

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



November 16, 2021

VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

David Wilson  
LS Power Grid California  
5000 Hopyard Road, Suite 480  
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Ms. Jo Lynn Lambert  
Pacific Gas & Electric Company  
707 Brookside Avenue  
Redlands, CA 92373

SUBJECT: Data Request #3 for the Gates 500 kV Dynamic Reactive Substation Project

Dear Mr. Wilson and Ms. Lambert:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our environmental review for the Gates 500 kV Dynamic Reactive Substation Project (Project), we have identified additional information required to adequately conduct the CEQA review. Please provide the information requested below (Data Request #3) by December 6, 2021. Please submit your response in electronic format to me and also directly to our environmental consultant, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), at the physical and e-mail addresses noted below. If you have any questions, please direct them to me as soon as possible.

In addition to the specific information requested, please review the attached Draft CEQA Project Description for technical accuracy and provide edits or updated design information as needed. Because the project description is at the internal draft stage, edits and updates provided directly to the project description will be incorporated into the Draft CEQA document and not posted for public review in track changes or prior to public release of the Draft CEQA document.

Sincerely,

Boris Sanchez  
Infrastructure Planning and CEQA, Energy Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Ave,  
San Francisco, California 94102  
[Boris.Sanchez@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Boris.Sanchez@cpuc.ca.gov)  
(408) 915-7434

ESA  
Attn: Michael Manka  
1425 North McDowell Blvd.  
Suite 200  
Petaluma, CA 94954  
[MManka@esassoc.com](mailto:MManka@esassoc.com)  
(707) 795-0908

## **Data Request #3 Gates 500 kV Dynamic Reactive Substation Project**

### **Applicant Proposed Measures**

1. Minor edits to the Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) in the PEA have been made to reflect the substation name change and for consistency. Please review Table 2-9 in the preliminary draft Project Description and confirm that the edits are acceptable.
2. PG&E, confirm that PG&E can commit to implementing the APMs relative to the PG&E interconnection and Gates Substation upgrades portion of the Project. If all APMs cannot be implemented by PG&E, identify those APMs.

### **Orchard Substation**

3. Project description states that the “Orchard Substation will be equipped with distribution-level power from station service transformers located within the facility that would step-down the energy from the PG&E 500 kV interconnection transmission lines to distribution power level.” Please confirm that all infrastructure needed for this step down is included in the project description.

### **Requests for PG&E Relative to its Interconnection and Gates Substation Upgrades**

4. PG&E responses to CPUC Data Request No. 2 included discussion of proposed revisions to the Gates Substation fence line relative to outdated plans associated with modifications at Bays 2 and 6. Provide updated proposed fence line expansion information, including the fenced area, required for the upgrades now that the interconnection and upgrades would be relative to Bays 1 and 2 (and no longer Bay #6). Include the proposed new fence line on Figure 9-2.
5. Provide dimensions (length, depth, and width) for trenching required for the STATCOM underground 500 kV XLPE lines.
6. For the Gas-Insulated Bus (GIB), please describe, and provide a figure that illustrates, any new support structures that would be constructed.
7. Confirm that the “deadend structures” needed for the interconnection are also referred to as the proposed transition stations.
8. Define CCVT.
9. The narrative response (dated 7-8-21) to Data Request No. 2 states there will be two transition stations; Figure 2-9 depicts transition station #1. Confirm if there is a second transition station that should be depicted on the figure or if the “Overhead to Underground Transition within Station Wall” is effectively Transition Station #2.
10. Provide detail on anticipated construction phasing including schedule and number of workers required at each phase.
11. Provide total length of 500 kV underground transmission lines. PG&E’s initial estimate is 5,300 linear feet. This appears to be shorter (based on conceptual layout provided by PG&E).

12. Provide a tabular list of the estimated types, quantities, daily use hours, and workdays for equipment expected to be used during each construction phase for the upgrades/expansion.
13. Will PG&E be submitting a Section 851 application to CPUC for the proposed interconnection or access roads?