This activity is described Notice to Proceed Request–2 for Initial Project-Related Activities for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project, Section 2.4 Subtransmission Line Relocations Section 11 Figure 6B, and Final Environmental Impact Report, Mesa 500-kV Substation Project, Section 2.2.1.4.

Describe how project refinement deviates from current project. Include photos.

- **Original Condition**: Three casings that were installed for the subtransmission line underground option traversing Potrero Grande Drive were routed significantly deeper than originally planned in order to safely avoid other underground utilities installed within the street. The cable manufacturer performed revised soil heat dissipation capability calculations to account for these as-built conditions. The increased depth of the subtransmission line caused a significant reduction in how much load each circuit could carry.

- **Justification for change**: An assessment of SCE forecast load projections indicates that two of the 13 circuits installed in this fashion will be over their 100% rating under normal conditions by 2024, only 5 years after first being energized. Due to the size of the conduits, it is not possible to increase the size of the conductor to achieve more capacity. In addition, it is completely impractical, due to space availability and cost impacts, to install another casing in the same underground alignment to split the two circuits into separate casings to alleviate the loading issues. The safest and most cost effective manner to obtain the needed capacity is to convert this short run to overhead wires. For this modification, SCE will install two new tubular steel riser poles (TSP) and one new lightweight steel (LWS) pole. One riser TSP will be located within the substation and the other will be installed approximately 800 feet away, on the north side of Potrero Grande within SCE’s fee-owned transmission line corridor property. The LWS pole will be installed in between the two, roughly 230 feet away from the first riser TSP, on the south side of Potrero Grande, within the franchise area of the street. There will be six overhead non-specular conductors installed to complete two 66kV circuits. This overhead design will essentially bypass one of three sets of underground conduit that was installed within a larger casing along the same general alignment.

- **Figure & KOPs**: Attached to this document.
  - Figure 1. Revised KOP, New Pole, and Line Locations for Minor Project Change Three at the Mesa Substation Project
  - Revised KOP 1
  - Revised KOP 2
- **Environmental (Aesthetics) Impact:**
  - **KOP 1:** The three taller LSTs and one TSP for the approved project with the two additional shorter poles add no additional silhouetting against the sky in KOP 1. These additional poles would be less dominant to viewers traveling along Potrero Grande Drive than the LSTs and one TSP already installed for the approved project.
  - **KOP 2:** The approved project involves removal of many structures in KOP 2 and replacement with fewer structures of similar alignment, resulting in slight improvement to the existing visual quality of the area. The additional pole within KOP 2 is much shorter than the LSTs in this alignment and the conduit aligns within the same space. The slight improvement to the existing visual quality of the area is not affected by the addition of this pole.

- **Concurrence:** the Final Environmental Impact Report, Mesa 500-kV Substation Project was consulted, as was the USACE Section 404 Permit (SPL-2015-0324), USFWS Biological Opinion (FWS-LA-15B0327-17F1426), CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600-2016-0034-R5), SWRCB Section 401 Permit (16-019), NTPR-1 Biological Review, Cultural Resources Management Plan for the Mesa Substation Project, and Paleontological Resources Management Plan for the Southern California Edison Mesa 500 Kilovolt Substation Project to determine whether other agencies, municipalities, utilities, etc. would need to provide concurrence with this MPC. For this situation, no project measures or plans stipulate consultation with agencies other than the CPUC.

**Resources:**
Potrero Grande, public sidewalk, ornamental vegetation, and bare earth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>☒ No Resources Present</th>
<th>☐ Resources Present</th>
<th>☐ N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Previous Biological Survey Report Reference:** Include dates of original “baseline” surveys (from EIR analysis) to prove that the areas/practices were previously analyzed. Include more recent preconstruction sweeps, if applicable, to prove that the applicant has an understanding of what resources are currently present in this new area or could be impacted by this new practice.]


ICF. 2011c. Preconstruction Biological Survey and Clearance Sweep Report for Southern California Edison's WP3 Transmission Line Work Segment 7 Transmission Line (M40-T1, M42-T6, WSS 7-7.62, WSS 7-7.63, WSS 7-7.64, WSS 7-7.75), and 66kV Relocation (4774404E to 4774410E, M7-T1) Los Angeles County, California. September. Prepared for Southern California Edison.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>No Resources Present</th>
<th>Resources Present</th>
<th>Within Project Component Area</th>
<th>N/A (paved/graveled area or no ground disturbance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Previous Cultural Survey Report Reference:


Ninyo and Moore. 2015. *Geotechnical Evaluation, Mesa 500kV Substation – Phase 1, 700 East Potrero Grande Drive, Monterey Park, California*, dated August 27.


