

From:

[Redacted]

Sent:

6/28/2021 4:42:10 PM

To:

[Redacted]

Subject:

Executive Field Trip Prep

Start:

6/29/2021 8:30:00 AM

End:

6/29/2021 9:30:00 AM

Show Time As:

Free

Recurrence:

(none)

Required Attendees:

[Redacted]

Optional Attendees:

[Redacted]

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 [Redacted])

- 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 ?

2 [Redacted] CWSP - LOS GATOS 1106 - LB44 - PHASE 2.1 (PM OWNER [Redacted])

- a. What was the cycle time of the project ?
  - i. Estimating Began

10/23/2018-CN24 Completed 3/25/2020

- 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 [Redacted])

- 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 [Redacted])

- 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

c. Land Dependencies;

gained

d. Environmental Dependencies;

easements cleared

iii. City of Concord

i. One of three easements

i. ERTC expected after Land

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 [REDACTED])

2 [REDACTED] CWSP - TIDEWATER 210614072 PH 1.2 (PM OWNER [REDACTED])

- What to the best of our knowledge are the challenges we expect to fact regarding (everyone to understand that this is a bit speculative, but given the location of the project what can we anticipate)
  - o Land Ownership Negotiations
  - o 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 Buck’s 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.

---

## Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

Need Help with Teams? Click on the Help option in this invite to connect you directly to our Teams at PG&E Training site!

[Learn More](#) | [Help](#) | [Meeting options](#)