

January 14, 2020

Connie Chen
Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #21 for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project

Dear Ms. Chen,

This report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **June 1 to 30, 2019**, 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 **June 6, 13, 19, and 26, 2019**. 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).

Several compliance concerns occurred during the period from June 1 to 30, 2019, however, 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 pertained to 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 automated database notifications from SCE, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, SCE's monthly compliance status report for June 2019 provided a compliance summary and included a description of construction activities from June 1 to 30, 2019, a detailed look-ahead construction schedule, a summary of compliance with Mesa Substation Project commitments (i.e., the 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 June 2019 reporting period, SCE self-reported one non-project related compliance observations. The compliance observation is described below.

On June 18, 2019, a biologist observed a non-project SCE subcontractor's vehicle and equipment trailer parked inside of a nest buffer. The biologist observed the subcontractor mowing vegetation (mustard and star thistle) inside and outside of the nest buffer. The biologist asked the subcontractor what his scope of work was for the area inside the buffer. He said he was to remove all vegetation in the ROW. However, he came across our red and white stakes and thought it might be an area to stay out of. Previous projects he worked on had used similar delineation methods, and he saw an ESA sign on one of the stakes. He was informed by the biologist that he should double check with his SCE assigned supervisor to make sure the environmental issues had been coordinated with the SCE environmental representative for this project.

This work is not related to the Mesa Substation Project. The incident was observed north of Potrero Grande and northeast of Saturn Street, and was not within any listed species habitat. The area affected (inside the RTHA 300' nest buffer) was surveyed and was completely inside approved disturbance limits. A two-hour observation of the RTHA-0185 nest was conducted to determine the status of the RTHA fledglings in the area, and any impacts the mowing may have on those fledglings. Two other known nests in this area were immediately updated to determine their status as well. FRED nest 222 (Song Sparrow) had fledged and fledglings could be heard in the mustard in the vicinity of the nest. FRED nest 221 (Mourning dove) still had chicks in the nest. This nest was in an Elderberry tree at the edge of the area to be mowed. One California towhee fledgling was observed near the SOSP nest. This incident conflicts with **MM BR-9: Construction Monitoring** and **Sections 2.7.1 of the Mesa Substation Project Nesting Bird Management Plan**.

During the June 2019 reporting period, the CPUC Compliance Monitor reported the following compliance concerns:

- On June 6, 13, 19, and 26 2019, the CPUC Compliance Monitor observed inadequate drip pan placement underneath parked equipment that was not being utilized. The CPUC Compliance Monitor recommended increasing the frequency of ensuring proper drip pan placement.
- On June 6, 2019, the CPUC Compliance Monitor noted that concrete channel onsite accumulated a significant amount of sediment, vegetative material and trash, and advised that this area be cleaned out before the next rainy season.
- On June 13, 2019, the CPUC Compliance Monitor noticed a piece of unattended equipment left idling. The Compliance Monitor notified staff onsite and advised that crews not leave equipment idling during breaks.
- On June 27, 2019, the CPUC Compliance Monitor inspected the Caltrans concrete channel located just outside of the southern boundary wall. He noted that project sediment remained in the channel and extensive vegetative material was left behind by the Caltrans crew. Unfortunately, the Caltrans crew removed half of the ficus tree with the bushtit nest in it and the nest was gone. The CPUC Compliance Monitor recommended entire cleaning of the Caltrans channel.

During the June 2019 reporting period, the CPUC did not issue a Non-Compliance.

Noise Compliance

There were no noise exceedances during the June 2019 reporting period.

Spills

During the June 2019 reporting period, there were no documented spills.

Public Concerns

There were no public concerns during June 2019.

Minor Project Changes

During June 2019, there was one email approval.

On June 12, 2019, SCE submitted an email request regarding current noxious/ invasive weed removal practices to the CPUC. During June 2019, a request via email was approved (see Table 1).

Table 1: Email Approvals for June 2019.

