



ecology and environment, inc.

Global Environmental Specialists

One Embarcadero Center, Suite 500
San Francisco, California 94111
Tel: (415) 398-5326, Fax: (415) 796-0846

February 4, 2018

Billie Blanchard
Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #3 for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

Dear Ms. Blanchard,

Construction for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project began on November 5, 2018. This report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **January 1 to 31, 2019**, for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project in Fresno County, California. Compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) and their contractors comply with the requirements of the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Final IS/MND) for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project, as adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on July 13, 2017.

Table 1 summarizes CPUC-approved Notice to Proceed (NTP) activities to-date for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project, based on activities proposed in PG&E's Notice to Proceed Requests (NTPRs).

Table 1 CPUC-approved NTP Activities for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

NTP#	Final NTP Submittal Date	CPUC NTP Issuance Date	Description of Approved Activities
NTP #1	11/1/2018	11/2/2018	Work within both the existing Sanger Substation footprint and the expansion area, including laydown/staging area setup; installation of access driveways, fencing, foundations, substation equipment, and a microwave tower; and installation of two antenna dishes at an offsite location (Fence Meadow Repeater Station).

Table 2 summarizes all CPUC-approved Minor Project Refinements (MPRs) to-date for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project.

Table 2 CPUC-approved MPRs for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

MPR#	Final MPR Submittal Date	CPUC MPR Approval Date	Description of Minor Project Refinement
MPR #001	5/24/2018	6/12/2018	Minor modifications to the placement and types of poles in the "power line reconfiguration" project component to suit

			engineering refinements that were made after Final IS/MND approval. The modifications would occur approximately 2,100 feet west, 750 feet east, and 165 feet south of the existing Sanger Substation footprint. In total, there would be modifications to seven poles.
MPR #002	7/17/2018	7/20/2018	An additional temporary laydown yard/staging area (approximately 974'x112') located north of the retention basin, running north between the western boundary of the substation expansion area and the western boundary of the existing Sanger Substation footprint. This area is owned in fee title by PG&E.
MPR #003	11/13/2018	11/14/2018	Use of an existing water well approximately 100 feet north of approved NTP #1 work areas, within the same parcel as the Sanger Substation Expansion Footprint. PG&E has obtained permission from the landowner to use this well for a specified timeframe. PG&E will access the well pump by foot, and will obtain water from this well for dust control purposes. MPR #3 adds no additional ground disturbance to the existing disturbance footprint, other than impacts from light foot traffic and temporary ground placement of a water hose.

Project Compliance Incidents

Onsite compliance monitoring by the Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E) compliance team during this reporting period focused on spot-checks of ongoing construction activities. Compliance Monitors Ben Arax, Danielle Gutierrez, and Evan Studley, who visited the Sanger Substation construction site on **January 3, 10, and 30, 2019**. CPUC Compliance Monitoring Reports that summarize observed construction activities and compliance events and verify mitigation measures (MMs) and applicant proposed measures (APMs) were completed for the site visits. These reports are attached below (Attachment 1).

Overall, the Sanger Substation Project has maintained compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program’s (MMCRP) Compliance Plan. Communication between the CPUC/E & E compliance team and PG&E has been regular and effective; the correspondence discussed and documented compliance events, upcoming compliance-related surveys and deliverables, and the construction schedule. Agency calls between the CPUC/E & E and PG&E, along with daily schedule updates and database notifications, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, PG&E’s weekly compliance status reports provided a compliance summary, a description of construction activities that occurred each week, a summary of compliance with MMCRP conditions (MMs/APMs) for biological, cultural and paleontological resources; the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP); noise and traffic control; onsite hazards; and the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP), as well as any non-compliance issues and resolutions, and public complaints and notifications.

Compliance Incidents and Minor Compliance Observations

During the January 2019 reporting period, PG&E did not self-report any compliance incidents. The CPUC Compliance Monitors did not report any compliance incidents during the January 2019, though noted that some BMPs and SWPPP installations needed minor repairs following rain.

