

Artesian 230kV Substation Expansion Project CPUC Minor Project Refinement Form

Minor project refinements are strictly limited to changes that will not trigger an additional permit requirement (except local government ministerial permits and associated requirements), do not substantially increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact based on criteria used in the IS/MND, create a new significant impact, are located within the geographic boundary of the study area of the IS/MND, and that don't conflict with any mitigation measure or applicable law or policy.

Date Requested: October 26, 2020			Report No.: MPR-5			
Date Approved: TBD			Approval Agency: California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)			
Property Owner(s): San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) – ROW City of Escondido			Location: Z12543 – Bypass Switch 689-3 N: 33.08649°; W: -117.07211° Intersection of Cranston Drive and S Centre City Parkway			
Land Use/Vegetative Asphalted bare groun	e Cover: Id and disturbed habitat		Sensitive R None	Resources:		
Modification From:	☐ Permit☐ Mitigation Measure	☐ Plan/Proce ☐ Other: Corwork area	nstruction	☐ Specification	☐ Drawing	

Reference Documents

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the San Diego Gas & Electric Company's Artesian 230kV Substation Expansion Project. Prepared for the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC A.16-08-010), dated February 2018.

Notice to Proceed (NTP) request for the Artesian 230/60 kV Substation Expansion Project. Authorized by the CPUC on September 18, 2019.

SDG&E 2016. SDG&E Proponents Environmental Assessment for the Artesian 230 kV Substation Expansion Project (A.16-08-010) Volumes I and II.



Describe how project refinement deviates from current project. Include photos.

The requested change is to make minor revisions to one work area associated with an existing wood pole and the installation of a new Bypass Switch (See photos in Attachment A). In order to initiate outages, a new Bypass Switch must be installed on the existing pole.

The specific changes are as follows:

Location:

Z12543 – Bypass Switch 689-3. The intersection of Cranston Drive and S Centre City Parkway. The proposed work area will be approximately 8,400 sq. ft. (70 ft x 120 ft.). Of this total, 5,100 sq. ft. (60 ft. x 100 ft.) will be within the unmaintained road median, and 3,300 sq. ft. (15 ft. x 150 ft.) will be within the northbound side of the asphalt road and road shoulder of South Centre City Parkway.

Construction Equipment and Durations:

Two bucket trucks and a crew truck will be needed to perform overhead work. No additional equipment is needed. Activity duration will be one day to complete. Once the 69kV Work on the project is completed, Henkels & McCoy (H&M) will return to the site to remove the bypass jumpers, which will also take one day.

Original Condition:

The photographs in Attachment A depict the original and proposed work area to be used for temporary construction activities.

Justification for Change:

The listed work area needs to be revised as described herein to allow for safe access to an existing pole along the 69kV power line alignment to install a new bypass switch in order to perform necessary outages. SDG&E performed a site walk with the construction contractor and requested a change where the need for MPR-5 was identified by the contractor as required to complete construction activities.

Maps & Figures:

Refer to Figuere 1 in Attachment B. Figure 1 depicts the original work area and the proposed modified MPR-5 work areas.

Environmental Impact:

The request work area modifications would not result in new impacts when compared to the impacts disclosed in the Final IS/MND. The existing Project Mitigation Measures and APMs would ensure that all impacts are less than significant. Additional detail is provided below for key resources.

Concurrence (if appropriate):

Concurrence for the modified work areas is not required. All work is within the IS/MND study area and does not trigger permits from any other agencies.

Resources:			
Biological	No Resources Present	Resources Present	N/A, Change would not affect resources



CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.			
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	□ Y ⊠ N	The MPR-5 scope of work would not affect CEQA impacts relating to geologic hazards, including seismicity. MPR-5 would occur along the existing 69kV alignment, which was included in the IS/MND as a Project feature and work area. Implementation of MPR-5 would not expose the Project, work areas, or workers to any new or increased risk from geologic hazards. Therefore, no change to CEQA impacts would occur as a result of MPR-5.			
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y 図 N	Agency approval (i.e., grading permit or similar process) is not required for implementation of MPR-5.			
Hazardous Materials and Waste	□ Y □ N	MPR-5 will not change the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes. Therefore, no change to CEQA impacts would occur as a result of MPR-5.			
Agency Consultation?	□ Y □ N	MPR-5 would not require additional agency consultation or approval related to hazardous materials or wastes. There would be no significant increase of threat or risk derived from the use of hazardous substances, which would not change from what was analyzed in the IS/MND.			
Hydrology and Water Quality	□ Y □ N	Use of the MPR-5 work area would not affect impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The MPR-5 work area was designed to avoid all aquatic resources in the area. All construction activities at the MPR-5 work area would be subject to the Project SWPPP and all applicable BMPs. Therefore, no change to CEQA impacts would occur as a result of MPR-5.			



CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
Agency Consultation?	□ Y ⊠ N	Use of MPR-5 Area will not affect or change the Project SWPPP in a manner that would require a change in Project coverage under the Construction General Permit. Recycled Water would not be used as part of MPR-5, and therefore MPR-5 would not affect the Water Reclamation and Recycling (WRR) permit. No additional agency consultation or new permits would be required.
Cultural Resources	N N	A desktop review of the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) database was conducted by the SDG&E Cultural Resources Specialist for this location and no resources are located at this pole. However, this pole location is within 100 feet of a recommended eligible historic resource. Therefore, monitoring by a qualified archaeologist will be required. No ground disturbance will occur as a result of the proposed work. Therefore, no paleontological resources compliance measures are required.
Agency Consultation?	□ Y □ N	The MPR-5 work area would not affect any cultural resources not previously disclosed in the IS/MND, and additional consultation would not be required.
Traffic and Circulation	□ Y ⊠ N	Implementation of MPR-5 would not change estimated trips in and out of the project area by workers or delivery vehicles. There would be no change in the level of service on streets surrounding the project area. There would be no effect on public transportation, Therefore, no change to CEQA impacts would occur as a result of MPR-5.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y 図 N	Agency Consultation is not required for implementation of MPR-5. There would be no new encroachment permits or changes to traffic control plan requirements.
Noise and Vibration	☐ Y ☑ N	Construction equipment used for implementation of MPR-5 would be similar to the equipment analyzed in the IS/MND. MPR-5 work would be physically located adjacent to the original work areas and impacts from construction noise would not differ from those disclosed in the IS/MND. Therefore, no change to CEQA impacts would occur as a result of MPR-5.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y	The Project must comply with the City of Escondido's noise ordinance. The addition of the MPR-5 work scope would not require consultation with the City, as work would conform to City's noise ordinance, including allowable hours for construction activities.
Aesthetics/ Visual Resources	☐ Y	Work performed under MPR-5 would not result in any additional impacts to the visual character in the project area. The physical changes that would result from MPR-5 would be temporary, located adjacent to the originally analyzed work areas. Therefore, no change to CEQA impacts would occur as a result of MPR-5.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y N	Agency Consultation is not required for use of the MPR-5 Area. The CPUC has exclusive jurisdiction over the siting, design, and construction of the Project.
Air Quality	□ Y N	The MPR-5 area but does not change the nature or intensity of construction activities. Therefore, MPR-5 is not anticipated to result in any changes relating to emission of criteria pollutants or diesel particulate matter (DPM).
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y	Additional agency consultation or approval would not be required for implementation of MPR-5.



CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
Biological and Aquatic Resources	× Y N	The approximately 5,100 sq. ft. area identified within the median around the pole consists of a small stand of California scrub oak (<i>Quercus berberidifolia</i>) and coastal sage scrub with an infilitration of disturbed habitat. Approximately 2,700 sq. ft. of the proposed work area is comprised of coastal sage scrub dominated by California buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>), California sagebrush (<i>Artemisia californica</i>), and coast goldenbush (<i>Isocoma menziesii</i>) with black sage (<i>Salvia mellifera</i>), deerweed (Acmispon glaber), and bush sunflower (<i>Encelia californica</i>) intermixed. This community appears to have been planted as part of prior restoration efforts due to the presence of irrigation lines. Approximately 1,800 sq. ft. of the proposed work area is comprised of disturbed habitat dominated by fountain grass (<i>Pennisetum setaceum</i>), brome grasses (<i>Bromus</i> spp.), crete weed (<i>Hedypnois cretica</i>), and wild oat (<i>Avena fatua</i>) that has infiltrated the coastal sage scrub, likely due to disturbance resulting from surrounding roads and residential development. The stand of California scrub oak makes up approximately 600 sq. ft. of the work area. Coastal California gnatcatcher (<i>Polioptila californica californica</i>) – a federally threatened species, California species of special concern (SSC), and NCCP-covered species – is known to occur in the vicinity of the work area. This species is not expected to nest in or adjacent to the work area due to the habitat being a small, isolated, and disturbed habitat patch with high adjacent anthropogenic disturbance. No special status plants were observed within the work area. Recommendations: All work shall be conducted in accordance with the project permits including the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting and Compliance Program (MMRCP). This includes the following site-specific recommendations: • In order to minimize impacts to coastal sage scrub habitat and California scrub oak, work shall be conducted from the paved roadways to the greatest extent feasible. If overland
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y	Because the MPR-5 work areas include sensitive and non-sensitive habitats similar to those analyzed and mitigated for in the IS/MND, no new or additional consultation, reporting, or permitting is required with the Wildlife Agencies.



Approvals	Date	Name (print)	Signatu	ire	
San Diego Gas and Electric Project Manager		Irina Peterson			Reviewed
San Diego Gas & Electric Compliance Manager		Keri Cuppage			□ Reviewed
CPUC Project Manager		Patricia Kelly	Patricia	Kelly	Approved Approved with conditions (see below) Denied
For CPUC Compliance	Manager Use	Only			
☐ Refinement Approved ☐ Refinement Denied ☐ Beyond Authority					
Conditions of Approval or Reason for Denial:					
CPUC requests biological monitor conduct site visit.					
Prepared by:				Date: 10	.27.2020

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT A Site Photographs

ATTACHMENT A - PROJECT PHOTOGRAPH LOG

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT 5



Project: Artesian 230kV Substation Expansion Project Photography: Chambers Group



Photograph # 1
Overview of Z12543 within median. Staging of equipment will occur on the road and within the median.



Photograph # 2
Overview of Z12543 and work area within median.





ATTACHMENT A - PROJECT PHOTOGRAPH LOG

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT 5



Project: Artesian 230kV Substation Expansion Project Photography: Chambers Group



Photograph # 3
View of disturbed habitat and coastal sage scrub surrounding pole.



 $\underline{ Photograph \ \# \ 4 } \\ In filtration of disturbed habitat around pole, within coastal sage scrub.$



ATTACHMENT B Figure

