

CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Project



☑ Weekly ☑ Storm Event ☐ Other D	ate: 2-10-2025 Time: 12:00pm-3:00pm		Project Name:		
	<u> </u>	<u></u>	Sudbury to Hudson		
CGP Certified	Gabriella Suazo (SWCA), Compliance Monitor,	EPA	Transmission Reliability Project		
Others present/affiliation(s): N/A			Project Location:		
Precipitation/Weather (since last inspection):	• •		Sudbury, Hudson, Stow, and		
,	re outlook): Partly cloudy, snowcover and ice, 3		Marlborough, MA		
Wilkins and Forest Ave (Hudson)	nent # and stationing): Segments 1-6 & MHs #1-4	on	USEPA #:		
	7/25 Duration:N/A Amount of rainfall (inches):N/A		MAR1003UW		
See comments.					
Summary of Activities/Locations Inspecte					
No activities observed onsite. All E&S cor	trols in Hudson inspected.				
Inspection Notes: Any Significant Discharges of Sediment (or o	ther) or Non-Compliance Actions? Yes N	No.			
Any Significant Discharges of Sediment (of o	iner) of Nort-Compliance Actions? \Box res \Box	NO			
Identify presence of stockpiles and document	when placed and when removed (week maximum	າ for stockpiles) 🛚 Ye	es 🗵 No		
Compliance with Previous Observations?	Yes □ No				
Compliance with Frevious Observations:	ies 🗆 NO				
New Corrective Action Recommendations?	□ Yes				
New Routine Maintenance Recommendation	s? □ Yes 図 No				
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE					
Compliant with applicable permits and applica	able environmental requirements? $\; oxtimes \; Yes \; oxtimes \; N$	o If not, explain:			
Other Comments & Observations					
-This SWPPP inspection covers Segments of SWPPP inspection- Segments 7-14 and	1-6 & MHs #1-4 on Wilkins and Forest Ave (Hu	ıdson). Balance			
or Sweet inspection- Segments 7-14 and	Sudbury Substation reported separatery.		Com		
	and sleet occurred off and on from Friday, 2/0		Authorized Ciamoture		
	Bround is frozen and snowmelt has not yet occi ieved to be from a mixture of rain and snow in		Authorized Signature		
observed in project rain gauge. This is bei	ieved to be from a mixture of fain and show in	0 0	Doto		
-Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be made when conditions allow Fresion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frezen ground. 2/10/2025					
when conditions allow. Erosion and sedim	entation issues are unlikely due to frozen grou	ina.	10/2023		
-There is a branch down in the ROW within	n segment 4.				
		_			
EVERSOURCE PROJECT MANAGER	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT	PRIME CONTRACT	TOR (BOND)		
Name: Bill Cooper	Primary Contact (Epsilon Associates)	Name: Matt Stoc	:k		
Phone: 812-929-3481	Name: Marc Bergeron (Ensilon	Phone: 617-512-6			

bcooper@entrustsol.com Email:

EVERSOURCE ENVIRONMENTAL CONTACT

Name: Matt Devlin 508-596-0147 Phone:

Email: matthew.devlin@eversource.com Associates)

Phone: 508-212-0420 (mobile)

Email: mbergeron@epsilonassociates.com

Secondary Contact (SWCA)

Name: Rebecca Weissman (SWCA) Phone: 339-203-7045

Email: Rebecca.weissman@swca.com

Email: <u>mstock@bond-civilutility.com</u>

SUB CONTRACTOR (ET & L Corp.)

Name: Jake Matys 978-844-2219 Phone: Email: jmatys@etlcorp.com

Section A – General Information (If necessary, complete additional inspection reports for each separate inspection location.)			
Inspector	Information		
Inspector Name: Gabriella Suazo	Title: Compliance Monitor, EPA CGP Certified		
Company Name: SWCA Environmental Consultants	Email: gabriella.suazo@swca.com		
Address: 153 Cordaville Road, Suite 130, Southborough, MA 01772	Phone Number: 774-287-3158		
Inspection	on Details		
Inspection Date: 2/10/2025	Inspection Location: This SWPPP inspection covers Segments 1-6 & MHs #1-4 on Wilkins and Forest Ave (Hudson). Balance of SWPPP inspection- Segments 7-14 and Sudbury Substation reported separately.		
Inspection Start Time: 12:00pm	Inspection End Time: 3:00pm		
Current Phase of Construction: Restoration	Weather Conditions During Inspection: Partly cloudy, snowcover and ice, 30s		
Did you determine that any portion of your site was unsafe for inspection per CGP	Part 4.5? ☐ Yes ⊠ No		
If "Yes," provide the following information:			
Location of unsafe conditions:			
The conditions that prevented you inspecting this location:			
Indicate the required inspection frequency: (Check all that apply. You may be su	bject to different inspection frequencies in different areas of the site.)		
Standard Frequency (CGP Part 4.2): At least once every 7 calendar days; OR Once every 14 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either	er:		
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period 			
Increased Frequency (CGP Part 4.3.1) (If site discharges to sediment or nutrient-impaired waters or to waters designated as Tier 2, Tier 2.5, or Tier 3): Solution Once every 7 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either:			
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period 			

Reduced Frequency (CGP Part 4.4):
□ For stabilized areas: Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once per month after first month until permit coverage is terminated
□ For stabilized areas on "linear construction sites": Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once more within 24 hours of the
occurrence of either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
Eor arid, semi-arid, or drought-stricken areas during seasonally dry periods or during drought: Once per month and within 24 hours of the occurrence of
either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
For frozen conditions where construction activities are being conducted: Once per month
Was this inspection triggered by a storm event producing 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period? ⊠ Yes □ No
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain?
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☐ On-site rain gauge: 0.40"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.26"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.26"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.40" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.40" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ⋈ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge □ Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.40" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge

Section B – Condition and Effectiveness of Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Controls (CGP Part 2.2) (Insert additional rows if needed) If "Yes," How Many Conditions Date on Which Conditions **Times (Including This** Type and Location of E&S Requiring **Condition First Requiring Routine** Occurrence) Has **Description of Conditions Observed** Control Corrective Observed (If Maintenance?1 This Condition Been Action?2,3 Applicable)? Identified? Silt fence was installed per the plan at construction entrances throughout. Portions of 1. Silt Fencing at Entrance ☐ Yes ☒ No erosion controls approved and marked for N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A pads throughout removal were removed between 11/25 & 12/06/2024. Rip-rap construction entrance pads have been 2. Construction Entrance ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A N/A removed sitewide now that process Pads material/stone base has been applied. 3. Filter Tubes at MH#1 area Filter tubes have been removed for Hudson ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A at Hudson Power & Light Substation work behind Hudson Light & Power. -Silt fencing has been removed from Bonazzoli 4. Silt Fencing at laydown lavdown vard. yards (25 Stowe Ct and 17 ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No -Stowe Ct laydown yard has been closed out for N/A N/A Bonazzoli Avenue) this project, silt fence remains installed for Bond's use of this vard for another project. 5. Straw Wattles in Hudson ☐ Yes ⋈ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A Straw wattles have been removed. N/A -Silt fence is installed and operating properly in seaments 1-6. -Portions of erosion controls approved and marked for removal were removed between 11/25 & 12/06/2024. -Additional sections of silt fence were added in front of compost filter tubes on east side of 6. Silt Fencing on ROW in N/A ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No Hudson bridge 130 for additional protection on 1/14/2025. -Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be made when conditions allow. Erosion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frozen around. 7. Silt Fencing & Filter ☐ Yes ☒ No Tubes in Stow (segment 1 N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A Controls are operating properly. Off Chestnut St) 8. Filter Tubes in -Filter tubes are installed and mostly operating ☐ Yes ☐ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A properly in segments 1-5. Hudson

					-Additional filter tubes were added to Bridge 130 area on 11/15/2024Portions of erosion controls approved and marked for removal were removed between 11/25 & 12/06/2024.
9. Inlet protection	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Roadwork completed for 2024 season, silt sack inlet protection has been removed.
10. Turbidity curtain/floating silt fencing in Hudson	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Floating silt fencing/turbidity curtain removed within segments 2/3 at Bridge 130 on 11/15/2024. Filter tubes were placed at the base of slopes adjacent to Fort Meadow Brook.
11. Silt fence & Filter Tubes along Forest Ave at MH #4	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Silt fence & filter tubes were removed at this location when road work was completed for the 2023 season.
12. Silt fence & Filter Tubes along roadwork at Wilkins St	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Silt fencing removed 11/20/24. Filter tubes left to decompose in place.
13. Rock lined swale & rock check dams within segment 1	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Rock lined swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 1 (Hudson & Stow).
14. Rock lined swale & rock check dams within segment 3	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Rock lined swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 3.
15. Rock check dams within segment 4	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Rock check dams installed and operating properly within segment 4.
16. Rock lined swale & rock check dams within segment 5	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Rock lined swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 5.
17. Swale & rock check dams within segment 6	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 6.

