



March 15, 2017

Andrew Barnsdale
Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #34 for Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

This monthly report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **January 1 to 31, 2017**, for the Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement (ACTR) Project (Aliso) in California. Compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by Southern California Gas Company (SCG), Southern California Edison (SCE), and their contractors are in compliance with the requirements of the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for Aliso, as adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on November 14, 2013, and as further modified in the Addendum to the Final EIR, as approved by the CPUC on December 18, 2014.

The CPUC has issued the following Notices to Proceed (NTPs) for the project to SCG and SCE:

- NTP #1 (February 25, 2014): The Guard House and road widening component.
- NTP #2 (May 27, 2014): Construction of new administrative buildings, removal of old buildings, and development of Fill Sites P-41 and P-43.
- NTP #3 (July 18, 2014): Construction of the Central Compressor Station (CCS), grading for the Natural Substation, and installation of five tubular steel poles (TSPs) and string conductor.
- NTP-A (October 28, 2014): Work along Natural-Newhall-San Fernando and MacNeil-Newhall-San Fernando 66-kilovolt (kV) subtransmission lines and at the San Fernando, Newhall, Chatsworth, Sunshine, and MacNeil substations.
- NTP-B (February 24, 2015): Construction of a portion of Telecommunications Route 3 from the San Fernando Substation to the temporary San Fernando Substation Tap.
- NTP-C (April 14, 2015): Construction and telecommunication installation associated with the MacNeil-Newhall-San Fernando and Natural-Newhall-San Fernando 66-kV subtransmission lines.
- NTP-D (June 8, 2015): Additional construction and telecommunication installation associated with the MacNeil-Newhall-San Fernando and Natural-Newhall-San Fernando 66-kV subtransmission lines, and construction of the Natural Substation.
- NTP-E (September 21, 2015): Additional construction and telecommunication installation on Telecommunications Routes 1, 2, and 3.

Onsite compliance monitoring by the Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E) compliance team during this reporting period focused on weekly spot-checks of ongoing construction activities. Compliance Monitor Vince Semonsen visited the Aliso construction site on January 10, 19, and 23, 2017. Site inspection reports that summarize observed construction activities and compliance events and verify mitigation measures (MMs)/applicant proposed measures (APMs) were completed for all site visits. Reports are attached below (Attachment 1).

Overall, the ACTR 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 SCG and SCE has been regular and generally effective; correspondence discussed and documented compliance events, upcoming compliance-related surveys and deliverables, and the construction schedule. Regular agency calls between CPUC/E & E, SCG, and SCE, along with weekly email updates from SCG and SCE, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, SCG's monthly compliance status report for January 2017 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from January 1 to 31, 2017; a detailed look-ahead construction schedule; a summary of compliance with project commitments (MMs/APMs) for air quality, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), noise, and the Worker Environmental Awareness Training Program (WEAP); a summary of non-compliance incidents; and a list of recent ACTR Project approvals.

In January 2017, SCE did not conduct any construction activities, beyond restoration and weed abatement; SCE's construction activities are nearly completed for the ACTR Project. Therefore, beginning January 2017, CPUC/E & E is no longer requiring SCE to provide a monthly compliance status report. SCE will be providing CPUC/E & E a final construction close-out report.

Compliance Incidents

On January 5, 2017, a diesel fuel delivery truck driver (third-party contractor to Kiewit, SCG's construction contractor) spilled an estimated 1 to 2 gallons of diesel fuel while refilling a 250-gallon diesel fuel cell adjacent to the Kiewit offices. The reservoir below the hose connection as well as the plastic lined secondary containment vessel below the fuel cell were full of rainwater from recent storms. The spilled fuel and rainwater flowed onto the adjacent road and near a storm drain that leads to Limekiln Creek. The truck driver left the site without reporting the spill. Kiewit staff noticed an oily sheen on the road, which prompted the Kiewit environmental manager to notify the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services. Kiewit immediately responded by placing oil-absorbing booms below the containment area, pumped the remaining water out of the secondary containment, placed oil absorbent materials in various locations, including the storm drain, and pumped any water with a visible sheen. Other agencies were notified, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LADPW), Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Los Angeles County Certified Unified Program Agency. Representatives from LADPW Sanitation and Flood Maintenance Division visited the site on January 5, 2017 to inspect the spill area and affected storm drain.

