



ecology and environment, inc.

Global Environmental Specialists

501 West Broadway, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 696-0578, Fax: (888) 645-4354

June 15, 2018

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #8 for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project

Dear Ms. Orsaba,

This report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **May 1 to 31, 2018**, 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 May 9, 17, and 29, 2018. 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).

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 discussed 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 database notifications, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, SCE's monthly compliance status report for May 2018 provided a compliance summary and included a description of construction activities from May 1 to 31, 2018, a detailed look-ahead construction schedule, a summary of compliance with Mesa Substation Project commitments (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 May 2018 reporting period, there was one compliance incident, as detailed below:

- On May 1, 2018, SCE informed the CPUC that overhead conductor work at Pasadena City College was scheduled for May 5, 2018, which would require partial parking lot closure of the Pasadena City College Community Education Center. SCE had been coordinating with Pasadena City College about the parking lot closure and did not foresee any issues; however, according to MM TT-4, SCE is required to provide 30 days advance notice to the CPUC prior to closures of the Pasadena City College Community Education Center. SCE provided the CPUC documentation of coordination and approval from Pasadena City College; however, by failing to provide 30 days advance notice, SCE is in conflict with MM TT-4: Pasadena City College Community Education Center Parking.

Noise Compliance

Exceedances of the stipulated noise levels were recorded on May 1, 2, and 8, 2018. SCE reported these exceedances to the CPUC, as required by the Noise Control Plan. Exceedances were due to equipment working in the immediate vicinity of the noise monitor.

Public Concerns

There were no public concerns during May 2018.

Minor Approvals

During May 2018, there were no email or Minor Project Change approvals.

Sincerely,



Jenny Vick
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:
Lori Rangel, SCE
Don Dow, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Report

May 9, 17, and 29, 2018



Mesa 500-kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	May 9, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS024
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Lisa Orsaba, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, calm, and warm
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	0945 to 1215
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? Except for the scrapers.	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 500-kilovolt (kV) Substation (Mesa Substation) site, the storm drain installation, and the Transmission Corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive and south of Highway 60.

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 0945 and walked through the main Mesa Substation site. I sent a text to ULM Services, Inc., project coordinator Pete Lubich informing him of my arrival.

My first stop was an area listed as the Senior Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) in the Plan of the Day (POD) (Photo 1). It appears that most of the excavation work had been completed at this location, and a crew was installing rebar on the day of my site visit. All of the small square foundation holes had escape boards placed inside (MM BR-10).

Earthmoving activity was ongoing, and a crew was using scrapers to deliver soil to the central portion of the Mesa Substation site (just west of the Senior MEER). The crew was backfilling the old water line and the new drainage piping (Photo 2). I observed water trucks wetting down the backfilling area and access roads throughout the morning (MM HY-1).

I looked at Potrero Grande Drive horizontal directional drilling (HDD) bore #2, which appeared to have had a second large plastic pipe pulled through; crews have one more pipe to pull through at this site (Photo 3). No one was working at this location during the time of my site visit, and the equipment appeared to be secured with no obvious leaks. The lattice steel tower with the bermed slurry catch basin underneath had been removed and the slurry had been spread out to dry at another onsite location.

I spoke with Noreas biological monitor Bob Huttar who was onsite and overseeing the removal of weeds from the Transmission Corridor south of Highway 60. Avian biological monitor Wayne Woodroof (Noreas) and lead biological monitor Matt Daniele (ICF) were also onsite to conduct morning sweeps and provide construction monitoring (MM BR-1, APM-BIO-03, APM-BIO-04, APM-BIO-06, MM BR-2).

Construction activities continued at the 16-kilovolt (kV) and 66-kV switchracks (Photos 4 and 10).

Storm drain installation continued at a number of locations throughout the Mesa Substation site. I had some concerns with the covering of the pipe overnight (Photo 5) and the lack of escape ramps (Photo 9). I sent a text to the ICF lead biological monitor Matt Daniele about these issues. A new wooden escape ramp (Photo 7) had been installed in the drainpipe trench at the westernmost end of the Mesa Substation site, and this new ramp was an improvement over the previous ramp. Crews were installing forms for the tie-in structures (Photo 12).

Wire pulling was ongoing within the Mesa Substation site (Photo 6), and equipment was parked near the detention basin.

Concrete work on the southern perimeter wall looked complete, and a small crew was painting the wall with what appeared to be a thick black plastic moisture barrier (Photo 8).

A crew was using an excavator near the southcentral portion of the Mesa Substation site to separate concrete for recycling (Photo 11).

My last stop was at the MarketPlace HDD site where personnel were working to ream the borehole (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 gone through the 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)

Escape ramps, bird surveys, and nesting buffers should all be checked.

