From:
Sent:
To:

Subject:Executive Field Trip PrepLocation:Microsoft Teams MeetingStart:6/29/2021 8:30:00 AMEnd: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
 - a. What was the cycle time of the project?
 - i. Estimating Began 8/28/19 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.
 - iv. 1104 went underground (4,165 LF) from the Sub and 1102 (2,751 LF) was hardened in place...remaining OH.
- 2. 35031662- CWSP LOS GATOS 1106 PHASE 2.1 (PM OWNER
 - a. What was the cycle time of the project?
 - i. Estimating Began 10/23/2018-Completed 3/25/2020
 - ii. No Land ownership issues trenching, all in 'franchise'.
 - What were the dependencies on the project, and how did it impact the timely execution of the project?
 - Land Ownership Negotiations
 - 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, 35145003- PSPS CWSP MORAGA 1103 CB (PM OWNER
 - a. Project was removed from the work plan Q4, 2020, and re-implemented into the work plan June, 2021.
 - b. Permit Dependencies;
 - Town of Moraga
 - ii. City of Orinda
 - c. Project is nearly ready to release to construction
- 1. 35145001-PSPS CLAYTON 2215 CB (PM OWNER
 - 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
- d. Environmental Dependencies;
 - i. ERTC expected after Land easements cleared

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
 - 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. 35219093- CWSP TIDEWATER 210614072 PH 1.1 (PM OWNER
- 2. 35231543- CWSP TIDEWATER 210614072 PH 1.2 (PM OWNER
 - 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)
 - Land Ownership Negotiations
 - o State Agency Coordination
- See the "Top 20" tab. These circuits and zones were selected by down to the projects. I would start with Middletown under
- 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!