
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: 2/24/2021 9:37:22 AM
Subject: RE: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

LOL- 08W needs to have the right people scoping then they would not have to change things. In a few more years they will understand. No one can scope work in the Feather River Canyon from google unless they already walked every location.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 09:17
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

Hi [REDACTED]

Changing scope after the 'wild fire committee' has already approved is not that easy...selling [REDACTED] is the best way to get there.

[REDACTED]

Please hold off on requesting a scope change on Phase 1 (per our discussion on the phone) until we have all of our requested changes on all three phases understood.

Please note the request made by [REDACTED] below, "Need to work with [REDACTED] to get this designed with a single 6" and use #5 boxes with 200A cable. There is not a reason this will need (2) 6" and 1-4" and 7 boxes. There is probably only 20a peak on the primary now." If we can reduce to only one conduit we can utilize HDD in some locations as a 'means and method' for installation. Additionally, the large 7 boxes are going to be a real problem in Caltrans R/W, and will more than likely require millions of dollars in retaining walls when Caltrans denies my request to place them in the travel lane.

Please advise,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 8:52 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

You can get me at [REDACTED]

I've been un-successful at getting my outlook updated. Mid-day is best for me.

[REDACTED] asked me to look at this thing earlier this year.

Your outlet red-line Bucks Creek looks close to what I was thinking. Need to work with [REDACTED] to get this designed with a single 6" and use #5 boxes with 200A cable. There is not a reason this will need (2) 6" and 1-4" and 7 boxes. There is probably only 20a peak on the primary now.

Before we involve Cal T and [REDACTED] it would be good to scope with the estimator so we can address the local folks with a somewhat solid plan. If we can establish the outlet for Bucks Creek Sub + the TX locations for Cresta Dam and [REDACTED] that should take most of the questions away. Rock Creek Bridge is the only thing I saw a big issue with. The local guys can help us once we determine what we are doing and make sure we get the details correct for permit.


Also need to see what Hydro is willing to do with the TX for the penstock metering valve at Rock Creek PH. It will be a long way up from the



Need to see if Hydro has GPR data for the Hwy 70 road bed to see if we can get 42" minimum cover and keep clearance over any hydro facilities.



Rock Creek



Merlin can go back like we just did [redacted] Poe. Pad on the Highway and tension secondary 1/0 ASCR across the river. We can negotiate to move the [redacted] service point with my MSA electrician.

PG&E data is for internal use only. Information to any entity PG&E requires the protection of Corporate Security



we can serve Merlin with either circle, OH 1/0 ASCR triplex tension across the river.

Cresta Dam

Should be able to take a pad here and get the dam a UG service. For Cal trans riser up and go in the back of


the first tunnel window, leave the old TX pole, top it and use to splice in UG service feed.



Also this one PM 35224713 (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

Should just be a spare TX under the energized TX. We keep it here so we can change it quick since it get's hit with lightning often. Should just be [REDACTED]




From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 07:46
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

H [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,




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 Caltrans 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]




From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 12:57:21 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: O8W-PM 35217268, 35224712, 35224713 - Bucks Creek 1101 Phase 1,2&3 - Pre-Engineering Meeting

Hi [REDACTED]

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

Please advise,



From: [REDACTED] s

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

To: [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] 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



4. All parties had the same burning question regarding the 'river crossing';
 1. 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.
 2. 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. 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:

then feed the Cresta Dam panel?