¹ Routine maintenance includes minor repairs or other upkeep performed to ensure that the site's stormwater controls remain in effective operating condition, not including significant repairs or the need to install a new or replacement control. Routine maintenance is also required for specific conditions: (1) for perimeter controls, whenever sediment has accumulated to half or more the above-ground height of the control (CGP Part 2.2.3.c.i); (2) where sediment has been tracked-out from the site onto paved roads, sidewalks, or other paved areas (CGP Part 2.2.4.d); (3) for inlet protection measures, when sediment accumulates, the filter becomes clogged, and/or performance is compromised (CGP Part 2.2.10.b); and (4) for sediment basins, as necessary to maintain at least half of the design capacity of the basin (CGP Part 2.2.12.f)

²Corrective actions are triggered only for specific conditions (CGP Part 5.1):

- 1. A stormwater control needs a significant repair or a new or replacement control is needed, or, in accordance with Part 2.1.4.c, you find it necessary to repeatedly (i.e., three (3) or more times) conduct the same routine maintenance fix to the same control at the same location (unless you document in your inspection report under Part 4.7.1.c that the specific reoccurrence of this same problem should still be addressed as a routine maintenance fix under 2.1.4); or
- 2. A stormwater control necessary to comply with the requirements of this permit was never installed, or was installed incorrectly; or
- 3. Your discharges are not meeting applicable water quality standards; or
- 4. A prohibited discharge has occurred (see CGP Part 1.3); or
- 5. During the discharge from site dewatering activities:
 - a. The weekly average of your turbidity monitoring results exceeds the 50 NTU benchmark (or alternate benchmark if approved by EPA pursuant to Part 3.3.2.b); or
 - b. You observe or you are informed by EPA, State, or local authorities of the presence of the conditions specified in Part 4.6.3.e.

³ If a condition on your site requires a corrective action, you must also fill out a corrective action log found at https://www.epa.gov/npdes/construction-general-permit-resources-tools-and-templates. See CGP Part 5.4 for more information.

Section C – Condition and Effectiveness of Pollution Prevention (P2) Practices and Controls (CGP Part 2.3) (Insert additional rows if needed)					
Type and Location of P2 Practices and Controls	Conditions Requiring Routine Maintenance? ¹	If "Yes," How Many Times (Including This Occurrence) Has This Condition Been Identified?	Conditions Requiring Corrective Action? ^{2, 3}	Date on Which Condition First Observed (If Applicable)?	Description of Conditions Observed
Sanitary waste facilities, project wide	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All sanitary facilities removed from project.
2. Storage handling of materials	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. No issues observed.
3. Sediment tracking/street sweeping	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. No issues observed.
4. Concrete washout pits	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All designated concrete washout stations have been removed.

Section D – Stabilization of Exposed Soil (CGP Part 2.2.14) (Insert additional rows if needed)					
Specific Location That Has Been or Will Be Stabilized	Stabilization Method and Applicable Deadline	Stabilization Initiated?	Final Stabilization Criteria Met?	Final Stabilization Photos Taken?	Notes
Road shoulder at 156 Forest Ave near MH #4	Seed and straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/30/2023	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/01/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Loam, seed, and straw were applied to disturbed road shoulderArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%).
2. Hydroseeding within segments 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5	Hydroseeding Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 11/14/2023		☐ Yes ☒ No	-Hydroseeding completed within segments 1-5Jute matting completed for portions of the work area within segments 2, 3, 4 & 5 where hydroseeding was completedAreas in segments 1-5 that were hydroseeded in fall of 2023 have revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%).
3. Seeding of shoulders within segment 6	Seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 5/28/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Seed has been applied to disturbed shoulders during period of inactivity (time of year restriction)Seeding on 5/28/2024 was temporary. See row 7 for permanent stabilization/hydroseeding.
4. Seeding of western shoulder of Wilkins Street	Seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	≥ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 6/26/2024	Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 11/05/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Loam & seed were applied to disturbed road shoulderArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%).
5. Jute netting within segment 1 on steeper slopes near Wilkins Street	Jute netting and seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 8/29/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Jute netting and seed was applied to steeper slopes within segment 1 near Wilkins Street.
6. Additional hydroseeding within segment 1	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 9/05/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseeding completed in additional areas of segment 1.

7. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 6 both sides of work area	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days		☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseeding was applied to majority of shoulders in segment 6 both sides of work area on 10/29/2024Hydroseeding applied to remaining shoulders in segment 6 on 10/31/2024.
8. Hydroseeing at MH #12 and MH #13 in segment 5 both sides of work area	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/31/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseeding was applied to disturbed soil at MH #12 and MH #13 in segment 5 on 10/31/2024.
9. Hydroseeding of planting beds and additional disturbed areas within segments 1-5 both sides of work areas	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 11/07/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	□ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseeding of planting beds and additional disturbed areas within segments 1-5 completed 11/07/2024.

	(Insert additional rows if needed)
Was a discharge (not includin	g dewatering) occurring from any part of your site at the time of the inspection? ⁴ \square Yes \boxtimes No
 The visual quality of the characteristics of pollutants. 	f the discharge, including color; odor; floating, settled, or suspended solids; foam; oil sheen; and other indicators of stormwater ollutant characteristics that are visible from your site and attributable to your discharge in receiving waters or in other constructed or
Discharge Location	Observations
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

⁴ If a dewatering discharge was occurring, you must conduct a dewatering inspection pursuant to CGP Part 4.3.2 and complete a separate dewatering inspection report.

Section F – Signature and Certification (CGP Part 4.7.2)

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information contained therein. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information contained is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I have no personal knowledge that the information submitted is other than true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

MANDATORY: Signature of Operator or "Duly Authorized Representative:"		
Signature:	Date: 2-10-2025	
Matthew Devlin		
Printed Name: Matt Devlin	Affiliation: Senior Environmental Specialist- Licensing and Pemitting- Eversource	
OPTIONAL: Signature of Contractor or Subcontractor		
Signature:	Date: 2-10-2025	
Elm-		
Printed Name: Gabriella Suazo	Affiliation: Compliance Monitor- SWCA Environmental Consultants	

Environmental Monitoring Photographs

Epsil	ON TES INC.		ı	PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG
Client Name: I	Eversource	Site Location: Sudbury Reliability Project	to Hudson Transmission	Town: Hudson
Photo No.: 1	Date: 2-10-2025		N.W.	
	ntrols and snow nt 1. Facing east			

Client Name: Eversource Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project Photo No.: 2 Date: 2-10-2025 Description: View of E&S controls and snow cover in segment 2. Facing east.

Epsilon

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 3

Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of bridge 130 from segment

2. Facing east.



Epsilon ASSOCIATES INC.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Town: Hudson

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Photo No.: 4

Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 3. Facing

west.



