

From:

Sent:

To:

Subject: Executive Field Trip Prep
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: 6/29/2021 8:30:00 AM
End: 6/29/2021 9:30:00 AM
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Meeting organized

Required Attendees:

Optional Attendees:

Group 1

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

Projects:

1. 35103325- CWSP - MORAGA 1102 & 1104 – OCB (PM OWNER- [REDACTED])
 - a. What was the cycle time of the project ?
 - i. Estimating Began 8/28/19-[REDACTED] Completed 4/14/2020
 - b. What were the dependencies on the project, and how did it impact the timely execution of the project ?
 - i. Challenging work was on PG&E property at/near Substation.
 - ii. Creek crossing required additional bio/enviro review... private property.
 - iii. Veg took two full weeks to complete due to extra care with property owners
 - iv. 1104 went underground (4,165 LF) from the Sub and 1102 (2,751 LF) was hardened in place... remaining OH utilizing composite poles.
2. 74022388- OCGC CWSP: X-1104 OH RECOND SKYLINE (PM OWNER- [REDACTED])
 - a. What was the cycle time of the project ?
 - i. Estimating Began 9/27/2019-[REDACTED] Completed 11/05/2020
 - ii. No Land ownership issues trenching, all in 'franchise'/PUE
 - b. What were the dependencies on the project, and how did it impact the timely execution of the project ?
 - o No new easements were needed
 - o Took two months to receive encroachment permit
 - o Popular hiking trail area where construction crews were required to be sensitive to ingress/egress of hikers.

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. 35145003- 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, BC and civil contract remaining dependencies.
 - d. No new Easements needed
 - e. Creek Crossing Bio and Enviro reviews.
 - f. When completed _____ people will more than likely not be affected by a PSPS event.
 - g. Construction is planned in 2022
1. 35145001-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
 - iii. City of Concord
 - c. Land Dependencies;
 - i. One of three easements gained from City of Walnut Creek (\$10k), in process to gain another from Save Mount Diablo (\$3.6k is the initial offer), and the last one is need from Crystal Ranch HOA (\$3.5k initial offer).
 - d. Environmental Dependencies;
 - i. ERTC expected after Land task are cleared in SAP.

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)
 - Land Ownership Negotiations
 - 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. 35219093- CWSP - TIDEWATER 210614072 PH 1.1 (PM OWNER- [REDACTED])
 - a. No Land Ownership negotiations on this project....all in a PUE.
 - b. Permit needed from East Bay Regional Parks (3-6 months to ascertain)
 - c. Permit needed from Contra Costa County
 - d. Project will need to be all performed at night due to traffic issues
2. 35231543- CWSP - TIDEWATER 210614072 PH 1.2 (PM OWNER- [REDACTED])
 - a. No Land Ownership negotiations on this project....all in a PUE.
 - b. Permit needed from East Bay Regional Parks (3-6 months to ascertain)
 - c. Permit needed from Contra Costa County
 - d. Project will need to be all performed at night due to traffic issues

- 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 unde [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](#)