**Disturbance Acreage Changes:**

| original disturbance acreage: N/A | New disturbance acreage: N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Section</th>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials and Waste</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CEQA Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Section</th>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th>(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn’t applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Circulation</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and Vibration</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>□ Y ☑ N</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern California Edison Environmental Project Manager</th>
<th>12/20/18</th>
<th>Lori Iles-Rangel</th>
<th>Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPUC Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Orsaba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROVED**

By Lori Iles-Rangel at 7:07 pm, Dec 20, 2018

For CPUC Compliance Manager Use Only

- □ Refinement Approved
- □ Refinement Denied
- □ Beyond Authority

**Conditions of Approval or Reason for Denial:**
Figure 1
MESA 500KV SUBSTATION
REVISED KOP, NEW POLE, AND
LINE LOCATIONS
FOR MINOR PROJECT CHANGE THREE
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- Vault

Conductors
- Minor Project Change #3 Proposed, OH
- Existing, OH
- Proposed, OH
- Temporary, OH

Construction Areas
- Construction Work Site
- Demo Site
- General Disturbance Area
- Guard Structure
- Permanent OMAreas
- Wire Setup
SCE Pole Work Order Map

1097103_0

IN: 4900605E
80°-TSP RISER
IN: 1-TSP-PO.ENG
IN: 1-TSP-FTG.ENG
IN: 6-954 SAC DE CLAMPS
IN: 6-POLY INSULATORS
IN: 6-POTHEADS(COLD SHRINK)
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(SEE DATA SHEET 160197)
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IN: 1-TSP-PO.ENG
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IN: 6-POLY INSULATORS
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IN: 1-PH 852
IN: 6-POST INSULATORS
IN: 6-954 POST CLAMPS

Preliminary Design
Not for Construction

Scale: 1" = 60 ft
January 7, 2018

Lori Rangel
Environmental Project Manager
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

RE: Mesa 500-kV Substation Project – Minor Project Change No. 3 Request, CPUC Data Request Memorandum

Dear Ms. Rangel,

On December 20, 2018, Southern California Edison (SCE) submitted Minor Project Change (MPC) No. 3 Request to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for review. CPUC understands that MPC No. 3 addresses design issues associated with two of the 13 subtransmission circuits approved for one of the three underground casings already installed under Potrero Grande Drive. Specifically, SCE has calculated that two of the 13 circuits will exceed their 100 percent rating for soil heat dissipation capability by 2024. To alleviate this potential exceedance, SCE’s requested modification will bypass the circuits in one of the three sets of underground casings beneath Potrero Grande Drive by re-orienting these lines to an overhead configuration.

For this project modification, SCE would install two new tubular steel riser poles (TSPs) and one new lightweight steel (LWS) pole. One TSP would be located within the substation fence wall and the other would be installed approximately 800 feet away, within SCE’s fee-owned transmission line corridor property on the north side of Potrero Grande Drive. The LWS pole would be installed in between the two TSPs, approximately 230 feet from the TSP within the fence line, on the south side of Potrero Grande Drive, within the franchise area of the street.

CPUC requests that SCE provide the following information to ensure a thorough review of MPC No. 3 Request, under the conditions evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project:

1. Provide a detailed map showing the exact locations of the proposed new TSP and LWS installations (and overhead lines) associated with MPC No. 3 in relation to the currently approved project and existing public infrastructure (e.g., streets and sidewalks). Include the locations of all proposed permanent and temporary disturbance/work areas, and provide the area for each (e.g., acres or square feet). Also provide the heights of the three proposed poles. The MPC No. 3 Request references a Figure 1, but the figure was not included.
2. Potrero Grande Drive and the associated public sidewalks are identified as resources that may be temporarily impacted by MPC No. 3. Please identify what these impacts would be (e.g., physical damage requiring repair, temporary closures, and duration and location of impacts, etc.).