Epsilon

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 5

Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of fallen branch in ROW within segment 4. Facing east.



Epsilon

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 6 Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 4. Facing west.



EpsilonASSOCIATES INC.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 7

Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snow cover in segment 5. Facing west.



Epsilon ASSOCIATES INC.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 8 Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 6. Facing west.



CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Project



Project Name:

☑ Weekly ☑ Storm Event ☐ Other Date: 2-10-2025 Time: 8:30am-12:00pm	Project Name:
Inspector name(s), title(s), and qualifications: Gabriella Suazo (SWCA), Compliance Monitor, EPA CGP Certified	Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability
Others present/affiliation(s): N/A	Project
Precipitation/Weather (since last inspection): Mixed precipitation, 10s-30s	Project Location:
Weather conditions (time of inspection & future outlook): Partly cloudy, snowcover and ice, 30s	Sudbury, Hudson, Stow, and
Inspection Location Description (include segment # and stationing): Segments 7-14 (within Sudbury) &	Marlborough, MA
Sudbury Substation.	USEPA #:
*Storm event info (approx):Start date/time:2/7/25 Duration:N/A Amount of rainfall (inches):N/A	MAR1003UW
See comments.	
Commence of Anti-Mine II and the relationship to the Anti-Mine II and the Mine	
Summary of Activities/Locations Inspected (include segment # and stationing): No activities observed onsite. All E&S controls in Sudbury inspected.	
No activities observed offsite. All Edo controls in Sudbury inspected.	
Inspection Notes:	
Any Significant Discharges of Sediment (or other) or Non-Compliance Actions? ☐ Yes ☐ No	
I de la	
Identify presence of stockpiles and document when placed and when removed (week maximum for stockpiles)	☐ Yes ⊠ No
Compliance with Previous Observations? ⊠ Yes □ No	
New Corrective Action Recommendations ☐ Yes ☐ No	
New Posters Maintenance Programme define Q T Vers.	
New Routine Maintenance Recommendations? ☐ Yes ☐ No	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	
Compliant with applicable permits and applicable environmental requirements? YES NO I If not, explain	in:
Other Comments & Observations	
-This SWPPP inspection covers Segments 7-14 & Sudbury substation. Balance of SWPPP inspection-	
Segments 1-6 & manhole areas (Forest Ave.) in Hudson reported separately.	Opposition
-Storms consisting of freezing rain, snow, and sleet occurred off and on from Friday, 2/07/2025 to	
Sunday 2/09/2025. Approximately 5" of snow fell. Ground is frozen and snowmelt has not yet	Authorized Signature
occurred. 0.40" observed in project rain gauge. This is believed to be from a mixture of rain and snow	Data
in the gauge.	Date
-Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be	2/10/2025
made when conditions allow. Erosion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frozen ground.	
	TDAGTOR (DOUR)
EVERSOURCE PROJECT MANAGER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT PRIME CON	TRACTOR (BOND)

Bill Cooper Name:

812-929-3481 (mobile) Phone:

Email: bill.cooper@eversource.com

EVERSOURCE ENVIRONMENTAL CONTACT

Name: Matt Devlin 508-596-0147 Phone:

Email: matthew.devlin@eversource.com Primary Contact (Epsilon Associates)

Name: Marc Bergeron (Epsilon Associates)

Phone: 508-212-0420 (mobile)

Email: mbergeron@epsilonassociates.com

Secondary Contact (SWCA)

Name: Rebecca Weissman (SWCA)

Phone: 339-203-7045

Email: Rebecca.weissman@swca.com

Name: Matt Stock Phone: 617-512-6766

mstock@bond-civilutility.com Email:

SUB CONTRACTOR (ET & L Corp.)

Name: Jake Matys Phone: 978-844-2219 Email: imatys@etlcorp.com

Section A – General Information (If necessary, complete additional inspection reports for each separate inspection location.)				
Inspector	Information			
Inspector Name: Gabriella Suazo	Title: Compliance Monitor, EPA CGP Certified			
Company Name: SWCA Environmental Consultants	Email: gabriella.suazo@swca.com			
Address: 153 Cordaville Road, Suite 130, Southborough, MA 01772	Phone Number: 774-287-3158			
Inspection	on Details			
Inspection Date: 2/10/2025	Inspection Location: This SWPPP inspection covers Segments 7-14 & Sudbury substation. Balance of SWPPP inspection-Segments 1-6 & manhole areas (Forest Ave.) in Hudson reported separately.			
Inspection Start Time: 8:30am	Inspection End Time: 12:00pm			
Current Phase of Construction: Restoration	Weather Conditions During Inspection: Partly cloudy, snowcover and ice, 30s			
Did you determine that any portion of your site was unsafe for inspection per CGF	P Part 4.5? □ Yes ⊠ No			
If "Yes," provide the following information:				
Location of unsafe conditions:				
The conditions that prevented you inspecting this location:				
Indicate the required inspection frequency: (Check all that apply. You may be su	ubject to different inspection frequencies in different areas of the site.)			
Standard Frequency (CGP Part 4.2): At least once every 7 calendar days; OR Once every 14 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either: A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period				
Increased Frequency (CGP Part 4.3.1) (If site discharges to sediment or nutrient-impaired waters or to waters designated as Tier 2, Tier 2.5, or Tier 3): Once every 7 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either:				
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hou A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or 				

Reduced Frequency (CGP Part 4.4):
□ For stabilized areas: Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once per month after first month until permit coverage is terminated
□ For stabilized areas on "linear construction sites": Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once more within 24 hours of the
occurrence of either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
□ For arid, semi-arid, or drought-stricken areas during seasonally dry periods or during drought: Once per month and within 24 hours of the occurrence of
either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
☐ For frozen conditions where construction activities are being conducted: Once per month
Was this inspection triggered by a storm event producing 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period? ≥ Yes ⊃ No
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain?
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☐ On-site rain gauge: 0.40"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☐ On-site rain gauge: 0.40"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.26"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.40" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.40" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.40" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ⋈ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge □ Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.40" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.26" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.40" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge

Section B – Condition and Effectiveness of Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Controls (CGP Part 2.2) (Insert additional rows if needed) If "Yes," How Many Conditions Date on Which Conditions **Times (Including This** Type and Location of E&S Requiring **Condition First Requiring Routine** Occurrence) Has **Description of Conditions Observed** Control Corrective Observed (If Maintenance?1 This Condition Been Action?2,3 Applicable)? Identified? Silt fencing installed per the plan & operating 1. Silt fencing at entrance properly segments 7-14. Portions of erosion ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A pads throughout. controls approved and marked for removal were removed 11/25 & 11/26/2024. -Silt fencing is installed per the plan & operating properly within segment 7-14. Portions of erosion controls approved and marked for removal were removed 11/25 & 11/26/2024. 2. Silt Fencing on ROW in X Yes ✓ No   No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A -Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple Sudbury locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be made when conditions allow. Erosion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frozen around. 3. Construction entrance All construction entrance pads have been ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A pads removed from seaments 7-14. Compost filter tubes are installed per the plan & operating properly within segments 7-14. 4. Compost filter tubes in ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A Portions of erosion controls approved and Sudbury marked for removal were removed 11/25 & 11/26/2024. 5. Compost Filter tubes at Stockpile and tubing within the Sudbury ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A N/A **Sudbury Substation** Substation have been removed. Silt sack inlet protection installed throughout the ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No 6. Inlet protection N/A N/A project has been removed. Floatina silt fencina/turbidity curtain within segments 13/14 at Bridge 127 was removed on 11/08/24. Compost filter tubes were placed 7. Floating silt fencing along banks of Hop Brook, that were previously located at segment ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A protected by floating silt fencing/turbidity 13/14 boundary at curtain. Bridge 127 in Sudbury Portion of filter tubes at Bridge 127 in segment 13 on the south side of work area are submerged under water. 8. Rock check dams within Rock check dams installed & operating properly ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A N/A within segments 7-11,13 & 14. segments 7-11, 13 & 14.

