

January 6, 2020

Mr. Michael Rosauer
Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #13 for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

Dear Mr. Rosauer,

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 **November 1 to 30, 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 NTPR 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 off-site location (Fence Meadow Repeater Station).
NTP #2	6/6/2019	6/7/2019	Work within both the existing Sanger Substation footprint and the expansion area, including laydown/staging area setup; installation of pole foundations, installation of poles, power line stringing, removal of pull sites, and restoration of impacted property.

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

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
			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 feet by 112 feet) 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 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., member of WSP (hereafter referred to as E & E) compliance team during this reporting period focused on spot-checks of ongoing construction activities. Compliance Monitors Evan Studley and Sam Hopstone visited the Sanger Substation construction site on **November 15 and 26, 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 Expansion 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 November 2019 reporting period, PG&E did not self-report any compliance incidents, and the CPUC did not issue any compliance incident reports.

Noise Compliance

Mr. Michael Rosauer
January 6, 2020
Page 3

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

Public Concerns

No public concerns were reported during November 2019.

Sincerely,
Ecology and Environment, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Silvia Yanez', written over a horizontal line.

Silvia Yanez
Project Manager

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

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORTS

NOVEMBER 15 AND 26, 2019



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-111519
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Date (mm/dd/yy)	11/15/19
CPUC Project Manager	Michael Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Evan Studley
CPUC (Ecology and Environment, Inc., member of WSP [E & E]) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	Clear, 72°F, calm
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Fernando Guzman	Start/End Time	11:00 AM – 12:05 PM
Project Notices to Proceed NTP(s)	NTP #2		

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 onsite 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 (best management practices [BMPs]) been installed in accordance with the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (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 miles per hour (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 onsite 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, managers, or monitors are smoking onsite?	X		
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or off-site 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		

AREAS MONITORED

Project areas on and near the substation expansion footprint, existing substation, and the temporary laydown/staging area.

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES

11:00 AM- I arrived onsite through north gate. I checked in with Jeff Clarkson (PG&E Senior Civil Inspector) and Ryan Slezak (CPUC Monitoring Supervisor), who provided a construction progress update. Mario provided a safety briefing. No biological resources were encountered during sweeps (MM BIO-2). Pending CPUC approval, biological monitoring will be reduced from full-time monitoring to weekly sweeps. Colibri Ecological Consultants will commence biological monitoring next week, and Miguel Cisneros will commence winter stormwater inspections next week. Current activities include improving the retention basin spillway and removal of the old fence and installation of new, expanded steel mesh fence. Future planned work includes finishing the concrete stairs. Civil construction was concluded in October and general contractor (GC) is proceeding during November.

11:20 AM- I began on south side of facility and observed fence removal and new fence installation (Photo 1). All holes from previous fence posts were covered. Starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) were observed flying in and around the towers. Jeff Clarkson is scheduled to leave the project in three weeks, when James will take over. One tubular steel pole (TSP) installation still remains to be completed. I headed west along northern boundary of expansion footprint. The retention basin has been scarified, and riprap added to the outfall and overflow spillway along the west side of the basin (Photo 2). Concrete swales looked good. The crew was installing red/white tape around swales for safety.

11:45 AM- I entered trailer and checked SWPPP binder for current reporting. The latest report is from 05/24/19. Current reports need to be submitted to SWPPP. I spoke with Ryan Slezak, who confirmed that inspections were being performed. I exited the trailer, noted that concrete vaults have been covered with steel plates. North of the trailer, I observed concrete swales are complete, and crews had poured staircases for the permanent structures. No railings were installed yet.




12:00 PM- I headed north along western boundary and continued to the laydown yard and observed materials stockpiled neatly and trash bins were covered; no debris or trash was noted. I headed east along northern boundary and, along the perimeter, observed wattles with sandbags in good condition (APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1). I headed south along the eastern boundary and observed wattles with sandbags in good condition and materials stockpiles neatly staged. I did not observe any trash or debris. I observed a trash can with fastenable lid at portable restroom. I proceeded south along the eastern boundary of the expansion footprint to the south gate.


12:05 PM- I checked in with Ryan Slezak and Jeff Clarkson before leaving the project site via the north gate.

NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES
MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED APM AES-3, APM AIR-1, MM BIO-2, APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1, MM-HAZ-1, APM NOI-4, MM TRAN-1 See additional applicant proposed measures (APMs) and mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the Description of Observed Activities section.
RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP
COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS
<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. (<i>no compliance incidents</i>)</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 separate Compliance Incident Form.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program (MMCRP) APMs or MMs, permit conditions, or approval requirements (e.g., minor project changes, NTP), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.</p>
<p>Compliance Incidents reported by PG&E's Compliance Team</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PG&E's Compliance Team reported Compliance Incidents since last CPUC Compliance Monitor visit. If boxed checked, describe issues and resolution status below.</p> <p>Description: (<i>include PG&E's report number</i>)</p>
<p>New Sensitive Resources</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p>Description: None.</p>

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	
11/15/19	Southern boundary		Photo 1- New fence going in, old fence being removed. Photo facing southwest.	
11/15/19	Laydown yard		Photo 2- Improved spillway with riprap and filter fabric. Photo facing southwest.	
11/15/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 3- Laydown yard is emptying of materials. Photo facing northwest.	

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/15/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 4- Rumble plates at both entrances are clean, riprap is sediment free, preventing trackout of sediment to roadway. Photo facing southwest.

Completed by:	Evan Studley
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	11/15/19
Reviewed by:	Sam Hopstone
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	11/16/19



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-112619
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Date (mm/dd/yy)	11/26/19
CPUC Project Manager	Michael Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Evan Studley, Sam Hopstone
CPUC (Ecology and Environment, Inc., member of WSP [E & E]) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	Clear, 70°F, calm
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Fernando Guzman	Start/End Time	2:00 PM – 2:50 PM
Project Notices to Proceed NTP(s)	NTP #2		

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 onsite 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 (best management practices [BMPs]) been installed in accordance with the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (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 miles per hour (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 onsite 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, managers, or monitors are smoking onsite?	X		
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or off-site 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 2:00 PM- We arrived onsite through southernmost gate in the old substation and checked in with Jeff Clarkson (PG&E Senior Civil Inspector) and Ryan Slezak, a biological supervisor with Colibri Ecological Consulting. Clarkson provided a construction progress update. Demobilization of civil crews has begun, and the crew will not work the rest of the week or the weekend. The SWPPP binder is being updated with the revised BMPs to be implemented during the rainy season. The south permanent fence is under construction.</p> <p>2:15 PM- We observed the fence construction and Retention basin and proceeded north along western swale to the laydown yard (Photos 1 and 2).</p> <p>2:20 PM- We entered south gate of laydown yard. We observed the trash roll-off bin has a durable cover for the incoming rain. The laydown yard is clean and no trash was observed (Photo 4). We exited the laydown yard and proceeded north along western swale. We observed that all foundations are complete and transformers have been placed on the foundations. The poles are being erected and grounding wire is being laid in the trenches.</p> <p>2:30 PM- We reached the north boundary and proceeded east along north fence to the north gate. We observed that the north gate is locked and all prior soil stockpiles have been removed (APM BIO-11). We proceeded south along east fence and observed all material is staged on pallets off the ground and restrooms are secondarily contained.</p> <p>2:40 PM- We entered the trailer and checked the SWPPP binder (APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1). The monthly inspections from the summer months have been updated.</p> <p>2:45 PM- We checked in with Mr. Slezak and exited the project site through southernmost gate in the old substation.</p>
<p>NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED APM AES-3, APM AIR-1, APM BIO-11, MM BIO-2, APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1, MM-HAZ-1, APM NOI-4, MM TRAN-1</p> <p>See additional applicant proposed measures (APMs) and mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the Description of Observed Activities section.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP</p>

COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS

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.

- Level 0 Acceptable.** (*no compliance incidents*)
- 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 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 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program (MMCRP) APMs or MMs, permit conditions, or approval requirements (e.g., minor project changes, NTP), 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:
None.

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
11/26/19	Old substation		Photo 1- Permanent fence is under construction along the south site boundary. Photo facing east.
11/26/19	Old substation		Photo 2- Retention pond has been roped off to prevent access. Photo facing north.
11/26/19	Old substation		Photo 3- Stairs to permanent structures are complete. Drainage swale has been roped off to prevent ped access. Photo facing east.
11/26/19	Laydown yard		Photo 4- Trash bins are covered for incoming rainstorm. Laydown yard is clean, no trash on ground. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/26/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 5- Equipment have oil drip pans to protect surrounding soil during incoming rainstorm. Photo facing northeast.
11/26/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 6- An open pit is covered with plywood, identified, and roped off to prevent pedestrian access. Photo facing southwest.

Completed by:	Evan Studley
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	11/26/19
Reviewed by:	Sam Hopstone
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	11/29/19