



April 13, 2016

Andrew Barnsdale
Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #23 for Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

This monthly report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities occurring during the period of **February 1 to 29, 2016**, for the Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement (ACTR) Project (Aliso) in California. Compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by Southern California Gas Company (SCG), Southern California Edison (SCE), and their contractors are in compliance with the requirements of the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for Aliso, as adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on November 14, 2013 (CPUC Notice Determination).

The CPUC has issued the following Notices to Proceed (NTPs) for the project to SCG and SCE:

- NTP #1 (February 25, 2014): The Guard House and road widening component.
- NTP #2 (May 27, 2014): Construction of new administrative buildings, removal of old buildings, and development of Fill Sites P-41 and P-43.
- NTP #3 (July 18, 2014): Construction of the Central Compressor Station (CCS), grading for the Natural Substation, and installation of five tubular steel poles (TSPs) and string conductor.
- NTP-A (October 28, 2014): Work along Natural-Newhall-San Fernando and MacNeil-Newhall-San Fernando 66-kilovolt (kV) subtransmission lines and at the San Fernando, Newhall, Chatsworth, Sunshine, and MacNeil substations.
- NTP-B (February 24, 2015): Construction of a portion of Telecommunications Route 3 from the San Fernando Substation to the temporary San Fernando Substation Tap.
- NTP-C (April 14, 2015): Construction and telecommunication installation associated with the MacNeil-Newhall-San Fernando and Natural-Newhall-San Fernando 66-kV subtransmission lines.
- NTP-D (June 8, 2015): Additional construction and telecommunication installation associated with the MacNeil-Newhall-San Fernando and Natural-Newhall-San Fernando 66-kV subtransmission lines, and construction of the Natural Substation.
- NTP-E (September 21, 2015): Additional construction and telecommunication installation on Telecommunications Routes 1, 2, and 3.

Onsite compliance monitoring by the Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E) compliance team during this reporting period focused on weekly spot-checks of ongoing construction activities. E & E's Compliance Monitor, Vince Semonsen, visited the Aliso construction site on February 2, 11, 19, and 25, 2016. Site inspection reports that summarize observed construction activities and compliance events and

verify mitigation measures (MMs) were completed for all site visits. Reports are attached below (Attachment 1).

Overall, the project has maintained compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program's (MMCRP) Compliance Plan. Communication between the CPUC/E & E compliance team and SCG and SCE has been regular and generally effective, with approximately daily correspondence to discuss and document compliance events, upcoming compliance-related surveys and deliverables, and the construction schedule. Weekly agency calls between CPUC/E & E, SCG, and SCE, along with weekly email updates from SCG and SCE, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, SCG's and SCE's monthly compliance status reports for February 2016, provided compliance summaries and included: a description of construction activities for February 1 to 29, 2016; a detailed look-ahead construction schedule; a summary of compliance with project commitments (applicant proposed measures [APMs]/MMs) for air quality, biological resources, and cultural and paleontological resources; Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) measures; noise measures; the Worker Environmental Awareness Training Program (WEAP); a summary of non-compliance incidents; and a list of recent ACTR Project approvals.

Compliance Incidents

Non-Compliance Report

No Non-Compliance Reports were issued during February 2016.

Follow-up on January Qualifying Storm Event

After a rain event that lasted from January 5 to January 7, 2016, the CPUC/E & E team expressed concern about SCG's compliance with its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit (General Permit), APM GE-2 (Erosion and Sediment Control), and MM BR-15 (Oak Tree Mitigation) contained in the MMCRP for the ACTR Project. Throughout January 2016, the CPUC/E & E and SCG held two conference calls and exchanged several emails regarding the rain event, compliance standards, and performance of stormwater best management practices (BMPs). At the end of January, the CPUC/E & E remained concerned about BMPs and stormwater management at the PS-42 Fill Site and Natural Substation area, as detailed in Monthly Report 22 (January 2016).