In accordance with their National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit, APM HZ-3, and APM HZ-5, SCG is required to handle and store hazardous materials following applicable regulations and must ensure construction procedures are implemented to minimize the potential for hazardous materials spills and releases. SCG's actions deviated from project requirements; SCG failed to identify that the secondary containment around the fuel tank was full and, therefore, could not function properly. APM HZ-3 and APM-HZ 5 must be implemented effectively in order to reduce impacts from spills and releases on biological and hydrological resources to a less than significant level, as required by the MMCRP and as described in the Final EIR.

Special Status Species Observations

Eleven live California newts, a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)-designated Species of Special Concern, were observed during January 2017; all newts were relocated out of harm's way. Six dead newts were documented during January 2017. The dead newts were collected in accordance with CDFW requested protocol.

Public Concerns

There were no public concerns during January 2017.

Minor Approvals

During January 2017, there were no email or minor project refinement approvals.

Please contact me if you have any questions concerning this summary report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lara Rachowicz".

Lara Rachowicz
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:

Derek Rodgers, SCG
Chris May, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Reports
January 10, 19, and 23, 2017



Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement	Date:	January 10, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS127
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Overcast and foggy with some light drizzle and cold temperatures.
E & E CM:	Lara Rachowicz	Start/End time:	0900 to 0930 at SCE components 1000 to 1100 at SCG
Project NTP(s):	The new Admin/IM Building (NTP-2), Central Compressor Station (CCS) (NTP-3), 12 kV power line (NTP-3), and PS-42 Fill Site. Tubular Steel Poles (TSPs) 2 through 42 (NTPs A, C, and D).		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

WEATP Training	Yes	No	N/A
Has WEATP training been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures properly installed and functioning?		X	
Is mud tracked onto paved public roadways cleaned up in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Is excessive fugitive dust leaving the work area?		X	
Equipment			
Are all vehicles observed maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are all vehicles/equipment observed arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas			
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are all excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology			

Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, 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		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas?		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)?		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? List:		X	
Are there wetlands or water bodies present near construction activities?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources?		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
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?		X	
Hazardous Materials			
Are hazardous materials stored appropriately?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are appropriate fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Is contaminated soil properly handled or disposed of, if applicable?	X		
Work Hours and Noise			
Are night lighting reduction measures in place, as needed?	X		
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are noise control measures in place within 100 feet of sensitive receptors as needed?			X

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

SCE access roads at TSPs 26, 24/25, and 12-22. The PS-42 Fill Site, the new Admin/IM Building, 12-kilovolt (kV) pole work, and the CCS.

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

My first stop was at the TSP 26 access road. The road looked stable; there was very little erosion and no mud on the paved frontage road.

I hiked into the drainage between TSPs 24 and 25 to check the creek, the access road, and the new creek culverts. These areas appeared to be in good condition following the rainfall events, with very little erosion and stable creek banks, access roads, and fill slopes. Photo 1 shows the creek channel (note the invasive tree tobacco) and Photo 2 shows the new fill slope/road shoulder above the creek culverts. The entrance to the TSP 24/25 access road appeared stable, with no noticeable erosion or mud flowing into the Crescent Valley Mobile Estates (Mobile Estates).

Sediment had traveled onto the paved access road at the entrance to TSPs 12-22 (Photo 3). I did not walk up the access road, but it appeared that the sediment was coming from the access road (noted in previous reports) and not from any of the Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement (ACTR) Project sites.

I drove to the Aliso Canyon facility and arrived at around 1000. I stopped at the ACTR Project trailer, but did not see any of the environmental personnel. I checked the Natural Substation area where I observed water flowing down the access road and entering the biofiltration unit, with clear water being discharged from the exit culvert (Photo 4). These ACTR Project components appeared to be functioning properly.

