



May 03, 2016

Jo Lynn Lambert
Attorney at Law
Pacific Gas and Electric Co.
707 Brookside Avenue
Redlands, California 92373

Re: Data Request No. 3 for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project. A. 15-09-012

Dear Ms. Lambert,

Upon further review of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E's) responses to Data Request #2 (April 29, 2016) for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project, the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC's) Energy Division requests the information contained in Attachment A to this letter.

One set of responses should be submitted to the Energy Division and another to Silvia Yáñez at Ecology and Environment, Inc. in San Francisco in hard copy and electronic format. To maintain the current schedule for preparation of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), we request that PG&E respond to this data request as soon as the information is available, within the next 10 calendar days. Separate submittals are acceptable if it expedites responding to this data request. Please inform us as soon as possible if you cannot provide responses by this date. Delays in responding to this data request may cause delays in preparation of the IS/MND.

The Energy Division reserves the right to request information at any point in the environmental review process and during construction of the project, if PG&E's PTC is granted. Please direct questions related to this application to me at (415) 703-2068 or Billie.Blanchard@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Billie Blanchard

Billie Blanchard
Project Manager
Energy Division
California Public Utilities Commission

CC: Mary Jo Borak, CPUC Energy Division, Supervisor
Molly Sterkel, CPUC Energy Division, Program Manager
Greg Heiden, CPUC Legal Division, Public Utilities Counsel
Silvia Yáñez, Ecology & Environment, Project Manager
Kristi Black, Ecology & Environment, Deputy Project Manager

Attachment A: Data Request #3

Attachment A: Sanger Substation Expansion Project Data Request # 3

Data requests for Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (PG&E’s) Sanger Substation Expansion Project are described in detail in the table below.

No.	Reference	Description of data being requested
Project Description		
1	Section 2.5.1, “Expanded Substation”; April 29 th 2016 Data Response, Item 6	<p>Provide more detail about the proposed changes to the Sanger Substation expansion layout design.</p> <p>PG&E’s Data Response Item 6 from April 29, in response to Data Request #6, states that the proposed project would include installation of a microwave tower on the expanded substation site instead of installing the fiber optic telecommunication route described in the PEA (page 2-10). In addition, Item 6 describes a substation design update to allow for relocation and enlargement of the two MPAC buildings proposed within the expanded substation site.</p> <p>Updated figures and visual simulations are needed to analyze the impacts of these components. Provide the following additional detail regarding recent updates to the substation design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated PEA Figure 2-4 showing the location of the proposed microwave tower and relocation of MPAC Building #2. If an updated Figure 2-4 is not currently available , provision of a basic layout schematic showing proposed expanded substation components is acceptable. • Similar to PEA Figure 2-6, a basic microwave tower design drawing, indicating components and above and below ground dimensions. • Updated PEA Figures 3.1-3b, 3.1-4b, and 3.1-5b, corresponding to visual simulations of the proposed project from VP1, VP 2, and VP6, respectively. A revised figure for VP7 is not needed at this time.

No.	Reference	Description of data being requested
2	Table 2-1, “Typical Construction Equipment”; April 29, 2016 Data Response, Item 3	<p>Confirm estimate of concrete to be imported.</p> <p>The PEA notes that concrete would be imported for foundations. PG&E’s response to Data Request No. 2 states that information about concrete use is not yet available. An estimate of concrete import is necessary to analyze traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas impacts.</p> <p>Based on average capacity of concrete trucks and the specific dimensions for concrete footings and foundations required for the structures and buildings described in the PEA and the response to Data Request No.2, it is estimated that approximately 2,300 cubic yards of concrete would be used during the proposed project construction, requiring about 230 truck trips total (assuming use of 10-CY capacity trucks). Confirm these estimates are valid; if not, provide a revised estimate. State whether these truck trips were accounted for in provided truck trip figures; if not, provide revised truck trip figures.</p>
3	April 29, 2016 Data Response, Item 7; March 4, 2016 Data Response, Items 28 and 29; November 23, 2015 Deficiency Letter Response, Item 19.	<p>Confirm number of soil hauling trips required during construction.</p> <p>PG&E’s response to Data Request No. 2 states that “there may be two to four dump trucks for soul inhaul and outhaul in the expanded substation at any time.” PG&E’s response to Deficiency Letter No. 1 states that a rough estimate for maximum soil import would be 30,000 cubic yards (assuming an overall site grade height increase of 2 feet). Revisions to Table 3.16-3 provided by PG&E in response to Data Request No. 1 indicate that there will be 1,056 construction support trucks over the course of Phase 1. However, soil imports do not appear to be included in the trip generation table. An estimate of soil import haul trips is necessary to analyze traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas impacts.</p> <p>Based on average capacity of dump trucks, it can be assumed that there would be approximately 3,000 truck loads all occurring during Phase 1 and evenly distributed throughout this construction phase. This assumption would lead to additional 45 daily roundtrips for soil hauling trips during the proposed project construction. Confirm these estimates are valid; if not, provide a revised estimate.</p>
4	April 29, 2016 Data Response, Item 7; March 4, 2016 Data Response, Items 28 and 29;	<p>Confirm number of support vehicle trips.</p> <p>PG&E’s response to Data Request No. 2 states that “ there may be up to 12 to 15 standard vehicles within the expanded substation site during construction.”</p> <p>Clarify what is defined as a “standard vehicle” and whether this definition would include worker vehicles. which have been identified in PG&E’s response to Data Request No. 1 as 30 vehicles every day. It is presumed, but not clear, that the 12 to 15 standard vehicles would be onsite any one time, instead of being a daily total of standard vehicles that would visit the site. Please confirm this interpretation is correct.</p>