On February 4, 2016, SCG responded to the CPUC's follow-up questions via an email discussing improvements made to BMPs at the PS-42 Fill Site and an explanation of its understanding of compliance at the Natural Substation area. The CPUC reviewed SCG's February 4 response and responded with a request that SCG prepare a plan to restore erosion that was evident within the oak swale below the Natural Substation and to update the SWPPP to help ensure additional erosion would not occur in the future. On February 22, 2016, SCG submitted a plan to modify the biofiltration unit inlet and install BMPs in the oak swale. The CPUC/E & E's review of SCG's plan remained ongoing at the end of February.

Other Incidents

On February 2, 2016, SCE's contractor, Henkels & McCoy (H&M) arrived at the entrance to the TSP 24/25 access road and discovered a broken 3-inch pipe leaking sewer water. It was determined that the pipe was part of the Crescent Valley Mobile Estates' (Mobile Estates) sump pump and that the damage was not caused by SCE or H&M; however, H&M crews fixed the pipe so that work could resume in the area.

On February 5, 2016, the SCE telecommunications foreman reported to the Los Hills Sheriff's Office the theft of suspended rope and travelers from the Browns Canyon segment of the Chatsworth telecommunications route (Telecommunications Route 2).

On February 13, 2016, slurry from a cement mixer belonging to an SCG contractor was spilled onto the road near the Guard House. The slurry was shoveled from the road and removed from the site for disposal the same day.

In SCG's February 2016 Monthly Report to the CPUC, a photograph of a California newt (*Taricha torosa*) was included. The photograph was taken during the night shift on February 18, 2016, and shows a person holding the newt, with the caption stating "Newt identified and relocated at the Central Compressor Station during night shift." SCG has permission from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to relocate this CDFW Species of Special Concern out of harm's way without the need for a scientific collecting permit. However, relocation protocol involves moving newts in the direction they are traveling using a plastic cup, not using bare hands. California newts are known to secrete toxins from their skin and they may be impacted by direct contact with humans; thus, handling is not approved by CDFW. Upon receiving the February Monthly Report, the CPUC/E & E Team contacted SCG about the incident. SCG confirmed that all biological monitors received the CDFW protocol. SCG committed to working with its environmental team to ensure the protocol is followed.

On February 24, 2016, SCG's AECOM biological monitor observed a contractor staging materials, parking vehicles, and operating equipment within an established bird nest buffer. The biological monitor informed the crew they were in a nesting bird buffer and had them leave the area. A CPUC-approved avian biologist observed the nest afterwards. The American bushtit (*Psaltiriparus minimus*) pair did not appear impacted and continued to conduct nest building activities. SCG's response to this encroachment included: requiring all of the contractor's staff to attend a nesting bird tutorial with the lead avian biologist; roping off nest buffers that are not along emergency routes; and enhancing outreach efforts to ensure contractors know how to avoid bird buffers. This incident was self-reported by SCG on February 26, 2016.

Special Status Species Observations

During February 2016, five live California newts were relocated and two dead newts were reported. On February 2, 2016, SCG and the CPUC Compliance Monitor met with CDFW staff at the ACTR Project site to discuss the newt population. The group reviewed the project area, data collection protocol, and current measures being taken to protect newts. CDFW expressed satisfaction with the current measures.

February 15, 2016 marked the beginning of the 2016 nesting bird season. To prepare, SCE and SCG began implementing the ACTR Project's Nesting Bird Management Plan in February. Preconstruction surveys, clearance sweeps, and daily sweeps will take place within suitable habitat for nesting birds within any of the work activity areas and include a minimum 100-foot survey buffer for non-raptors, and 500 feet for raptors. The status of all active nests within the survey buffer are being documented, summarized, and sent to the CPUC in weekly reports and a weekly nesting bird table.