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
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Foundation work within the Senior MEER. Photo facing south.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Storm drain pipe installation and backfilling of the old water line trench. Photo facing south.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Potrero Grande Drive HDD equipment and newly pulled plastic pipe.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – 66-kV switchrack area. Photo facing south.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Storm drain pipe installation near the detention basin. Photo facing east.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – Wire pulling equipment. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – Storm drain pipe at the Mesa Substation outlet location; note the escape ramp located next to the new piping. Photo facing west.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Southern perimeter wall; a crew is painting the wall. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Storm drain pipe installed through the center of the Mesa Substation site. Photo facing north.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – 16-kV switchrack area.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 11 – Excavator separating concrete from the pile of rubble. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – Storm drain pipe connection site along the southern perimeter. Photo facing south.
5/09/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – Market Place HDD operation. Photo facing west.



Mesa 500-kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	May 17, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS025
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Lisa Orsaba, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy and mild temperatures with a slight breeze
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	1100 to 1430
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? Except for the scrapers.	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 500-kilovolt (kV) Substation (Mesa Substation), the storm drain installation, and the Transmission Corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive and south of Highway 60.

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 briefly met with ULM Services, Inc., project coordinator Pete Lubich. He said to be careful of the scrapers and transfer trucks that would be operating throughout the Mesa Substation site.

I checked the location of the Senior Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) and it appeared that all of the footings had been poured (Photo 1). A segment of the Senior MEER storm drain system had been installed (Photo 2). There was an exit ramp out of this trench, but the storm drain pipe should have been capped (MM BR-10). I saw ICF lead biological monitor Matt Danielle and we discussed the need to cap the storm drain pipe so animals would not become trapped. He stated that he was concerned that capping the pipe would trap any animals already inside the pipe, and there was no way to look inside the pipe for animals (MM BR-1, APM-BIO-03, APM-BIO-04, APM-BIO-06, MM BR-2).

Earthmoving activities were ongoing immediately west of the Senior MEER. Soil was being delivered from other parts of the Mesa Substation site to backfill the area over the old water line (Photo 3).

I observed water trucks wetting down the backfill material and the access roads (MM HY-1). I also observed a pumper truck and concrete trucks being rinsed in concrete catch basins (Photo 4).

The third and final plastic conduit had been pulled through at the Potrero Grande Drive HDD bore (Photo 5). Most of the drilling equipment had been removed, and some cleanup and dust control was needed.

Tie-in work continued at several locations along the storm drain system (Photos 6 and 12).

A long stretch of the storm drain system immediately west of the 16-kV switchrack area had been slurried in (Photo 7). This trench only had one thin board installed as an escape ramp, and it should have had an earthen escape ramp cut in. I looked at this location with Noreas avian biological monitor Wayne Woodroof and we discussed the need for an earthen ramp. He indicated that a couple of rabbits and squirrels had been found in the trenches and we both agreed that rabbits would not be able to exit the trench via the board.

The weeds were still growing on the banks of the detention basin (Photo 8) and in the area along the south side of the southern perimeter wall (Photo 10). This area also had trash and piles of concrete (Photo 10), leftover plastic (Photo 11), and mud in the existing storm drain near the new storm drain inlet (Photo 9). The storm drain inlet was under construction, but water was seeping into the channel. I spoke with Noreas biological monitor Bob Huttar about the weeds; he said they were developing a plan for weed removal. I also expressed my concern about the trash and the mud inside the existing storm drain.

Construction activities were ongoing at the 16-kV and 66-kV switchrack areas (Photo 13). Noreas avian biological monitor Wayne Woodroof said they were closely monitoring the 66-kV switchrack area, as birds regularly try to nest there.




A crew was using a large excavator to load transfer trucks with soil from a portion of the newly dismantled substation (Photo 14). This soil was being used to backfill the old water line area. A long, straight-walled trench had been dug immediately west of the area where the excavator crew was working (Photo 15). This trench had an earthen ramp at one end, but I recommended another ramp to Noreas avian biological monitor Wayne Woodroof.




The MarketPlace horizontal directional drilling (HDD) operation continued during my site visit, and all equipment and fuel containers were well contained (Photo 16). Near the drilling operation, I noticed some holes around the newly pulled plastic pipe (Photo 17). I contacted ICF lead biological monitor Matt Daniele who then brought it to the attention of the HDD foreman. I also spoke to Matt Daniele about additional dust control measures being implemented in less traveled areas and my concerns with escape ramps.


