



August 16, 2021

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #42 for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project

Dear Ms. Chen,

This report summarizes the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **March 1 to 31, 2021**, 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 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 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, 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 WSP USA Inc. (WSP), formerly Ecology and Environment, Inc., 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 **March 5, 9, 17, 24, and 30**. 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).

The CPUC did not issue a Non-compliance during the period from March 1 to 31, 2021. WSP prepared a memorandum on February 21, 2021, that provided a summary of a stormwater visual monitoring activity that occurred on February 4, 2021, for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project in Los Angeles County, California. Stormwater compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by SCE and their contractors comply with applicable permits and the compliance plan. SCE submitted responses to the memorandum to the CPUC/WSP. Responses to the memorandum are currently

WSP USA
425 MARKET STREET
17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

Tel.: 415-398-5326
wsp.com

under review. Communication between the CPUC/WSP 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/WSP and SCE, along with daily schedule updates and automated database notifications from SCE, supplied additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, SCE's monthly compliance status report for March 2021 supplied a compliance summary and included a description of construction activities from March 1 to 31, 2021, a detailed review of the 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 March 2021 reporting period, SCE did not self-report any non-project or project-related compliance incidents.

Additionally, during the March 2021 reporting period, the CPUC Compliance Monitor reported the following compliance concerns:

- On March 17, 2021, the CPUC Compliance Monitor noted the project area received approximately 0.5 inches of rain last week and an additional 0.4 inches on Monday, March 15. The CPUC Compliance Monitor did not see rainwater runoff but did note muddy areas, mud stains on the v-ditch, and numerous visible erosion rivulets. Mud stains behind the gravel bag check dams within the v-ditch running east to west between the boundary wall and the soil stockpile showed that sediment from the site filled the area behind each of the check dams. It was also evident that the drain inlet within this v-ditch had clogged, creating a large pond. The gravel bags and filter fabric around and over this drain inlet had been pulled out to allow the water to drain out, and the materials were placed near the edge of the v-ditch.

WSP prepared a memorandum on February 12, 2021, that provided a summary of a stormwater visual monitoring activity that occurred on February 4, 2021, for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project in Los Angeles County, California. Stormwater compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by SCE and their contractors comply with the terms and conditions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 as amended by Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ, and Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ. SCE provided responses to the memorandum on March 18, 2021. As of March 31, 2021, the responses to the memorandum are under review.

During the March 2021 reporting period, the CPUC did not issue a Non-Compliance.

Noise Compliance

No noise exceedances occurred during the March 2021 reporting period.

Spills

No spills were reported during the March 2021 reporting period.

Public Concerns

One public concern was received on March 27, 2021 by the CPUC. A local resident contacted the CPUC regarding fugitive dust collecting in their neighborhood. SCE responded to comments made by the

resident about techniques used to control fugitive dust and the extended timeline for completion of the project. All questions raised by the resident were answered and the incident required no further action by CPUC or SCE.

Minor Project Changes

On February 2, 2021, SCE submitted a minor project change (MPC) Request 14 to the CPUC. On March 4, 2021, the CPUC/WSP submitted a request to SCE for additional information regarding MPC Request 14. On March 23, 2021, SCE responded to comments and provided a revised MPC 14 Request. As of March 31, 2021, MPC Request 14 remains under review.

During March 2021, two requests via email were approved:

- On March 9, 2021, SCE submitted Mesa Buffer Reduction Request Form 0044 to the CPUC. On March 17, 2021, SCE submitted a revised Mesa Buffer Reduction Form 0044 and applicable California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) buffer reduction request approvals to the CPUC (see Table 1).
- On March 18, 2021, SCE submitted Mesa Buffer Reduction Request Form 0045 to the CPUC. On March 19, 2021, SCE submitted the applicable CDFW and USFWS buffer reduction request approvals to the CPUC (see Table 1).

Table 1: Email Approvals for March 2021.