If the same routine maintenance was found to be necessary three or more times for the same control at the same location (including this occurrence), follow the corrective action requirements and record the required information in your corrective action log, or describe here why you believe the specific condition should still be addressed as routine maintenance:

¹ Routine maintenance includes minor repairs or other upkeep performed to ensure that the site's stormwater controls remain in effective operating condition, not including significant repairs or the need to install a new or replacement control. Routine maintenance is also required for specific conditions: (1) for perimeter controls, whenever sediment has accumulated to half or more the above-ground height of the control (CGP Part 2.2.3.c.i); (2) where sediment has been tracked-out from the site onto paved roads, sidewalks, or other paved areas (CGP Part 2.2.4.d); (3) for inlet protection measures, when sediment accumulates, the filter becomes clogged, and/or performance is compromised (CGP Part 2.2.10.b); and (4) for sediment basins, as necessary to maintain at least half of the design capacity of the basin (CGP Part 2.2.12.f)

²Corrective actions are triggered only for specific conditions (CGP Part 5.1):

- 1. A stormwater control needs a significant repair or a new or replacement control is needed, or, in accordance with Part 2.1.4.c, you find it necessary to repeatedly (i.e., three (3) or more times) conduct the same routine maintenance fix to the same control at the same location (unless you document in your inspection report under Part 4.7.1.c that the specific reoccurrence of this same problem should still be addressed as a routine maintenance fix under 2.1.4); or
- 2. A stormwater control necessary to comply with the requirements of this permit was never installed, or was installed incorrectly; or
- 3. Your discharges are not meeting applicable water quality standards; or
- 4. A prohibited discharge has occurred (see CGP Part 1.3); or
- 5. During the discharge from site dewatering activities:
 - a. The weekly average of your turbidity monitoring results exceeds the 50 NTU benchmark (or alternate benchmark if approved by EPA pursuant to Part 3.3.2.b); or
 - b. You observe or you are informed by EPA, State, or local authorities of the presence of the conditions specified in Part 4.6.3.e.

³ If a condition on your site requires a corrective action, you must also fill out a corrective action log found at https://www.epa.gov/npdes/construction-general-permit-resources-tools-and-templates. See CGP Part 5.4 for more information.

Sec	ction C – Condition		ollution Prevention ditional rows if neede		d Controls (CGP Part 2.3)
Type and Location of P2 Practices and Controls	Conditions Requiring Routine Maintenance? ¹	If "Yes," How Many Times (Including This Occurrence) Has This Condition Been Identified?	Conditions Requiring Corrective Action? ^{2, 3}	Date on Which Condition First Observed (If Applicable)?	Description of Conditions Observed
Sanitary waste facilities, project wide	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All sanitary facilities have been removed from project.
2. Sediment tracking/street sweeping	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. No issues observed.
Storage handling of materials	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All project related materials and equipment have been removed.
4. Concrete washout stations	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All designated concrete washout stations have been removed.

	Secti		of Exposed Soil (CG ional rows if needed)	P Part 2.2.14)	
Specific Location That Has Been or Will Be Stabilized	Stabilization Method and Applicable Deadline	Stabilization Initiated?	Final Stabilization Criteria Met?	Final Stabilization Photos Taken?	Notes
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segment 14	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/24/2023	☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segment 14. Removal within segment 14, progressing west to eastArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date near bridge 128 within segments 7 & 8.	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.		✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed near bridge 128 within segments 7 & 8. Two rounds, as notedArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%)
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segment 11	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 9/18/2023	Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segment 11Area has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segment 10	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 9/19/2023	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segment 10Area has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)
5. Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segments 8 & 9	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/3/2023	Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segments 8 & 9Area has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)
Wetland replication area within segment 14 completed	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ NoIf "Yes," date initiated:10/31/202310/18/2024	□ Yes ⊠ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to the wetland replication area within segment 14Area revegetated, but was disturbed and seeded again 10/18/2024

7. Seeding of shoulders within segment 7 8. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 8 both sides off work area.	Seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days. Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date initiated: 5/28/2024 ☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date initiated: 8/26/2024	 X Yes X No If "Yes," date criteria met: X Yes No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024 	☐ Yes ☑ No	-Seed was applied to disturbed segment shoulders during period of inactivity (time of year restriction)Seeding on 5/28/2024 was temporary. See row 16 for permanent stabilization/hydroseedingHydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
9. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 9 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/11/2024	Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (>70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
10. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 10 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/22/2024	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
11. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 11 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/19/2024		☐ Yes ☒ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
12. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 12 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/31/2024	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	□ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.

13. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 13 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/31/2024	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
14. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 14 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/31/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
15. Hydroseeding of planting beds and additional disturbed areas within segments 7-14 both sides of work areas.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/25/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseed was applied to planting beds and any additional disturbed areas within segments 7-14.
16.Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 7 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/29/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shoulders.

	(Insert additional rows if needed)
Was a discharge (not includin	g dewatering) occurring from any part of your site at the time of the inspection? ⁴ \square Yes \boxtimes No
 The visual quality of the characteristics of pollutants. 	f the discharge, including color; odor; floating, settled, or suspended solids; foam; oil sheen; and other indicators of stormwater ollutant characteristics that are visible from your site and attributable to your discharge in receiving waters or in other constructed or
Discharge Location	Observations
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

⁴ If a dewatering discharge was occurring, you must conduct a dewatering inspection pursuant to CGP Part 4.3.2 and complete a separate dewatering inspection report.

Section F – Signature and Certification (CGP Part 4.7.2)

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information contained therein. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information contained is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I have no personal knowledge that the information submitted is other than true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

MANDATORY: Signature of Operator	or "Duly Authorized Representative:"
Signature: Matthew Devlin	Date: 2-10-2025
Printed Name: Matt Devlin	Affiliation: Senior Environmental Specialist - Licensing & Permitting - Eversource
OPTIONAL: Signature of Contractor or Subcontra	ctor Senior Environmental Scientist/Compliance Monitor
Signature:	Date: 2-10-2025
Printed Name: Gabriella Suazo	Affiliation: Compliance Monitor- SWCA Environmental Consultants

Environmental Monitoring Photographs

Epsil	lon ates inc.			PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG
Client Name:	Eversource	Site Location: Sudbury Reliability Project	to Hudson Transmission	Town: Sudbury
Photo No.: 1	Date: 2-10-2025		XXX	X

Epsi	on ates inc.		F	PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG
Client Name:	Eversource	Site Location: Sudbury Reliability Project	to Hudson Transmission	Town: Sudbury
Photo No.: 2	Date: 2-10-2025			
Description: View of E&S co snowcover in s west.	ontrols and segment 8. Facing			

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission **Reliability Project**

Town: Sudbury

Photo No.: 3

Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 9. Facing



PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission **Reliability Project**

Town: Sudbury

Photo No.: 4 Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of silt fence damaged by the snow near MH #20 in segment 10. Facing east.



Epsilon

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Sudbury

Photo No.: 5

Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 11. Facing west.



Epsilon ASSOCIATES INC.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project


Town: Sudbury


Photo No.: 6 Date: 2-10-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 12. Facing west.







CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT **Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Project**

☐ Other Date: 2-14-2025 Time: 11:30am-2:30pm

☐ Weekly



Project Name:

Sudbury to Hudson

Inspector name(s), title(s) and qualifications: Gabriella Suazo (SWCA), Compliance Monitor, EPA CGP Certified	Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability
Others present/affiliation(s): N/A	Project
Precipitation/Weather (since last inspection): Mixed, 0s-40s	Project Location:
Weather conditions (time of inspection & future outlook): Mostly sunny, snowcover and ice, 30s	Sudbury, Hudson, Stow, and Marlborough, MA
Inspection Location Description (include segment # and stationing): Segments 1-6 & MHs #1-4 on Wilkins and Forest Ave (Hudson)	USEPA #:
*Storm event info (approx): Start date/time:2/13/25 Duration:N/A Amount of rainfall (inches): 0.30"	MAR1003UW
Summary of Activities/Locations Inspected (include segment # and stationing):	
No activities observed onsite. All E&S controls in Hudson inspected.	
Inspection Notes:	
Any Significant Discharges of Sediment (or other) or Non-Compliance Actions? ☐ Yes ☐ No	
Identify presence of stockpiles and document when placed and when removed (week maximum for stockpiles) $\ \Box$	Yes ⊠ No
Compliance with Previous Observations? ⊠ Yes □ No	
New Corrective Action Recommendations? ☐ Yes ☐ No	
New Routine Maintenance Recommendations? ☐ Yes No	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	
Compliant with applicable permits and applicable environmental requirements? ⊠ Yes □ No If not, explain: _	
Other Comments & Observations	
-This SWPPP inspection covers Segments 1-6 & MHs #1-4 on Wilkins and Forest Ave (Hudson). Balance of SWPPP inspection- Segments 7-14 and Sudbury Substation reported separately.	dim
-Ground is frozen and snowmelt has not yet occurred. 0.30" observed in project rain gauge.	Authorized Signature
-Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be made when conditions allow. Erosion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frozen ground.	Date
-There is a branch down in the ROW within segment 4.	2/14/2025
EVERSOURCE PROJECT MANAGER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT PRIME CONTRA	ACTOR (BOND)

Name: Bill Cooper Phone: 812-929-3481

bcooper@entrustsol.com Email:

EVERSOURCE ENVIRONMENTAL CONTACT

Name: Matt Devlin 508-596-0147 Phone:

Email: matthew.devlin@eversource.com

Primary Contact (Epsilon Associates)
Name: Marc Bergeron (Epsilon

Associates)

Phone: 508-212-0420 (mobile)

Email: mbergeron@epsilonassociates.com

Secondary Contact (SWCA)

Name: Rebecca Weissman (SWCA) Phone: 339-203-7045

Email: Rebecca.weissman@swca.com

Name: Matt Stock Phone: 617-512-6766

mstock@bond-civilutility.com

SUB CONTRACTOR (ET & L Corp.)

Name: Jake Matys 978-844-2219 Phone: Email: imatys@etlcorp.com

	neral Information reports for each separate inspection location.)
Inspector	Information
Inspector Name: Gabriella Suazo	Title: Compliance Monitor, EPA CGP Certified
Company Name: SWCA Environmental Consultants	Email: gabriella.suazo@swca.com
Address: 153 Cordaville Road, Suite 130, Southborough, MA 01772	Phone Number: 774-287-3158
Inspection	on Details
Inspection Date: 2/14/2025	Inspection Location: This SWPPP inspection covers Segments 1-6 & MHs #1-4 on Wilkins and Forest Ave (Hudson). Balance of SWPPP inspection- Segments 7-14 and Sudbury Substation reported separately.
Inspection Start Time: 11:30am	Inspection End Time: 2:30pm
Current Phase of Construction: Restoration	Weather Conditions During Inspection: Mostly sunny, snowcover and ice, 30s
Did you determine that any portion of your site was unsafe for inspection per CGP	Part 4.5? ☐ Yes ⊠ No
If "Yes," provide the following information:	
Location of unsafe conditions:	
The conditions that prevented you inspecting this location:	
Indicate the required inspection frequency: (Check all that apply. You may be su	bject to different inspection frequencies in different areas of the site.)
Standard Frequency (CGP Part 4.2): ☐ At least once every 7 calendar days; OR ☐ Once every 14 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either	er:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-ho A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or 	
Increased Frequency (CGP Part 4.3.1) (If site discharges to sediment or nutrient-im ☑ Once every 7 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either	· ·
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hou A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or 	

Reduced Frequency (CGP Part 4.4):
□ For stabilized areas: Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once per month after first month until permit coverage is terminated
□ For stabilized areas on "linear construction sites": Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once more within 24 hours of the
occurrence of either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
Eor arid, semi-arid, or drought-stricken areas during seasonally dry periods or during drought: Once per month and within 24 hours of the occurrence of
either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
☐ For frozen conditions where construction activities are being conducted: Once per month
Was this inspection triggered by a storm event producing 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period? ⊠ Yes □ No
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain?
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☐ On-site rain gauge: 0.30"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.52"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.52"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.30" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.30" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ⋈ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge □ Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.30" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Handscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge

Section B – Condition and Effectiveness of Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Controls (CGP Part 2.2) (Insert additional rows if needed) If "Yes," How Many Conditions Date on Which Conditions **Times (Including This** Type and Location of E&S Requiring **Condition First Requiring Routine** Occurrence) Has **Description of Conditions Observed** Control Corrective Observed (If Maintenance?1 This Condition Been Action?2,3 Applicable)? Identified? Silt fence was installed per the plan at construction entrances throughout. Portions of 1. Silt Fencing at Entrance ☐ Yes ☒ No erosion controls approved and marked for N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A pads throughout removal were removed between 11/25 & 12/06/2024. Rip-rap construction entrance pads have been 2. Construction Entrance ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A N/A removed sitewide now that process Pads material/stone base has been applied. 3. Filter Tubes at MH#1 area Filter tubes have been removed for Hudson ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A at Hudson Power & Light Substation work behind Hudson Light & Power. -Silt fencing has been removed from Bonazzoli 4. Silt Fencing at laydown lavdown vard. yards (25 Stowe Ct and 17 ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No -Stowe Ct laydown yard has been closed out for N/A N/A Bonazzoli Avenue) this project, silt fence remains installed for Bond's use of this vard for another project. 5. Straw Wattles in Hudson ☐ Yes ⋈ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A Straw wattles have been removed. N/A -Silt fence is installed and operating properly in seaments 1-6. -Portions of erosion controls approved and marked for removal were removed between 11/25 & 12/06/2024. -Additional sections of silt fence were added in front of compost filter tubes on east side of 6. Silt Fencing on ROW in N/A ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No Hudson bridge 130 for additional protection on 1/14/2025. -Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be made when conditions allow. Erosion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frozen around. 7. Silt Fencing & Filter ☐ Yes ☒ No Tubes in Stow (segment 1 N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A Controls are operating properly. Off Chestnut St) 8. Filter Tubes in -Filter tubes are installed and mostly operating ☐ Yes ☐ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A properly in segments 1-5. Hudson

					-Additional filter tubes were added to Bridge 130 area on 11/15/2024Portions of erosion controls approved and marked for removal were removed between 11/25 & 12/06/2024.
9. Inlet protection	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Roadwork completed for 2024 season, silt sack inlet protection has been removed.
10. Turbidity curtain/floating silt fencing in Hudson	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Floating silt fencing/turbidity curtain removed within segments 2/3 at Bridge 130 on 11/15/2024. Filter tubes were placed at the base of slopes adjacent to Fort Meadow Brook.
11. Silt fence & Filter Tubes along Forest Ave at MH #4	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Silt fence & filter tubes were removed at this location when road work was completed for the 2023 season.
12. Silt fence & Filter Tubes along roadwork at Wilkins St	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Silt fencing removed 11/20/24. Filter tubes left to decompose in place.
13. Rock lined swale & rock check dams within segment 1	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Rock lined swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 1 (Hudson & Stow).
14. Rock lined swale & rock check dams within segment 3	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Rock lined swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 3.
15. Rock check dams within segment 4	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Rock check dams installed and operating properly within segment 4.
16. Rock lined swale & rock check dams within segment 5	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Rock lined swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 5.
17. Swale & rock check dams within segment 6	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Swale & check dams installed and operating properly within segment 6.

