

DATA NEEDS #6 FOR PETITION FOR MODIFICATION #1

PG&E FULTON-FITCH MOUNTAIN RECONDUCTORING PROJECT – A.15-12-005;
D.17-12-012

Table 1 Data Needs #6 for Petition for Modification #1

ID	Applicant References	Issue	Data Need
Project Description			
PD-01	<p>2017 IS/MND: 2.5.1 Conductor</p> <p>Supplemental PEA: 2.3.1.1 Southern Segment</p> <p>Data Needs #3: PD-01 and</p>	<p>Existing and Proposed Conductor</p> <p>Note: this data need is a duplicate of Data Needs #5 (PD-01). It was included for clarity, so all remaining data needs are collected in one document. The CPUC requested that PG&E respond by March 14, 2019. Minor clarifications regarding the data needs have been added and are <u>underlined</u>.</p> <p>Section 2.5.1 of the 2017 IS/MND describes existing and approved conductor modifications in the Southern Segment for the 60 kV line (Fulton-Hopland line) and the two 230 kV lines (Geysers #12-Fulton and Geysers #17-Fulton lines). Section 2.3.1.1 of the Supplemental PEA describes proposed changes to the approved conductor modifications in the Southern Segment based on PG&E's proposal to replace existing tubular steel poles (TSPs) described in PFM #1. For clarity, existing, approved, and proposed conductor details are summarized in Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c below.</p> <p>More information is needed to determine if proposed pole and conductor modifications would meet current design standards for wildfire safety.</p>	<p>a. Review conductor specifications provided in Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c for accuracy and completeness. Provide any additional or revised information as applicable.</p> <p>b. Specify if proposed conductor is fire resistant. Specify if proposed conductor is insulated <u>or covered</u>. Specify whether insulated <u>or covered</u>, fire resistant conductor exists for 60 kV or 230 kV.</p> <p>c. Provide a summary list and brief description of current design standards for proposed pole and conductor conditions (e.g., state and federal laws, regulations, or orders). Identify recent design standards imposed by CPUC to address wildfire hazards.</p> <p>d. Specify (a) which design standards have been incorporated into the proposed design already; (b) which design standards would be incorporated prior to construction with an explanation; and, (c) which design standards would not be incorporated with a rationale for why not.</p>
Hydrology and Water Quality			
HWQ-1	<p>Final IS/MND: 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality</p> <p>Supplemental PEA:</p>	<p>Dewatering during TSP Foundation Construction</p> <p>Construction of TSP foundations could require extensive dewatering based on the descriptions in the geotechnical investigation report and potential for encountering shallow ground groundwater.</p>	<p>a. Confirm the land discharge permit covers the proposed activities and volumes identified. Identify any additional/alternative discharge permits that will be obtained, if necessary.</p> <p>b. Identify the locations where land discharge would occur. There appear to be few, if any, locations where</p>

