Mesa 500-kV Substation Project
CPUC Minor Project Change Form

Date Requested: December 20, 2018
Report No.: 05

Date Approved: Approval Agency: CPUC

Property Owner(s): SCE
Location/Milepost: North and South of Potrero Grande
Avenue

Land Use/Vegetative Cover: Bare earth and
compacted dirt/gravel
Sensitive Resources: None

Modification From: ☐ Permit ☐ Drawing
☐ Specification ☐ Mitigation Measure
☐ Procedure ☐ Other:

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:** Currently, there is no way to isolate the newly installed underground getaway cables between the 66 kV switchrack and the subtransmission riser poles, the locations where the proposed switches are to be installed. Without these switches, if there were ever an issue with one of those underground cables, the entire circuit would need to be de-energized in order for a crew to safely work on the repairs.

• **Justification for change:** In order to provide additional operating flexibility, these switches will be installed between the switchrack and the subtransmission riser poles. With the switches, the portion under repair can be separated from the balance of the circuitry, allowing for power to flow between other substations that are connected to the circuit in question. For this change, SCE will install new switches on three 66kV circuits. One switch will be installed on a new stronger pole in the same location as pole 6604, near the 60 freeway (existing pole to be replaced). The second switch will be installed on a new pole to be located on the north side of Saturn Ave in between poles 6608 and 6609. The third switch will be installed on a new pole to be located on the north side of Saturn Ave between poles 6611 and 6612.

• **Figure:** Attached to this document.
  - Figure. New Mesa Substation Overhead Pole Switches

• **Environmental Impact:**
The bare earth and compacted dirt/gravel area beneath the three poles provides no useful habitat for any wildlife or botanical species, and does not host cultural resources or paleontological resources. Adding switches to these three poles will not be a significant additional project impact.

• **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:**
Bare earth and compacted dirt/gravel

<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/gravelpaved/graded 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.*
Ninyo and Moore. 2016. *Geotechnical Evaluation, Mesa 500kV Substation – Phase 2, 700 East Potrero Grande Drive, Monterey Park, California, dated May 6.*

Disturbance Acreage Changes: ☐ Yes ☑ No
<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>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
(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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Section</th>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No potential additional impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Consultation?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Agency consultation is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approvals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name (print)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Edison Environmental Project Manager</td>
<td>12/20/18</td>
<td>Lori Iles-Rangel</td>
<td>Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPUC Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Orsaba</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For CPUC Compliance Manager Use Only**

- ☐ Refinement Approved
- ☐ Refinement Denied
- ☐ Beyond Authority

**Conditions of Approval or Reason for Denial:**

Prepared by: ________________________  Date: ________________________
February 18, 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. 5 Request: Installation of three new switches

Dear Ms. Rangel,

On December 20, 2018, Southern California Edison (SCE) submitted Minor Project Change (MPC) No. 5 Request to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for review. The proposed MPC would involve the installation of new switches on three 66-kV circuits. Two switches (SP 1 and SP 2) would be installed on new poles to be located on the north side of Saturn Avenue; SP 1 would be installed between Pole 6608 and Pole 6609, and SP 2 would be installed between Poles 6611 and Pole 6612. The third switch (SP 3) would be installed on a new, stronger pole in the same location as Pole 6604, near California Highway 60; the existing pole (Pole 6604A) would be replaced by the new pole containing the switch. A figure of MPC No. 5 work areas and switch pole schematics are provided in Attachment 1. Installation of the three new switches would allow SCE to isolate the newly installed underground getaway cables between the 66-kV switchrack and the subtransmission riser poles, which are located where the proposed switches would be installed. Without these switches, if repairs are ever required on the new underground cables, SCE would need to de-energize the entire circuit to ensure that crews can safely work on the system.

The Mesa 500-kV Substation Project was evaluated in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared by the CPUC. The CPUC issued a Permit to Construct the Project on February 9, 2017 (Decision 17-02-015). The mitigation measures (MMs) and applicant proposed measures (APMs) described in the EIR were adopted by the CPUC as conditions of Project approval. In August 2017 the CPUC adopted the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan (MMCRP) to ensure compliance with all APMs and MMs during project implementation.

This letter documents the CPUC’s evaluation of all activities covered in the MPC No. 5 Request. The CPUC has carefully reviewed this MPC request, and has verified that the proposed activities adhere to all applicable APM and MM requirements. The evaluation process ensures that all APMs and MMs applicable to the location, and all activities covered in the MPC are implemented, as required in the CPUC’s decision. The evaluation process further ensures that the following criteria are met:
The proposed change does not trigger additional discretionary permit requirements that are not defined in the EIR or MMCRP.

The proposed change does not increase the severity of an impact or create a new impact, based on the thresholds used in the EIR.

The proposed change is within the geographic scope of the study area utilized in the EIR.

The proposed change does not conflict with any APM or MM, and the refinements would not result in a new conflict with any applicable guideline, ordinance, code, rule, regulation, order, decision, statute, or policy not already identified within the IS/MND.

