

From: [REDACTED]
CC: [REDACTED]
Sent: 6/28/2021 3:07:36 PM
Subject:

Group 1

Recently completed undergrounding projects – just 1 or 2. The mileage may not be long. Focus is to understand.

Projects:

1. [REDACTED] CWSP - MORAGA 1102 & 1104 – OCB (PM OWNER-M1NO)
 - a. What was the cycle time of the project ?
 - i. Estimating Began 8/28/19-CN24 Completed 4/14/2020
 - b. What were the dependencies on the project, and how did it impact the timely execution of the project ?
 - i.
2. [REDACTED] CWSP - LOS GATOS 1106 - LB44 - PHASE 2.1 (PM OWNER-SLKD)
 - a. What was the cycle time of the project ?
 - i. Estimating Began 10/23/2018-CN24 Completed 3/25/2020
 - b. What were the dependencies on the project, and how did it impact the timely execution of the project ?
 - o Land Ownership Negotiations
 - o State Agency Coordination

Group 2

Undergrounding projects that have completed Estimating but are in the Dependency Clearing Stage – Do not need to be high risk projects. We pull from the pool of projects that we do have. Again 1 – 2 examples.

Projects:

1. [REDACTED] PSPS CWSP - MORAGA 1103 – CB (PM OWNER-M1NO)
 - a. Project was removed from the work plan Q4, 2020, and re-implemented into the work plan June, 2021.
 - b. Permit Dependencies;
 - i. Town of Moraga
 - ii. City of Orinda
 - c. Project is nearly ready to release to construction
1. [REDACTED] PSPS - CLAYTON 2215 – CB (PM OWNER-M1NO)
 - a. Project was removed from the work plan Q4, 2020, and re-implemented into the work plan June, 2021.
 - b. Permit Dependencies;
 - i. Contra Costa County
 - ii. Walnut Creek
 - iii. City of Concord
 - c. Land Dependencies;
 - i. One of three easements gained
 - d. Environmental Dependencies;
 - i. ERTC expected after Land easements cleared

Focus is to understand

- What is the process currently used to clear the dependencies related to (other dependencies or requirements that have newly been put in place)
 - o Land Ownership Negotiations
 - o State Agency Coordination

- See the same tab as above.

Group 3

Undergrounding projects in the high risk area that are in estimating – Again 1 – 2.
Focus is to understand

Projects:

1. [REDACTED] CWSP - TIDEWATER 210614072 PH 1.1 (PM OWNER-M1NO)
2. [REDACTED] CWSP - TIDEWATER 210614072 PH 1.2 (PM OWNER-M1NO)

- What to the best of our knowledge are the challenges we expect to face regarding (everyone to understand that this is a bit speculative, but given the location of the project what can we anticipate)
 - Land Ownership Negotiations
 - State Agency Coordination
- See the “Top 20” tab. These circuits and zones were selected by [REDACTED] I isolated it down to the projects. I would start with Middletown under [REDACTED]
- You could ask all the PMs on the list if they have anything as unique as Bucks Creek, but frankly I wonder if we weren’t clear enough that Bucks Creek is an outlier as far as dependency complication goes.
- Middletown is a much better cross section of our work in my opinion.
- Wish I could have made more progress on this for you but I ran out of time.

[REDACTED]
Project Manager Supervisor

[REDACTED]
**Pacific Gas and
Electric Company**