<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-9. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)</p> <p>All project personnel appear to have gone through the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (MM BR-5). See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)</p> <p>Dust control, escape ramps, weed removal, and cleanup around the southern perimeter wall.</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance on-site, environmental observations of note)</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY</p> <p>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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>


Date	Non-Compliance Issue and Resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #




<p>PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCE ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:</p>
--



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Foundation work within the Senior MEER. Photo facing south.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Storm drain pipe installation; escape ramp is in place but the pipe is not capped.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Backfilling continues over the old water line. Photo facing south.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Pumper truck being rinsed off within a concrete catch basin.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – The third pipe has been pulled at the Potrero Grande Drive HDD operation. Photo facing east.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – Tie-in work on the storm drain system.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – Storm drain pipe slurred in; an escape ramp is needed here. Photo facing south.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Weeds growing on the detention basin wall. Photo facing west.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – Existing drainage channel near the new storm drain pipe tie-in. Several inches of mud exist in the channel. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 10 – Concrete, trash, and weeds outside of the perimeter wall. Photo facing east.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 11 – Plastic left from the temporary storm water diversion channel.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 12 – Storm drain pipe connection site located just south of the 66-kV switchrack area. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 13 – 66-kV switchrack area.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 14 – Excavation begins for the newly dismantled portion of the old substation. Photo facing east.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 15 – Open trench. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 16 – Storm drain inlet and MarketPlace HDD operation. Photo facing east.
5/17/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 17 – Open holes located within the Market Place HDD area.



Mesa 500-kV Substation Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Mesa 500-kV Substation Project	Date:	May 29, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS026
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Lisa Orsaba, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy and warm with a slight breeze
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	1315 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? Except for the scrapers.	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 500-kilovolt (kV) Substation (Mesa Substation), the storm drain installation, and the Transmission Corridor north of Potrero Grande Drive and south of Highway 60.

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 1315 and checked in with ULM Services, Inc., project coordinator Pete Lubich. This was a short site visit and I was not able to look at all of the construction activities.

Upon entering the site I looked at the Senior Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) location where extensive construction activity was taking place (Photo 1). More workers were required, as the aboveground portion was beginning to be built. This area looked well contained and I noted no compliance issues.

At the Potrero Grande Drive horizontal directional drilling (HDD) bore, the drilling equipment was being used by the crew to pull the conduit through the plastic pipe (Photo 2). This work did not require any mud mixing equipment, so only a small crew was at this location to operate the drill rig. Another crew was stationed north of Potrero Grande Drive gluing the conduit together as it was pulled through.

Earthmoving activities were taking place in an area just south of the Potrero Grande Drive HDD work with the use of scrapers (Photo 3). I observed water trucks providing dust control throughout the site (MM HY-1).

The weeds were still growing on the banks of the detention basin (Photo 4) and at a number of other locations within the Mesa Substation site. I spoke with ICF lead biological monitor Matt Daniele who said they were working on a plan to remove the weeds.

There were numerous storm drain inlet locations that remained open (Photo 5). All of the storm drains appeared to have adequate escape ramps and the storm drain pipes had been capped (MM BR-10).

Construction activities continued at the 16-kV and 66-kV switchrack areas (Photo 6). The biological monitors sweep these areas at least twice a day to ensure no birds are beginning to nest in the equipment (MM BR-1, APM-BIO-03, APM-BIO-04, APM-BIO-06, MM BR-2). I discussed this activity with the Noreas avian biological monitor Wayne Woodroof. ICF lead biological monitor Matt Daniele (a coastal California gnatcatcher specialist) said that the sensitive birds had moved back into the environmentally sensitive area (ESA) but had not exhibited any nesting behavior.

I went with ICF lead biological monitor Matt Daniele and Noreas avian biological monitor Wayne Woodroof to look at the new storm drain inlet connected to the existing drainage channel (Photo 7). A lot of the trash and concrete debris had been cleaned out of the area since my previous site visit, and most of the mud had been removed from the drainage channel.

Crews were using a large excavator to load transfer trucks with soil from the old substation (Photo 8).

Foundations were being poured in the area east of the 66-kV switchrack (Photo 9).

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 gone through the 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)

Escape ramps, weed removal, and cleanup around the southern perimeter wall.

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
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 1 – Work continues within the Senior MEER. Photo facing east.
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 2 – Potrero Grande Drive HDD operation pulling conduit.
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 3 – Scrapers moving soil between the HDD area and the 66-kV switchrack. Photo facing south.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 4 – Weeds growing on the banks of the detention basin. Photo facing west.
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 5 – Storm drain pipe remains open; note the escape ramps and capped pipe.
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 6 – 16-kV switchrack area. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 7 – Storm drain inlet into the existing drain channel. Mud and trash have been removed. Photo facing west.
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 8 – Excavation of the old substation. Photo facing north.
5/29/18	Mesa Substation		Photo 9 – New foundation poured. Photo facing northwest.