

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



September 2, 2025

Dustin Joseph, AICP
LS Power Grid California, LLC
16150 Main Circle Drive, Suite 310
Chesterfield, MO 63017

Ms. Jo Lynn Lambert
Counsel for Pacific Gas & Electric Company
707 Brookside Avenue
Redlands, California

Re: Data Request #11 for LS Power Grid California, LLC's Collinsville 500/230 Kilovolt Substation Project (A.24-07-018)

Dear Mr. Joseph and Ms. Lambert:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Energy Division submits the attached Data Request #11 associated with LS Power Grid California, LLC's (LSPGC) Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) Application (A.24-07-018) for the Collinsville 500/230 Kilovolt (kV) Substation Project. Attachment A contains questions and requested information applicable to LSPGC and Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E). The CPUC is requesting that LSPGC and PG&E submit responses to this data request by September 5, 2025.

Please direct questions related to this request to me at Connie.Chen@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

connie chen

Connie Chen
Project Manager, Energy Division

Attachment A: Data Request #11

cc: Michelle Wilson, CPUC Energy Division
Aaron Lui, Panorama Environmental, Inc.

Attachment A: Data Request



Project: LS Power Grid's Collinsville 500/230 kV Substation Project

Title: Data Request #11

From: California Public Utilities Commission
Panorama Environmental, Inc.

To: LS Power Grid California, LLC (LSPGC)
Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E)

Date: September 2, 2025

DATA REQUESTS

DATA REQUESTS

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
n/a	DR-1: Alternative 6a/6b – Underground Portions of the Transmission Line within Suisan Marsh Protection Plan Management Areas In response to Data Request #10, LSPGC identified a new alternative scenario that would involve installing portions of the 230 kV transmission line underground where it is within the Suisan Marsh Protection Plan Management Areas and within the PG&E property south of the proposed substation site. The route of the 230 kV underground line would be west of the Alternative 4 overhead route. The CPUC currently expects to retain this new alternative for analysis in the EIR, which is referred to as Alternative 6a/6b, with a and b variants representing minor connection differences associated with the substation location scenarios being considered (e.g., equipment locations based on the Proposed Project vs. Alternatives 1 and 2). More information is needed about Alternative 6a/6b to complete the EIR impact analysis.	1	Please provide a detailed description of all operation and maintenance activities associated with a 230 kV undergrounding scenario south of the proposed substation, including inspection frequencies, maintenance of permanent access roads, vegetation management for the underground facilities if any, operational dewatering considerations, etc.	LSPGC
		2	Please provide any comments from Solano County on the alternative design. Please provide the contact information for Solano County staff that LSPGC coordinated with regarding the alternative design.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-2: Alternative 4 and Alternative 6a/6b Access Roads The use of an existing access road (roughly 0.6 mile) was identified for Alternative 6a/6b. It appears this access road would also be used for Alternative 4. Additional information is needed about the conditions and use of this existing access road, as well as possible improvements that may be required to facilitate construction activities.	1	Please clarify if the existing access road identified for Alternative 6a/6b would also be used with Alternative 4.	LSPGC
		2	Please explain the conditions of this existing access road, including the existing widths and surface characteristics (dirt or gravel), etc. Please describe any improvements to the road that would be required, such as grading or the placement of gravel, and what the maximum maintained width would be.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-3: Air Quality Emissions Assumptions for Alternatives In response to Data Request #10, LSPGC provided equipment and construction schedule information to support AQ and GHG emission assumptions for the alternatives. The CPUC has follow-up questions regarding Alternative 5, and this information is needed for Alternative 6a/6b.	1	Please update the attached excel file (DR10_Alts AQ Assumptions_LSPGC and PG&E_v2.xlsx) to address both Alternative 6a (complete replacement of the 230 kV overhead route for the Proposed Project) and Alternative 6b (partial replacement of the 230 kV overhead route for Alternatives 1 and 2).	LSPGC
		2	Please see the attached excel file (DR10_Alts AQ Assumptions_LSPGC and PG&E_v2.xlsx) (Alternative 5 tab) and clarify the equipment assumptions added below the prior values that were provided for Alternative 5.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-4: Alternative 4 Potential Design Refinements New information is now available about potentially sensitive environmental areas in the vicinity of the Alternative 4 which may not have been considered when developing the initial Alternative 4 design, such as the locations of potential wetlands and any culturally sensitive areas.	1	Please review the preliminary design for Alternative 4 and determine if any sensitive environmental areas can be avoided by adjusting the locations of poles and access routes. If such improvements can be made, please provide updated GIS for the Alternative 4 design.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-5: Alternative 4 and Alternative 6a/6b Access Roads	1	Please clarify if the existing access road identified for Alternative 6a/6b would also be used with Alternative 4.	LSPGC