Description	Approval Date
SCE is seeking a buffer reduction request approval to continue installing best management practices (BMPs) on a stockpile adjacent to a restricted use area, prior to forecasted rain events. SCE and USFWS interagency coordination led to SCE revising Buffer Reduction Request Form 0044 to a 150-foot buffer. After additional USFWS questions were addressed, SCE received concurrence from USFWS and submitted the approval to the CPUC on March 17, 2021. The CPUC submitted concurrence to proceed with the buffer reduction (as described in the revised Buffer Reduction Request Form 0044) and with planned monitoring and contingencies.	March 17, 2021
SCE is seeking a buffer reduction for a red-tailed hawk nest established within the operating substation. This nest was established in a substation structure while ongoing operations and construction activities were occurring in the vicinity, as described I Mesa Buffer Reduction Request Form 0045. The reduction request is to allow use of an existing road within the substation only, no other activities would occur in the reduced buffer. SCE submitted CDFW and USFWS approval to the CPUC on March 19, 2021. On March 19, 2021, after receiving CDFW and USFWS approvals, the CPUC submitted concurrence to proceed with the buffer reduction (as described in the Buffer Reduction Request Form 0045) and with planned monitoring and contingencies.	March 19, 2021

Sincerely,



Silvia Yanez
Project Manager, WSP

cc:
Lori Rangel, SCE
Don Dow, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Reports
March 5, 9, 17, 24, and 30 2021



Mesa 500-kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	March 5, 2021
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison (SCE)	Report #:	VS158
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Sunny, mild, and calm
WSP CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End time:	1100 to 1230
Project NTP(s):	Notice to Proceed (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 belly scappers.</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 sent a text to the Mesa Substation Project Environmental Inspector (EI)/Site representative about my approximate arrival time. I arrived onsite at 1100 and stopped at the construction trailers. A crew was onsite drilling and pouring the foundation

holes for towers located north of the trailers (Photo 1).

Over the last 24 hours the site received about 0.2 inches of rain causing the site to be muddy. I was escorted into the project site by one of the site representatives and we entered through the Markland gate, staying on the paved roadways. We parked at the southwest corner of the Phase 4 work site and walked into the work areas.

The Phase 4 area contained a large quantity of bare ground that was concerning for sheet flow of stormwater runoff (Photo 2). The rainwater runoff from this area was contained in the detention basins.

Outside of the southern boundary wall gravel check dams were placed in the new V-ditch (Photos 3 and 4). Little rainwater runoff was present in this area with minimal riling on the soil stockpile or flow lines through the staging area. Runoff traveling along the southern side of the soil stockpile remained a concern (Photo 5). We inspected the best management practices (BMPs) outside of the boundary wall (Photo 6).

Gravel bags were installed at a location where runoff from Highway 60 might enter the project site (Photo 7). It did not appear any rainwater came into the site at this location.

I walked through the Phase 4 construction area noting the ongoing foundation work, conduit installation, and infrastructure work (Photos 8, 9, 10, and 11). The work areas were in good condition with drip secondary containment under the equipment with minimal trash present.

Work on pumping out the small triangular catch basin had begun (Photo 12). This water was being pumped through a filter system and then into the detention basin (Photo 13).

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

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).

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

Inspect BMPs throughout the project site to ensure their effectiveness at containing runoff water.

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

The stockpiled soil within the Transmission Corridor had no BMPs present.

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 the WSP Compliance Manager (CM). Inform the WSP 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
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 1 – Tower foundations being drilled and poured east of Market Place Drive. Photo facing northwest.</p>
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 2 – Open ground ready for Phase 4 work. Photo facing east.</p>
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 3 – Stockpiled soil and the new v-ditch with check dams. Photo facing east.</p>

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – V-ditch drain inlet with BMPs. Photo facing north.
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Soil stockpile with one straw wattle near the riprapped drain inlet. Photo facing east.
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – BMPs installed along the outside of the southern boundary wall, with check dams in the v-ditch. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – Gravel bags placed where rainwater runoff may enter the site from Highway 60. Photo facing west.
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Transformer foundation work. Photo facing northeast.
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Pull station installation. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – Forms for a new pull station. Photo facing northeast.
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 11 – Conduit installation. Photo facing southeast.
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – Small triangular catch basin. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/05/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – Filter system for the water pumped out of the catch basin. Photo facing west.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/08/21

