PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

June 6, 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 #5 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 #5 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 of this data request contains questions and requested information applicable to both LSPGC and Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E). The CPUC is requesting that LSPGC and PG&E submit separate responses to this data request by June 20, 2025, as outlined below.

- LSPGC: Please respond to the data requests (DRs) identified as appliable to LSPGC, including DR-1 through DR-5, and DR-8.
- PG&E: Please respond to the DRs identified as appliable to PG&E, including DR-5 through DR-7 and DR-9.

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 #5

cc: Michelle Wilson, CPUC Energy Division
Susanne Heim, Panorama Environmental, Inc.

Attachment A: Data Request

Project:	LS Power Grid's Collinsville 500/230 kV Substation Project
Title:	Data Request #5
From:	California Public Utilities Commission Panorama Environmental Inc.
To:	LS Power Grid California, LLC (LSPGC) Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)
Date:	June 6, 2025

DATA REQUESTS

Project Description

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
Data Request #2, DR-8	**DR-1: Permanent Land Rights** Need clarification on the size of Parcel ID: 0090-12-0300. The Solano County Parcel Viewer indicates: • Measured GIS Acreage: 64.11 • Recorded Assessor Acreage: 61.05 Which is the correct number based on the negotiations to acquire permanent land rights to 28.3 acres.	A	Please confirm if this text is accurate. "The proposed substation site would require permanent land rights to be acquired by LSPGC, which include approximately 28.3 acres of a 61.05-acre parcel (Parcel ID: 0090-12-0300).	LSPGC
n/a	**DR-2: Basic Project Objectives** The CPUC must define basic project objectives for evaluation in the ASR. The basic project objectives are the fundamental drivers for the project.	A	Please verify that the following are the basic project objectives: • Meet the CAISO policy-driven need established for the project in its Transmission Plans by: – Relieving congestion on the 230 kV system and providing greater support for 230 kV lines in the Contra Costa region. – Reliably and economically supporting increased energy demand in the Bay Area. – Facilitating deliverability of load from existing and proposed renewable energy projects and progressing California's renewable energy goals. – Achieving commercial operation by May 2028 consistent with the 2024-2025 Transmission Plan timelines and policy goals.	LSPGC
n/a	**DR-3: Substation Buildout** There is discussion in the Project Description about future substation buildout. Additional information is needed to understand the future buildout and timing of the buildout to determine whether the buildout is reasonably foreseeable.	A	Please provide information on the source for the proposed substation buildout. What is the timing of the substation buildout? What would cause the substation buildout? Are there currently any proposals (e.g., interconnection of other transmission lines in the CAISO transmission plans) that would require buildout of the substation?	LSPGC

Alternatives

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
n/a	**DR-4: Substation Alternative Site A (Adjacent to Existing Wind Energy Substations)** SMUD identified two concerns related to this alternative site related to (1) potential for interference with an existing microwave communication tower and (2) potential for impact on an existing aircraft detection lighting system (ADLS) radar tower. The CPUC requests an engineering evaluation of these concerns and information to support the alternatives evaluation process. The following requests were submitted to LSPGC via email on May 20, 2025.	A	Potential interference with SMUD's existing microwave communication tower: • Provide information on the types of potential direct or indirect inference/impacts that could occur to existing microwave communication towers. Explain how LSPGC would evaluate and avoid such interference/impacts at an engineering and design level. • Specifically address the potential for beam path obstruction leading to signal loss; electromagnetic interference that could degrade signal quality; or multipath interference resulting in phase cancellation or signal distortion.	LSPGC