DATA REQUESTS

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
	The use of an existing access road (roughly 0.6 mile) was identified for Alternative 6a/6b. It appears this access road would also be used for Alternative 4. Additional information is needed about the conditions and use of this existing access road, as well as possible improvements that may be required to facilitate construction activities.	2	Please explain the conditions of this existing access road, including the existing widths and surface characteristics (dirt or gravel), etc. Please describe any improvements to the road that would be required, such as grading or the placement of gravel, and what the maximum maintained width would be.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-6: Health Risk Assessment (HRA) On August 19, 2025, LSPGC provided a revised copy of the HRA following a meeting with the CPUC and LSPGC specialist. Two remaining items should be addressed in the HRA and an updated copy should be provided.	1	Please correct the rounding error (1 percent difference) on page 12 (DR-2B Pittsburg Substation TAC DPM).	LSPGC
		2	The revised HRA did not provide clarification for the 8.43 acres used for the Collinsville Substation. During the meeting, it was mentioned that the active construction work areas were summed up and used as source areas in AERMOD. We agree with this approach. Although the requested clarification was not provided for the Collinsville Substation in the revised HRA. Please update the HRA to document this assumption.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-7: Helicopter Use Assumptions and Feasibility of Workhour Restrictions In addition, information is needed about how helicopters would be used for the project alternatives, and if it would be feasible to restrict the use of helicopters between the hours of 9am and 4pm to minimize noise impacts.	1	Where the use of helicopters is proposed during construction, is it feasible to limit the helicopters workhours between the hours of 9am and 4pm to minimize potential noise threshold exceedances? Please explain how restricting the use of helicopters to these hours would change the construction schedule, if at all.	LSPGC and PG&E
		2	Does PG&E expect to use helicopters to construction the 500 kV line under the Alternatives 1 and 2 scenarios?	PG&E
n/a	DR-8: Aquatic Resources Technical Report (ARTR) The ARTR needs to be updated to reflect the current Proposed Project features, and old information related to the in-river structure should be replaced. LSPGC informed the CPUC that this updates to the ARTR are expected in the next week or so.	1	Please updated the ARTR to reflect the current Proposed Project per discussions with the CPUC team.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-9: Notification List Contact Information Contact information is needed to supplement the CPUC's notification list in the vicinity of project alternative areas selected for evaluation in the EIR. In addition, contract information should also be provided for the PG&E transposition sites, if such information was not included with the original contact list provided to the CPUC.	1	Please provide a spreadsheet of contact information within 300 feet of the project features (i.e., new facilities and permanent roads) for the six selected alternatives. The contact information should include the names, addresses, and parcels of landowners within 300 feet as well as any available contract information for leaseholders associated with affected properties. Please separate the contact information by alternative or clearly identify which alternatives are within 300 feet.	LSPGC
		2	Please provide contact information, as described above, for properties within 300 feet of the PG&E transposition site features.	LSPGC
n/a	DR-10: Ridgway Rail Requirements in APM BIO-15 USFWS informed the CPUC that USFWS provided comments on USFWSBA-AMM-24: California Ridgway's Rail Avoidance, which includes similar language to LSPGC APM BIO-15.	1	If common language in AMM-24 and APM BIO-15 is updated to address USFWS' comments, please provide a revised version of APM BIO-15 for use in the EIR to avoid potential conflicts between the two measures.	LSPGC