Proposed Topics from the CPUC and Stakeholders for PG&E TPR Process Stakeholder Meeting on July 29, 2025

1. **PG&E Project Planning Strategy / Risk Based Portfolio Planning Framework and Integrated Grid Planning**
   a) Please provide a brief overview of PG&E's RBPPF and IGP framework. Please explain key inputs and considerations used to develop project rankings.
   b) Please provide an update on PG&E's progress in implementing and using these frameworks, along with any other modifications to PG&E's project planning strategy.
   c) Please explain whether the criteria PG&E uses to assign an RBPPF score have been modified in 2025.
   d) In the TPR Project Spreadsheet, Field 26 "Utility Prioritization Ranking - Integrated Grid Planning", numerous projects indicate "in-flight future scope," and "future IGP scope," along with "NA" and "non-IGP scope." Please explain what each of these descriptors mean, how often they are updated, and what causes them to be updated.
   e) Please explain if there have been any shifts in project RBPPF rankings since November 2024.
2. **Cost/Benefit Analyses (See Data Field 66)**
   a) Please provide an update on PG&E's incorporation of cost/benefit analyses in its project planning strategy.
   b) PG&E has previously communicated that it is reviewing the Copperleaf tool that other California utilities utilize and are exploring how additional benefits can be captured. Please explain how PG&E may or may not use Copperleaf in its cost/benefit analyses.
   c) Would PG&E provide an example to explain how PG&E plans to incorporate a more granular approach to evaluate project-level CBRs to capture reliability, capacity, and grid stability benefits? PG&E has evaluated reliability consequences using historical outage data at the line level to create project-level CBRs that include both wildfire and reliability benefits. Would it implement a similar approach for other benefits?
   d) Please provide PG&E's timeline for fully populating Field 66 (Cost Benefit Analysis) beyond the limited cost/benefit percentages currently included.
   e) For PO EX112927 -- Colgate - Alleghany Wood Structure Replacement [sic], Field 66 shows a cost/benefit ratio of 4110.13%. Field 26 "Utility Prioritization Ranking – RBPPF" shows an RBPPF of 4.01113. Please explain in detail how each of these numbers was developed and describe why a project with such a high cost/benefit ratio does not have a higher RBPPF.
   f) PO 5790356 -- Colgate-Grass Valley 60kV Structure Repl shows 513.27% in Field 66, while Field 26's RBPPF is 3.00105. Please explain in detail how each of these numbers were developed and describe why a project with such a high cost/benefit ratio does not have a higher RBPPF.

g) For PO 5777912 -- Pittsburg - San Mateo 230kV Twr Repl, Field 66 shows a cost/benefit ratio of 1886.64%. Field 26 shows an RBPPF of 4.03102. Please explain in detail how each of these numbers were developed and describe why a project with such a high cost/benefit ratio does not have a higher RBPPF.
h) In the July 29th stakeholder meeting, PG&E should walk stakeholders through the Utility Prioritization Ranking – RBPPF score for some selected projects for which CBRs are calculated.

3. **CWIP Rate Base Incentive Projects**
   a) For each of the projects noted below, please provide a detailed update on each project's scope, cost, and timeline to completion. Please show all POs included in each T.Dot.
      i. Manning Project: Construction of the Manning 500/230 kV Substation (T.0009194);
      ii. Collinsville Project: Construction of the Collinsville 500/230 kV Substation (T.0009189);
      iii. Newark Project: Construction of the Newark-Northern Receiving Station High-Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) (T.0009168 or its successor); and,
      iv. Metcalf Project: Construction of the Metcalf-San Jose B HVDC (T.0009169)
   b) Please provide a map or diagram that includes the major segments of these projects and identify the major segments for which PG&E is responsible and LS Power is responsible. Please highlight how these projects tie to each other and illustrate dependencies to other major projects planned in the South Bay (e.g., San Jose A – Substation Rebuild).
   c) Please include a description of how PG&E's interconnection process(es) may differ, if it does, if a project is AC or DC.
   d) Please explain how the CAISO rescoping of LS Power's project(s) affects PG&E's ability to recover the costs it incurs to interconnect the project(s).
   e) Please provide PG&E's current monthly capital expenditure forecast for each of the POs that are part of the above-noted T.Dots.
4. **Competitively-Bid Projects Interconnected by PG&E**
   a) Please provide an overview of the work performed by PG&E to interconnect LS Power's Table Mountain, Round Mountain, and Fern Road projects (i.e., T.0006815 -- LSPower Round Mountain Area 500kV Dynami). Please include a discussion of any challenges encountered by PG&E during the development of the interconnection project.
   b) Please provide an overview of the work performed by PG&E to interconnect T.0004672 -- Gates: 500 kV Dynamic Voltage Support. Please include a discussion of any challenges encountered by PG&E during the development of the interconnection project.
   c) For both T.0006815 and T.0004672, please identify which projects in the TPR are dependent on the completion of these competitively-bid projects.
   d) Please provide an update for the following two projects:
      a) Humboldt 500 kV Substation and 500 kV line to Collinsville
      b) Humboldt to Fern Road 500 kV Line

5. **Major Projects Update**
   Please provide an overview of each of the following major projects, including any project drivers, timelines to completion, current status, project risks, and project dependencies.