Public Concerns

On February 6, 2016, SCE met with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the Mobile Estates to discuss removing the block wall near the entrance of TSPs 24/25. No decision was made at the meeting, and the Mobile Estates manager and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LADWP) will continue to evaluate the possibility of removing the block wall.

Minor Approvals

During February 2016, MPR-H Amendment 1 and other minor email approvals were issued (Table 1).

Table 1: Minor Approvals for February 2016

Description	Approval Date
Email approval to stage rebar cages for 12-kV powerline work at SCE's TSP 45 staging area. (SCG)	February 3, 2016
Email approval to clear vegetation around the new Admin/IM Building, per fuel modification requirements. (SCG)	February 3, 2016
MPR H Amendment 1 approval to modify the final grading limits of the access road leading to TSP 49. (SCE)	February 4, 2016

Please contact me if you have any questions concerning this summary report.

Sincerely,



Lara Rachowicz
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

CC:
Seth Rosenberg, SCG
Chris May, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Reports and Site Visit Report
February 2, 11, 19, and 25, 2016



Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement	Date:	February 2, 2016
Project Proponent:	Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS090
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy and cold with a slight breeze.
E & E CM:	Lara Rachowicz	Start/End time:	0900 to 1230 at the Aliso Storage Field. 1230 to 1430 checked SCE work.
Project NTP(s):	The new Admin/IM Building (NTP-2) and Central Compressor Station (CCS) (NTP-3). P-41 Fill Site (NTP-2), PS-42 Fill Site, P-32 Fill Site (NTP-3), and the Natural Substation (NTP-3 and NTP-A). TSPs 2 through 42 (NTPs A, C, and D) and the SCE 210 Freeway Yard. Telecommunications Route 2 (NTP-E).		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

WEATP Training	Yes	No	N/A
Has WEATP training been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures properly installed and functioning?	X		
Is mud tracked onto paved public roadways cleaned up in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Is excessive fugitive dust leaving the work area?		X	
Equipment			
Are all vehicles observed maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are all vehicles/equipment observed arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas			
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		

Are vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are all excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology			
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas?		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)?		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? List:		X	
Are there wetlands or water bodies present near construction activities?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources?		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?	X		
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources?		X	
Hazardous Materials			
Are hazardous materials stored appropriately?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are appropriate fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Is contaminated soil properly handled or disposed of, if applicable?	X		
Work Hours and Noise			
Are night lighting reduction measures in place, as needed?			X
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are noise control measures in place within 100 feet of sensitive receptors as needed?			X

<p>AREAS MONITORED (i.e., structure numbers, yards, or substations)</p> <p>I checked the PS-42 Fill Site work and CCS within the Aliso Storage Field and TSPs 26 and 21 along the SCE line.</p>
<p>DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES (i.e., mitigation measures of particular focus or concern, construction activity, any discussions with first-party monitors or construction crews)</p> <p>I arrived at the Aliso Storage Field at 0900 and traveled to the PS-42 Fill Site to check if the site had remained in stable condition after the latest rain event. Several days prior to this site visit, almost one inch of rain fell at the facility. I noted some ponded water on top of the PS-42 Fill Site – see photo; however, the area was in good condition, and I did not note any serious erosion issues.</p> <p>I did not check the Natural Substation, as there was no work being conducted.</p> <p>At 1000, I attended a meeting with Dan Blankenship and Tim Hovey (both with CDFW) and Johnny Grady, Seth Rosenberg, and Jennifer Campbell (all with SCG) to discuss the newt population and migration patterns. We met at the lower sedimentation basin/newt pond (near the Guard House). Tim Hovey was prepared to take tissue samples if any newts were present. Tim Hovey had discussed the newts with Dr. Sam Sweet (University of California Santa Barbara Herpetologist), who was interested in a DNA analysis of this population. Dr. Sweet thinks newts might have been introduced to the Aliso Storage Field area. We checked the areas where newts are commonly seen and likely migration routes; however, no newts were observed during the site visit. We checked the exclusion barriers and discussed how best to protect the newts from vehicular traffic. The consensus was that the current fencing was adequate and the ongoing monitoring was the best method of protection, especially during wet weather conditions. Dan Blankenship and Tim Hovey hoped that another site visit might be possible later in the year to collect some newt tissue samples.</p> <p>The CCS and the new Admin/IM Building were in good condition after the rain events. There were small areas with exposed soil that will require erosion blankets or additional BMPs. One portion of the new Admin/IM Building had a significant amount of exposed soil, and it looked like sediment-laden water had flowed off the site into a drainage ditch without any sediment controls – see photos.</p> <p>I met with SCE's lead monitor, Todd White (Arcadis), at TSP 21 where a crew was repairing some of the BMPs on the pull site and the access road – see photos. The paved road into the Mobile Estates looked clean. Todd White had a crew of biologists placing cages around some of the lily planting restoration locations and around some control points – see photos.</p> <p>At TSP 26, crews had installed a McCarthy drain and have replaced the BMPs – see photo.</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)</p> <p>Onsite monitors were in place and overseeing the construction activities; all construction personnel appear to have gone through the training (APM HZ-6).</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)</p> <p>BMPs should continue to be checked throughout the ACTR Project sites.</p>