DATA NEEDS #6 FOR PETITION FOR MODIFICATION #1

ID	Applicant References	Issue	Data Need
	<p>2.4.6 Erosion, Sediment, and Pollution Control</p> <p>Data Needs #2: GEO-01</p> <p>Data Needs #3: HWQ-1</p>	<p>On February 15, 2019, PG&E provided information on dewatering activities in response to Data Needs #3 (HWQ-01). PG&E identified two options for disposing groundwater removed from foundation excavations: (1) transport off site to approved disposal facilities, or (2) discharge to land in accordance with State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2003-0003-DWQ, <i>Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges to Land with a Low Threat to Water Quality</i> (land discharge permit). A copy of the land discharge permit was provided; however, the covered activities do not specify TSP foundation construction or land discharges at volumes estimated by PG&E (10,000 to 100,000 gallons or greater).</p>	<p>land discharge could occur in the Southern Segment without issue. Discharge locations should be within a project area and meet the requirement specifications detailed in the permit.</p> <p>c. Complete the “pre-project” evaluation requirements specified in the land discharge permit, including identifying potential known contaminants as specified in the permit. Provide CPUC with the results and assessment of known contaminants that may be encountered.</p>
Utilities			
UTL-01	<p>Supplemental PEA: 2.4.4.2 Pole Installation</p> <p>Data Needs #1: UTL-01 and UTL-02</p> <p>Data Needs #2: UTL-01 and UTL-02</p> <p>Data Needs #3: TT-04</p> <p>Underground Utilities Maps (PG&E 2019)</p> <p>Arcing Risk Mitigation Requirements for Poles 9 and</p>	<p>Underground Utilities Study</p> <p>On February 20, 2019, PG&E provided maps showing underground utilities. These maps alone are insufficient and fail to provide information that has been requested regarding underground utilities. A complete Underground Utilities Study must be prepared by qualified engineers and submitted to the CPUC. The study should include a risk assessment for underground utilities at each TSP location and identify design measures to avoid impacts or an increase in hazards. The format of the study is flexible (i.e., report, memo, or detailed letter), but must include the information listed under item a.</p> <p>Some but not all of the data requested under items b through g are redundant to this list and should be incorporated into the Underground Utilities Study.</p>	<p>a. Provide a complete Underground Utilities Study (i.e., report, memo, or letter with adequate details) that has been prepared by qualified engineers, and at a minimum, includes the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Utility details (i.e., size, pressure, capacity, voltage, and material considerations) ii. Utility owner and operator iii. Proximity to the proposed TSP foundations (rather than the point center point), including the excavation hole iv. An assessment of potential direct impacts and design measures for avoidance v. An assessment of potential indirect impacts on utilities and design measures for avoidance vi. An assessment of potential hazards associated with underground utilities and electrical lines (i.e., arcing, induced current, and other electrical interference) and design measures for avoidance vii. Methods, standards, and thresholds used in the study

DATA NEEDS #6 FOR PETITION FOR MODIFICATION #1

ID	Applicant References	Issue	Data Need
	10 (Corrosion Service 2019)	<p>Potential Direct Impacts on Underground Utilities and Design Measures</p> <p>The underground utility maps show the center point of new TSP locations that are less approximately 7 feet from underground utilities for Poles 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 19. Pole 14 appears to be directly on top of a gas line and electrical line. The supplemental PEA states concrete pier foundations for new TSPs would be 5 to 7 feet in diameter.</p> <p>PG&E’s response to Data Needs #3 (TT-04) states “Currently, based on the underground survey provided, there is no plan to modify existing underground facilities as part of the project” and no work areas were identified where utilities may need to be relocated, as requested. This statement appears to be contradicted by the underground utility maps that were provided.</p> <p>Apparent conflicts between underground utilities and the foundations for proposed TSPs must be addressed by qualified engineers. Design measures must be implemented to avoid direct impacts on utilities, such as adjusting the TSP location or relocating the utilities. This information is required to complete the CEQA review for PFM 1.</p>	<p>viii. Conclusions and limitations of the study</p> <p>ix. Preparer names, organizations, and professional qualifications</p> <p>b. Explain the distances shown in underground utility maps in relation to the TSP foundations and excavation holes. Explain how close foundation excavations could be to the utilities before resulting in a direct impact, and when avoidance measures would be implemented.</p> <p>c. Clarify if any utilities may need to be relocated, such as at the proposed location for Pole 14 where an underground gas line and electrical line are shown.</p> <p>d. The Underground Utilities Study should clearly identify all TSPs and utilities where direct impacts could occur and explain how they would be avoided by repositioning the proposed TSP or relocating underground utilities. In such cases, PG&E must provide either (1) the adjusted TSP locations or (2) engineering drawings for relocating the utilities, construction procedures, and records of coordination with non-PG&E utility owners and operators.</p>