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
		B	Potential interference/impacts with SMUD's existing aircraft detection lighting system (ADLS) radar tower: • Provide information on the types of potential direct or indirect inference/impacts that could occur to the ADLS radar tower. Explain how LSPGC would evaluate and avoid such interference/impacts. • Specifically address the potential for radar obstruction leading to a loss in radar coverage; electromagnetic interference that could degrade signal quality and processing; or multipath interference resulting in signal reflection or diffraction.	LSPGC
n/a	**DR-5: Grading and Activity Level for Alternative Substation Sites** Panorama will need to evaluate the impacts of the alternatives considered in detail in the EIR. Additional information is needed to support the analysis for air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, geology and soils, hydrology, and transportation.	A	Please provide the following information to support the EIR analysis of impacts for each alternative considered in detail (i.e., two substation sites, 230 kV overhead segment alternative alignment, 500-kV TSP alternative, and submarine segment alternative): • Volume of grading and earthwork at each substation site. The volume can be provided as a range or comparable number to the proposed project. • 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. • Anticipated peak daily and annual maximum equipment activity level (and associated emissions) for off-road equipment, on-road equipment, and helicopters for each on land alternative. Estimated peak daily and annual maximum equipment activity level and associated emissions for the reroute of the submarine segment. The estimate can be provided in relation to the Proposed Project as an estimated percent increase or decrease. Explain the reasoning for any anticipated increase or decrease in activity level. • Are there any streams or drainages that would need to be rerouted for the alternative? • Are there any known buried utilities within the alternative work areas or adjacent the alternatives?	**PG&E:** Bullets 1 & 2: These questions apply to the substation alternatives, but PG&E can state that the 500 kV TSP alternative would likely require more grading and earthwork than the proposed standard towers due to the need for a level pad for the larger crane as well as the additional pole foundations in the 3-pole configurations. PG&E is unable to estimate the volumes or off haul potential without further information. Bullet 3: The activity levels would vary from those of the proposed project as follows: Due to the extreme weight of TSP sections, helicopters would be used less for construction and a larger crane would be necessary. The larger crane would require grading of a level area at each location of the single monopoles (3 locations of two poles each or 6 locations if necessary). Field review is needed to determine whether one pad or two will be needed at each monopole location; substantial cut and fill may be required to establish the necessary crane pad. Aside from grading for the pad, roughly the same volume of earthwork would be required for each suspension monopole as for the original tower designs. For the 3-pole locations (6 poles at 4 locations), more earth work would be required due to the higher number of poles versus proposed structure footings. Bullet 4: There is one stream to be crossed by the 500 kV line. For the monopole alternative, the stream would be crossed in a location having a 3-pole configuration, with 2 poles on one side of the creek and 1 pole on the other side. No rerouting would be necessary. Bullet 5: No, other than the gas line previously identified that can be avoided.

				LSPGC/PG&E

Biological Resources

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
n/a	**DR-6: Wetland and Vernal Pool Surveys at PG&E Transposition Sites** Based on review of the BRTR Addendum and discussion with the biologists who conducted the survey, there is the potential for wetlands and/or vernal pools to occur along access roads and within work areas for the transposition sites.	A	Please provide a schedule and details for the vernal pool survey in advance of the surveys for review and comment by the CPUC team. A brachiopod specialist should conduct the vernal pool evaluation. Datasheets shall be prepared documenting conditions in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers wetland delineation manual and Arid West Regional Supplement for the wetlands that cannot be avoided.	PG&E: This work is in progress.

Section/Page Reference	CPUC Comment	Request ID	CPUC Request	LSPGC/PG&E Response
			If wetlands or vernal pools are present within the access roads, define measures to avoid the wetlands/vernal pools such as timing of access, plating, or other approaches that would avoid damage from driving on the road. If wetlands or vernal pools are present in the work areas, evaluate work area modifications that would avoid the wetland or vernal pool to the extent feasible.	
n/a	**DR-7: Botanical Surveys at PG&E Transposition Sites** The BRTR Addendum identified the potential for rare plants to occur within the transposition site areas; however, focused surveys were not included with the addendum. Focused surveys during the appropriate blooming period are needed.	A	Provide a schedule for completion of rare plant surveys at the transposition sites.	PG&E: As stated in PG&E's Data Response #4 (DR-16 A): PG&E had understood that LSPGC was undertaking plant surveys in the transposition areas, but now understands we were mistaken. It is now too late to do it this year. PG&E has therefore agreed with the CPUC team that it will perform seasonally appropriate rare plant surveys prior to construction.
n/a	**DR-8: Characteristics of Rare Plant Populations Identified** The GIS data provided to Panorama includes polygons of rare plant populations but there are no estimates/numbers included in the metadata or points for the rare plants. During discussion with Insignia, Panorama learned that GIS point data exists and was not provided. This information is needed to estimate population impacts to the species.	A	Provide GIS point data for rare plant polygons within the 230 kV line route.	LSPGC
n/a	**DR-9: Burrowing Owl and Crotch's Bumble Bee Surveys** PG&E discussed that focused surveys were being completed for burrowing owl and Crotch's bumble bee at the transposition sites and work areas to support applications for a California incidental take permit for construction.	A	Please provide the focused burrowing owl and Crotch's bumble bee survey reports to the CPUC when available.	PG&E: Survey reports will be provided when available.