
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
CC: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12/28/2020 4:30:50 PM
Subject: RE: Exec Status Update 08W - 12.24.20
Attachments: 35191318 - Field Scoping Documentation - ADE.docx; 35191383 - Field Scoping Documentation - ADE.docx; 35192284 - Field Scoping Documentation - ADE.docx; RE: Recent Desktop Scoping Sessions

Hey [REDACTED]

Hope you and family had a good Christmas.

I am reaching out because it sounds like the scoping process will be moving at a much quicker pace. Maybe my approach to these projects is too in depth and we should have been getting through these quicker. Since you and your team will own & operate these after they are built, I am very curious what your thoughts are about this new approach? I would very much like our teams to be on the same page so we are successfully planning, scoping, designing, building, operating & learning from these CWSP projects. For now, and as we move forward in the future.

We visited three of the Silverado projects last week and have started to fill out the scoping documentation. This is the first time we have done this, so any feedback would be appreciated. Even if you feel we are taking too long to get this filled out, we welcome the feedback.

35191318 – recommending staying overhead. Expanding this project a few spans would be beneficial to take advantage of existing anchoring points.

35191383 – recommending staying overhead in place. The alternate route would be difficult to achieve.

35192284 – recommending underground the entire way along Pope Valley Road. We can make this work, but it will take additional time compared to staying overhead.

We are scheduled to go look at Las Gallinas (35191319) & Fulton (35192292) on Wednesday. Based on the desktop review, my personal preference would be to put sections of these projects underground. Should we just skip the field trip and put that we recommend underground on the scoping documents? Or do you feel it would be beneficial to have some pictures and additional information from the field?

The Middletown circuits are much more complex. Most of the taps we can segment out and call to keep overhead. If we are going to turn this area off during PSPS, should we just go with all overhead along the mainline as well? These projects provide an opportunity to put a long stretch [REDACTED] underground and harden a very large portion of the circuit from outside of Middletown to almost Cobb. This feels like a great opportunity to thoroughly evaluate the benefits of undergrounding a large portion of a circuit, instead of hardening small sections. We aren't given enough data to know at this point if undergrounding [REDACTED] would be beneficial or not. I am just looking for the best approach for the long term. We can call to keep everything overhead to meet the end of the January deadline. Anything further, will take us more time to evaluate I am afraid.

I respect your opinion and know you and your team have put a ton of work into these projects. I would very much like that hard work not to go to waste.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Thank you for your time.
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2020 8:17 AM
To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Exec Status Update 08W - 12.24.20

Team,

See attached, the primary miles we need to have addressed by the end of January are ranked in Column E from 2021001 to 2021094. The additional jobs ranked 2021200 will be needed to fill in where this other work cannot be completed in 2021.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, December 24, 2020 11:21 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Exec Status Update 08W - 12.24.20

Good afternoon [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

I present to you the Exec Status Update for December 24, 2020. Please note I have created a folder on the Sharepoint labeled 'Exec Status Updates 08W' where I will be storing all of these updates.

Best Regards and Happy Holidays,