DATA NEEDS #6 FOR PETITION FOR MODIFICATION #1

ID	Applicant References	Issue	Data Need
		<p>Arcing Risks and Design Measures</p> <p>On February 15, 2019, PG&E provided two design drawings titled "Arcing Risk Mitigation Requirements" for TSPs 9 and 10 where grounding plans were identified along a PG&E gas pipeline.</p> <p>More information is needed about the risk assessment methods, standards, thresholds, and need for mitigation to ground or reposition TSPs. A risk assessment is needed for all other TSPs in the Southern Segment.</p> <p>The arcing risk drawings include notes under the calculation summary table that reference additional explanation is provided in "PGE (AFS2017) PRO-001". This referenced document is needed to adequately interpret the calculation values and safe distances that are identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Provide the full report referenced in the arcing risk mitigation diagrams: "PGE (AFS2017) PRO-001." f. Unless provided separately in "PGE (AFS2017) PRO-001," provide methods, standards, voltage thresholds, and distance thresholds used to determine potential arcing risks and the need for risk mitigation identified in the drawings, including grounding or pole relocation. g. Provide the arcing risk assessments and calculations for all the TSPs that would be replaced in the Southern Segment beyond Poles 9 and 10. Provide design drawings for risk mitigation at any other TSPs like Poles 9 and 10.
Traffic and Transportation			
TT-01	<p>Supplemental PEA: 2.4.7 Traffic Control</p> <p>Data Needs #1: TRA-02</p> <p>Data Needs #2: TRA-01</p> <p>Data Needs #3: TT-01</p> <p>Traffic Control Plans (Parmeter General Engineers & Services Inc. 2018)</p>	<p>Traffic Control Plans</p> <p>PG&E's response to Data Needs #3 regarding workhours identified in the traffic control plans is not adequate. As stated previously, MM Noise-1 restricts work between 7:00 am and 10:00 pm. Operating equipment in the Southern Segment between 6:00 am and 7:00 am would violate MM Noise-1. The proposed workhours of 6:00 am to 7:00 pm should be shifted back by 1 hour to be consistent with MM Noise-1.</p> <p>In response to Data Needs #3, PG&E described 1-minute traffic stops on River Road for ingress/egress to a "temporary staging area" at the Fulton Substation park and ride. This location is identified as Pull Site 1 in the Final MND and is not an approved staging area. Limited staging is acceptable at this location during conductor installation; however, the work area should not be used as a primary staging area or for storing poles. Extensive traffic stops on River Road for ingress/egress would substantially disrupt circulation and create an avoidable traffic hazard. Staging</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Revise the Traffic Control Plans to list workhours that comply with MM Noise-1 (between 7:00 am and 10:00 pm). b. Given the response, specify where primary staging and pole storage would occur during construction in the Southern Segment. Specify when Pull Site 1 would be used, the number of days and weeks, and roughly how many traffic stops would be required per day for ingress/egress.

DATA NEEDS #6 FOR PETITION FOR MODIFICATION #1

ID	Applicant References	Issue	Data Need
		activities at Pull Site 1 should be limited to periods when conductor removal and installation occur at the adjacent poles. Primary staging activities and pole storage should be directed to an approved staging area in the Southern Segment, such as SA/LZ-1, -2, and -3, or the PG&E's Airport Yard.	
TT-02	Supplemental PEA: 2.4.7 Traffic Control Data Needs #1: TRA-02 Data Needs #2: TRA-01 Data Needs #3: TT-03 Traffic Control Plans (Parmeter General Engineers & Services Inc. 2018)	Coordination with Sonoma County Regarding Road Closures and Detour Routes MM Traffic-1 requires PG&E to coordinate with Sonoma County to obtain encroachment permits and review proposed detour routes. In Data Needs #3 (TT-03), CPUC requested that PG&E initiate this process with the County; provide the County with proposed traffic control plans and a detailed project schedule; and, to submit the County's comments and any traffic plan revisions to the CPUC. In response to Data Needs #3, PG&E stated the "Plan is currently being reviewed by Sonoma County."	c. Provide the schedule for County review of the traffic control plans and when the requested information will be provided to CPUC. d. Per Data Needs #3 (TT-03), ensure that all the requested information is provided to the County, including a detailed schedule of work activities when traffic controls would occur. e. Provide the County's comments on the traffic control plans and requested revisions. f. Incorporate the County comments into the final traffic plans and submit to CPUC.
Wildfire			
WF-01	PG&E's Wildfire Mitigation Plan (February 2019) Data Needs #5: WF-01	Senate Bill (SB) 901 and PG&E's Wildfire Mitigation Plan Note: this data need is a duplicate of Data Needs #5 (WF-01). It was included for clarity, so all remaining data needs are collected in one document. The CPUC requested that PG&E respond by March 14, 2019. <i>SB 901 requires electric utilities to prepare and submit wildfire mitigation plans that describe the utilities' plans to prevent, combat, and respond to wildfires affecting their service territories. On February 6, 2019, PG&E and other utilities submitted their initial plans to the CPUC.</i>	a. <i>Specify if proposed conditions applicable to PFM #1 meet PG&E's recent Wildfire Mitigation Plan. Specify any plan elements that would not be met and provide a rationale for why not.</i> b. <i>Provide any revisions to PFM #1 and Supplemental PEA information that may be necessary to address PG&E's recent Wildfire Mitigation Plan.</i>