Description	Approval Date
The contractor would use a skid steer with a cutter attachment to remove weeds onsite to address the noxious/invasive weeds before they all seed. Once the weeds are removed, the removal activity would likely not occur again until early next year, during the appropriate season. There were substantially more weeds this year, due to the significant amount of rain received, which also prevented onsite crews from starting weed removal until later than desired.	June 19, 2019

Sincerely,



Silvia Yanez
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:
Lori Rangel, SCE
Don Dow, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Reports

June 6, 13, 19, and 26, 2019



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	June 6, 2019
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS074
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Hazy sunshine, mild temperatures, and breezy winds
E & E CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End Time:	1230 to 1445
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? <i>Except for the scrapers.</i>	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 Mesa Operations Building work, the stormwater drainpipe system, conduit installation, wall construction, and the Transmission Corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive.

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 and noted that the concrete channel around the substation had been pumped out. Project Coordinator Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.) said that the water would be used for dust suppression throughout the project site – Photo 1. The channel accumulated a significant amount of sediment, vegetative material, and trash, and should be cleaned out before the next rainy season. The Power Grade crew completed pumping water out of the catch basin that is located south of the existing substation – Photo 14. The crew was pumping water out of the “triangular” retention basin at the western end of the project site – Photo 9. The water pump placed in the triangular retention basin was not well contained; I notified Pete Lubich about this concern.

The trash previously noted along the entry fence had been removed. The rumble plates at the main project entry/exit appeared clean. However, the entry/exit best management practices (BMPs) east of Market Place Drive leading to the construction trailers and staging area needed upgrades – Photo 17. I notified Project Coordinator Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.) about this concern.

Construction work continued at the Senior Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER). There was new equipment installed outside of the building – Photo 2. Crews were using water trucks for dust suppression throughout the project site and I noticed that street sweeper trucks were cleaning the public roads – Photo 16.

Construction work along the northern boundary wall continued, including: sealing the new wall – Photo 3; and additional wall installation toward the western end of the wall – Photo 4.

The covering of the northern soil berm with concrete was near completion – Photo 5.

I saw biological monitor Matt Daniele (ICF) near the “triangular” retention basin. We briefly discussed the bird nesting issues and onsite monitoring requirements.

Construction work at the 220-kilovolt (kV) switchrack area included: more foundation pouring – Photo 6; aboveground installation – Photo 7; and extensive trenching and installation of copper wire – Photo 8. Many of the generators being used throughout the project site were well contained – Photo 6.

I did not notice new BMPs installed along the southwestern segment of the project site, where rainwater runoff heads toward East Markland Drive – Photo 10.

Conduit installation was being completed near the southern boundary wall – Photo 11. I saw biological monitor Karly Moore who was overseeing this construction activity.

I inspected drip pans under some of the parked equipment – Photos 12 & 13. While there were drip pans under the equipment, the pans were not an adequate size and were not placed in a location that would catch engine fluids. I notified Project Coordinator Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.) about this issue.

All concrete washout bins were nearly full and the area around the bins needed to be cleaned – Photo 15.

The wall around the Mesa Operations Building appeared to be nearly complete – Photo 18. An crew was using an excavator outside of the wall – Photo 19.

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 completed Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (MM BR-5). See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities.

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

Check on drip pans and BMP upgrades.

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

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
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Channel surrounding the substation is now dry. Photo facing east.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Senior MEER. Photo facing south.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Scaffolding along the northern wall – crews are installing moisture barrier materials. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Northern wall installation. Photo facing west.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Concrete cover slope below the northern wall. Photo facing west.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – 220-kV foundation work – note the contained generator. Photo facing south.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – 220-kV above ground installation work. Photo facing south.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Installation of copper grounding wire. Photo facing south.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Pumping captured rainwater out of the triangular retention basin. The water would be used for dust control. The pump is inadequately contained. Photo facing northwest.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 10 – Southwestern portion of the project between the detention basin and the southern fence where no BMPs are placed. Photo facing west.</p>
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 11 – Conduit work just inside of the southern perimeter wall. Photo facing north.</p>
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 12 – Poorly placed drip pans.</p>

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/6/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – Poorly placed drip pans – more than one pan is needed for this piece of equipment.
6/6/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 14 – Retention basin located south of the substation. Photo facing west.
6/6/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 15 – Concrete washout station needing recycling and cleanup. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 16 – Street sweeping of Market Place Drive.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 17 – Exit/Entry BMP east of Market Place Drive needs maintenance. Photo facing northwest.
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 18 – Wall around the Mesa Operations Building. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/6/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 19 – Earthwork along the outside of the Mesa Operations Buildings northern wall. Photo facing east.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	6/10/19

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	6/10/19



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	June 13, 2019
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS075
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Overcast skies, mild temperatures, and breezy winds
E & E CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End Time:	0745 to 1045
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? <i>Except for the scrapers.</i>	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 Mesa Operations Building work, the stormwater drainpipe system, conduit installation, wall construction, and the Transmission Corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive.

