

January 24, 2021

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #26 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 December 1 to 31, 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 WSP) 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 December 8 and 15, 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 Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP), as well as any non-compliance issues and resolutions, and public complaints, and notifications.

Mr. Michael Rosauer
January 24, 2021
Page 3

Compliance Incidents and Minor Compliance Observations

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

Public Concerns

No public concerns were reported during December 2020.

Sincerely,
Ecology and Environment, Inc.

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

Silvia Yanez
Project Manager

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

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORTS DECEMBER 8 AND 15, 2020



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	PG&E	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-120820
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission	Date (mm/dd/yy)	12/08/20
CPUC Project Manager	Mike Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Ben Arax
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	Sunny, 41°F, wind 5 mph
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Angelica Oregel	Start/End time	7:57 – 8:35 AM
Project 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 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, 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

7:57- Arrived on site, crew was not present. Met with SWCA biologist Angelica Oregel.

8:00 – Conducted site inspection on the outside of the footprint. Ms. Oregel stated that several TSPs were constructed on the eastern side of the footprint (Photo 1). Ms. Oregel conducts daily sweeps for sensitive species before commencement of work (MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3). She reported that no biological resources have recently been observed on site. The south retention basin was in good condition (Photo 2). A break in the outer fence was observed upon inspection (Photo 3), which Ms. Oregel immediately notified the foreman on site of. Site materials were cleanly stored (Photo 4).

010:33- Exited site through egress point onto McCall Avenue.

NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED
 APM AES-3, APM-AIR-1, MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1, APM-NOI-3, 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 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: 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
12/08/20	McCall Avenue		Photo 1- Constructed TSPs. Photo facing east.
12/08/20	Old Substation		Photo 2- Retention basin clean and undisturbed. Photo facing east.
12/08/20	Laydown Yard		Photo 3- Break in the fence observed. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/08/20	Laydown Yard		Photo 4- Staged materials. Photo facing south.

Completed by:	Ben Arax
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	12/08/20
Reviewed by:	Sam Hopstone
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	12/13/2020



Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	PG&E	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-121520
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission	Date (mm/dd/yy)	12/15/20
CPUC Project Manager	Mike Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Sam Hopstone
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	foggy, 38°F, calm
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Angelica Oregel	Start/End time	08:15 – 09:00
Project 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 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, 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, temporary laydown/staging area, and fields east and west of expansion footprint.

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES

08:15- Arrived on site. Entered field east of McCall Avenue through north entrance, parallel to northern boundary of expansion footprint. Continued east, then south to the main clearing adjacent to TSP foundations and staged TSP components. Observed no crews or recent activity in the area (Photo 1).

08:25- Continued south along east perimeter road to Jensen Avenue. Turned right, proceeded west along Jensen Avenue, past the fields west of the laydown yard, and turned right onto the perimeter road at the west boundary of the field. Proceeded north along the perimeter road, then east along the northern perimeter road to the northwest corner of the laydown yard (Photo 2).

08:35- Met SWCA biologist Angelica Oregel in staging area adjacent to the northwest corner of the laydown yard. Current activity includes T-Line crews stringing cables and conduits between TSPs and surrounding existing power lines. Ms. Oregel conducts daily sweeps for sensitive species surrounding the project footprint, the wildlife buffer surrounding the footprint, and any temporary work areas outside the boundary of the expansion footprint (MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3). She reported that no special status species have been observed on site.

08:45- Proceeded south along the west boundary of the laydown yard and observed crews staging trucks and heavy equipment in the laydown yard, preparing to mobilize for stringing activities in the fields west of the laydown yard (Photo 3). Returned to vehicle, and proceeded west along the perimeter road along the north boundary of the field. Continued west to Thompson Avenue, turned left, proceeded south to clearing adjacent to TSP's along Thompson Avenue.

08:55- (Photo 4).

Returned to vehicle, proceeded south along Thompson Avenue to Jensen Avenue, turned left and continued east along Jensen Avenue to south boundary of old substation. Observed that detention basin is in good condition, and most of the stormwater flows from recent storms have infiltrated as designed (Photo 5).

09:00- Departed from site onto Jensen Avenue.

NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED

APM AES-3, APM-AIR-1, MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1, APM-NOI-3, 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 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: 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
12/15/20	East Field		Photo 1- Multiple TSPs have been installed, and conduit strung, in the fields east of McCall Avenue. View west.
12/15/20	West Field		Photo 2- Crews have opened a secondary entrance in laydown yard. Delineators demarcate potential rut areas in roadway. View southeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/15/20	West Field		Photo 3- Crews stage T-Line equipment and vehicles in laydown yard prior to stringing lines to TSP's. View southeast.
12/15/20	Thompson Avenue		Photo 4- Cables have been hung between new substation and surrounding TSPs in fields adjacent to Thompson Avenue. View southeast.
12/15/20	Expansion Footprint		Photo 5- Remaining equipment and materials are staged out of the path of travel. View southeast.

Completed by:	Sam Hopstone
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	12/15/20
Reviewed by:	Jedidiah Yoxtheimer
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	12/15/20