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/09/21



Mesa 500-kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	March 9, 2021
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison (SCE)	Report #:	VS159
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy, mild, and breezy. Rain in the forecast
WSP CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End time:	1100 to 1330
Project NTP(s):	Notice to Proceed (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 belly scappers.</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 1100 on a cool, cloudy, and breezy day, with rain predicted for later in the afternoon/evening. I stopped at the construction trailers and noted that the lattice work tower foundations north of the trailers were poured and the drilling

equipment moved offsite (Photo 1).

I checked in with the site representatives and they met me at the Potrero Grande Drive entrance. After a brief tailboard we traveled to the project site.

My first stop was at the soil stockpile outside of the southern boundary wall. The California gnatcatchers (*Polioptila californica californica*) occupying the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) began nesting so a buffer boundary was set up to encompass most of the soil stockpile (Photo 2). I met with the onsite avian biologist, and we spoke about the nesting gnatcatchers and the nest buffer. Best management practice (BMP) installation had begun on the soil stockpile but was on hold until a nest buffer reduction could be acquired.

I met with the site-Qualified Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Practitioner, and we discussed the BMP work ahead of the upcoming storm system. Most of the site appeared well prepared, so my main concern was with rainwater runoff coming down the southern side of the soil stockpile and exiting the site via the ripped drain inlet (Photo 3). We discussed directing runoff into the v-ditch that drains to the detention basin. I also inquired about waiting until the day before the storms arrival to begin stabilizing the soil stockpile. We walked over to the Phase 4 construction area and discussed the amount of sheet flow expected from the open soil area and where it would go.

A crew was removing broken concrete from the staging area located west of the soil stockpile (Photo 4). A water truck was working with the crew to minimize dust.

The BMPs along the outside of the southern boundary wall remained in place (Photo 5).

The captured rainwater runoff in the small triangular catch basin had been pumped out (Photo 6). With the incoming storm, the small triangular catch basin would likely fill with water again.

I walked through the Phase 4 construction area. A crew was pouring slurry around a newly installed cable tray (Photo 7), conduit installation continued (Photo 8), work continued on the cable tray pumping unit (Photo 9), another cable tray pulling location was being formed and poured (Photo 9), and infrastructure foundations were being built (Photo 10). Drip pans were in place throughout and containment appeared adequate under the other construction equipment (Photo 11).

My final stop was at the soil stockpile in the southeast corner of the project site (Photo 12). I asked the site representatives why no BMPs were installed on and around this soil pile and the plastic sheeting was removed (Photo 13). They said there was a dispute about who was responsible for this soil pile, hence the lack of BMPs.

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

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).

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

Inspect BMPs onsite.

COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance onsite, 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 the WSP Compliance Manager (CM). Inform the WSP 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
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Tower foundations were poured east of Market Place Drive. Photo facing northwest.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Nesting bird buffer signage on the soil stockpile. Photo facing east.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Stockpiled soil and the drainage corridor along the southern side of the stockpile. Photo facing east.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Removal of construction debris. Photo facing west.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – BMPs installed along the outside of the southern boundary wall. Photo facing west.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – The small triangular catch basin was almost dry after the water was pumped out. Photo facing northeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/09/21	Mesa Substation	 A long, narrow concrete channel for cable tray installation in a dirt field at a substation. The channel is filled with a dark material, likely cable trays. In the background, there are several tall metal structures, possibly power lines or towers, and a concrete mixer truck is visible on the right side. The sky is blue with some clouds.	Photo 7 – Cable tray installation within the Phase 4 work area. Photo facing south.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation	 A worker in a yellow safety vest and a red hard hat is standing next to a trench. The trench is filled with a dark material, likely cable trays. In the background, there are several tall metal structures, possibly power lines or towers. An orange traffic cone is visible in the foreground. The sky is blue.	Photo 8 – Conduit installation. Photo facing south.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Cable tray pumping station installation. Photo facing south.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – Poured forms for a new cable tray pull station. Photo facing east.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 11 – Transformer foundation work continued. Photo facing southeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – Secondary containment under a diesel generator. Photo facing south.
03/09/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – Soil stockpile without BMPs. Photo facing east.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/16/21

