

February 8, 2019

Lisa Orsaba
Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #15 for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project

Dear Ms. Orsaba,

This report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **December 1 to 31, 2018**, for the Mesa 500-kilovolt (kV) Substation (Mesa Substation) Project in Los Angeles County, California. Compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by Southern California Edison (SCE) and their contractors comply with the requirements of the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Mesa Substation Project, as adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on February 9, 2017.

The CPUC has issued the following Notices to Proceed (NTPs) for the Mesa Substation Project to SCE:

- NTP #1 (September 27, 2017) – Vegetation removal and grading, water line relocation, Operating Industries Incorporated (OII) well removal, and various line relocations (transmission, subtransmission, distribution, and telecommunications).
- NTP #2 (November 15, 2017) – Remaining construction components, including vegetation removal and grading, and the removal, replacement, relocation, modification, and/or construction of perimeter and retaining walls, Mechanical Electrical Equipment Rooms (MEERs), operations and test and maintenance buildings, storm drains, lattice steel towers, various poles, underground trenches, concrete foundations, and associated components. Equipment modification at 29 satellite substations.

Onsite compliance monitoring by the Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E) compliance team during this reporting period focused on spot-checks of ongoing construction activities. Compliance Monitor Vince Semonsen visited the Mesa Substation construction sites on **December 4, 11, and 18, 2018**. Site inspection 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 Mesa Substation 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 SCE 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 SCE, along with daily schedule updates and database notifications, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, SCE's monthly compliance status report for November 2018, submitted to the CPUC on January 10, 2019, provided a compliance summary and included a description of construction activities from November 1 to 30, 2018, a detailed look-ahead construction schedule, a summary of compliance with Mesa Substation Project commitments (MMs/APMs) for biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), noise, and the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP), non-compliance issues and resolutions, and public complaints and notifications.

Compliance Incidents

During the December 2018 reporting period, SCE self-reported one non-project related compliance observation. The compliance observation did not elevate to a non-compliance.

- On December 19, 2018, a biological monitor observed a non-project related O&M Environmental Solutions (adjacent property) crew conducting soil surface monitoring using hand tools and a work truck within the coastal sage scrub Environmentally Sensitive Area (Restricted Use Area) south of Grading Area 2B and within 100 feet south of the Environmentally Sensitive Area. No ground disturbance was observed. The activities occurred within Coastal California Gnatcatcher coastal sage scrub habitat. The area affected was surveyed and was partially within the Restricted Use Area and partially within the 100 foot Environmentally Sensitive Area buffer.

During the December 2018 reporting period, the CPUC Compliance Monitor reported the following compliance concerns:

- On December 4, 2018, the CPUC Compliance Monitor observed substantial erosion along the large detention basin slopes, as well as some jute netting damage where stormwater had overwhelmed BMPs around the detention basin. He also observed an area in the southeastern corner of the project site where stormwater had flowed into a wall trench, running along the wall until it left the Mesa Substation Site at a low spot. The CPUC Compliance Monitor and the Qualified SWPPP Inspector had previously identified this location as requiring a berm, but the berm was never installed. Overall, the CPUC Compliance Monitor noted a need for additional BMP installation onsite.
- On December 11, 2018, the CPUC Compliance Monitor observed substantial erosion where water had rapidly flowed towards the detention basin. He noted that improved BMP installations could help minimize this erosion. Additionally, he noted that the water level line in the large detention basin was approximately six feet from the basin floor, though the basin was no longer filled with water. Sediment-laden stormwater had overwhelmed the sandbags and Visqueen plastic that SCE had installed surrounding the standpipe. The sediment-laden stormwater then rapidly left the detention basin through the small holes located near the base of the standpipe, leaving the Mesa Substation Site through the storm drain system.
- On December 18, 2018, the CPUC Compliance Monitor noted that BMPs should be upgraded sitewide, including at both detention basins, to better manage stormwater flow. Additionally, he observed that the large detention basin was nearly dry, indicating that nearly all of water that had run into the basin during recent rain events had flowed offsite through the standpipe and into the storm drain system.