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 0745. I saw Project Coordinator Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.) and we talked briefly about project activities. Work continued inside the Senior Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) – Photo 1.

A crew was pumping out a conduit vault located north of the 220-kilovolt (kV) switchrack area – Photo 2. They did not have drip pans placed under either of the two engines; however, as I stood by and took notes, one of the crewmembers put drip pans in place. Crews were also pumping out a gray-colored liquid that appeared to be concrete slurry. Project Coordinator Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.) confirmed it was just sediment-laden water and that it would be used for dust control throughout the site.

Construction work along the northern boundary wall continued and crews resumed sealing the new wall – Photo 3. The concrete wall work was completed along the western end of the wall – Photo 4.

A short stretch of conduit trench was excavated, likely for completing repair work on the conduit – Photo 5.

Construction work at the 220-kV switchrack area continued, including: ongoing pouring of foundations – Photo 6; aboveground installation and connection work – Photo 7; and extensive grounding work (i.e., trenching and installation of copper wire) – Photo 8. Crews were also spreading gravel within the switchrack area after completion of grounding activities – Photo 9. One piece of unattended equipment was left idling; I spoke to a crewmember onsite and requested/recommended that they not leave equipment idling.

I saw biological monitor Wayne Woodroof (Noreas) who was regularly observing the switchrack areas for nesting birds. A “V” ditch was being dug and poured along the inside of the wall that surrounds the switchrack areas – Photo 10.

At the “triangular” retention basin, a water pump was still in place to pump out the water for use as dust suppression – Photo 11. The pump was placed in a pink plastic “kiddie pool” that was acting as a containment device.

Electrical conduit installation was ongoing near the southern boundary wall – Photo 12. There were no changes to the best management practices (BMPs) installed along the outside of the southern boundary wall – Photo 13.

I inspected whether drip pans were placed under parked equipment; several appeared to be randomly placed and were not catching any of the engine fluids – Photos 14. Additionally, a single drip pan was not large enough to cover all potential drip locations under larger pieces of equipment.

I spoke to lead biological monitor Matt Daniele (ICF) about weed removal throughout the project site and whether using a mower for weed removal would be best during this time.

Excavation activities for a fence/wall around the Mesa Operations Building continued at the southeastern corner of the building site and along the northern side – Photos 15 & 16.

Trash and debris remained inside the concrete channel that surrounds the Existing Mesa Substation – Photo 17.

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 completed Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (MM BR-5). See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities.

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

Check on drip pans and BMP upgrades.

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

Instead of using drip pans under the parked equipment, it might be better to set up a plastic tarp drip catchment system.

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
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Senior MEER. Photo facing south.
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Crew pumping out a conduit vault – note the lack of a drip pans under the generator. Photo facing south.
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Crews are installing moisture barrier materials on the northern wall. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – The lower portion of the northern wall has been poured. Photo facing east.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Conduit repair work.
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – 220-kV foundation work. Photo facing north.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – 220-kV above ground installation work. Photo facing north.
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Installation of copper grounding wire. Photo facing south.
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Spreading gravel w/in the 220-kV rack area. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 10 – “V” ditch being built on the inside of the wall surrounding the rack areas. Photo facing west.</p>
			<p>Photo 11 – Pumping rainwater runoff out of the triangular retention basin. The pumped water would be used for dust control. The pump was contained with a small kiddie pool. Photo facing west.</p>
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 12 – Conduit work inside of the southern boundary wall. Photo facing north.</p>

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – BMPs outside of the southern boundary wall. Photo facing southwest.
6/13/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 14 – Poorly placed drip pans – more than one pan is needed for this piece of equipment.
6/13/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 15 – Excavation work near the projects eastern entrance. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 16 – Earthwork along the outside of the Mesa Operations Buildings northern wall. Photo facing east.
6/13/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 17 – Channel surrounding the substation has a lot of trash and debris inside. Photo facing east.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	6/14/19

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	06/14/19



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	June 19, 2019
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS076
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear skies, warm weather, and calm winds
E & E CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End Time:	1330 to 1530
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? <i>Except for the scrapers.</i>	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 Mesa Operations Building work, the stormwater drainpipe system, conduit installation, wall construction, and the Transmission Corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive.