Page 3

events.

Noise Compliance

During the January 2019 reporting period, there were no exceedances of the stipulated noise levels.

Public Concerns

There were no public concerns during January 2019.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ilja Nieuwenhuizen".

Ilja Nieuwenhuizen
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:

Michael Calvillo, PG&E
Carie Montero, Parsons
Lincoln Allen, SWCA

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Compliance Monitoring Reports
January 3, 10, and 30, 2019



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	PG&E	Report No.	CM-DG-010319
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission	Date (mm/dd/yy)	01/03/19
CPUC Project Manager	Billie Blanchard	Monitor(s)	Danielle Gutierrez
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Ilja Nieuwenhuizen	AM/PM Weather	Partly cloudy, 55° F, calm
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Aileen Cole	Start/End time	12:50 PM – 1:20 PM
Project NTP(s)	NTP #1		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST *(Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)*

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all on-site personnel (e.g., construction workers, managers, inspectors, monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed, in accordance with the project's SWPPP??	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) installed correctly (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	X		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways?	X		
Is dust control being implemented, in accordance with the Dust Control Plan (e.g., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are covered with tarps, pull-outs and streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	X		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are vehicles maintaining speed limits: 15 mph on unpaved roads/10 mph off-road?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment/mud and noxious weeds or other plant debris?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A

Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are trenches/excavations covered at night, or when not possible, are wildlife escape ramps installed, constructed of earth fill or wooden planks no less than 10 inches wide?	X		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have required preconstruction surveys been completed for biological resources (special status species, raptors and other nesting birds, burrowing owls, San Joaquin kit fox), as appropriate?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Is project complying with biological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features (e.g., is the refueling/maintenance buffer in place within 100 feet of the irrigation ditch)?	X		
Has wildlife (sensitive species or not) been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred on adjacent habitat (sensitive or not sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are appropriate buffers/exclusion zones for identified sensitive cultural/paleo resources (e.g. cultural sites) clearly marked and being maintained?	X		
Is the project in compliance with cultural/archaeological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
Is the project in compliance with paleontological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for potential archaeological, cultural, or paleontological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used on-site properly managed?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are required fire prevention and control measures in place, and no crew members,	X		

managers, or monitors are smoking onsite?			
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or offsite disposal?	X		
Work Hours and Noise	Yes	No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?	X		
Is construction occurring within approved work hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?	X		

<p>AREAS MONITORED Project areas on and near the substation expansion footprint, exiting substation, and the temporary laydown/staging area.</p>
<p>DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES 12:50 PM – Arrived on site. I met with Jessie Henderson-McBean (PG&E EI), who gave a brief description of the day's activities. Jeff Clarkson (PG&E Senior Civil Inspector) was onsite in a PG&E meeting when I arrived.</p> <p>12:55 PM – I performed a pedestrian survey of the Project perimeter from the laydown yard/staging area, towards Jensen Avenue, then to the northern Project boundary, to McCall Avenue, then south towards Jensen Avenue adjacent to McCall Avenue. Overall, the onsite BMPs are well-kept (Photo 1) (APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1).</p> <p>1:05 PM – I observed a soil compactor, water truck (Photo 2), loader, scraper (Photo 3), and grader (Photo 4) in use on the substation expansion footprint. Ms. Henderson-McBean pointed out that a broken-down scraper had been moved onto the black plastic tarp, and pans had been placed underneath to catch drips if they occur (Photo 5) (MM HAZ-1). She said that Chris Carroll (AJ Excavation Foreman) is expecting a large flatbed truck to tow the broken down scraper off the project site later that day.</p> <p>1:15 PM – I observed the southern driveway entrance point (at the southern edge of the Substation Expansion Footprint) and noticed that it was well-maintained (Photo 6). I observed a sweeper truck on McCall Avenue sweeping the road after trucks and heavy machinery entered and exited the Substation Expansion Footprint (APM GHG-1).</p> <p>1:20 PM – Left project site.</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BIO-1, APM PAL-1, MM CUL-2, APM HAZ-3, MM HAZ-2, MM TRAN-1).</p> <p>See additional APMs and MMs listed in the description of observed activities section.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP None</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS</p> <p>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY Below please describe any Compliance Incidents (Level 1, 2, or 3) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a compliance issue in the field, please note this on this monitoring form. In addition, Level 1, 2 or 3 Compliance Incidents, fill out and submit a separate Compliance Incident Report Form.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 0 Acceptable. (no compliance incidents)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Level 1: Minor Problem. An event or observation that slightly deviates from project requirements, but does</p>