Noise Compliance

During the December 2018 reporting period, SCE self-reported multiple noise exceedances on December 27, 2018. However, these noise exceedances were all the result of instrument calibration, and were not project-related. CPUC therefore has not identified these noise exceedances as compliance incidents.

Spills

During the December 2018 reporting period, there were no documented spills.

Public Concerns


There were no public concerns during December 2018.

Minor Approvals

In December 2018, SCE requested permission to start planned construction in the Pasadena City College parking lot earlier than was scheduled, per Pasadena City College request. The expedited schedule would ensure that all parking spaces are available to students and staff when winter break ends. The CPUC approved

SCE's request for an expedited schedule on December 11, 2018. The expedited schedule should minimize anticipated traffic and facilities impacts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ijja Nieuwenhuizen".

Ijja Nieuwenhuizen
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:
Lori Rangel, SCE
Don Dow, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Reports
December 4, 11, and 18, 2018



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	December 4, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS051
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Lisa Orsaba, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Sunny, mild temps and breezy
E & E CM:	Caitlin Barns	Start/End time:	1115 – 1345 hrs
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, 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 new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed?		X	
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) properly installed (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?		X	
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways, in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are tarped, 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 observed vehicles maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads? Except for the belly scrappers.	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment or 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?	X		

Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are wildlife escape ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Has wildlife been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts to these features?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?			X
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite, if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo 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?	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 hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?			X

AREAS MONITORED (i.e., structure numbers, yards, or substations)

The Mesa Substation work, the stormwater drainpipe installation, conduit installation work, and the Transmission Corridor work north of Potrero Grande Drive and south of Hwy 60.

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES (i.e., mitigation measures of particular focus or concern, construction activity, any discussions with first-party monitors or construction crews)

I arrived onsite at 1115 hrs and notified Pete Lubich (ULM Services) of my arrival. I then contacted QSP Lucy Cortez-Johnson regarding rainfall totals; she said that the site had received approximately 1.15 inches of rain from the last storm and that she was onsite on Monday 12/3/18 overseeing the post-storm clean-up.

I walked to the Senior MEER building and photographed the ongoing construction – Photo 1.

Concrete has been poured or is currently being poured at a number of locations throughout the project – Photos 6, 7 & 12. Concrete trucks were washing out in the designated concrete washing location – Photo 2.

Foundation installation continues in the 220-kV rack area for the large “disconnect” equipment. Any holes/excavations that remained overnight were covered with black plastic – Photo 3.

There was some ponded water in the large detention basin – Photo 4. Some of the rainwater runoff from the project site came into the detention basin over the jute netting, causing some slope erosion. I discussed site drainage and BMP maintenance with Power Grade foreman Willie Clark.

The smaller triangular detention basin located at the western end of the project site was nearly filled with water – Photo 5.

A crew was pouring concrete for the southern boundary combo wall fence posts – Photo 6.

Crews are backfilling the conduit trench with slurry. Crews recently finished slurring a trench by the southern wall – Photo 7.

Ponded water remains throughout the project site – Photo 8.

Stormwater runoff from the southeastern portion of the project flowed down toward the southern boundary wall – Photo 9. It flowed into the wall trench – Photo 10, running along the outside of the wall until it left the project site at a low spot – Photo 11. Lucy Cortez-Johnson (QSP) arrived onsite; I showed Lucy Cortez-Johnson and Craig Pernot (Power Grade Safety Lead) the rainwater runoff area. This is the location Lucy Cortez-Johnson and I inspected during my previous site visit, when we both agreed that a berm was needed to redirect stormwater runoff. However, the berm was never installed.

Crews are conducting tower work within the telecommunications area north of Potrero Grande Drive – Photo 13.

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-9. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).
See the MMs listed in the observed activities.

RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)

BMP maintenance and site drainage.

COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance on-site, environmental observations of note)

Better control of rainwater sheet flow through the project site is needed.



COMPLIANCE SUMMARY



Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3 fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to E & E Compliance Manager. Inform E & E CM of any non-compliance incidents.

