

From: Kolset, Timothy
Sent: 1/27/2014 11:52:55 AM
To: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); Sterkel, Merideth "Molly" (MeridethMolly.Sterkel@cpuc.ca.gov); Fong, Russell@HSR (russell.fong@hsr.ca.gov)
Cc: Dietrich, William (william.dietrich@cpuc.ca.gov); Borak, Mary Jo (maryjo.borak@cpuc.ca.gov); rachel.taylor@hsr.ca.gov (rachel.taylor@hsr.ca.gov); Marian Moe (Marian.Moe@doj.ca.gov); O'Donnell, Arthur J. (Arthur.O'Donnell@cpuc.ca.gov); Fielding, Karl (fieldingk@pbworld.com); mark.mcloughlin@hsr.ca.gov (mark.mcloughlin@hsr.ca.gov)

Bcc:

Subject: RE: High Speed Rail and PG&E meeting on transmission extension agreements

Hi Molly,
Thank you for reaching out on this topic.

Currently, PG&E has provided the High Speed Rail project team with technical studies, detailing the facilities required to interconnect the High Speed Rail. The studies include required interconnection facilities, associated PG&E network upgrades and a rough order of magnitude of the interconnection costs, based on maximum operational power loads. PG&E and the Authority have begun discussions on the requirements listed in the technical studies, to come to an agreement on scope. Once an agreement on scope is confirmed the project will commence with the single phase study. The single phase study provides and analysis of the trains impact on the PG&E network after all interconnection facilities and network upgrades have been applied. The two studies must be complete in order to understand the magnitude of the interconnection requirements and how the cost will be allocated.

The project team would welcome discussions with the CPUC and PG&E on Rule 15 and 16 tariffs to develop a better understanding of the division of capital costs. Though there are more discussions to have on the interconnection scope, developing an understanding of allocated costs will benefit both parties as we move toward construction.

I will reach out to Meredith on setting up a discussion between the parties.

Regards,
Tim Kolset
916-500-8910

From: Sterkel, Merideth "Molly" [MeridethMolly.Sterkel@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2014 5:09 PM
To: Fong, Russell@HSR; Allen, Meredith
Cc: Marian Moe; rachel.taylor@hsr.ca.gov; Borak, Mary Jo; Dietrich, William; Kolset, Timothy; Fielding, Karl; O'Donnell, Arthur J.; mark.mcloughlin@hsr.ca.gov
Subject: High Speed Rail and PG&E meeting on transmission extension agreements

Russell,

I am writing to try to figure out who at High Speed Rail should meet with PG&E to discuss their Transmission tariffs. I recently had a long meeting that included Mark McLoughlin, Rachel Taylor, Scott Rothenberg (and a few others) at HSR. It also included several people from the PB Environment planning team (Karl Fielding, Tim Kolsett). We are working with that group of folks to try to get a process moving where PG&E can provide next level (i.e. more detailed) information about facilities needed to be built to interconnect HSR electrically to the

grid.

During these recent meetings, it became clear that HSR has never had a briefing from PG&E on the transmission extension process. There is a pretty detailed tariff procedure (approved as a CPUC tariff) that governs installation of new distribution facilities to serve new customers. Those tariffs (known as Rule 15 and 16) give customers allowances for the portion of the extension cost that will be supported by revenues from other loads served by the extension.

Since HSR is looking at PG&E interconnection costs, I wanted PG&E to discuss with HSR what might be possible for an electric transmission service extension agreement. PG&E has done a few such agreements for other large/unusual customers – and clarity on this (when it comes many moons from now) would give you some additional understanding of the real costs that will face HSR from an electric service connection perspective.

To put it simply – previous meetings I’ve been a part of with HSR have focused on the environmental document process – what it will take to make sure environmental documents that cover electrical interconnection facilities are adequate. I think we need to have a meeting with HSR focused on the costs of those facilities—and the agreements with PG&E on who and how to pay for those costs.

Who would be the right group to meet with? Sorry to include so many people on the cc: line...

The lead to arrange this meeting from PG&E’s side is Meredith Allen, meae@pge.com<<mailto:meae@pge.com>>, and she is cc:ed here.

Molly

Molly Tirpak Sterkel
California Public Utilities Commission, Energy Division
Program Manager, Infrastructure Planning and Permitting Branch
T: 415-703-1873, E: mts@cpuc.ca.gov

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.