not put a resource at unpermitted risk. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.

- Level 2: Compliance Deviation.** An event or observation that deviates from project requirements and puts a resource at risk, or shows a trend toward placing resources at risk, but is corrected without affecting the resource. Repeated Level 1 Minor Problems left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 2 Compliance Deviation. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.
- Level 3: Non-Compliance.** An event or observation that violates project requirements and affects a resource. Repeated Level 2 Compliance Deviations left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 3 Incident. An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the MMCRP applicant proposed measures (APMs) or mitigation measures (MMs), permit conditions, or approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.

Compliance Incidents reported by PG&E's Compliance Team

- PG&E's Compliance Team reported Compliance Incidents since last CPUC Compliance Monitor visit. If boxed checked, describe issues and resolution status below.

Description: *(include PG&E's report number)*

New Sensitive Resources

- New biological, environmental, cultural/archaeological, or paleontological discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc., has occurred since last CPUC Compliance Monitoring visit. If checked, please describe the new discoveries and documentation/verification below.




Description:

Date	Level	Compliance Incident and Resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	Corresponding Level 1, 2, or 3 Report #

PREVIOUS COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS OR ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:

None

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
01/03/19	Southern edge of retention basin along Jensen Ave.		Photo 1 – Wattles aligned with fence to prevent site runoff/run-on. Facing west.
01/03/19	Northern edge of expansion footprint.		Photo 2 – Soil compactor and water truck in use on expansion footprint. Facing east.
01/03/19	Northern edge of expansion footprint.		Photo 3 – A scraper in use and a loader turned off on the substation expansion footprint. Facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
01/03/19	Southern edge of expansion footprint.		Photo 4 – Grader in use on the substation expansion footprint. Facing north.
01/03/19	Northern edge of expansion footprint.		Photo 5 – Broken-down scraper parked on black plastic tarp next to a loader not in use. Facing east.
01/03/19	Southern edge of expansion footprint.		Photo 6 – Southern driveway entrance/exit point along McCall Avenue is neat and well-maintained. Facing east.

Completed by:	Danielle Gutierrez
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	01/03/19
Reviewed by:	Patrick Sauls
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	01/04/19



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	PG&E	Report No.	CM-CPUCBA-011019
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission	Date (mm/dd/yy)	01/10/19
CPUC Project Manager	Billie Blanchard	Monitor(s)	Ben Arax, Dani Gutierrez
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Ilja Nieuwenhuizen	AM/PM Weather	51° F, Foggy
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Aileen Cole	Start/End time	10:00 AM- 10:45 AM
Project NTP(s)	NTP #1		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all on-site personnel (e.g., construction workers, managers, inspectors, monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed, in accordance with the project's SWPPP??	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) installed correctly (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	X		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways?	X		
Is dust control being implemented, in accordance with the Dust Control Plan (e.g., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are covered with tarps, pull-outs and streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	X		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are vehicles maintaining speed limits: 15 mph on unpaved roads/10 mph off-road?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment/mud and noxious weeds or other plant debris?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A

Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are trenches/excavations covered at night, or when not possible, are wildlife escape ramps installed, constructed of earth fill or wooden planks no less than 10 inches wide?	X		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have required preconstruction surveys been completed for biological resources (special status species, raptors and other nesting birds, burrowing owls, San Joaquin kit fox), as appropriate?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Is project complying with biological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features (e.g., is the refueling/maintenance buffer in place within 100 feet of the irrigation ditch)?	X		
Has wildlife (sensitive species or not) been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred on adjacent habitat (sensitive or not sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are appropriate buffers/exclusion zones for identified sensitive cultural/paleo resources (e.g. cultural sites) clearly marked and being maintained?	X		
Is the project in compliance with cultural/archaeological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
Is the project in compliance with paleontological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for potential archaeological, cultural, or paleontological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used on-site properly managed?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are required fire prevention and control measures in place, and no crew members,	X		

managers, or monitors are smoking onsite?			
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or offsite disposal?	X		
Work Hours and Noise	Yes	No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?	X		
Is construction occurring within approved work hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?	X		

<p>AREAS MONITORED Project areas on and near the substation expansion footprint, existing substation site, and the temporary laydown/staging area</p>
<p>DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES 10:00 AM- Arrived on site. I observed the flooded conditions (Photo 1). However, water had not entered/exited the site (APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1).</p> <p>10:05 AM- I met with Jeff Clarkson (PG&E Senior Civil Inspector), who stated that planned work for the day included underground utility location (Photo 2) and preparations associated with building a temporary fence several feet east of the western edge of the existing substation footprint (Photo 3). Mr. Clarkson informed us of the muddy/flooded conditions on site (Photo 5, Photo 6), and that the laydown/staging area and the retention basin are not being used due to excessive mud.</p> <p>10:08 AM- Storm reports for the previous week were observed. Mr. Clarkson mentioned that the latest during- and post-storm reports were conducted and waiting to be obtained.</p> <p>10:15 AM- Inspected the substation expansion footprint (Photos 4-9). Muddy and wet conditions around the site were observed (Photo 5, Photo 6, Photo 7). The retention basin and laydown/staging area was not in use to prevent vehicles from getting trapped in mud (Photo 8, photo 9). Despite rainy conditions, the site looked well-maintained and had no evident run-on/runoff onsite (APM GEO-2/WQ-1).</p> <p>10:45 AM- Completed inspection, left site.</p>
<p>NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED MM BIO-1, APM HAZ-3, MM HAZ-2, APM GHG-1, MM HAZ-1</p> <p>See additional APMs and MMs listed in the description of observed activities section.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP None</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY Below please describe any Compliance Incidents (Level 1, 2, or 3) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a compliance issue in the field, please note this on this monitoring form. In addition, Level 1, 2 or 3 Compliance Incidents, fill out and submit a separate Compliance Incident Report Form.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 0 Acceptable. (no compliance incidents)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Level 1: Minor Problem. An event or observation that slightly deviates from project requirements, but does not put a resource at unpermitted risk. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and fill out a</p>

separate Compliance Incident Form.

Level 2: Compliance Deviation. An event or observation that deviates from project requirements and puts a resource at risk, or shows a trend toward placing resources at risk, but is corrected without affecting the resource. Repeated Level 1 Minor Problems left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 2 Compliance Deviation. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.

Level 3: Non-Compliance. An event or observation that violates project requirements and affects a resource. Repeated Level 2 Compliance Deviations left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 3 Incident. An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the MMCRP applicant proposed measures (APMs) or mitigation measures (MMs), permit conditions, or approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.

Compliance Incidents reported by PG&E's Compliance Team

PG&E's Compliance Team reported Compliance Incidents since last CPUC Compliance Monitor visit. If boxed checked, describe issues and resolution status below.

Description: *(include PG&E's report number)*

New Sensitive Resources

New biological, environmental, cultural/archaeological, or paleontological discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc., has occurred since last CPUC Compliance Monitoring visit. If checked, please describe the new discoveries and documentation/verification below.