- New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- Non-compliance – Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-Compliance Level 3: 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 APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.

Date	Non-compliance issue and resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #



PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCE ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:


REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 1 – Senior MEER building construction. Photo facing south
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 2 – Concrete trucks washing out in the designated location.
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 3 – Foundation work continues within the 220-kV rack area. Open holes are covered with black plastic overnight. Photo facing north

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 4 – Some ponding of water in the detention basin. Photo facing southwest
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 5 – Small triangular detention basin is nearly full. Photo facing west

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 6 – Wall work along the southern boundary of the Mesa Substation site. Photo facing west
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 7 – The conduit trench was recently backfilled with concrete slurry. Photo facing west
12/4/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Poned water onsite. Photo facing west

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 9 – Evidence of rainwater runoff coming from the southeastern portion of the site. Photo facing east
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 10 – Rainwater entered the boundary wall trench. Photo facing southwest

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 11 – Rainwater runoff exited the project site at this location along the outside of the southern boundary wall. Photo facing east
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 12 – Crews pouring concrete slurry. Photo facing north

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/4/18	Mesa substation		Photo 13 – Tower work within the telecommunications corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive. Photo facing south



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	December 11, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS052
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Lisa Orsaba, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Mostly sunny, mild temps and calm
E & E CM:	Caitlin Barns	Start/End time:	0930 – 1330 hrs
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, 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 new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed?		X	
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) properly installed (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?		X	
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways, in accordance with the project’s SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are tarped, 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 observed vehicles maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads? Except for the belly scrappers.	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment or 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?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		

Are excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are wildlife escape ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Has wildlife been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts to these features?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?			X
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite, if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo 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?	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 hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?			X

AREAS MONITORED (i.e., structure numbers, yards, or substations)

The Mesa Substation work, the stormwater drainpipe installation, conduit installation work, and the Transmission Corridor work north of Potrero Grande Drive and south of Hwy 60.

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES (i.e., mitigation measures of particular focus or concern, construction activity, any discussions with first-party monitors or construction crews)

I arrived onsite at 0930 hrs and notified Pete Lubich (ULM Services) that I was onsite.

The site was very muddy; I talked to lead environmental biologist Matt Daniele (ICF), who said that the project site received nearly 3 inches of rain in the most recent storm system. He said that it rained all day on Thursday, 12/6/2018, with occasional periods of heavy rain (approximately one inch per hour). I also saw biological monitor Wayne Woodroof (Noreas) onsite and we talked about onsite work and cleanup activities after the rain.

Construction activities were ongoing at the Senior MEER – Photo 1. A crew was shoveling out mud from the Senior MEER conduit pulling pits and cleaning up the general vicinity – Photo 2.

Crews continued to install the “disconnect” equipment within the 220-kV rack area – Photo 3, and were conducting trenching work in the area – Photo 4. I met and talked to Power Grade foreman Shane Londagin, who said there are approximately 120 to 150 crewmembers onsite.

There had been substantial rainwater runoff during the recent storm event, as indicated by the erosion riles created by water flowing off the existing substation site – Photo 5, and the water filled excavations observed throughout the project site – Photo 6.

Sheet flow across the project site was primarily directed into the detention basin. Large erosion riles developed where the water entered the basin at the northeast – Photo 7, and southeast corners of the detention basin – Photo 8. The water in the detention basin appeared to have reached a maximum depth of approximately 6 feet, as indicated by the sediment line on the bank by the standpipe – Photo 9. The gravel bags and Visqueen plastic that had covered the holes in the standpipe failed – Photo 10, allowing the sediment-laden stormwater runoff to drain offsite.

Stormwater runoff had also filled the small triangular detention basin at westernmost edge of the project site – Photo 11. Water flowing off the project site had eroded the banks of the small triangular basin as well – Photo 12, filling it to a level several feet higher than the standpipe – Photo 13. The opening to this standpipe had been covered with a piece of filter fabric, but the filter fabric failed, allowing captured water to leave the site. Water was being pumped from the small triangular basin into the large detention basin; this pumped water immediately ran offsite through the standpipe and into the stormdrain system.

