

March 8, 2021

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #28 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 February 1 to 28, 2021, 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 February 10 and 24, 2021. 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  
March 8, 2021  
Page 3

#### Compliance Incidents and Minor Compliance Observations

During the February 2021 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 February 2021 reporting period, there were no exceedances of the stipulated noise levels.

#### Public Concerns

No public concerns were reported during February 2021.

Sincerely,  
Ecology and Environment, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Silvia Yanez', with a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Silvia Yanez  
Project Manager

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

# ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORTS

FEBRUARY 10 AND 24, 2021



## Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	PG&E	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-092420
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission	Date (mm/dd/yy)	2/10/21
CPUC Project Manager	Mike Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Ben Arax
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	Partly Cloudy, 47°F, wind 3 mph
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Angelica Oregel	Start/End time	8:00 – 8:50 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		

<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</p> <p>8:00 - Arrived on site, crew observed working east of the substation. Met with SWCA biologist Angelica Oregel and shadowing monitor Travis Albert.</p> <p>8:06 – Conducted site inspection. Ms. Oregel stated that the crew on-site was taking down old lines from an existing tower (Photo 1, Photo 2). The tower is the former site of a Red-tailed hawk nest. The nest was inactive and the hawk has not been seen for some time. Because of this, the crew was approved to remove the tower (MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, MM BIO-4). This tower, per Ms. Oregel, is to be taken down Thursday. The same day, a paleontologist is expected to look for any archaeological/historical resources, if present. New power lines are to be installed on Saturday. Ms. Oregel also stated that grading and paving inside the substation will occur in March.</p> <p>8:30 – Observed crew implementing traffic safety procedures (Photo 3) to minimize traffic accidents (MM TRAN-1).</p> <p>8:53- Exited site through egress point onto McCall Avenue.</p>
<p>NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED</p> <p>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</p> <p>See additional APMs and MMs listed in the description of observed activities section.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP</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. (<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</p>

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
2/10/2021	East of existing substation		Photo 1- Crew working on TSPs/power poles. Photo facing southeast.
2/10/2021	East of existing substation		Photo 2- Crew removing old power lines. Photo facing southwest.
2/10/2021	McCall Avenue		Photo 3- Traffic cones in place to mitigate accidents, etc. Photo facing south.

Completed by:	Ben Arax
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	2/10/2021
Reviewed by:	Travis Albert
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	2/11/2021



## Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report

Project Proponent	PG&E	Report No.	CM-CPUCDG-022421
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission	Date (mm/dd/yy)	2/24/21
CPUC Project Manager	Mike Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Ben Arax
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Manager	Silvia Yanez	AM/PM Weather	Clear, 43°F, wind 2 mph
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Angelica Oregel	Start/End time	8:00 – 8:57 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		

<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</p> <p>8:00 - Arrived on site. Met with SWCA biologist Angelica Oregel and shadowing monitors Travis Albert and Marianna Fusich-Waller.</p> <p>8:05 – Conducted site inspection. The crew on site was observed pulling out grounding wire (Photo 1) and connecting jumpers (Photo 2). Ms. Oregel stated that construction was virtually completed outside of the substation. She also stated that the crew was redtagging equipment in the staging area to be moved off-site (Photo 3). Grading in the staging area is expected to occur in mid-March.</p> <p>8:13 – Crew was observed removing and replacing conductors within the existing substation footprint (Photo 4).</p> <p>8:45 – Up-to-date SWPPP reports were observed (APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1).</p> <p>8:57- Exited site through egress point onto McCall Avenue.</p>
<p>NEW SENSITIVE RESOURCE DISCOVERIES</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED</p> <p>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</p> <p>See additional APMs and MMs listed in the description of observed activities section.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP</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. (<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</p>

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
2/24/2021	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 1- Crew pulling grounding wires. Photo facing north.
2/24/2021	Substation expansion footprint		Photo 2- Crew connecting jumpers. Photo facing northwest.
2/24/2021	Staging Area		Photo 3- Equipment redtagged for removal. Photo facing northeast.
2/24/21	Existing substation footprint		Photo 4- Crew removing and replacing conductors. Photo facing east.

Completed by:	Ben Arax
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	2/24/2021
Reviewed by:	Marianna Fusich-Waller
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	2/24/2021