

From: Redacted
Sent: 12/4/2013 12:11:23 PM
To: 'Dietrich, William' (william.dietrich@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); 'Sterkel, Merideth "Molly"' (MeridethMolly.Sterkel@cpuc.ca.gov); 'Borak, Mary Jo' (maryjo.borak@cpuc.ca.gov); 'Mulligan, Jack M.' (jack.mulligan@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: HSR - potential agenda items for 12/16 to Kate from Bill

Hi All,

In preparation for our call at 3pm, below are a few more thoughts on the agenda for the 12/16 meeting with HSR. This essentially tracks the content that Bill suggested below, adds a few items and then divides it into whether HSR or PG&E is on point to lead the discussion on the various items.

Also, I don't think we have a call in number set up yet, so we can use this one if convenient:

Redacted

Thanks,
Kate

Proposed Agenda for PG&E-HSR-CPUC Meeting on 12-16-13

- HSR:
 - Overview of schedule associated with energization of various HSR segments (#4 below)
 - High level description of critical path activities necessary to meet energization schedule

(#5 below)

- Overview of CEQA review for each segment (i.e. what has been completed, what is in progress, what is schedule for remaining segments)
- PG&E
 - Recap of Phase 1 and Phase 2 interconnection studies completed to date (provides opportunity to ask clarifying questions regarding how these studies were completed such as item #6)
 - Remaining items to finalize interconnection project descriptions (e.g. HSR selection of final locations and design, completion of single phase study, PG&E do 60% design etc) (#1, #2, #3, and #5 below)
 - CEQA review options (#5)

From: [Redacted]

Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 2:56 PM

To: 'Dietrich, William'

Cc: Sterkel, Merideth "Molly"; Borak, Mary Jo; Mulligan, Jack M.; Allen, Meredith

Subject: RE: HSR - potential agenda items for 12/16 to Kate from Bill

Thanks Bill, yes, this is helpful. For the most part, the team was comfortable with this, although we would like an update from HSR on where things are with their CEQA reviews (what has been completed, what is yet to be performed) and would like to talk through the various options and their impacts on schedule associated with the CEQA review for the interconnection facilities.

Thanks and happy Thanksgiving.

Kate

From: Dietrich, William [<mailto:william.dietrich@cpuc.ca.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 2:43 PM

To: [Redacted]

Cc: Sterkel, Merideth "Molly"; Borak, Mary Jo; Mulligan, Jack M.
Subject: HSR - potential agenda items for 12/16 to Kate from Bill

Hi Kate,

It was good talking with you.

Re: next Tuesday and your phone call with Molly. I wrote down the gist of what I tried to communicate during my phone call with you regarding the agenda for the 12/16 meeting, in case it's helpful to supplement your notes. You probably got it all.

Bill

- 1) HSR's technical requirements report re: single-phase (a.k.a. two-phase) service that it wants
- 2) Status of PG&E's Phase 2 interconnection study for sites 7-13 (depends on #1, in my view)
- 3) Clarification of the Project Description for CEQA purposes (depends on #1 and #2, in my view)
(Note: Sites could be grouped for more than one EIR.)
- 4) Clarification of HSR's schedule; when is electrical power needed for the first segment, for testing?
- 5) Think about critical path and lay out all the steps on critical path and parallel to it.
- 6) To what extent did PG&E's Phase 1 study include not only electrical consideration of alternative substation sites, but also consider environmental constraints in selecting alternative sites?

I'm sure there are more things than this to discuss.