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 1330 on clear and warm day. Crews were using water trucks for dust suppression and street sweepers to clean the public roads.

Most of the construction work at the Senior Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) building continued inside; however, a crew was connecting the roof downspouts to the site drainage system. Crews prepared the area around the building to pour a concrete walkway – Photo 1.

Extensive activity continued within the various switchrack areas, including aboveground equipment installation, stringing wire, and connection work – Photos 2 & 3 – as well as ongoing installation of copper grounding wire – Photo 11. There were numerous small generators in use throughout these areas, all of which were well contained.

Construction work to seal the new northern boundary wall continued – Photo 4. I spoke briefly with Craig Pernot (Power Grade) and saw biological monitors Matt Daniele (ICF) and Wayne Woodroof (Noreas) onsite.

Areas with open excavations were well covered – Photo 5.

A small construction crew was working on the manhole covered access shaft to the stormwater drainage system at the far western portion of the site near East Markland Drive. I noted some small concrete washouts near the site – Photo 6 – and an inadequate containment system for their generator – Photo 7. Power Grade foreman Willie Clark came by and I pointed out both issues to him. He said they would lift the concrete and get better containment for the generator.

Crews appeared to begin preparing paving the East Markland Drive entry/exit area, as they have regraded the area and compacted the road base – Photo 8.

Concrete forms were built around the electrical conduit installation near the southern boundary wall – Photo 9. The trench had an excellent escape ramp.

“V” ditch construction work continued along the southern boundary wall, with crews conducting concrete pours in the ditch – Photo 10. A crew was washing a pumper truck’s equipment into the concrete truck.

The weed mowing equipment was onsite and addressed large areas located south of the Existing Mesa Substation – Photos 12 & 13. Prior to mowing, a crew with a water truck was spraying the area to minimize the amount of dust generated. A biological monitor was observing this activity. The kestrel buffer had been removed.

Proper drip pan placement under the parked equipment continued to be a issue – Photo 14. I recommended a larger, plastic-lined catchment basin to be installed for large equipment, such as scrapers.

Construction for a fence/wall around the Mesa Operations Building continued – Photo 15. I also noted a crew working in a deep pit/excavated area north of Potrero Grande Drive – Photo 16.

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 completed Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (MM BR-5). See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities.

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

Inspect drip pans.

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

Instead of using drip pans under the parked equipment, it may be better to set up a plastic tarp drip catchment system.

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
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Work outside the Senior MEER. Photo facing south.
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Overhead equipment installation at the 220-kV switchrack area. Photo facing west.
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Crews working at the 220-kV switchrack area using well contained generators. Photo facing west.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Sealing the northern wall continued. Photo facing northwest.
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Excavations have been covered. Photo facing west.
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – A crew working on the storm drain system near E. Markland Drive – note the concrete washout on the ground. Photo facing west.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – Generator with an inadequate catch basin. Photo facing north.
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Installation of road base at the Markland entry/exit. Photo facing west.
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Conduit work with concrete forms installed. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – “V” ditch being poured. Photo facing east.
			Photo 11 – Copper grounding wire installation. Photo facing north
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – Weed mowing machine. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/19/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – Areas already mowed south of the existing substation. Photo facing west.
6/19/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 14 – No drip pan in place.
6/19/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 15 – Wall installation work continues around the Mesa Operations Building. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/19/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 16 – Earthwork north of Potrero Grande. Photo facing west.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	6/24/19

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	6/24/19



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	June 26, 2019
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS077
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy skies, mild temperatures, and calm winds
E & E CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End Time:	1115 to 1400
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? <i>Except for the scrapers.</i>	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 Mesa Operations Building work, the stormwater drainpipe system, conduit installation, wall construction, and the Transmission Corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive.

