
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: 2/24/2021 7:45:45 AM
Subject: RE: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

Hi [REDACTED]

I would like to talk to you but it seems as if your cell-phone is not listed. I tried calling last week and it just rang and rang, not even allowing me to leave a VM, just did it again this morning with the same result... [REDACTED] is the only number listed for you?

Please advise,

[REDACTED]
Project Manager
Office [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Pacific Gas and
Electric Company

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 6:45 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

[REDACTED]
I can meet you with an estimator out there one day and look at what you're proposing. I would suggest you use my [REDACTED] contacts & [REDACTED] contacts.

I can introduce you to them and they are comfortable working with you things will be easy. I can also introduce you to all the players for Hydro up there that you will need to come to agreement with also during scoping. If you involve our Caltrans liaison [REDACTED] or the account rep for [REDACTED] you will get nowhere. I already had this painful experience so I'm trying to work with the Caltrans and Railroad on the lower section of the Bucks Creek 1101.

[REDACTED]
Project Manager- Project & Contract Management
Distribution Electric

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 12:57:21 PM
To: [REDACTED]

PGE-DIXIE-NDCAL-000003167

Subject: FW: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

H [REDACTED]

You are listed as a contact in the scoping documents as someone that could work with the [REDACTED] to determine the use of an existing transformer... can you provide me with your contact at the [REDACTED]?

Please advise,

[REDACTED]

Project Manager
Office: [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 11:29 AM
To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - 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 35217268 (Phase 1)

1. We learned the following:
 - a. Sub-Station (per Foreman [REDACTED]) is undergoing its own project under PM 35212441, 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 35212441 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:
- How does this scope reduce risk?
 - Is 'undergrounding this small section 'constructible' when you consider the following:
 - Stairway, creek crossing, and proximity to sub-station
 - See picture



4. 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 35224712 of about the same distance of OH-Hardening scope being removed from PM 35217268.
 - b. Here is the basic idea in RED.....the dashed line is proposing UG:



PM 35224712 (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 'guardrail' 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 35224713 (Phase 3)

1.  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 [REDACTED] 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:

then feed the Cresta Dam panel?

[REDACTED]
Project Manager

Office: [REDACTED]

Mobile [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

**Pacific Gas and
Electric Company**