Description:

Date	Level	Compliance Incident and Resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	Corresponding Level 1, 2, or 3 Report #

PREVIOUS COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS OR ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/10/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 1- Raised and graded soil to be spread across the substation expansion footprint. Photo facing northwest
1/10/19	McCall Avenue		Photo 2- AJ Excavation crew locating an underground utility line in order to not damage it during construction. Photo facing southeast.
1/10/19	Existing substation footprint		Photo 3- Pink line attached to delineator to identify where the new fence will be installed. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/10/19	Existing substation footprint		Photo 4- Vehicles stored within the existing substation footprint when not in use. Photo facing southwest.
1/10/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 5- Muddy, flooded conditions within the substation expansion footprint. Photo facing west.
1/10/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 6- View of the substation expansion footprint conditions from McCall Avenue. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/10/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 7- Flooded conditions within the expansion footprint. Photo facing northeast.
1/10/19	Laydown/staging area		Photo 8- The laydown/staging area is not in use due to muddy and flooded conditions.
1/10/19	Retention Basin		Photo 9- The retention basin is filled with water. Photo facing southeast.

Completed by:	Ben Arax
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	1/10/19
Reviewed by:	Dani Gutierrez
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	1/10/19



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	PG&E	Report No.	CM-BA-013019
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission	Date (mm/dd/yy)	01/30/19
CPUC Project Manager	Billie Blanchard	Monitor(s)	Ben Arax
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Ilja Nieuwenhuizen	AM/PM Weather	62°F, Sunny, wind 3 mph
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Aileen Cole	Start/End time	12:28 PM – 1:10 PM
Project NTP(s)	NTP #1		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all on-site personnel (e.g., construction workers, managers, inspectors, monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed, in accordance with the project's SWPPP??	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) installed correctly (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	X		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways?	X		
Is dust control being implemented, in accordance with the Dust Control Plan (e.g., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are covered with tarps, pull-outs and streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	X		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are vehicles maintaining speed limits: 15 mph on unpaved roads/10 mph off-road?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment/mud and noxious weeds or other plant debris?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A

Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are trenches/excavations covered at night, or when not possible, are wildlife escape ramps installed, constructed of earth fill or wooden planks no less than 10 inches wide?	X		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have required preconstruction surveys been completed for biological resources (special status species, raptors and other nesting birds, burrowing owls, San Joaquin kit fox), as appropriate?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Is project complying with biological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features (e.g., is the refueling/maintenance buffer in place within 100 feet of the irrigation ditch)?	X		
Has wildlife (sensitive species or not) been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred on adjacent habitat (sensitive or not sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are appropriate buffers/exclusion zones for identified sensitive cultural/paleo resources (e.g. cultural sites) clearly marked and being maintained?	X		
Is the project in compliance with cultural/archaeological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
Is the project in compliance with paleontological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for potential archaeological, cultural, or paleontological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used on-site properly managed?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are required fire prevention and control measures in place, and no crew members,	X		

managers, or monitors are smoking onsite?			
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or offsite disposal?	X		
Work Hours and Noise	Yes	No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?	X		
Is construction occurring within approved work hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?	X		