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/16/21



Mesa 500-kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	March 17, 2021
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison (SCE)	Report #:	VS160
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy, mild, and calm
WSP CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End time:	1100 to 1300
Project NTP(s):	Notice to Proceed (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 belly scappers.</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 1100 and stopped at the construction trailers. A crew was building the lattice work tower north of the trailers (Photo 1). A bulldozer was reworking the earthen slope between the trailers and the lattice tower work (Photo 2). Another crew

was installing best management practices (BMPs) nearby and would begin work on the newly prepared slopes.

I checked in with the site representatives and we met at the Potrero Drive entrance. Professional electric crews were actively working on installation of the 500-kilovolt (kV) substation infrastructure (Photo 3), in addition to excavating and pouring the foundations for the infrastructure (Photos 4 and 5). A paleontology monitor was onsite inspecting the tailings from the foundation drilling.

We drove to the area south of the southern boundary wall where I met with Craig Pernot of Power Grade; I also observed the project's Qualified Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Practitioner onsite. I was notified that the project area received approximately 0.5 inches of rain last week and an additional 0.4 inches on Monday March 15. I did not see any rainwater runoff, but muddy areas, mud stains on the v-ditch, and the numerous erosion rivulets were visible. The mud stains behind the gravel bag check dams within the v-ditch running east to west between the boundary wall and the soil stockpile showed that sediment coming from the site filled the area behind each of the check dams (Photo 6). The drain inlet within this v-ditch had clogged up, creating a large pond (Photo 7). The gravel bags and filter fabric around and over this drain inlet had been pulled out to allow the water to drain. The materials were left by the edge of the v-ditch.

Stormwater runoff rivulets were noted coming off the top of the soil stockpile (Photo 8) and from around the southern side of the soil stockpile (Photo 9). The California gnatcatcher (*Poliioptila californica californica*) nest buffer remained in place; no additional BMPs were installed over and around the soil stockpile. Project biologists were waiting for a reduced buffer determination by the various agencies.

Runoff coming from the Highway 60 corridor created an erosion rill on the slope above the gravel bag BMPs (Photo 10), and rivulets were noted coming into the BMP area outside of the southern boundary wall (Photo 11).

Muddy sediment was captured behind the gravel bag check dams within the v-ditch running down the offsite drain inlet (Photos 12 and 13). The captured sediment was excavated from the v-ditch, but sediment laden runoff had drained offsite via the drain inlet or the CalTrans channel. A Power Grade crew was working on the drain inlet at the end of the v-ditch (Photo 14).

The existing BMPs remained at the head of the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) channel and needed to be removed and the area restored (Photo 15).

Water had been captured by the small triangular catch basin (Photo 16). The v-ditch draining into the catch basin from the east remained full of sediment from last year and needed to be removed (Photo 17).

Clear water was noted in the western detention basin and was draining into the outlet culver via holes in the standpipe (Photo 18).

Mud had accumulated in the BMPs along the fence separating the new energized substations and the Phase 4 work area (Photo 19). Due to the amount of sediment, these BMPs were no longer effective.

A pair of red-tailed hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*) appeared to be nesting in the 220-kV substation equipment and a nest buffer was established (Photo 20).

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

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).

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

Inspect BMPs onsite.

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

What was the reasoning for cutting holes in the metal standpipe in the western detention basin?