Approximately half of the flat upper portion of the PS-42 Fill Site was holding water (Photo 5). No crews were onsite, but the pumps, hoses, and baker tanks were in place for pumping out the water. The PS-42 Well Pad was submerged in water, and it appeared that some additional gravel bags had been installed around the PS-42 Well Pad to keep the water from entering the PS-42 Fill Site (Photo 6).

At the 12 kV/TSP A2 access road, a large number of straw wattles and gravel bags had been installed along the road (Photo 7); however, muddy water and sediment appeared to have penetrated the best management practices (BMPs) and flowed into Limekiln Creek. I saw SCG's monitor, Ray Romero (AECOM), and Derek Rodgers (SCG) at the access road and we spoke about the situation and possible solutions. Derek Rodgers stated that they were waiting for a more permanent solution until work on the 12-kV system was completed and would need to wait for the area to dry out.

The silt fencing installed along Limekiln Creek below the CCS had been repaired (Photo 8).

Crews continued to work at the new Admin/IM Building and were preparing to do some final concrete work (Photo 9). The stockpile of soil had been adequately covered with plastic (Photo 10).

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

Onsite monitors were in place and overseeing the construction activities; all construction personnel appear to have gone through the training (APM HZ-6).

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

Continue to check the TSP A2 access road after major rain events.

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

Possible energy dissipater/catch basin where the oak swale drainage meets the TSP A2 access road.




COMPLIANCE SUMMARY




Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries (compliance level 0) 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.

- Compliance Level 0: 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: Violates the project's environmental requirements but does not immediately put environmental resources at risk. Applicant will need to correct the action and/or prevent repeat incidents of the same issue. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: (Minor Incident) Level 2 should be those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, minor risk to environmental resources such as activities that result in a deviation from the mitigation measure requirements that result in minor, short-term impact to 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: (Major Incident) Level 3 are those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, major risk to environmental resources such as: major environmental incident that is not in compliance with the applicant mitigation measures, mitigation measures, permit condition, approval (e.g., variances, addendums) requirements, and/or environmental construction specifications; violation of the law; or documented repetitive occurrences of Level 2 Minor Incident events. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SoCalGas or 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
1/10/17	Drainage between TSPs 24 and 25		Photo 1 – The creek channel and banks look stable; there are numerous areas of tree tobacco (invasive species) in and along the creek.
1/10/17	Drainage between TSPs 24 and 25		Photo 2 – The fill slope above the culvert outfall is in good condition with no erosion issues.
1/10/17	Entrance to the TSP 12-22 Access Road		Photo 3 – Mud and rock traveled down the access road and flowed out onto the paved road in the Crescent Valley Mobile Estates.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/10/17	Natural Substation		Photo 4 – Outflow culvert from the Natural Substation biofiltration unit, with energy dissipation structures.
1/10/17	PS-42 Fill Site		Photo 5 – Water that had ponded at the PS-42 Fill Site; water was not being pumped from the PS-42 Fill Site during my visit.
1/10/17	PS-42 Well Pad		Photo 6 – Water on the PS-42 Well Pad; gravel bags had been added to keep water from entering the PS-42 Fill Site.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/10/17	TSP A2 Access Road		Photo 7 – Straw wattles appeared to be overwhelmed by the rainwater runoff coming down the oak swale and then down the TSP A2 access road.
1/10/17	Paved Road along Limekiln Creek and below the CCS		Photo 8 – The new barrier (silt fencing) has been repaired.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/10/17	New Admin/IM Building	 A photograph of a construction site for a new building. In the foreground, there is a large pile of wooden formwork and rebar. A worker in a white shirt and hard hat is visible in the background near a concrete wall under construction. The ground is wet, suggesting recent rain.	Photo 9 – Concrete work still being conducted.
1/10/17	New Admin/IM Building	 A photograph showing a large pile of soil or earth covered with a black plastic tarp. The tarp is secured with white bags. In the foreground, there is a coiled green hose. The background shows the exterior of a building under construction.	Photo 10 – The soil stockpile has been adequately covered.



Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement	Date:	January 19, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS128
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy, cool, and breezy. One inch of rain had fallen overnight.
E & E CM:	Lara Rachowicz	Start/End time:	1000 to 1130 at SCG
Project NTP(s):	The new Admin/IM Building (NTP-2), Central Compressor Station (CCS) (NTP-3), 12 kV power line (NTP-3), and PS-42 Fill Site.		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

WEATP Training	Yes	No	N/A
Has WEATP training been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures properly installed and functioning?		X	
Is mud tracked onto paved public roadways cleaned up in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Is excessive fugitive dust leaving the work area?		X	
Equipment			
Are all vehicles observed maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are all vehicles/equipment observed arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas			
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are all excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology			
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, gnatcatcher,	X		

least Bell's vireo) resources as appropriate?			
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		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas?		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)?		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? List:		X	
Are there wetlands or water bodies present near construction activities?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources?		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
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?		X	
Hazardous Materials			
Are hazardous materials stored appropriately?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are appropriate fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Is contaminated soil properly handled or disposed of, if applicable?	X		
Work Hours and Noise			
Are night lighting reduction measures in place, as needed?	X		
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are noise control measures in place within 100 feet of sensitive receptors as needed?			X

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

12-kilovolt (kV) pole work and Limekiln Creek.

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

The purpose of this site visit was to examine the effects of the recent rain events on the 12-kV/TSP A2 pole access road. Rainwater runoff coming down the "oak swale" drainage from the Natural Substation and its access road had been creating erosion problems on the TSP A2 access road, with mud and debris-laden water then flowing into Limekiln Creek. According to Derek Rogers (SCG), the Aliso Canyon Natural Gas Storage Field (Aliso Storage Field) had received approximately 1 inch of rain over the past 12 hours.

Since my last site visit, SCG had crews upgrade the best management practices (BMPs) along the access road, adding straw wattles and gravel bag containment basins along the road (Photo 1). Crews had also added a silt fence diversion structure where the oak swale drainage flowed onto the TSP A2 access road (Photo 3). The silt fence had been stabilized with metal "T" posts, gravel bags, and rock riprap to withstand the flow of rainwater runoff coming down the drainage. This structure diverted runoff away from the TSP A2 access road and into the old oak swale drainage channel.

During the most recent rain storm, the combination of the additional BMPs and the silt fence diversion structure appeared to have been an adequate for reducing the flow of water onto the TSP A2 access road and capturing sediment before the water entered Limekiln Creek. However, it should be noted that one inch of rain over a 12-hour period is not considered a significant rain event; therefore, the area should be closely monitored for the adequacy of the diversion structure solution during larger rain events.

I had concerns that the diversion fencing would redirect the rainwater runoff traveling down the oak swale drainage into Limekiln Creek without the aid of any BMPs to trap mud and debris. However, upon examination of drainage above and below the silt fence diversion structure (Photos 2 and 4, respectively), it appeared that only small amounts of mud and debris were traveling into the drainage during the most recent storm. I only observed the flowlines from the runoff and some extra piles of oak leaves below the diversion structure (Photo 4). The erosion rill shown in Photo 2 has remained the same since the rains last year.

I met with Derek Rodgers (SCG) and SCG monitor Ray Romero (AECOM) and we discussed the sediment control upgrades. I explained what I look for as evidence that sediment-laden water entered Limekiln Creek, and I showed them the areas where mud and debris had dropped out on the roadway below the TSP A2 access road and near Limekiln Creek, itself. Derek Rodgers stated that he had not checked those areas before or during my last site visit. During future site visits, I will take additional photos and discuss when and where areas of sediment loss is a concern with onsite environmental personnel.

Photo 5 shows a pregnant female newt that I observed in the grass below the TSP A2 access road. The newt was traveling to Limekiln Creek.

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

Onsite monitors were in place and overseeing the construction activities; all construction personnel appear to have gone through the training (APM HZ-6).

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

Continue to check the TSP A2 access road after major rain events.

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

Possible energy dissipater/catch basin where the oak swale drainage meets the TSP A2 access road.