DATA NEEDS #6 FOR PETITION FOR MODIFICATION #1

ID	Applicant References	Issue	Data Need
		<i>Information is needed about PG&E's recent Wildfire Mitigation Plan and its consistency with proposed conditions applicable to PFM #1.</i>	
WF-02	Supplemental PEA (Revised): 3.18 Wildfires Data Needs #4: EA-01	CEQA Guidelines On February 28, 2019, PG&E provided a partial response to Data Needs #4 regarding additional analysis in the Supplemental PEA to address the 2019 CEQA Guidelines. PG&E reported that the remaining PEA analysis on wildfire topics would be submitted the week of March 4, 2019.	c. Provide the schedule for when the remaining PEA analysis on wildfire topics will be provided.
CEQA Process			
CP-01	n/a	Affected Properties for Mailing List According to Section 15163 (c) of the CEQA Guidelines, a "supplement to an EIR shall be given the same kind of notice and public review as is given to a draft EIR under Section 15087." Updated information on affected properties in the Southern Segment is needed to prepare the mailing list, including the associated GIS data to verify the list, as was provided during the initial application review.	a. Using current assessor information, provide an updated list (MS Excel spreadsheet) and associated GIS parcel data of affected properties in the Southern Segment within 300 feet of project facilities. Include the APN number, owner mailing address, and parcels physical address.

DATA NEEDS #6 FOR PETITION FOR MODIFICATION #1

Table 2a Existing Conductor in the Southern Segment

Existing Lines	Voltage (kV)	Existing Conductor Type	Total Length
Fulton-Hopland	60	4/0 aluminum	1.8 miles
Geysers #12-Fulton	230	Bundled 113 <i>kcmil</i> ¹ all-aluminum conductors (AAC)	1.8 miles
Geysers #17-Fulton	230	Bundled 113 <i>kcmil</i> AAC	1.8 miles

Table 2b Approved Reconductoring in the Southern Segment (2017 Final IS/MND)

Existing Lines	Voltage (kV)	New Conductor Type	Reconductoring Length	Transfer Length
Fulton-Hopland	60	477 <i>kcmil</i> aluminum composite steel-supported (ACSS) & 477 <i>kcmil</i> aluminum conductor composite reinforced	1.8 miles	--
Geysers #12-Fulton	230	954 <i>kcmil</i> ACSS 54/7 "Cardinal" conductor	1.4 miles	0.4 mile
Geysers #17-Fulton	230	n/a	--	1.8 miles

Table 2c Proposed Reconductoring in the Southern Segment (2018 PFM #1)

Existing Lines	Voltage (kV)	New Conductor Type	Reconductoring Length	Transfer Length
Fulton-Hopland	60	477 <i>kcmil</i> ACSS conductor	1.8 miles	--
Geysers #12-Fulton	230	Single-strand 945 <i>kcmil</i> ACSS	400 feet	1.3 miles
Geysers #17-Fulton	230	Single-strand 945 <i>kcmil</i> ACSS	400 feet	1.3 miles

¹ *kcmil* (1,000 circular mils) is a unit of measure for the size of a conductor. *Kcmil* wire size is the equivalent cross-sectional area in thousands of cmils. A *cmil* is the area of the circle with a diameter of 0.001 inch.