<p>AREAS MONITORED Project areas on and near the substation expansion footprint, existing substation, and the temporary laydown/staging area</p>
<p>DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES 12:28- I arrived on site. The site conditions were very muddy, but in compliance (APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1)</p> <p>12:31- I conducted the site inspection, and observed that soil compaction equipment (Photo 6) was turned off while not in use (APM GHG-1). The substation expansion footprint was graded, clean, and well-kept (Photo 8). I observed that the restrooms were moved from the existing substation footprint to the substation expansion footprint (Photo 1), away from construction equipment. Old concrete fence footings had been removed and laid down east of the retention basin, within the staging area (Photos 2, 4 & 5). A hose from the existing substation footprint leading to the eastern edge of the retention basin was observed (Photo 3). Silt fence was observed sagging adjacent to the water tank on the northwest side of the expansion footprint (Photo 7). The silt fence on the southern side of the northernmost driveway located along McCall Avenue, immediately north of the expansion footprint, had a significant rip (Photo 9).</p> <p>12:50- Completed the site inspection</p> <p>12:55- I met with Jeff Clarkson (PG&E Senior Civil Inspector) and observed up-to-date storm reports. After explaining the rips in the silt fence, Mr. Clarkson explained that Chennie Castañon (PG&E EI) had brought this information to his attention. Mr. Clarkson also stated that he had requested maintenance for the silt fence, and that the repairs are a function of when they are available.</p> <p>1:10- Left Project site</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED MM BIO-1, APM HAZ-3, MM HAZ-2, MM HAZ-1</p> <p>See additional APMs and MMs listed in the description of observed activities section.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP Inspection of silt fence is recommended upon next visit.</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY Below please describe any Compliance Incidents (Level 1, 2, or 3) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a compliance issue in the field, please note this on this monitoring form. In addition, Level 1, 2 or 3 Compliance Incidents, fill out and submit a separate Compliance Incident Report Form.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 0 Acceptable. (no compliance incidents)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Level 1: Minor Problem. An event or observation that slightly deviates from project requirements, but does not put a resource at unpermitted risk. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and fill out a</p>

separate Compliance Incident Form.

Level 2: Compliance Deviation. An event or observation that deviates from project requirements and puts a resource at risk, or shows a trend toward placing resources at risk, but is corrected without affecting the resource. Repeated Level 1 Minor Problems left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 2 Compliance Deviation. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.

Level 3: Non-Compliance. An event or observation that violates project requirements and affects a resource. Repeated Level 2 Compliance Deviations left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 3 Incident. An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the MMCRP applicant proposed measures (APMs) or mitigation measures (MMs), permit conditions, or approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.

Compliance Incidents reported by PG&E's Compliance Team

PG&E's Compliance Team reported Compliance Incidents since last CPUC Compliance Monitor visit. If boxed checked, describe issues and resolution status below.

Description: *(include PG&E's report number)*

New Sensitive Resources

New biological, environmental, cultural/archaeological, or paleontological discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc., has occurred since last CPUC Compliance Monitoring visit. If checked, please describe the new discoveries and documentation/verification below.




Description:




Date	Level	Compliance Incident and Resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	Corresponding Level 1, 2, or 3 Report #

PREVIOUS COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS OR ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:

Silt fence was observed with a significant rip immediately north of the substation expansion footprint, adjacent to the northernmost driveway along McCall Avenue. Jeff Clarkson explained that he contacted site maintenance in order to fix the tear. Follow-up to inspect the silt fence is recommended.

The irrigation pipe had been removed without prior notification.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/30/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 1- Portable restrooms in the expansion footprint, adjacent to the existing substation, have been moved away from construction vehicles. Photo facing south.
1/30/19	Laydown/staging area		Photo 2- Excavated concrete fence footings piled north of the retention basin, within the staging area. Photo facing southwest.
1/30/19	Laydown/staging area		Photo 3- Hose leading from inside the existing substation to the eastern edge of the retention basin. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/30/19	Retention basin		Photo 4- Excavated irrigation pipe east of the retention basin. Photo facing west.
1/30/19	Retention basin		Photo 5- Concrete footings from old fencing has been removed and placed on the eastern side of the retention basin. Photo facing southwest.
1/30/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 6- Vehicles are turned off and staged together while the construction workers are on lunch break. Photo facing northeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/30/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 7- The silt fence adjacent to the water tank on the northwest side of the substation expansion footprint is sagging. Photo facing northwest.
1/30/19	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 8- Well-maintained driveway along McCall Avenue, complete with rumble strips. Photo facing south.
1/30/19	Truck egress point		Photo 9- There is a significant tear in the silt fence on southern side of truck egress point. Photo facing southeast.

Completed by:	Ben Arax
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	1/30/19
Reviewed by:	Danielle Gutierrez
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	1/30/19