COMPLIANCE SUMMARY



Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries (compliance level 0) 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.



- Compliance Level 0: 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: Violates the project's environmental requirements but does not immediately put environmental resources at risk. Applicant will need to correct the action and/or prevent repeat incidents of the same issue. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: (Minor Incident) Level 2 should be those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, minor risk to environmental resources such as activities that result in a deviation from the mitigation measure requirements that result in minor, short-term impact to 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: (Major Incident) Level 3 are those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, major risk to environmental resources such as: major environmental incident that is not in compliance with the applicant mitigation measures, mitigation measures, permit condition, approval (e.g., variances, addendums) requirements, and/or environmental construction specifications; violation of the law; or documented repetitive occurrences of Level 2 Minor Incident events. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SoCalGas or 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
1/19/17	TSP A2 Access Road		Photo 1 – Upgraded BMPs at the end of the TSP A2 access road.
1/19/17	Oak Swale Drainage		Photo 2 – Erosion rill at the base of the oak swale drainage channel.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/19/17	TSP A2 Access Road		Photo 3 – Silt fence diversion structure installed to divert rainwater runoff into the old oak swale drainage and away from the TSP A2 access road.
1/19/17	Old Oak Swale Drainage		Photo 4 – Aftermath of the rainwater runoff diverted into the old oak swale drainage.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/19/17	Limekiln Creek		Photo 5 – A female newt traveling toward Limekiln Creek.



Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement	Date:	January 23, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS129
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Cold, cloudy, and windy with scattered showers.
E & E CM:	Lara Rachowicz	Start/End time:	1100 to 1300 at SCG
Project NTP(s):	The new Admin/IM Building (NTP-2), Central Compressor Station (CCS) (NTP-3), 12 kV power line (NTP-3), and PS-42 Fill Site.		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	Yes	No	N/A
WEATP Training			
Has WEATP training been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures properly installed and functioning?		X	
Is mud tracked onto paved public roadways cleaned up in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Is excessive fugitive dust leaving the work area?		X	
Equipment			
Are all vehicles observed maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are all vehicles/equipment observed arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas			
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are all excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology			
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, gnatcatcher,	X		

least Bell's vireo) resources as appropriate?			
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		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas?		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)?		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? List:		X	
Are there wetlands or water bodies present near construction activities?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources?		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
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?		X	
Hazardous Materials			
Are hazardous materials stored appropriately?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are appropriate fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Is contaminated soil properly handled or disposed of, if applicable?	X		
Work Hours and Noise			
Are night lighting reduction measures in place, as needed?	X		
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are noise control measures in place within 100 feet of sensitive receptors as needed?			X

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

PS-42 Fill Site, 12-kilovolt (kV) pole work, and Limekiln Creek.

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

Following the weekend storms, I made a site visit to the Aliso Canyon Natural Gas Storage Field (Aliso Storage Field) to evaluate the erosion/sediment issues. Since my site visit on the January 19, 2017, Aliso Canyon received around 5 inches of rain.

I arrived at 1100 and went to the Natural Substation to check the biofiltration unit. On the way, I noted a large area of ponded water at the Well Pad located at the top of the access road (Photo 1). Water from this Well Pad was flowing over the curb and down the Natural Substation access road. Since the amount of water traveling down the access road has been contributing to the oak swale erosion, I recommend that this water is directed away from the roadway.

At the Natural Substation, the bioswale was partially full (Photo 2) and appeared to have been filled and spilled during the recent heavy rains (Photos 3, 4, and 5). At the time of my site visit, clean water was still exiting the biofiltration unit and running through the oak swale.

I stopped at the PS-42 Fill Site, the top of which was nearly filled with water (Photo 6). Pumping equipment and baker tanks were onsite, but no activity was taking place.

At the TSP A2 access road, additional gravel bags had been added to the existing best management practices (BMPs) (Photo 7), all of which appeared to have slowed and contained the rainwater runoff flowing down the road. The runoff was greatly reduced by the silt fence diversion structure, and I did not observe any new mud on the paved parking area or near the Limekiln Creek drain.