3. Verify that SCE does not require new or amended local permits or approvals (e.g., for encroachment, lane closure, traffic control, etc.) to install the poles, especially the LWS and the northernmost TSP that are proposed outside of the substation wall, along Potrero Grande Drive. During the EIR production phase, the City of Monterey Park expressed concerns regarding potential project-related sidewalk and road impacts. Therefore, please submit documentation of MPC No. 3 notification to the City of Monterey Park—and any subsequent correspondence with the City—to the CPUC. The notification shall adequately describe the project activities as proposed in MPC No. 3, and construction activities that may occur within the sidewalk and/or franchise area of the street, and how these differ from the plans that the City previously reviewed.

4. Please provide justification for placing the LWS pole located along the southern side of Potrero Grande Drive between the sidewalk and the substation wall, rather than within wall. The proposed location may have small impacts the aesthetic quality of the vegetation/plantings along Potrero Grande Drive. Is there a reason why the LWS couldn’t easily be placed within the wall to avoid potential impacts?

The CPUC appreciates SCE’s efforts to maintain environmental compliance and consistency with the Final EIR for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project, and requests that SCE provide the information requested above within two weeks’ time to ensure a timely review of MPC No. 3 Request.

Sincerely,

Lisa Orsaba
CPUC Project Manager

cc:
Ilja Nieuwenhuizen, E & E Compliance Manager
Aileen Cole, E & E Deputy Compliance Manager
Don Dow, SCE Project Manager
January 17, 2019

Lori Rangel
Environmental Project Manager
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

RE: Mesa 500-kV Substation Project – Minor Project Change No. 3 Request, CPUC Data Request # 2 Memorandum

Dear Ms. Rangel,

On December 20, 2018, Southern California Edison (SCE) submitted Minor Project Change (MPC) No. 3 Request to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for review. On January 7, 2019 the CPUC submitted a data request to SCE for the MPC No. 3 Request.

The CPUC requests that SCE provide the following additional information to ensure a thorough review of the MPC No. 3 Request, under the conditions evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project:

1. SCE provided responses to the CPUC’s January 7, 2019 data request by electronic mail on January 9, 2019. Please resubmit those responses in letter format, including SCE letterhead.

2. Provide a table that reports the areas (square feet and acres) of proposed permanent disturbance areas (e.g., for pole footings) and temporary disturbance areas (e.g., work areas) associated with MPC No. 3, including the areas for the three proposed poles. Include the areas (square feet and acres) of overlap with work areas already analyzed in the Final EIR, and Notice to Proceed 1 and 2 (NTP-1 and NTP-2).

3. Please confirm that SCE has informed the City of Monterey Park of the changes that are the subject of MPC No. 3, and that SCE has received correspondence indicating that the City has expressed no major concerns regarding proposed MPC No. 3 activities.

The CPUC appreciates SCE’s efforts to maintain environmental compliance and consistency with the Final EIR for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project, and requests that SCE provide the information requested above within two weeks’ time to ensure a timely review of MPC No. 3 Request.
Sincerely,

Lisa Orsaba
CPUC Project Manager

cc:
Ilja Nieuwenhuizen, E & E Compliance Manager
Aileen Cole, E & E Deputy Compliance Manager
Don Dow, SCE Project Manager
February 1, 2019

Lisa Orsaba  
Project Manager  
State of California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA  94102-3298

Re: Mesa 500-kV Substation Project – Minor Project Change No. 3 Request,  
SCE Responses to CPUC Data Requests #1 and #2

Ms. Orsaba,

In response to Southern California Edison (SCE) Request for a Minor Project Change (MPC) No. 3, submitted on December 20, 2018, SCE is responding to CPUC data requests dated January 7 and January 17, 2019.

**MPC No. 3 - CPUC Data Request #1, January 7, 2019**

1. **Provide a detailed map showing the exact locations of the proposed new TSP and LWS installations (and overhead lines) associated with MPC No. 3 in relation to the currently approved project and existing public infrastructure (e.g., streets and sidewalks). Include the locations of all proposed permanent and temporary disturbance/work areas, and provide the area for each (e.g., acres or square feet). Also provide the heights of the three proposed poles. The MPC No. 3 Request references a Figure 1, but the figure was not included.**

SCE previously provided a figure (MPC3 Figure 1.pdf) showing the location of the new proposed structures along with the previously approved project elements, via email on January 9. We included a work area around the two new proposed structures that fall outside the substation, on the north and south sides of Potrero Grande. Each of these work areas is 5,000 square feet, but mostly overlap with previously approved work areas. Also attached was a work order map (1097103_0.pdf) which shows each of the structures (1, 2 and 3) and their pole heights. FYI, the visual simulations provided with our initial submittal were generated from the pole height information on this work order map.
2. Potrero Grande Drive and the associated public sidewalks are identified as resources that may be temporarily impacted by MPC No. 3. Please identify what these impacts would be (e.g., physical damage requiring repair, temporary closures, and duration and location of impacts, etc.).