Crews continue work on the southern boundary combo wall – Photo 16. There was substantial surface flow down the access road along the inside of the boundary wall – Photo 15; this water had been redirected away from the wall trench, and therefore did not leave the Mesa Substation Site – Photo 14.

Work on the Mesa Operations Building continues, though conditions are very muddy – Photo 17.

The telecommunications corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive was being cleaned up after rainwater overwhelmed most of the BMPs during the most recent rain event. Crews were working on cleaning out the “V” ditches, reestablishing the straw wattles, and potentially hydromulching the whole area. SWPPP inspector Lucy Cortez-Johnson had indicated that most hydroseeding crews were currently booked conducting repairs following wildfires elsewhere in the state.

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-9. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).
See the MMs listed in the observed activities.

RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)

BMP maintenance and site drainage.

COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance on-site, environmental observations of note)

Seal the detention basin standpipe so that it holds water and allows suspended sediment to settle prior to draining.




COMPLIANCE SUMMARY




Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3 fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to E & E Compliance Manager. Inform E & E CM of any non-compliance incidents.

- New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- Non-compliance – Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-Compliance Level 3: 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 APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.


Date	Non-compliance issue and resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #




PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCE ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 1 – Senior MEER building construction. Photo facing south
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 2 – Crews cleaning mud from around the conduit – pulling pits near the Senior MEER building. Photo facing east
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 3 – Foundation installation work and installation of the “disconnect” structures continue within the 220-kV rack area. Photo facing north

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 4 – Some trenching work being done. Photo facing west
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 5 – Erosion rille generated by stormwater runoff leaving the Mesa Substation Site.
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 6 – Rack foundation excavations filled with stormwater runoff. Photo facing north

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 7 – Rainwater runoff was directed into the detention basin – note the erosion rills on the bank. Photo facing east
12/11/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Erosion rill on the southeast corner of the detention basin. Photo facing northwest
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 9 – Standpipe in the large detention basin – note the water level on the banks (approximately 6 feet in height from the bottom of the basin).

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 10 – Significant quantities of sediment-laden water drained out of the detention basin at the base of the standpipe, entering the stormdrain system.
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 11 – Rainwater runoff captured in the smaller triangular detention basin. Photo facing west
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 12 – Erosion along the banks of the triangular detention basin. Photo facing east

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 13 – Standpipe in the triangular detention basin.
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 14 – Gravel bags placed along the outside of the southern boundary fence where stormwater had previously escaped the Mesa Substation Site.
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 15 – Evidence of large amounts of stormwater runoff running along the southern portion of the project site. Photo facing west

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 16 - Wall work along the southern boundary of the project area. Photo facing southeast
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 17 – Work on the Mesa Operations Building. Photo facing northwest
12/11/18	Mesa substation		Photo 18 – BMP repairs within the telecommunications corridor North of Potrero Grande. Photo facing north



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	December 18, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS053
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Lisa Orsaba, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Hazy sunshine, mild temps and calm
E & E CM:	Caitlin Barns	Start/End time:	1230 – 1445 hrs
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, 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 new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) properly installed (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?		X	
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways, in accordance with the project’s SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are tarped, 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 observed vehicles maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads? Except for the belly scrappers.	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment or 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?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		

Are excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are wildlife escape ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Has wildlife been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts to these features?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?			X
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite, if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo 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?	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 hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?			X

AREAS MONITORED (i.e., structure numbers, yards, or substations)

The Mesa Substation work, the stormwater drainpipe installation, conduit installation work, and the Transmission Corridor work north of Potrero Grande Drive and south of Highway 60.

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES (i.e., mitigation measures of particular focus or concern, construction activity, any discussions with first-party monitors or construction crews)

I arrived onsite at 1230 hrs and notified Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.) of my arrival. We discussed the detention basin. Pete

Lubich said the Mesa Substation Site did not receive any rain during the last storm system that moved through the region.

Work on the Senior MEER continues – Photo 1.