The silt fence diversion structure sustained the increased rainwater runoff; however, some of the rocks and gravel bags were washed away from in front of the fence (Photo 8). Rocks and gravel bags can be seen in the drainage, approximately 50 feet below the silt fence (Photo 11).

I noted increased erosion above the silt fencing compared to my last visit (Photo 10). The increased rainwater runoff from the recent storm and associated mud and debris appeared to have eroded portions of the old oak swale drainage channel, creating deep rills below the silt fence (Photo 9), and deposited mud, rock, and gravel bags along the channel (Photo 11) and into Limekiln Creek. Photo 12 shows the upper sedimentation basin/newt pond just downstream of the old oak swale drainage was full of mud, rock, and debris. Many mud slides were noted throughout Aliso Canyon; therefore, not all of the sediment and debris in the newt pond can be attributed to the oak swale runoff.

The lower sedimentation basin/newt pond had also been completely filled in with sediment and debris (Photo 13).

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

Onsite monitors were in place and overseeing the construction activities; all construction personnel appear to have gone through the training (APM HZ-6).

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

Continue to check the TSP A2 access road after major rain events.

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

Diversion of water away from the oak swale is recommended, especially for water from the Well Pad above the Natural Substation access road and water from the access road, itself.

COMPLIANCE SUMMARY


Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries (compliance level 0) 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.




- Compliance Level 0: 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: Violates the project's environmental requirements but does not immediately put environmental resources at risk. Applicant will need to correct the action and/or prevent repeat incidents of the same issue. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: (Minor Incident) Level 2 should be those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, minor risk to environmental resources such as activities that result in a deviation from the mitigation measure requirements that result in minor, short-term impact to 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: (Major Incident) Level 3 are those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, major risk to environmental resources such as: major environmental incident that is not in compliance with the applicant mitigation measures, mitigation measures, permit condition, approval (e.g., variances, addendums) requirements, and/or environmental construction specifications; violation of the law; or documented repetitive occurrences of Level 2 Minor Incident events. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SoCalGas or 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
1/23/17	Well Pad above the Natural Substation Access Road		Photo 1 – Ponded water on the Well Pad above the Natural Substation access road. This water was flowing over the curb and down the access road.
1/23/17	Bioswale at the Natural Substation		Photo 2 – Overview of the bioswale; note that the covers to the irrigation boxes washed down the access road.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/17	Natural Substation Bioswale		Photo 3 – Water filled the bio swale and drained out the concrete overflow ditch.
1/23/17	Natural Substation Bioswale		Photo 4 – Nearly clogged intake drains within the bioswale.
1/23/17	Natural Substation Access Road		Photo 5 – Some ponded water in the access road.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/17	PS-42 Fill Site		Photo 6 – Water filled the top of the PS-42 Fill Site. Pumping equipment remains onsite.
1/23/17	TSP A2 Access Road		Photo 7 – BMPs at the entrance to the TSP A2 access road. Additional bags had been added since my previous site visit.
1/23/17	TSP A2 Access Road		Photo 8 – Silt fencing used to divert water away from the TSP A2 access road. Much of the rock and gravel bags were washed away.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/17	TSP A2 Access Road		Photo 9 – Erosion below the diversion structure.
1/23/17	Oak Swale just above the Silt Fence Diversion Structure		Photo 10 – New erosion within the oak swale above the silt fence.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/17	Old Oak Swale Drainage below the TSP A2 Access Road		Photo 11 – Mud, debris, and gravel bags were deposited within the original oak swale drainage, approximately 50 feet below the silt fence diversion structure.
1/23/17	Limekiln Creek, Upper Sedimentation Basin/Newt Pond		Photo 12 – The upper sedimentation basin/newt pond below the CCS was completely filled with sediment and debris.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/17	Limekiln Creek, Lower Sedimentation Basin/Newt Pond		<p>Photo 13 – The lower sedimentation basin/newt pond near the Guard House has also been completely filled with sediment and debris. Note the oil booms in the trapped sediment.</p>