Please identify the POs associated with each T.Dot and provide capital expenditures by the respective PO.

a) T.0010623 – Salinas Area Reinf Chualar Sub
b) T.0010465 – San Jose A – Substation Rebuild
c) T.0000155 – Lockeford – Lodi Area 230 kV Development
d) T.0010534 – North Dublin-Vineyard Recond Project
e) T.0000156 – Wheeler Ridge Junction Substation
f) T.0000154 – Estrella 230 kV Transmission Substation
g) T.0007072 -- IGNACIO-MARE ISL 115KV (IGN SUB/HWY SUB)
h) T.0004271 -- Morgan Hill-Watsonville 115kV Area Reinforcement

6. **PO 5560199 -- EGMP Cap**
   The public redacted Project Charter, titled "5560199_CH1_Redacted," in Section A) Overview, indicates work under this PO is to "modernize PG&E's transmission monitoring and control system and improve Electric Operations (EO) infrastructure." Please describe the primary drivers of this initiative and describe the substation upgrades to allow for the use of a single system for all transmission grid operations and controls, as referenced on Page 1 of 9 of the referenced document.
7. **High-Speed Rail Project Update**
   Please provide an update on any activities on this project, including any revised scope and engineering assessments. Please confirm that no costs for any California High-Speed Rail work has been allocated to ratepayers, pursuant to CPUC Resolution E-4886, Ordering Paragraph #6:

   > *PG&E shall not recover costs for the Projects in Commission-established rates until the Commission has issued a final order regarding the cost allocation issues in response to the PG&E application ordered herein. Similarly, PG&E should not recover costs for the Projects in FERC-established rates until the Commission has issued a final order regarding the cost allocation issues from FERC.*
8. **MPAC Installation Update**
   a) Please provide an overview of any alternative solutions PG&E has considered to the use of MPACs.
   b) Please discuss any studies PG&E has conducted or plans to conduct to evaluate or determine MPAC solutions are the preferred option over other options.
9. **COTA Bushing Replacement Program 2025-2029**
   a) Please provide an overview of the COTA Bushing Replacement Program, including the number of transmission transformers with COTA bushings and locations of each.
   b) Please explain PG&E's need to initiate this program, including whether any COTA bushings have failed between 2020 and 2025.
   c) Please describe any mitigation measures PG&E has in place to monitor in-service COTA bushings condition.
10. **Load Interconnection Processes**
    a) Please provide an update on PG&E's "Rule 30" application to the CPUC, reflecting any revisions PG&E may have made to its proposal. Include a description of any costs which would be borne by FERC jurisdictional ratepayers under PG&E's proposal, when and how ratepayers would be made aware of associated ratebase additions, and how stakeholders can keep apprised of any system impacts of projects under PG&E's proposal,
    b) If acceptance of PG&E's Rule 30 proposal would impact any projects in the May TPR project spreadsheet, please identify those POs and describe the impacts.

c) Please provide an update on PG&E's Bay Area "cluster study" for new load interconnection projects, last discussed in the February 4, 2025 TPR Stakeholder Meeting.

11. Tower Coating

a) Please provide a summary of the work completed to date, along with average cost per tower and issues encountered.
b) Please provide the workplan for 2025, 2026, and 2027.
c) Please share any studies performed by PG&E on the efficacy of the product(s) used for tower coating.

12. Cathodic Protection

a) Please provide a summary of the work completed to date, along with average cost per tower, estimated per tower filed inspection cost, and issues encountered.
b) Please provide the workplan for 2025, 2026, and 2027.
c) Please share any studies performed by PG&E on the efficacy of the product(s) used for cathodic protection.