COMPLIANCE SUMMARY




Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3, fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to the WSP Compliance Manager (CM). Inform the WSP 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
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Erecting a lattice work tower north of the construction trailers. Photo facing northwest.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Preparation of the slope for BMPs. Photo facing west.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Infrastructure installation in the 500-kV substation area. Photo facing south.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Cable tray trenches in the 500-kV substation area. Photo facing north.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Foundation holes in the new 500-kV substation. Photo facing east.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – The v-ditch between the southern boundary wall and the soil stockpile with mud stains visible. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 7 – The v-ditch drain inlet area at the western end of the soil stockpile with muddy areas visible from the last rain event. Photo facing north.</p>
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 8 – Erosion rills coming from the soil stockpile. Photo facing north.</p>
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		<p>Photo 9 – Rainwater runoff from the south of the soil stockpile. Photo facing north.</p>




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – Rainwater runoff flowing into the site from the Highway 60 corridor. Photo facing south.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 11 – Rainwater runoff rivulets flowed into the BMP area. Photo facing southwest.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – Mud captured in the v-ditch. Photo facing west.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – V-ditch leading from the offsite drain inlet. Photo facing east.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 14 – Work on the drain inlet outside of the southern boundary wall. Photo facing west.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 15 – Existing BMPs that needed to be removed and the area restored. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 16 – Water captured in the small triangular catch basin. Photo facing north.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 17 – The v-ditch leading into the triangular catch basin remained full of sediment. Photo facing northeast.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 18 – The western detention basin was drained. Photo facing southeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 19 – Mud collected in the BMPs along the new substation fence line. Photo facing north.
03/17/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 20 – Bird nesting buffer signage for a pair of red-tailed hawks. Photo facing west.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/22/21

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/22/21



Mesa 500-kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	March 24, 2021
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison (SCE)	Report #:	VS161
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, mild, and calm
WSP CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End time:	1100 to 1330
Project NTP(s):	Notice to Proceed (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 belly scappers.</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 1100 and stopped at the construction trailers. I had notified the site representative several hours before my arrival time but did not receive a response. I called the site representative when I arrived and eventually met with another site

representative who escorted me on my site visit.

A crew was erecting the lattice work tower north of the trailers. The best management practice (BMP) work continued on the slope between the trailers and the lattice tower work, with jute netting, straw wattles, and Macdrains being installed (Photo 1).

The Professional Electric crews were working at several locations within the 500-kilovolt (kV) substation and Phase 4 area. Cable tray excavation and installation was ongoing (Photos 2 and 3), several foundations were recently poured (Photo 4), and drilling for infrastructure foundations continued (Photo 5). Work continued to form and pour the cable tray pumping station (Photo 6). I noted an erosion rivulet from the Phase 4 work area indicating rainwater runoff was significant (Photo 7). The foundation holes were adequately covered, and the trenches had climbing structures in place.

A crew was excavating a diversion channel along the transmission corridor's southern boundary fence where runoff from Highway 60 enters the project (Photo 8). The new channel would redirect rainwater runoff east and into the ripped drain inlet.

Crews had completed repouring the concrete berms around the drain inlet down at the end of the v-ditch (Photo 9). The reconfigured berms would allow the drain to collect runoff from the transmission corridor and from Highway 60.

According to the onsite avian biologists, the California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) buffer reduction was granted and only allowed for BMP installation on the soil stockpile. Due to the number of nesting birds in and around the project site, three biological monitors were onsite. The project received approvals to reduce the buffer around the red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) nest, including allowing vehicles to pass the nest without stopping.

Power Grade crews were installing straw wattles and using a water truck to spray the soil stockpile with a soil sealant (Photos 10, 11, and 12). The site representatives were hesitant to let me access the area because the buffer reduction was only for BMP installation; I discussed access into the area with the avian biologists.

A bulldozer was working on the soil stockpile located in the southeastern corner of the project site (Photo 13).

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

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).

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

Check on nest buffers and the BMP installation.

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

It would be beneficial if BMPs were installed before the end of the rainy season.

