



# **Aspen** *Environmental Group*

## **PROJECT MEMORANDUM PG&E ATLANTIC-DEL MAR REINFORCEMENT PROJECT**

**To:** Jensen Uchida, CPUC  
**From:** Vida Strong, Aspen Project Manager  
**Date:** May 18, 2005  
**Subject:** Weekly Report #4: May 8, 2005 – May 14, 2005  
**CPUC Environmental Monitor (EM):** Anne Sweet

Aspen EM Anne Sweet was on site May 12<sup>th</sup> at the Atlantic-Del Mar Project location to monitor construction activities. The weather was clear; however, showers occurred earlier during the subject week. The PG&E Environmental Inspector (EI), Kevin Kilpatrick, was on-site to ensure compliance with the adopted Final Mitigated Negative Declaration and other permit requirements. The PG&E EI also served as the project biologist conducting California tiger salamander (CTS) aestivation surveys, ongoing bird surveys, as well as installation of resource flagging and managing the installation of sediment controls.

### **OVERHEAD:**

#### **Summary of Activity:**

All overhead construction including pole, foundation, and line stringing work will be done by PG&E. The PG&E crews work Mondays through Thursdays.

Per the PG&E EI, the pole numbering used during reporting has been changed; the poles are now labeled sequentially starting at the Del Mar Substation rather than the Atlantic Substation. Thus Pole locations 1-5 as referenced in the previous three Weekly reports are now Pole 3/25, Pole 3/24, Pole 3/23, Pole 3/22, and Pole 3/21 respectively. Foundation work is now complete at these locations. Flagging and erosion controls around resource areas will be kept in place and maintained through pole placement and stringing. Per the Essex EI, the red-tailed hawk nest identified within 250 ft of the Pole 3/21 and 3/22 sites was monitored and no evidence of construction disturbing the birds was noted. Per previous correspondence with CDFG, work is allowable within the 250-ft buffer of the nest as long as disturbance does not occur.

During the site tour on May 4<sup>th</sup>, the CPUC EM, the PG&E EI and the PG&E crew foreman walked the area around Poles 3/20 and 3/19. The project description states that no new access roads will be created as part of the project. Per the PG&E Foreman the main access road which runs under the Roseville Parkway overpass adjacent to Antelope Creek is not stable enough to handle heavy equipment. An alternate area was reviewed, which looks like a decommissioned two-track that PG&E wants to use for access. There is an area which PG&E wants to use for access which connects the two-track to the street, which does not appear to be an access road; however, the area is very disturbed. On May 12<sup>th</sup>, the CPUC EM informed the Essex EI that a Temporary Extra Workspace request will need to be submitted and approved for use of the disturbed non-access road area.

There is no existing access road to provide full access to the Pole 3/19 location. On May 9<sup>th</sup> the PG&E EI submitted a memo which stated that PG&E assumes use of the entire 80-foot easement right-of-way spanning the pole locations for travel and staging. On May 10<sup>th</sup> the CPUC EM informed the PG&E EI that a variance request would be required for any overland travel and/or staging outside of the 100-ft by 100-ft pole location areas addressed in the project documents. Due to the description in the Proponent's Environmental Assessment that no new road would be built, the environmental review for the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was focused on the poles sites and existing access roads. The proposed use of the entire right-of-way cannot occur until the environmental impacts in any areas not expressly assessed in the MND have been assessed and any additional project impacts have been approved by the CPUC in a variance or project amendment.

On May 12<sup>th</sup>, the CPUC EM toured the Pole 2/16 site. Crews had augured the foundation hole that morning. The pole is located adjacent to a drainage swale area and it was noted that no erosion controls were installed around the pole location. The PG&E EI was notified that erosion controls need to be placed to protect drainage areas. Per the crew Foreman during drilling, groundwater was encountered at 17 ft below ground surface (bgs). The foundation hole was drilled to 20 ft bgs. There was standing water located close to the pole area, but when asked about it the Foreman said that the water was from the recent rains, no ground water was removed from the hole. During the concrete pour, the pit overflowed due to ground water intrusion. During the tour, crews were trying to contain the overflow. It was noted that no resource areas were impacted and the area was being cleaned up (see Figure 1). A CTS survey report had not been submitted prior to construction at the Pole 2/16 site. The CPUC EM asked if the area had been surveyed for CTS prior to construction. The PG&E EI said that it had, but the report had not been written or submitted. The CPUC EM told the PG&E EI that prior to construction at all pole locations a CTS survey report must be submitted to the CPUC. If work occurs at another location with out the submittal of a CTS survey report a CPUC Project Memorandum would be issued. The next pole location to be augured, Pole 2/15 was toured. There exists a vernal pool area east of the location. The PG&E EI had begun installing the protective sediment fencing as outlined in the USFWS letter of no effect.