13. Shunt Splice Replacement Program

a) Please provide an overview of the program scope, goal, and operation.

b) Please provide a summary of the work completed to date, along with average cost per tower, estimated per tower filed inspection cost, and issues encountered.
c) Please provide the workplan for 2025, 2026, and 2027.
d) Please share any studies performed by PG&E on the efficacy of the product(s) used for shunt splices.
e) Please explain the FERC accounts to which these costs are booked and provide the associated depreciable life.
f) Please explain whether any of the shunt splice replacements recently added or that will be added in the next five years will be replaced as part of known planned reconductoring projects.

14. Grid Enhancing Technologies

a) Please provide any updates on Grid Enhancing Technologies (GETs) PG&E is evaluating (e.g., Ambient Adjusted Ratings (AAR) and Dynamic Line Rating (DLR)), if any GETs projects have been in coordination with the CAISO, and how deployment of these technologies have enhanced grid operation and congestion/constraint mitigation timelines.
b) Please provide an update on PG&E's AAR implementation that it indicated previously was planned by July 2025. Please explain whether the costs associated with the planned AAR implementation are captured in PG&E's TPR. If so, please identify the PO. If not, please explain.
c) Please provide an overview of any pilot programs that have deployed GETs and provide any next steps in their evaluation.

15. AFUDC and Placing Projects On Hold

a) Please provide an update on how PG&E's "automated hold" process is working, including the names and number of projects that have been placed on hold. Please include whether PG&E has established a "de minimis"

spending threshold that would allow projects to be placed on hold even when minimal capital expenditures are being incurred.

b) Please identify any projects that are greater than $15 million that PG&E has placed on hold using its manual process since March 2025.

c) Please provide an update on the Egbert 230kV Switching Station, including which POs have been placed "on hold", and current engineering, construction, and completion timelines. Please include an assessment of how these timelines may differ from those previously communicated and provide the reasons for any variances.
   - In particular, please elaborate on how PG&E Prioritization has caused further delay of the Egbert project to October 2029.
   - Please provide a breakdown of the $45 million expenditure incurred so far towards the PO 5767214 (MARTIN SUB_230KV BUS EXT)
   - Please explain why the PO 5767217 REROUTE JEFFERSON_MARTIN 230KV LINE is deferred.

16. Supply Chain Issues

a) Please explain whether PG&E is encountering any supply chain issues for transformers, circuit breakers, and other critical transmission-related infrastructure. If it is, please explain them and describe PG&E's plans to address.

b) Please provide an update on PG&E's advance procurement of transformers and circuit breakers, both for emergency inventory and known projects. Please include estimated delivery timelines and the process for transferring any charges from the "other balance sheet" (OBS) to actual planning orders.

c) Please describe how new or proposed tariffs are affecting the cost and availability of transformers, circuit breakers, and other critical transmission-related infrastructure.

17. Generator Interconnection Network Upgrades and CAISO TPP Reliability and Policy-Driven Projects Through CAISO 2023-2024 TPP

a) Please provide an update on projects at or greater than 1MW that are interconnecting to PG&E's electric transmission system. Please identify the updates to those included in the January 2025 CAISO Transmission Development Forum (TDF).

b) Please identify the type and amounts (MW and MWh) of generation that will interconnect to the electric grid.

a) Diablo Canyon Area 230 kV High Voltage Mitigation: This reliability-driven project was approved by the CAISO in the 2023-2024 Transmission Plan.[1] Why isn't it being included in the Project Spreadsheet?

b) Collinsville 230 kV Reactor: All projects approved as policy-driven by the CAISO in the 2023-2024 Transmission Plan, except for this project involving the addition of 20-ohm reactors on the Collinsville – Pittsburg 230 kV line, were included in the Project Spreadsheet (PS). Please explain why this project is missing.[2]

[1] CAISO 2023-2024 Transmission Plan, May 23, 2024, p.5.

[2] CAISO 2023-2024 Transmission Plan, May 23, 2024, p.6.

c) Please provide a timeline for the projects approved in the CAISO 2024-2025 Transmission Plan to be included in the PS.

18. Systemwide Idle Line Removal Updates

a) Please provide the final results of the work under this program through the end of 2024, including the individual project names and associated costs to meet the $85 million disallowance.
b) Please provide PG&E's 2025 to 2029 workplan for additional idle line removal that is not part of the $85 million disallowance. Please identify all POs related to this work that are part of PG&E's TPR project spreadsheet.

19.Temporary Power Costs in Capital Orders

a) Please explain how PG&E identifies which capital orders include temporary power costs to serve customers. (See TPR-Process-DR_ED-001-Q027, later updated in FERC-TO21-IR_CPUC-PGE_03-AU.119 through FERC-TO21-IR_CPUC-PGE_03-AU.123).
b) Please provide a list of the capital orders to which PG&E has booked costs associated with temporary power to serve customers.