¹ Routine maintenance includes minor repairs or other upkeep performed to ensure that the site's stormwater controls remain in effective operating condition, not including significant repairs or the need to install a new or replacement control. Routine maintenance is also required for specific conditions: (1) for perimeter controls, whenever sediment has accumulated to half or more the above-ground height of the control (CGP Part 2.2.3.c.i); (2) where sediment has been tracked-out from the site onto paved roads, sidewalks, or other paved areas (CGP Part 2.2.4.d); (3) for inlet protection measures, when sediment accumulates, the filter becomes clogged, and/or performance is compromised (CGP Part 2.2.10.b); and (4) for sediment basins, as necessary to maintain at least half of the design capacity of the basin (CGP Part 2.2.12.f)

²Corrective actions are triggered only for specific conditions (CGP Part 5.1):

- 1. A stormwater control needs a significant repair or a new or replacement control is needed, or, in accordance with Part 2.1.4.c, you find it necessary to repeatedly (i.e., three (3) or more times) conduct the same routine maintenance fix to the same control at the same location (unless you document in your inspection report under Part 4.7.1.c that the specific reoccurrence of this same problem should still be addressed as a routine maintenance fix under 2.1.4); or
- 2. A stormwater control necessary to comply with the requirements of this permit was never installed, or was installed incorrectly; or
- 3. Your discharges are not meeting applicable water quality standards; or
- 4. A prohibited discharge has occurred (see CGP Part 1.3); or
- 5. During the discharge from site dewatering activities:
 - a. The weekly average of your turbidity monitoring results exceeds the 50 NTU benchmark (or alternate benchmark if approved by EPA pursuant to Part 3.3.2.b); or
 - b. You observe or you are informed by EPA, State, or local authorities of the presence of the conditions specified in Part 4.6.3.e.

³ If a condition on your site requires a corrective action, you must also fill out a corrective action log found at https://www.epa.gov/npdes/construction-general-permit-resources-tools-and-templates. See CGP Part 5.4 for more information.

Section C – Condition and Effectiveness of Pollution Prevention (P2) Practices and Controls (CGP Part 2.3) (Insert additional rows if needed)								
Type and Location of P2 Practices and Controls	Conditions Requiring Routine Maintenance? ¹	If "Yes," How Many Times (Including This Occurrence) Has This Condition Been Identified?	Conditions Requiring Corrective Action? ^{2, 3}	Date on Which Condition First Observed (If Applicable)?	Description of Conditions Observed			
Sanitary waste facilities, project wide	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All sanitary facilities removed from project.			
2. Storage handling of materials	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. No issues observed.			
3. Sediment tracking/street sweeping	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. No issues observed.			
4. Concrete washout pits	□ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All designated concrete washout stations have been removed.			

Section D – Stabilization of Exposed Soil (CGP Part 2.2.14) (Insert additional rows if needed)						
Specific Location That Has Been or Will Be Stabilized	Stabilization Method and Applicable Deadline	Stabilization Initiated?	Final Stabilization Criteria Met?	Final Stabilization Photos Taken?	Notes	
Road shoulder at 156 Forest Ave near MH #4	Seed and straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/30/2023	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/01/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Loam, seed, and straw were applied to disturbed road shoulderArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%).	
2. Hydroseeding within segments 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5	Hydroseeding Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 11/14/2023	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/01/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Hydroseeding completed within segments 1-5Jute matting completed for portions of the work area within segments 2, 3, 4 & 5 where hydroseeding was completedAreas in segments 1-5 that were hydroseeded in fall of 2023 have revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%).	
3. Seeding of shoulders within segment 6	Seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 5/28/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Seed has been applied to disturbed shoulders during period of inactivity (time of year restriction)Seeding on 5/28/2024 was temporary. See row 7 for permanent stabilization/hydroseeding.	
4. Seeding of western shoulder of Wilkins Street	Seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	≥ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 6/26/2024	Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 11/05/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Loam & seed were applied to disturbed road shoulderArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%).	
5. Jute netting within segment 1 on steeper slopes near Wilkins Street	Jute netting and seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 8/29/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Jute netting and seed was applied to steeper slopes within segment 1 near Wilkins Street.	
6. Additional hydroseeding within segment 1	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 9/05/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseeding completed in additional areas of segment 1.	

7. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 6 both sides of work area	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days		☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseeding was applied to majority of shoulders in segment 6 both sides of work area on 10/29/2024Hydroseeding applied to remaining shoulders in segment 6 on 10/31/2024.
8. Hydroseeing at MH #12 and MH #13 in segment 5 both sides of work area	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/31/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseeding was applied to disturbed soil at MH #12 and MH #13 in segment 5 on 10/31/2024.
9. Hydroseeding of planting beds and additional disturbed areas within segments 1-5 both sides of work areas	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 11/07/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	□ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseeding of planting beds and additional disturbed areas within segments 1-5 completed 11/07/2024.

(Insert additional rows if needed)								
Was a discharge (not includin	Was a discharge (not including dewatering) occurring from any part of your site at the time of the inspection? $^4 \square Yes \boxtimes No$							
 The visual quality of the characteristics of pollutants. 	 The characteristics of the discharge, including color; odor; floating, settled, or suspended solids; foam; oil sheen; and other indicators of stormwater pollutants. Signs of the above pollutant characteristics that are visible from your site and attributable to your discharge in receiving waters or in other constructed or 							
Discharge Location	Observations							
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								

⁴ If a dewatering discharge was occurring, you must conduct a dewatering inspection pursuant to CGP Part 4.3.2 and complete a separate dewatering inspection report.


Section F – Signature and Certification (CGP Part 4.7.2)

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information contained therein. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information contained is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I have no personal knowledge that the information submitted is other than true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

MANDATORY: Signature of Operator or "Duly Authorized Representative:"						
Signature: Date: 2-14-2025						
Matthew Devlin						
Printed Name: Matt Devlin Affiliation: Senior Environmental Specialist- Licensing and Pemitting- Ev						
OPTIONAL: Signature of C	Contractor or Subcontractor					
Signature:	Date: 2-14-2025					
Elm-						
Printed Name: Gabriella Suazo Affiliation: Compliance Monitor- SWCA Environmental Consultants						

Environmental Monitoring Photographs

Epsilon ASSOCIATES INC.		PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG		
Client Name: Eversource	Site Location: Sudbury to Reliability Project	Town: Hudson		
Photo No.: 1 Date: 2-14-2025 Description:				
View of E&S controls and snow cover in segment 1. Facing east				



Epsilon ASSOCIATES INC.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 3

Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of bridge 130 from segment 3. Facing west.

Epsilon ASSOCIATES INC.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 4 Date:


Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 3. Facing east.



Client Name: Eversource Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project Description: View of fallen branch in ROW within segment 4. Facing west.



PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission **Reliability Project**

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 7

Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snow cover in segment 5. Facing west.



PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission **Reliability Project**

Town: Hudson

Photo No.: 8

Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 6. Facing east.



CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Project



Project Name:

☐ Weekly ☐ Storm Event ☐ Other Date: 2-14-2025 Time: 8:30am-11:30am	Project Name:							
Inspector name(s), title(s), and qualifications: Gabriella Suazo (SWCA), Compliance Monitor, EPA CGP Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability								
Certified	Project							
Others present/affiliation(s): N/A Precipitation/Weather (since last inspection): Mixed, 0s-40s	Project Location:							
Weather conditions (time of inspection & future outlook): Mostly sunny, snowcover and ice, 20-30s	Sudbury, Hudson, Stow, and							
Inspection Location Description (include segment # and stationing): Segments 7-14 (within Sudbury) &	Marlborough, MA							
Sudbury Substation.	USEPA#:							
*Storm event info (approx):Start date/time:2/13/25 Duration:N/A Amount of rainfall (inches): 0.30"	MAR1003UW							
Summary of Activities/Locations Inspected (include segment # and stationing):								
No activities observed onsite. All E&S controls in Sudbury inspected.								
Inspection Notes:								
Any Significant Discharges of Sediment (or other) or Non-Compliance Actions? ☐ Yes ☐ No								
Identify presence of stockpiles and document when placed and when removed (week maximum for stockpiles)	☐ Yes ⊠ No							
Compliance with Previous Observations? ⊠ Yes □ No								
New Corrective Action Recommendations ☐ Yes ☒ No								
New Routine Maintenance Recommendations? ☐ Yes								
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE								
Compliant with applicable permits and applicable environmental requirements? YES ☒ NO ☐ If not, expla	ain:							
Other Comments & Observations	_							
-This SWPPP inspection covers Segments 7-14 & Sudbury substation. Balance of SWPPP inspection- Segments 1-6 & manhole areas (Forest Ave.) in Hudson reported separately.	Land							
-Ground is frozen and snowmelt has not yet occurred. 0.30" observed in project rain gauge.	Authorized Signature							
-Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be								
made when conditions allow. Erosion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frozen ground.	Date							
	2/14/2025							
EVERSOURCE PROJECT MANAGER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT PRIME CON	ITRACTOR (BOND)							

Name: Bill Cooper

812-929-3481 (mobile) Phone:

Email: bill.cooper@eversource.com

EVERSOURCE ENVIRONMENTAL CONTACT

Matt Devlin Name: Phone: 508-596-0147

matthew.devlin@eversource.com Email:

Primary Contact (Epsilon Associates)

Name: Marc Bergeron (Epsilon

Associates)

Phone: 508-212-0420 (mobile)

Email: <u>mbergeron@epsilonassociates.com</u>

Secondary Contact (SWCA)

Name: Rebecca Weissman (SWCA)

Phone: 339-203-7045

Email: Rebecca.weissman@swca.com

Matt Stock Name: Phone: 617-512-6766

Email:

mstock@bond-civilutility.com

SUB CONTRACTOR (ET & L Corp.)

Name: Jake Matys Phone: 978-844-2219 Email: imatys@etlcorp.com

Section A – General Information						
(If necessary, complete additional inspection reports for each separate inspection location.)						
Inspector	nformation					
Inspector Name: Gabriella Suazo Title: Compliance Monitor, EPA CGP Certified						
Company Name: SWCA Environmental Consultants	Email: gabriella.suazo@swca.com					
Address: 153 Cordaville Road, Suite 130, Southborough, MA 01772	Phone Number: 774-287-3158					
Inspection	on Details					
Inspection Date: 2/14/2025 Inspection Location: This SWPPP inspection covers Segments 7-14 & 3 substation. Balance of SWPPP inspection-Segments 1-6 & manhole of Ave.) in Hudson reported separately.						
Inspection Start Time: 8:30am Inspection End Time: 11:30am						
Current Phase of Construction: Restoration Weather Conditions During Inspection: Mostly sunny, snowcover and 30s						
Did you determine that any portion of your site was unsafe for inspection per CGP	Part 4.5? ☐ Yes ☒ No					
If "Yes," provide the following information:						
Location of unsafe conditions:						
The conditions that prevented you inspecting this location:						
Indicate the required inspection frequency: (Check all that apply. You may be su	bject to different inspection frequencies in different areas of the site.)					
Standard Frequency (CGP Part 4.2): At least once every 7 calendar days; OR Once every 14 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either:						
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period 						
Increased Frequency (CGP Part 4.3.1) (If site discharges to sediment or nutrient-impaired waters or to waters designated as Tier 2, Tier 2.5, or Tier 3): Solution Once every 7 calendar days and within 24 hours of the occurrence of either:						
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period 						

Reduced Frequency (CGP Part 4.4):
□ For stabilized areas: Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once per month after first month until permit coverage is terminated
□ For stabilized areas on "linear construction sites": Twice during first month, no more than 14 calendar days apart; then once more within 24 hours of the
occurrence of either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
□ For arid, semi-arid, or drought-stricken areas during seasonally dry periods or during drought: Once per month and within 24 hours of the occurrence of
either:
 A storm event that produces 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period, or
 A snowmelt discharge from a storm event that produces 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period
For frozen conditions where construction activities are being conducted: Once per month
Was this inspection triggered by a storm event producing 0.25 inches or more of rain within a 24-hour period? ⊠ Yes □ No
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain?
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☐ On-site rain gauge: 0.30"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☐ On-site rain gauge: 0.30"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.52"
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? On-site rain gauge: 0.30" Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? Yes No
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.30" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.30" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ⋈ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge □ Weather station representative of site.
If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 0.25 inches or more of rain? ☑ On-site rain gauge: 0.30" ☑ Weather station representative of site. Weather station location: NOAA, Laurence G Hanscomb Field Airport: 0.52" Total rainfall amount that triggered the inspection (inches): 0.30" Was this inspection triggered by a snowmelt discharge from a storm event producing 3.25 inches or more of snow within a 24-hour period? □ Yes ☑ No If "Yes," how did you determine whether the storm produced 3.25 inches or more of snow? □ On-site rain gauge

Section B – Condition and Effectiveness of Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Controls (CGP Part 2.2) (Insert additional rows if needed) If "Yes," How Many Conditions Date on Which Conditions **Times (Including This** Type and Location of E&S Requiring **Condition First Requiring Routine** Occurrence) Has **Description of Conditions Observed** Control Corrective Observed (If Maintenance?1 This Condition Been Action?2,3 Applicable)? Identified? Silt fencing installed per the plan & operating 1. Silt fencing at entrance properly segments 7-14. Portions of erosion ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A pads throughout. controls approved and marked for removal were removed 11/25 & 11/26/2024. -Silt fencing is installed per the plan & operating properly within segment 7-14. Portions of erosion controls approved and marked for removal were removed 11/25 & 11/26/2024. 2. Silt Fencing on ROW in X Yes ✓ No   No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A -Snow is weighing down the silt fence in multiple Sudbury locations along the ROW. Silt fence repairs will be made when conditions allow. Erosion and sedimentation issues are unlikely due to frozen around. 3. Construction entrance All construction entrance pads have been ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A pads removed from seaments 7-14. Compost filter tubes are installed per the plan & operating properly within segments 7-14. 4. Compost filter tubes in ☐ Yes ⋈ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A Portions of erosion controls approved and Sudbury marked for removal were removed 11/25 & 11/26/2024. 5. Compost Filter tubes at Stockpile and tubing within the Sudbury ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A N/A **Sudbury Substation** Substation have been removed. Silt sack inlet protection installed throughout the ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No 6. Inlet protection N/A N/A project has been removed. Floatina silt fencina/turbidity curtain within segments 13/14 at Bridge 127 was removed on 11/08/24. Compost filter tubes were placed 7. Floating silt fencing along banks of Hop Brook, that were previously located at segment ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A protected by floating silt fencing/turbidity 13/14 boundary at curtain. Bridge 127 in Sudbury Portion of filter tubes at Bridge 127 in segment 13 on the south side of work area are submerged under water. 8. Rock check dams within Rock check dams installed & operating properly ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No N/A N/A within segments 7-11,13 & 14. segments 7-11, 13 & 14.