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

Restoration of the various remaining sites should be completed as soon as possible so the seed bank benefits from the remaining winter rains.




COMPLIANCE SUMMARY




Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries (compliance level 0) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3 fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to E & E Compliance Manager. Inform E & E CM of any non-compliance incidents.




- ☐ Compliance Level 0: New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 1: Violates the project's environmental requirements but does not immediately put environmental resources at risk. Applicant will need to correct the action and/or prevent repeat incidents of the same issue. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 2: (Minor Incident) Level 2 should be those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, minor risk to environmental resources such as activities that result in a deviation from the mitigation measure requirements that result in minor, short-term impact to resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 3: (Major Incident) Level 3 are those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, major risk to environmental resources such as: major environmental incident that is not in compliance with the applicant mitigation measures, mitigation measures, permit condition, approval (e.g., variances, addendums) requirements, and/or environmental construction specifications; violation of the law; or documented repetitive occurrences of Level 2 Minor Incident events. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- ☐ Non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SoCalGas or SCE report identification number.

Date	Non-compliance issue and resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #

PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCE ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/2/16	PS-42 Fill Site		Some ponded water on top of the PS-42 Fill Site.
2/2/16	PS-42 Fill Site		The PS-42 Fill Site remained in good condition following the rain event.
2/2/16	CCS		Ongoing construction at the CCS.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/2/16	CCS		The area between the CCS and the new Admin/IM Building has a substantial amount of exposed soil.
2/2/16	CCS		Maintenance on the BMPs continues around the CCS.
2/2/16	New Admin/IM Building		Excavation work is taking place at the lower portion of the new Admin/IM Building.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/2/16	New Admin/IM Building		Sediment-laden water ponding at this location drains into a "V" ditch located under the plywood boards. BMPs are suggested for this location.
2/2/16	TSP 26		A McCarthy drain and new BMPs have been installed.
2/2/16	TSP 21/22 pull site		BMP work at the TSP 21/22 pull site.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/2/16	TSP 21		A small amount of final grading was completed around the TSP 21 site.
2/2/16	TSP 21		Biologists installing cages around the lily restoration plantings.



Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement	Date:	February 11, 2016
Project Proponent:	Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS091
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, sunny, and warm with a slight breeze.
E & E CM:	Lara Rachowicz	Start/End time:	0945 to 1230 at the Aliso Storage Field. 1230 to 1430 checked SCE work.
Project NTP(s):	The new Admin/IM Building (NTP-2) and Central Compressor Station (CCS) (NTP-3). P-41 Fill Site (NTP-2), PS-42 Fill Site, P-32 Fill Site (NTP-3), and the Natural Substation (NTP-3 and NTP-A). TSPs 2 through 42 (NTPs A, C, and D) and the SCE 210 Freeway Yard. Telecommunications Route 2 (NTP-E).		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

WEATP Training	Yes	No	N/A
Has WEATP training been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures properly installed and functioning?	X		
Is mud tracked onto paved public roadways cleaned up in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Is excessive fugitive dust leaving the work area?		X	
Equipment			
Are all vehicles observed maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are all vehicles/equipment observed arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas			
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		

Are vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are all excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology			
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas?		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)?		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? List:		X	
Are there wetlands or water bodies present near construction activities?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources?		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?	X		
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources?		X	
Hazardous Materials			
Are hazardous materials stored appropriately?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are appropriate fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Is contaminated soil properly handled or disposed of, if applicable?	X		
Work Hours and Noise			
Are night lighting reduction measures in place, as needed?			X
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are noise control measures in place within 100 feet of sensitive receptors as needed?			X

AREAS MONITORED (i.e., structure numbers, yards, or substations)

I checked the PS-42 Fill Site, the Natural Substation, the new Admin/IM Building, and the CCS within the Aliso Storage Field; I also checked the TSP 24/25 access road and TSP 32 along the SCE subtransmission line.

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES (i.e., mitigation measures of particular focus or concern, construction activity, any discussions with first-party monitors or construction crews)

I arrived onsite at the Aliso Storage Field at 0945 and checked in at the office. I spoke with Jim Strader (SCG) about the status of the ongoing gas leak in the area. A relief well drilling rig had been erected near the ACTR Project's Oak Tree Mitigation Site – see photo.

I caravanned with Seth Rosenberg (SCE) to the Natural Substation to look at possible solutions to the erosion within the oak swale. My main recommendation was to find a way to divert some of the water away from the oak swale, and I suggested that water from the access road be captured and directed into the drainage west of the road. We also looked at the erosion rills in the oak swale (see photo) and discussed ways to slow the water flow in the rills and allow sediment to drop out.

Very little work was being conducted at the Natural Substation, and major construction at this site is almost complete (see overview photo).

I checked the PS-42 Fill Site where the BMPs were installed – see photos. The site looked similar to the previous week, except that the ponded water had dried up on the top of the last fill key. The well pad above the PS-42 Fill Site was being used for non-ACTR Project purposes – see photo. Seth Rosenberg (SCE) indicated that the ACTR Project is turning the site over to the operations and maintenance (O&M) team.

I observed some trenching within the CCS site, and crews were installing walls on the structure surrounding the new turbines – see photos. I spoke with Juan Miranda and Luis who were the SCG onsite biological monitors, and they said the work was going well (APM BR-1d).

The new Admin/IM Building was having the final preparation work conducted prior to paving the site – see photos. The fuel modification work (vegetation clearing) was being completed around the new Admin/IM Building; the area had been staked out and surveyed (APM BR-1a and APM BR-1c) prior to work being performed. Only perennial non-native vegetation had been removed from the Limekiln Creek riparian corridor – see photo.

I drove to the TSP 32 extra work space location where an excavator was breaking down the old steel lattice towers in preparation for transport offsite – see photo. The new access road to the TSP 32 site continues to direct a fair amount of rainwater runoff, which created some rills; additional BMP maintenance is needed in this area. A portion of the rainwater runoff coming off the TSP 32 pad is not going into the McCarthy drain and is creating an erosion issue on the slope and under the McCarthy drain, itself – see photo.

I met with SCE's lead monitor, Todd White (Arcadis), at the Mobile Estates and we drove to the TSP 24/25 access road. The entrance to the access road had been cleaned (APM AQ-7) and the rock and rumble plates had been reinstalled – see photo. LADPW crews were working in the area.