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 the WSP Compliance Manager (CM). Inform the WSP 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
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Erection of a lattice work tower north of the construction trailers where BMP installation was underway. Photo facing northwest.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Trenching near the cable trays. Photo facing east.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Excavation within the Phase 4 work area. Photo facing north.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Newly poured foundations within the Phase 4 work area. Photo facing south.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Foundation holes in the 500-kV substation work area. Photo facing north.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – Forming and pouring the cable tray pumping station. Photo facing northwest.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – Rainwater runoff rivulets flowing through the Phase 4 work area. Photo facing east.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Diversion ditch excavation for rainwater runoff coming into the site from the Highway 60 corridor. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Drain inlet at the end of the v-ditch outside of the southern boundary wall. Photo facing west.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – Straw wattle installation on the west side of the Mount Mesa stockpile. Photo facing east.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 11 – Mount Mesa was sprayed with a soil sealant. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – BMP installation on the east side of Mount Mesa. Photo facing southwest.
03/24/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – Dozer working on the Marketplace Drive soil stockpile. Photo facing east.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/29/21
Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	03/29/21

a



Mesa 500–kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	March 30, 2021
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison (SCE)	Report #:	VS162
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Connie Chen, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Sunny, cool, and calm
WSP CM:	Silvia Yanez	Start/End time:	0930 to 1115
Project NTP(s):	Notice to Proceed (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 tarpred, 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 belly scappers.</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 0930 and stopped at the construction trailers.

The lattice work tower north of the trailers appeared to be completely erected (Photo 1). Several crewmembers were in the tower installing raptor nesting exclusion balls.

I met one of the site representatives and a biological monitor at the Potrero Grande Drive entrance for a brief tailboard before heading into the project site. The biological monitor updated me on the nesting bird issues around the site. Access remained limited around the Mount Mesa stockpile due to the California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) nest. Mourning doves (*Zenaida macroura*) and house finches (*Haemorhous mexicanus*) were trying to nest in the various substations; the biological monitors could remove the nest material for these species if no eggs were laid yet.

Construction activity within the 500-kilovolt (kV) substation and Phase 4 was underway with Professional Electric crews erecting the infrastructure towers (Photos 2 and 3), pouring foundations (Photos 4 and 5), and constructing the cable tray pumping station (Photo 6). The gas-powered generators had secondary containment in place.

The short v-ditch near Highway 60 was poured, directing runoff from the highway into the offsite drain (Photo 7). No equipment or materials remained in this area.

Power Grade crews had completed installing the best management practices (BMPs) on the Mount Mesa stockpile (Photo 8). They were continuing to install BMPs at the east end of the project site and on the Market Place Drive soil stockpile (Photo 9).

Parked equipment appeared to be well contained and street sweepers continued to on work the public roads around the project site.

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

All project personnel appear to have been WEAP trained (MM BR-5).

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

Check on nest buffers and the BMP installation.

COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance onsite, 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 the WSP Compliance Manager (CM). Inform the WSP 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
03/30/21	Mesa Substation	 A tall, lattice-work tower under construction at a substation site. The tower is made of steel and has several horizontal cross-arms. It is situated on a dirt area with other construction equipment and vehicles nearby. The sky is clear and blue.	Photo 1 – A crew was installing raptor exclusion balls to the newly erected lattice work tower north of the construction trailers. Photo facing northwest.
03/30/21	Mesa Substation	 Phase 4 infrastructure work at a substation site. The image shows a large metal structure, possibly a bus or switchgear, being installed. There are orange traffic cones and a concrete path in the foreground. The sky is clear and blue.	Photo 2 – Phase 4 infrastructure work. Photo facing northeast.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/30/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Phase 4 infrastructure work. Photo facing north.
03/30/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Pouring foundations within the Phase 4 work area. Photo facing southeast.
03/30/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Rebar work for a transformer foundation. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/30/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – Building the cable tray pumping station. Photo facing northwest.
03/30/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – Completed diversion ditch for rainwater runoff coming into the site from the Highway 60 corridor. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/30/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Straw wattle installation on the top and west side of the Mount Mesa stockpile. Photo facing east.
03/30/21	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – BMP installation around and on the Market Place Drive stockpile. Photo facing south.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	04/05/21

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	04/05/21