The poles will be installed behind the sidewalks, with the pole on the south side of Potrero Grande between the sidewalk and the new substation perimeter wall. We anticipate no sidewalk repairs to be needed, but we would need to establish traffic control to install the LWS pole, which will require a lane closure permit from the City of Monterey Park for the installation. Most of the foundation work for the TSPR on the north side of Potrero Grande can be performed from the SCE-owned property north of the sidewalk, but a similar lane closure permit may be required there too if a crane needs to set up to install the pole. An exact schedule for the work is not yet finalized, but is anticipated to only take a couple days to install each pole, and an additional day to string both sets of conductors across Potrero Grande (which will also require temporary traffic stoppage.)

3. Verify that SCE does not require new or amended local permits or approvals (e.g., for encroachment, lane closure, traffic control, etc.) to install the poles, especially the LWS and the northernmost TSP that are proposed outside of the substation wall, along Potrero Grande Drive. During the EIR production phase, the City of Monterey Park expressed concerns regarding potential project-related sidewalk and road impacts. Therefore, please submit documentation of MPC No. 3 notification to the City of Monterey Park—and any subsequent correspondence with the City—to the CPUC. The notification shall adequately describe the project activities as proposed in MPC No. 3, and construction activities that may occur within the sidewalk and/or franchise area of the street, and how these differ from the plans that the City previously reviewed.

We will need site specific encroachment permits with traffic control plans. We are communicating with the City of Monterey Park, and will provide copy of this coordination.

4. Please provide justification for placing the LWS pole located along the southern side of Potrero Grande Drive between the sidewalk and the substation wall, rather than within wall. The proposed location may have small impacts the aesthetic quality of the vegetation/plantings along Potrero Grande Drive. Is there a reason why the LWS couldn’t easily be placed within the wall to avoid potential impacts?

The placement of the LWS pole on the south side of Potrero Grande was determined by both the location of the TSP within the substation property, as well as the need to stay safely away from the nearest duct bank on the north side of Potrero Grande. Additionally, we need to meet “swing and rise” clearance requirements between the structures on both sides of Potrero Grande. Due to the long span, and the significant difference in elevation between Potrero Grande and
the substation surface, the LWS is required to help meet GO-95 ground clearance requirements as we cross Potrero Grande. If the LWS was located within the wall, much taller structures would have been required.

MPC No. 3 - CPUC Data Request #2, January 17, 2019

1. SCE provided responses to the CPUC’s January 7, 2019 data request by electronic mail on January 9, 2019. Please resubmit those responses in letter format, including SCE letterhead.

   Responses to Data Request #1, dated January 7, 2019 are contained herein this written response.

2. Provide a table that reports the areas (square feet and acres) of proposed permanent disturbance areas (e.g., for pole footings) and temporary disturbance areas (e.g., work areas) associated with MPC No. 3, including the areas for the three proposed poles. Include the areas (square feet and acres) of overlap with work areas already analyzed in the Final EIR, and Notice to Proceed 1 and 2 (NTP-1 and NTP-2).

   Table provided below. Please note that the TSPR South of Potrero Grande is entirely within the previously approved permanently disturbed substation, so no NEW impacts are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New/MPC Impacts</th>
<th>Overlap with Previous Approved Work Area</th>
<th>Total New/MPC Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South of Potrero Grande TSPR</strong></td>
<td>707</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South of Potrero Grande LWS</strong></td>
<td>707</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North of Potrero Grande TSPR</strong></td>
<td>707</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please confirm that SCE has informed the City of Monterey Park of the changes that are the subject of MPC No. 3, and that SCE has received correspondence indicating that the City has expressed no major concerns regarding proposed MPC No. 3 activities.

SCE informed the City of Monterey Park via various emails. SCE had a meeting with the City today, Friday, February 1. The City acknowledges the need for this change, but would like to be kept informed should an option to keep the lines underground be possible. Copy of the Cities email communication following the February 1 meeting is provided via email.

Please let us know if you have any additional questions, or require further information.

Thank you.

Lori Iles-Rangel
Project Manager, Environmental
Project Execution, Major Environmental Projects
Environmental Services Department
M. 626-476-6253
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead, CA 91770