



August 22, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Connie Chen
California Environmental Quality Act Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission Energy Division
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94201

**RE: LSPGC Response to CPUC Data Request #10 for LS Power Grid California, LLC's
Collinsville 500/230 Kilovolt Substation Project (A.24-07-018)**

Dear Ms. Chen,

As requested by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), LS Power Grid California, LLC (LSPGC) has collected and provided the additional information that is needed to continue the environmental review of the Collinsville 500/230 kilovolt (kV) Substation Project (Application 24-07-018). This letter includes the following enclosures:

- A Response to Data Request Table providing the additional information requested in the Data Request #10, received August 15, 2025.
 - Attachment A: Alt AQ Assumptions
 - Attachment B: Underground Alternative A
 - Attachment C: Underground Alternative B

The attachments listed above can be accessed via the following link:

[LSPGC Response to CPUC DR-10](#)

Please contact us at (925) 808-0291 or djoseph@lspower.com with any questions regarding this information. If needed, we are also available to meet with you to discuss the information contained in this response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dustin Joseph". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dustin Joseph
Director of Environmental



Enclosures

cc: Jason Niven (LSPGC)
Doug Mulvey (LSPGC)
Lauren Kehlenbrink (LSPGC)
Clayton Eversen (LSPGC)
David Wilson (LSPGC)
Michelle Wilson (CPUC)
Aaron Lui (Panorama)
Peter Mye (Panorama)
Susanne Heim (Panorama)

DATA REQUESTS

DATA REQUESTS

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
n/a	DR-1: Air Quality Emissions Assumptions for Alternatives More information is needed from LSPGC and PG&E about the work periods, durations, and intensities of activities that would be different for the project alternatives compared to the Proposed Project. This information is needed to determine how the air quality emissions calculated for the Proposed Project may be greater or less with the alternatives for specific activities and periods.	1	Please review Attachment A (DR10_Alts AQ Assumptions.xlsx) and provide the approximate work activity information identified for the five alternatives. Specifically, we are looking for start date and end date for each activity and total number of workdays. Additional questions are provided in the notes. Activities that are assumed to be unaffected by the alternative are shown in dark grey.	LSPGC and PG&E have coordinated, and the responses are documented in Attachment A .
n/a	DR-2: Alternative 4 Design Modifications LSPGC informed the CPUC that design modifications are proposed to Alternative 4: 230 kV Overhead Segment Alternative Route that are intended to avoid/minimize impacts to existing wetlands and Suisan Marsh.	1	Please provide preliminary design modifications to Alternative 4: 230 kV Overhead Segment Alternative Route that avoid/minimize impacts to existing wetlands and Suisan Marsh. Please provide detailed GIS data layers, construction details (workspace, excavation volumes and grading quantities, etc.), impact values, schedule information, etc. consistent with the CPUC's prior requests for the alternatives.	LSPGC has proposed an alternative route intended to avoid/minimize impacts to the Suisun Marsh Secondary Management Area. Two alternatives are proposed. Alternative A is proposed for the current proposed substation location and Alternative B is proposed for both substation alternative locations. Please see Attachment B and Attachment C for GIS and additional information.
n/a	DR-3: Grading Quantities for the Proposed Project and Alternatives The following grading volumes have been provided by LSGPC for the Proposed Project, as detailed in the current version of Project Description: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Total cut: 40,000 cubic yards• Total fill (select import and net fill): 39,000 cubic yards• Total export/wasted: 11,000 cubic yards• Total import (select import/structural fill): 11,000 cubic yards Our understanding is that the total combined cut and fill volume for the Proposed Project would be 79,000 cubic yards. In response to Data Request #5, LSPGC provided Attachment C which describes volumes of grading for Scenario A (Understood to be Alternative 1: North of Talbert Lane) and Scenario B (Understood to be Alternative 2: Adjacent to Existing Wind Energy Substations), as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Volume of grading and earthwork at each substation site. The volume can be provided as a range or comparable number to the proposed project.	1	Please clarify if the grading/excavation values and total cut and fill volume (79,000 cubic yards) in the project description for the Proposed Project remain accurate or provide updated values.	The values provided in the Proposed Project remain accurate.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Scenario A: Overall this scenario has less elevation change than the proposed location, but scenario A is situated over the head of a large drainage. <u>Estimated quantity of general fill (cut to compacted fill) is 40,000 cubic yards (approximately 1/3 increase compared to the proposed site).</u>– Scenario B: Overall the slope is more consistent but greater (approximately 35-40' of elevation change in existing grade from corner to corner of pad) for scenario B. <u>Estimated quantity of general fill (cut to compacted fill) is 60,000 cubic yards (approximately double compared to the proposed site).</u>• Would either substation alternative result in off haul of soil material due to increased grading or do you anticipate cut and fill would be balanced on site? If off haul is anticipated, provide a rough estimate of the volume of off haul and associated number of truck trips anticipated.	2	Please provide the following total grading values for Collinsville Substation at the locations for Alternative 1 (North of Talbert Lane) and Alternative 2 (Adjacent to Existing Wind Energy Substations), consistent with the values provided for the Proposed Project to support a comparison of the alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Total cut: [X] cubic yards• Total fill (select import and net fill): [X] cubic yards• Total export/wasted: [X] cubic yards Total import (select import/structural fill): [X] cubic yards	Approximate values are shown below and are subject to change. Scenario A Total cut: 46,000 cubic yards Total fill (select import and net fill): 51,000 cubic yards Total export/wasted: 6,000 cubic yards Total import (select import/structural fill): 11,000 cubic yards Scenario B Total cut: 68,000 cubic yards Total fill (select import and net fill): 71,000 cubic yards Total export/wasted: 8,000 cubic yards Total import (select import/structural fill): 11,000 cubic yards

DATA REQUESTS

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
	<div><div><div>– Scenario A: LSPGC expect that site grading could be balanced.</div><div>– Scenario B: LSPGC expect that site grading could be balanced.</div></div><div>The total grading volumes are needed for Alternatives 1 and 2, as the values provided do not appear greater than the Proposed Project as stated.</div></div>			