During the site tour on May 12<sup>th</sup>, the CPUC EM and the PG&E EI walked the area around the access road leading to pole 13/17 and pole 3/18. The access road that leads to these locations goes over a culvert which the crew Foreman said would be crushed by the heavy equipment (see Figure 2). Alternate access was looked at; however, after evaluation of the culvert, PG&E decided to bridge/reinforce the area over the culvert to allow heavy equipment travel. The CPUC EM confirmed that clean gravel could be brought in to stabilize and level the area in order to lay down steel plates.

#### **Environmental Compliance Activities:**

Per the Essex EI, the red-tailed hawk nest identified within 250 ft of the Pole 3/21 and 3/22 sites was monitored and no evidence of construction disturbing the birds was noted. Per previous correspondence with CDFG, work is allowable within the 250-ft buffer of the nest as long as disturbance does not occur.

On May 12<sup>th</sup> a CTS survey report had not been submitted prior to construction at the Pole 2/16 site. The CPUC EM told the PG&E EI that prior to construction at all pole locations a CTS survey report must be submitted to the CPUC. If work occurs at another location with out the submittal of a CTS survey report a CPUC Project Memorandum would be issued.

On May 12<sup>th</sup>, the CPUC EM toured the Pole 2/16 site, which had been augured. The pole is located adjacent to a drainage swale area and it was noted that no erosion controls were installed around the pole location. The PG&E EI was notified that erosion controls need to be placed to protect drainage areas.

The CPUC EM observed that all other overhead construction activities were in compliance with mitigation measures adopted in the MND and other permit requirements. Erosion controls were in place around the construction areas, unless otherwise noted.

#### **UNDERGROUND:**

##### **Summary of Activity:**

The underground work including trenching and conduit installation has been contracted to Wilson Construction. The horizontal bore work will be subcontracted. Construction will most likely start with the boring operation at Sunset Avenue, which is tentatively scheduled to start in July.

#### **Environmental Compliance Activities:**

None

**NOTICES TO PROCEED (NTP):**

Table 1 presents the NTPs issued by the CPUC for the Atlantic–Del Mar Project to date.

**TABLE 1  
NOTICES TO PROCEED  
(Updated 5-17-05)**

NTP #	Date Issued	Description
1	11-03-03	Mobilization within the Atlantic and Del Mar Substations, and overhead installation from the Del Mar Substation to the railroad right-of-way (northern 0.25 miles), City of Rocklin.
2	3-08-05	Construction of the remaining overhead portion (approximately 4 miles) and the underground portion (approximately 1.3 miles) of the Atlantic–Del Mar Reinforcement Project, within the Cities of Roseville and Rocklin in Placer County.

**ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE:**

No Non-Compliance Reports (NCRs) or Project Memorandums (PMs) have been issued for the project to date.

**VARIANCE REQUESTS:**

On April 14<sup>th</sup>, PG&E submitted Variance Request #1 to modify the implementation of Applicant Proposed Measure 7.2 at Wetlands #2 and #30. Revisions to Variance Request #1 were submitted on April 19<sup>th</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup>, and 27<sup>th</sup>; and the CPUC EM field validated the revised request with the Essex EI on April 26<sup>th</sup>. The request was approved by CPUC on May 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**TABLE 2  
VARIANCE REQUEST STATUS  
(Updated 5-17-05)**

Variance Request #	Date Submitted	Description	Status	CPUC Approval Date
1	4-19-05	Modify the implementation of Applicant Proposed Measure 7.2 at Wetlands #2 and #30 to allow the use of non-rubber tired vehicles and to allow discretionary re-fueling on the project right-of-way.	Approved	5-2-05

**UPCOMING ITEMS:**

None.

**AGENCY PERSONNEL CONTACTS:**

None.

## Photographs



**Figure 1** – Pole 2/16 location after the concrete pour, May 12, 2005.  
Note the lack of erosion controls.



**Figure 2** – Culvert within an access road slated for use,  
May 12, 2005.