best consistent location of which it would be ideal if the 7-boxes could be landed in the 'travel lane'. This will need to be discussed with Caltrans before moving forward with the design.
- b. Any proposed poles to be placed within 52' from ETW if absolutely needed will need 'gaurdrail' protection to assist with DSDD exception requests.

3. Rock Creek Bridge Crossing

- a. Scope is not clear for this crossing since it leads us to a 'what-if' scenario of, if Caltrans doesn't allow the conduits to be attached to the existing bridge we should span the river OH. This will need to be discussed with Caltrans to first determine 'if' we can attach to their bridge before scope is locked.

PM [REDACTED] (Phase 3)

1. RR Siding Service/Tx located in picture below also has a weather station on pole and scope for

replacing this Tx is another 'what if' scenario of:

- a. Does the RR need the service?
- b. If they do can we serve via a crossing at the Cresta Dam.
- c. If Cresta Dam doesn't work should we cross the river a different location?
- d. What do we do about the weather station?



e. Here is pic:

2. Termination of UG scope at Cresta Dam is not clear for the following reasons:


- a. Not constructible to 'trench' to....see pic:



- i. We were not able to see the panel at the Cresta Dam to determine loading needs.
  - ii. It also appears that this transformer feeds a Caltrans Pedestal for lights in the tunnels.
- b. The question is:
  - i. First, do we need the river crossing at the outflow of the dam if we are going to cross the river at a different location to feed the RR Tx?
    1. If we don't need the river crossing could we install a pad-mount Tx and trench in a service through the tunnel ~100LF to the Caltrans pedestal and then feed the



Cresta Dam panel?



Email: [ISSQ@PGE.COM](mailto:ISSQ@PGE.COM)  
Pacific Gas and  
Electric Company