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 and notified Project Coordinator Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.).

An area at the Senior Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) building had forms installed for a concrete pour – Photo 1. I went inside of the building and spoke with one of the crewmembers who mentioned they pulled several miles of wire, all of which entered the building through the basement – Photo 2.

I counted at least five locations along the northern portion of the project site where crews dug pairs of matching excavations. Each pit was approximately 4 feet by 6 feet and approximately 7 feet deep. Climbing structures were installed in the pits – Photo 3. Some contained a gravel bed and others appeared to have prefabricated conduit vaults – Photo 4.

Construction work continued the new northern boundary wall. Most of the activities conducted were application of moisture barriers – Photo 5.

Weed mowing continued throughout the project site near the upper edge of the detention basin – Photo 6. I did not notice the equipment onsite, so it is possible that the work was completed. I spoke with biological monitor Matt Daniele (ICF) about weed mowing and asked if any bird nesting activity was seen. He said that several California towhee nests were found ahead of the mowing, and the avian biologists installed buffer zones – Photo 17. I noted that biological monitor Wayne Woodroof (Noreas) was onsite.

I walked toward the small “triangular” retention basin and noted that it was nearly dry – Photo 7. There was extensive trash and debris in that area; however, most of it was coming from the public roadway. I noticed a crew picking up trash throughout the switchrack areas. Water trucks were regularly spraying all the access roads throughout the site. A scraper was operating and transporting soil throughout the site.

The electrical conduit installed near the southern boundary wall was poured with concrete and the forms were stripped off – Photo 8.

Ongoing construction work in the various switchrack areas included installation of the copper grounding wire and the equipment installation, stringing wire, and connection work – Photos 9 & 10.

Drip pans were not correctly placed under the parked equipment – Photo 11. However, I notified Project Coordinator Pete Lubich (ULM Services, Inc.) and Power Grade foreman Willie Clark about this concern and they both mentioned that the equipment was parked only during the lunch break. Therefore, the drip pans were not replaced under the engines. As mentioned previously, other systems for drip containment may work better than trying to get the small drip pans accurately placed.

The foundations for the wall around the Mesa Operations Building was poured – Photo 12. A crew was installing the brick portion of the wall – Photo 13. The mortar mixing station was muddy, and the mortar splashed in surrounding areas – Photo 14. Significant weed removal was completed around the Mesa Operations Building.

A crew was working on best management practices (BMPs) within the telecommunications corridor located north of Potrero Grande Drive – Photo 15.

In the trailer/staging area, east of the Market Place, a bathroom facility was installed – Photo 16. Several temporary trailers

would be set up here in preparation for Phase 3 of the project.

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 completed Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (MM BR-5). See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities.

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

Inspect drip pan placement.

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

Instead of using drip pans under the parked equipment, it might be better to set up a plastic tarp drip catchment system. I observed a pair of accipiter's flying over the substation and reported it to the onsite biologists.

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
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Work outside of the Senior MEER building. Photo facing south.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Wires in the basement of the Senior MEER building.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Vault excavations along the northern portion of the project. Photo facing west.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Excavations with vaults placed in them.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – The northern retaining wall. Photo facing west.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – Some weed mowing was completed around the top of the detention basin. Photo facing west.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – The triangular retention basin is nearly dry. Photo facing north.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Electrical conduit has been poured. Photo facing north.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Copper wire grounding work w/in the 220-kV switchrack area. Photo facing north.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – Above ground equipment installation in the 220-kV switchrack area. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 11 – Placement of drip pans.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – The wall foundation was poured near the Mesa Operations Building entry way. Photo facing north.
6/26/19	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – Work on the brick installation for the wall around the Mesa Operations Building. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/26/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 14 – Mortar mixing station near the Mesa Operations Building. Photo facing southeast.
6/26/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 15 – BMP upgrades completed north of Potrero Grande. Photo facing north.
6/26/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 16 – Restroom installation within the telecommunications corridor, located east of Marketplace. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/26/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 17 – Bird nesting buffer in the telecommunications corridor, located east of Marketplace. Photo facing east.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	6/29/19

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	6/30/19