The CPUC has determined that MPC No. 5 meets the above criteria. MPC No. 5 is approved by the CPUC for the proposed activities based on the factors described below.

**CPUC Evaluation of MPC No. 5 Request**

The CPUC evaluated SCE’s MPC Request No. 5 to verify that it fulfills the requirements of the MMCRP. In accordance with the MMCRP, the CPUC reviewed the request to confirm that no new impacts on sensitive resources, or increases in impact severity, would result from the requested MPC activities. The following discussion summarizes this analysis for biological, cultural, paleontological, and other environmental resources, areas as well as aesthetics and visual resources.

*Location of Ground Disturbance Areas*

MPC No. 5 would occur entirely within approved temporary work areas north of Saturn Avenue, and immediately north of California Highway 60. All work areas associated with MPC No. 5 activities fall within the Final EIR Study Area. SP 1 would be located within an approved work area north of Saturn Drive, SP 2 would be located within Staging Yard 1, and SP 3 would be located within the substation property boundary.

*Aesthetics/Visual Impacts*

SP 1 and SP 2 would be installed on new poles approximately 79 and 84 feet tall (aboveground), respectively. SP 3 would be installed on a new pole approximately 88 feet tall (aboveground), which would replace the existing Pole 6604 within the same footprint. All three switches and associated poles would be set back more than 50 feet from the nearest public roadway, and would be consistent with the surrounding industrial viewshed. The three new switches would not be expected to substantially degrade the surrounding viewshed.

*Biological, Cultural, Paleontological Resources, and other Environmental Resources*

As identified in the Final EIR, SP 1 and SP 3 would be installed in areas with non-native vegetation, and SP 2 would be installed on Disturbed/Developed land. None of the switches would be installed in suitable natural habitat for any special status species, and the work areas do not overlap with USFWS Critical Habitat for any species. The ground disturbance areas for installation of all three switches are located within the applicable Final EIR study areas for sensitive resources, including special status animals and plants, wetlands and other waters, and cultural and paleontological resources.
Although special status species (e.g., Coastal California Gnatcatcher) have been observed intermittently passing through the MPC No. 5 work areas, none of these species have been documented nesting within or adjacent to the work areas. At the time of MPC No. 5 approval, only one currently active bird nest (special status or non-special status species) has been documented in the vicinity of SP 1, SP 2, or SP 3. SP 2 is located within the disturbance buffer of an active Red-tailed hawk nest located slightly to the northeast in a Lattice Steel transmission line tower (Nest RTHA-0185). However, SCE is required to avoid or reduce impacts on active nests during all construction activities—including when installing these switches—by implementing the relevant protection measures of the MMCRP. These include monitoring active nests and other sensitive biological resources (MM BR-9), and implementing disturbance buffers and other measures in the Nesting Bird Management Plan (MM BR-11). If additional active nests are observed, appropriate nest buffer distances would be implemented around these nests also. No cultural or paleontological resources have been identified within MPC No. 5 work areas.

The Final EIR documents numerous ephemeral drainages (jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional) near SP 1 and SP 2, near Staging Yard 1 in a highly disturbed landscape. These drainages were identified in the Final EIR as experiencing temporary impacts related to project activities. Temporary impacts on these ephemeral drainages associated caused by MPC No. 5 activities would be consistent with the type and extent of impacts analyzed in the Final EIR. These drainages were identified in the Final EIR as being subject to temporary project-related impacts. The permanent switch installation footprints would not fall within the drainage areas, so permanent impacts are not anticipated. Regardless, SCE would be required to adhere to all measures and strategies described in their Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) to minimize impacts to water features site-wide.

Permits
No additional permits or approvals are required for MPC No. 5 activities.

MPC No. 5 Conditions of Approval
MPC No. 3 is approved by the CPUC with conditions. The conditions presented below shall be met by SCE and its contractors:

1. All applicable Project MMs, APMs, compliance plans, and permit conditions shall be implemented. Some measures have on-going/time-sensitive requirements and shall be implemented prior to and during construction, where applicable.
2. Copies of all relevant permits, compliance plans, and this MPC, shall be available on site for the duration of construction activities.
3. SCE shall implement all appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs for the MPC No. 5 refinement area as defined in the SWPPP, and as specified by the Qualified SWPPP Practitioner. Sediment and erosion control BMPs shall be properly maintained throughout the duration of construction activities.
4. All activities (e.g., grading, trenching, etc.) shall be monitored by a CPUC-approved monitors in accordance with the MMCRP, where appropriate.
7. All complaints related to MPC No. 5 activities received by SCE shall be logged and reported immediately to the CPUC. This includes complaints relevant to traffic, as well as lighting, noise, vibration, dust, etc. Where feasible, complaints shall be resolved, depending on the nature of the complaint, through construction site or activity modifications. Complaints or disputes that cannot be modified through construction site or activity modifications shall be resolved through the dispute resolution communications processes described in the MMCRP.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding this MPC approval.

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
Attachment 1:
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