If the same routine maintenance was found to be necessary three or more times for the same control at the same location (including this occurrence), follow the corrective action requirements and record the required information in your corrective action log, or describe here why you believe the specific condition should still be addressed as routine maintenance:

¹ Routine maintenance includes minor repairs or other upkeep performed to ensure that the site's stormwater controls remain in effective operating condition, not including significant repairs or the need to install a new or replacement control. Routine maintenance is also required for specific conditions: (1) for perimeter controls, whenever sediment has accumulated to half or more the above-ground height of the control (CGP Part 2.2.3.c.i); (2) where sediment has been tracked-out from the site onto paved roads, sidewalks, or other paved areas (CGP Part 2.2.4.d); (3) for inlet protection measures, when sediment accumulates, the filter becomes clogged, and/or performance is compromised (CGP Part 2.2.10.b); and (4) for sediment basins, as necessary to maintain at least half of the design capacity of the basin (CGP Part 2.2.12.f)

²Corrective actions are triggered only for specific conditions (CGP Part 5.1):

- 1. A stormwater control needs a significant repair or a new or replacement control is needed, or, in accordance with Part 2.1.4.c, you find it necessary to repeatedly (i.e., three (3) or more times) conduct the same routine maintenance fix to the same control at the same location (unless you document in your inspection report under Part 4.7.1.c that the specific reoccurrence of this same problem should still be addressed as a routine maintenance fix under 2.1.4); or
- 2. A stormwater control necessary to comply with the requirements of this permit was never installed, or was installed incorrectly; or
- 3. Your discharges are not meeting applicable water quality standards; or
- 4. A prohibited discharge has occurred (see CGP Part 1.3); or
- 5. During the discharge from site dewatering activities:
 - a. The weekly average of your turbidity monitoring results exceeds the 50 NTU benchmark (or alternate benchmark if approved by EPA pursuant to Part 3.3.2.b); or
 - b. You observe or you are informed by EPA, State, or local authorities of the presence of the conditions specified in Part 4.6.3.e.

³ If a condition on your site requires a corrective action, you must also fill out a corrective action log found at https://www.epa.gov/npdes/construction-general-permit-resources-tools-and-templates. See CGP Part 5.4 for more information.

Section C – Condition and Effectiveness of Pollution Prevention (P2) Practices and Controls (CGP Part 2.3) (Insert additional rows if needed)						
Type and Location of P2 Practices and Controls	Conditions Requiring Routine Maintenance? ¹	If "Yes," How Many Times (Including This Occurrence) Has This Condition Been Identified?	Conditions Requiring Corrective Action? ^{2, 3}	Date on Which Condition First Observed (If Applicable)?	Description of Conditions Observed	
Sanitary waste facilities, project wide	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All sanitary facilities have been removed from project.	
2. Sediment tracking/street sweeping	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. No issues observed.	
Storage handling of materials	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All project related materials and equipment have been removed.	
4. Concrete washout stations	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	☐ Yes ☒ No	N/A	Construction activities completed. All designated concrete washout stations have been removed.	

If the same routine maintenance was found to be necessary three or more times for the same control at the same location (including this occurrence), follow the corrective action requirements and record the required information in your corrective action log, or describe here why you believe the specific condition should still be addressed as routine maintenance:

Section D – Stabilization of Exposed Soil (CGP Part 2.2.14) (Insert additional rows if needed)						
Specific Location That Has Been or Will Be Stabilized	Stabilization Method and Applicable Deadline	Stabilization Initiated?	Final Stabilization Criteria Met?	Final Stabilization Photos Taken?	Notes	
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segment 14	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/24/2023	☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segment 14. Removal within segment 14, progressing west to eastArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)	
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date near bridge 128 within segments 7 & 8.	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.		✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed near bridge 128 within segments 7 & 8. Two rounds, as notedArea has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (≥70%)	
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segment 11	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 9/18/2023	Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segment 11Area has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)	
Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segment 10	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 9/19/2023	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segment 10Area has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)	
5. Areas where invasive species removal has been completed to date within segments 8 & 9	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/3/2023		☐ Yes ☒ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to areas where invasive plants have been removed within segments 8 & 9Area has revegetated. Revegetation coverage is adequate for CGP (>70%)	
Wetland replication area within segment 14 completed	Seed & straw Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ NoIf "Yes," date initiated:10/31/202310/18/2024	□ Yes ⊠ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Seed & straw have been applied to the wetland replication area within segment 14Area revegetated, but was disturbed and seeded again 10/18/2024	

7. Seeding of shoulders within segment 7 8. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 8 both sides off work area.	Seed Stabilization deadline is 7 days. Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date initiated: 5/28/2024 ☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date initiated: 8/26/2024	 X Yes X No If "Yes," date criteria met: X Yes No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024 	☐ Yes ☑ No	-Seed was applied to disturbed segment shoulders during period of inactivity (time of year restriction)Seeding on 5/28/2024 was temporary. See row 16 for permanent stabilization/hydroseedingHydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
9. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 9 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/11/2024	Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (>70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
10. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 10 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/22/2024	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
11. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 11 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/19/2024		☐ Yes ☒ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
12. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 12 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/31/2024	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	□ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.

13. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 13 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/31/2024	✓ Yes ☐ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ⊠ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
14. Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 14 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 7/31/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met: 10/1/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No	-Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shouldersPortions of segment have adequate revegetation for CGP (≥70%) as of 10/1/2024. See row 16 for portions of this segment that have not yet reached stabilization threshold.
15. Hydroseeding of planting beds and additional disturbed areas within segments 7-14 both sides of work areas.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/25/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ☒ No	Hydroseed was applied to planting beds and any additional disturbed areas within segments 7-14.
16.Hydroseeding of shoulders within segment 7 both sides off work area.	Hydroseed Stabilization deadline is 7 days.	✓ Yes □ No If "Yes," date initiated: 10/29/2024	☐ Yes ☒ No If "Yes," date criteria met:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Hydroseed was applied to recently loamed shoulders.

(Insert additional rows if needed)					
Was a discharge (not including dewatering) occurring from any part of your site at the time of the inspection? ⁴ \square Yes \boxtimes No					
 If "Yes," for each point of discharge, document the following: The visual quality of the discharge. The characteristics of the discharge, including color; odor; floating, settled, or suspended solids; foam; oil sheen; and other indicators of stormwater pollutants. Signs of the above pollutant characteristics that are visible from your site and attributable to your discharge in receiving waters or in other constructed or natural site drainage features. 					
Discharge Location	Observations				
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					

⁴ If a dewatering discharge was occurring, you must conduct a dewatering inspection pursuant to CGP Part 4.3.2 and complete a separate dewatering inspection report.

Section F – Signature and Certification (CGP Part 4.7.2)

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information contained therein. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information contained is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I have no personal knowledge that the information submitted is other than true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

MANDATORY: Signature of Operator or "Duly Authorized Representative:"					
Signature: Matthew Devlin	Date: 2-14-2025				
Printed Name: Matt Devlin	Affiliation: Senior Environmental Specialist - Licensing & Permitting - Eversource				
OPTIONAL: Signature of Contractor or Subcontractor Senior Environmental Scientist/Compliance Monitor					
Signature:	Date: 2-14-2025				
Printed Name: Gabriella Suazo	Affiliation: Compliance Monitor- SWCA Environmental Consultants				

Environmental Monitoring Photographs

Epsilon ASSOCIATES INC.			PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG	
Client Name: Eversource		Site Location: Sudbury Reliability Project	to Hudson Transmission	Town: Sudbury
Photo No.: 1	Date: 2-14-2025		XXX	
			A AMPLE 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	

Client Name: Eversource Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission Reliability Project Photo No.: 2 Date: 2-14-2025 Description: View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 8. Facing east.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission **Reliability Project**

Town: Sudbury

Photo No.: 3

Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 9. Facing



PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission **Reliability Project**

Town: Sudbury

Photo No.: 4

Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of silt fence damaged by the snow near MH #20 in segment 10. Facing east.



PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission

Town: Sudbury


Photo No.: 5

Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 11. Facing

east.



PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG

Town: Sudbury

Client Name: Eversource

Site Location: Sudbury to Hudson Transmission

Reliability Project

Photo No.: 6

Date: 2-14-2025

Description:

View of E&S controls and snowcover in segment 12. Facing

west.



