

September 24, 2014

Mr. Matthew Fogelson
Attorney
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street
P.O. Box 7442, B30A
San Francisco, CA 94120-7442

RE: Data Request #12 for Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Application for a Permit to Construct the Santa Cruz 115-kilovolt Reinforcement Project (A. 12-01-012)

Dear Mr. Fogelson:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) requests additional data related to the Santa Cruz 115-kV Reinforcement Project (A.12-01-012) related to potential project alternatives.

1. Has PG&E considered, as an alternative to the proposed route, constructing the single-circuit 115kV line segment to Rob Roy Substation along Freedom Boulevard from about its intersection with Hames Road? The alignment could be built from the Northern Alignment down Hames Road (for a distance of approximately 0.6 miles), where there is existing distribution, or overland to the west of Hames Road (for a distance of about 1,600 feet).
 - a. If this route was determined infeasible or did not pass initial screening, please identify why. Approximately 0.7 miles of Freedom Boulevard is included in the proposed project. Are transmission lines not typically constructed on an arterial roadway? If not, please identify why not, and support with data/evidence (i.e., number of car collisions per mile that could damage or take the line out of service). Please identify any environmental impacts that were considered.
 - b. If this route is feasible, please provide additional information on this route, including the number of poles that would be required and the types of poles, any special construction or design considerations that would be different from the proposed project, the right-of-way needs for the project, and whether homes or structures would fall within that right-of-way that could be impacted. Please identify any environmental impacts that were considered, including any information on public notification or input ascertained by PG&E, if available.
2. Please provide additional information on the Valencia Alternative, including the types and number of poles that would be needed, any construction methods or design considerations that would be different from the proposed project, staging and landing zones, an estimation of tree removal and trimming, and right-of-way needs and considerations. Provide any environmental information that you may have available and/or environmental considerations. Please provide any information on public notification or input ascertained by PG&E, if available.

3. In Data Response 10, question #5, PG&E discussed reconductoring 25.9 miles of the existing Green Valley-Camp Evers line and Green Valley-Rob Roy line. The response indicated some technical and environmental difficulties associated with a reconductoring project, but did not state whether it was an infeasible alternative. Please provide more information on a reconductoring project and its feasibility. The response indicated that steel poles may need to replace wooden poles due to the weight of the conductor. Please indicate where steel poles may be required and how many. Please provide a project description for reconductoring that includes the pole types and design required, any construction methods that differ from those of the proposed project, and any right-of-way and environmental issues (beyond those listed in Data Response 10).

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this data request.

Sincerely,



Tania Treis, Principal
Panorama Environmental, Inc.

cc: Matthew Fogelson, PG&E
Lisa Orsaba, CPUC