Installation of the above- and below-ground infrastructure continues within the 220-kV rack area. Crews were raising and placing the large rack support structures – Photo 2, and trenching the copper grounding wire through the newly installed “disconnects” – Photo 3.

Substantial construction equipment was parked onsite; all equipment appears to have well-placed drip pans.

I spoke with Bob Hutar (biological monitor, Noreas), who stated that he will be leaving the Mesa Substation Project at the end of 2018.

The small triangular detention basin is nearly dry; water is being pumped from the small triangular detention basin into the large detention basin – Photo 4. BMPs should be upgraded at the detention basins for effectiveness in future rain events.

The large detention basin was also nearly dry – Photo 5. Photo 6 is a close-up of the standpipe, showing where sediment-laden water is draining out through the bottom of the standpipe system. Pete and I discussed possible ways to seal the standpipe to prevent this.

Crews continue work on the southern boundary combo wall. Activities include both foundation work – Photo 8, and fencing installation on top of the wall – Photo 7.

A crew was pouring concrete slurry within the 220-kV rack area – Photo 9.

I observed multiple locations where additional BMP installation/maintenance might help site conditions. Sheet flow through the southern portion of the project reaches a small berm lined with gravel bags – Photo 10; this berm should be made larger to accommodate heavy flows. Additionally, it appeared that rainwater runoff from Highway 60 had bypassed the grouted riprap entry site and spilled into the project area – Photo 11; installation of additional gravel bags would help manage this onsite flow. At the end of my site visit I spoke with Lucy Cortez-Johnson (QSP), who said she would talk to the contractor about improving BMPs at these locations.

A drilling rig is operating in the southeast corner of the project site drilling foundation holes for four new TSPs to be installed – Photo 12. Linette Davenport (biological monitor, Coastal California Gnatcatcher biologist, Borrego Biological) is monitoring activities in this area, because it is near Coastal California Gnatcatcher habitat. An archaeological monitor is also observing activities in this area.

Work continued at the new Mesa Operations Building – Photo 13.

The telecommunications corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive was being hydroseeded – Photo 14. Much of the corridor had been reworked to remove any riles prior to hydroseeding.

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-9. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).
See the MMs listed in the observed activities.

RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)

BMP maintenance and site drainage.

COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance on-site, environmental observations of note)

Seal the detention basin standpipe to better retain water and to allow sediment to settle down before draining from the basin.



COMPLIANCE SUMMARY



Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3 fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to E & E Compliance Manager. Inform E & E CM of any non-compliance incidents.




- New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- Non-compliance – Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-Compliance Level 3: 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 APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.



Date	Non-compliance issue and resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #




PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCE ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 1 – Senior MEER building construction. Photo facing south
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 2 – Erection of structural supports within the 220-kV rack area. Photo facing south

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 3 – Trenching for the grounding wire within the disconnect structures. Photo facing south
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 4 – Small triangular detention basin. Photo facing west

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 5 – Large detention basin. Note the overwhelmed visqueen plastic around the standpipe. Photo facing east
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 6 – Close-up of the standpipe drainage system in the detention basin. Note the holes along the bottom of the standpipe that allow sediment-laden water to quickly exit the detention basin via the stormdrain system.
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 7 – Fence installation along the southern boundary of the Mesa Substation Site. Photo facing east

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/18/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Foundation wall work along the southern boundary of the Mesa Substation Site. Photo facing southeast
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 9 – Concrete slurry in a conduit trench. Photo facing north

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 10 – Small berm redirecting large amounts of stormwater runoff. Photo facing southeast
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 11 – Rainwater runoff coming off of Highway 60 appears to have bypassed the onsite drainage system due to inadequate BMPs. Photo facing south
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 12 – Drilling work near Coastal California Gnatcatcher habitat. This work is being monitored by a Coastal California Gnatcatcher biologist. Photo facing east

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 13 – Work on the Mesa Operations Building continues. Photo facing west
12/18/18	Mesa substation		Photo 14 – BMP repairs and hydroseeding north of Potrero Grande Drive within the telecommunications corridor. Photo facing north