

August 17, 2020

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #20 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 **June 1 to 30, 2020**, 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 offsite 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 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 **June 3 and 18, 2020**. 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

Mr. Michael Rosauer
August 17, 2020
Page 3

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 June 2020 reporting period, PG&E did not self-report any compliance incidents, and the CPUC did not issue any compliance incident reports.

Noise Compliance

During the June 2020 reporting period, there were no exceedances of the stipulated noise levels.

Public Concerns

No public concerns were reported during June 2020.

Sincerely,
Ecology and Environment, Inc.



Silvia Yanez
Project Manager

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

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORTS

JUNE 3 AND 18, 2020



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-060320
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Date (mm/dd/yy)	06/03/20
CPUC Project Manager	Billie Blanchard	Monitor(s)	Sam Hopstone
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	Clear, 82°F, calm
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Angelica Oregel	Start/End time	07:00 AM – 08:00 AM
Project NTP(s)	Notice to Proceed (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 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		

AREAS MONITORED

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

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES

07:00 AM – I arrived onsite and entered through the south gate into the existing substation footprint. I checked in with the SWCA Biologist Angelica Oregel. Current activity included feeding wire through underground conduit, installing wiring on closed circuit television (CCTV) wiring, testing insulators, and drilling for a foundation east of South McCall Avenue. Future activities include the same. Ms. Oregel conducted daily sweeps for sensitive species before commencement of work (Mitigation Measures [MM] BIO-2, MM BIO-3).

07:10 AM – I proceeded southwest to the detention basin and observed that the entire basin remained in good condition (Applicant Proposed Measure [APM] WQ-1). I headed north into the expansion footprint and met with the PG&E Foreman James Kacerek, who joined the monitoring tour. We observed that crews had been feeding cables into vaults and through the underground conduit. All vaults that did not have the lid secured were delineated and roped off to prevent pedestrian access (Photo 1). We headed west into the temporary staging area.

7:20 AM – I proceeded north through the temporary staging area, which was mostly empty with a clear path for travel. I observed water trucks that were mobilized onsite for dust suppression (APM AIR-1). I exited east through the north gate into the expansion footprint. A paleontologist checked in before proceeding to the excavation site east of the project site, on the other side of South McCall Avenue (MM CUL-1). I observed that earthwork had been completed and no soil was stockpiled onsite, and the stockpile location had been compacted (Photo 2).

7:40 AM – I continued east along the north project boundary to the east fence and proceeded south along the east side of the work area. Ms. Oregel observed an active mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*) nest and eggs in the gear chain of a manlift along the east fence (Photo 3). A wildlife buffer was secured around the equipment (MM BIO-4), consisting of delineators and red/white flagging (Photo 4). Mr. Kacerek promptly notified all crews working onsite and notified PG&E of the nest and proposed activities.

7:50 AM – Ms. Oregel assessed the potential dimensions of the new wildlife buffer for the request to be submitted that day and headed to the construction trailers to locate the wildlife buffer signage. I proceeded south along the east boundary to the south boundary of the expansion footprint. I observed that the western kingbird (*Tyrannus verticalis*) buffer delineation had not changed, and the buffer materials remained in good condition (Photo 5).

7:55 AM – I proceeded south into the existing substation footprint. I entered the construction trailer and checked

the SWPPP binder (APM GEO-2), which was current through mid-May. No deficiencies had been reported.

8:00 AM – I checked in with Ms. Oregel and Mr. Kacerek, both of whom had no issues to report. I exited the site through the southern gate in the existing substation and proceeded north on South McCall Avenue to the excavation site. I observed multiple PG&E crews and the paleontological monitor mobilizing for the drilling that was scheduled to be performed that day (Photo 6). All vehicles were staged well away from the traffic lanes and shoulder of South McCall Avenue (MM TRAN-1).

NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED

APM AES-3, APM BIO-11, MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1, MM HAZ-1, APM NOI-4

See additional APMs and MMs listed in the Description of Observed Activities section.

RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP

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, 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:
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
06/03/20	Expansion footprint		Photo 1 – All vaults that were entered for work were delineated until work had been completed and the cover was secured. Photo facing northeast.
06/03/20	Expansion footprint		Photo 2 – Earthwork had been completed and the soil stockpile was removed. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
06/03/20	Expansion footprint		Photo 3 – A mourning dove established a nest in a manlift near the east boundary. Photo facing south.
06/03/20	Expansion footprint		Photo 4 – The crew rapidly responded, notified all workers onsite, and implemented a nest buffer for the mourning doves. Photo facing north.
06/03/20	Expansion footprint		Photo 5 – The western kingbird buffer remained in good condition. Photo facing southeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
06/03/20	South McCall Avenue		Photo 6 – Crews prepared to drill a foundation east of McCall Avenue. Photo facing east.

Completed by:	Sam Hopstone
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	06/03/20
Reviewed by:	Evan Studley
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	06/03/20



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-061820
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Date (mm/dd/yy)	06/18/20
CPUC Project Manager	Billie Blanchard	Monitor(s)	Evan Studley
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	Clear, 76°F, calm
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Angelica Oregel	Start/End time	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Project NTP(s)	Notice to Proceed (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 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		

AREAS MONITORED

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

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES

8:30 AM – I arrived onsite and entered through the north gate into the substation expansion footprint. I checked in with the SWCA Biologist Angelica Oregel. Current activity included feeding wire through underground conduit, installing closed circuit television (CCTV) wiring, testing insulators, and drilling for a foundation east of South McCall Avenue. Future activities included the same. Ms. Oregel conducted daily sweeps for sensitive species before commencement of work (Mitigation Measures [MM] BIO-2, MM BIO-3).

8:45 AM – I proceeded west with Ms. Oregel to the temporary staging area. All materials observed to be stockpiled neatly, and no refuse was observed. A small puddle was present beneath the water tower spigot. I headed south towards the infiltration basin; it appeared in good condition (Applicant Proposed Measure [APM] WQ-1). I headed north to the construction trailer to inspect the SWPPP binder. All required SWPPP inspection reports had been submitted through mid-May. I proceeded north into the expansion footprint.

0855- I proceeded east through the substation expansion to the eastern boundary. All vaults were secured during the inspection. I observed that the western kingbird (*Tyrannus verticalis*) buffer delineation was unchanged and the buffer materials remained in good condition. I observed water trucks had been mobilized on site for dust control (APM AIR-1). I proceeded north along the eastern boundary of the substation expansion footprint. I observed that straw wattles remained in good condition outside the fence line. I observed the wildlife buffer consisting of delineators and red and white flagging around the active mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*) nest and eggs in the gear chain of a manlift along the east fence (MM BIO-4).

0900- I checked in with Ms. Oregel who had no issues to report. I exited the site through the northern gate in the new substation footprint. All vehicles were staged well away from the traffic lanes and shoulder of South McCall Avenue or within the substation footprint (MM TRAN-1).

NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED

APM AES-3, APM BIO-11, MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1, MM HAZ-1, APM NOI-4

See additional APMs and MMs listed in the Description of Observed Activities section.

RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP

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, 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:
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

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description

Completed by:	Evan Studley
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	06/22/20
Reviewed by:	Sam Hopstone
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	08/27/20