Water coming down the access road at Drainage #4 was causing an erosion problem where it drained into the culvert outfall area – see photo. I have mentioned the need for some additional BMPs (APM GE-2) for this area in several previous reports and have also spoken with some of the onsite Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) crew. A deep erosion rill is cutting under the riprap along the access road toward TSP 25 – see photo. Todd White said that SCE is working on a more long-term and substantial solution for this location.

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

Onsite monitors were in place and overseeing the construction activities; all construction personnel appear to have gone through the training (APM HZ-6).

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

BMPs should continue to be checked throughout the Aliso Storage Field, especially at Drainage #4 along the TSP 24/25 access road.

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

Restoration of the various remaining sites should be completed as soon as possible so the seed bank benefits from the remaining winter rains (APM BR-3).




COMPLIANCE SUMMARY




Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries (compliance level 0) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3 fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to E & E Compliance Manager. Inform E & E CM of any non-compliance incidents.

- ☐ Compliance Level 0: New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 1: Violates the project's environmental requirements but does not immediately put environmental resources at risk. Applicant will need to correct the action and/or prevent repeat incidents of the same issue. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 2: (Minor Incident) Level 2 should be those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, minor risk to environmental resources such as activities that result in a deviation from the mitigation measure requirements that result in minor, short-term impact to resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 3: (Major Incident) Level 3 are those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, major risk to environmental resources such as: major environmental incident that is not in compliance with the applicant mitigation measures, mitigation measures, permit condition, approval (e.g., variances, addendums) requirements, and/or environmental construction specifications; violation of the law; or documented repetitive occurrences of Level 2 Minor Incident events. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- ☐ Non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SoCalGas or SCE report identification number.




Date	Non-compliance issue and resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #




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


REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/11/16	PS-42 Fill Site		The water that was previously ponded on top of the PS-42 Fill Site has dried out.
2/11/16	PS-42 Fill Site		There were no changes to the PS-42 Fill Site. BMPs are in place.
2/11/16	Relief wells and Oak Tree Mitigation Site		The first relief well associated with an ongoing well leak at the Aliso Storage Field (non-ACTR Project related) can be seen in the foreground. A second relief well drilling rig has now been set up, adjacent to the ACTR Project's Oak Tree Mitigation Site.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/11/16	Natural Substation		Overview –the Natural Substation's installation is nearing completion.
2/11/16	Oak swale below the Natural Substation		Erosion scars through the oak swale.
2/11/16	CCS		Construction continues at the CCS – crews are installing walls around the new turbines.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/11/16	CCS		Trenching work continues within the CCS area.
2/11/16	New Admin/IM Building		Final grading of the site is nearing completion.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/11/16	New Admin/IM Building		Preparation for paving is being conducted.
2/11/16	New Admin/IM Building		Fuel modification (i.e., vegetation clearing) on the slope between the site and Limekiln Creek.
2/11/16	TSP 32		An excavator is breaking down the old lattice towers for transport offsite.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/11/16	TSP 32		Rainwater runoff is traveling around the McCarthy drain and eroding the slope and under the drain, itself.
2/11/16	TSP 24/25 access road entrance		Crews have cleaned up the entrance to the access road and have reinstalled the rumble plates and rock.
2/11/16	Drainage #4 along the TSP 24/25 access road		BMP stabilization of this portion of the access road is needed to prevent sediment from running into the drainage.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/11/16	TSP 24/25 access road		<p>The road stabilization riprap is being undermined by rainwater runoff. SCE is planning to repair this.</p>



Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement	Date:	February 19, 2016
Project Proponent:	Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS092
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, sunny, and warm with a slight breeze. The recent rainfall total equals 0.75 inch.
E & E CM:	Lara Rachowicz	Start/End time:	0830 to 1000 checked SCE work. 1015 to 1230 at the Aliso Storage Field.
Project NTP(s):	The new Admin/IM Building (NTP-2) and Central Compressor Station (CCS) (NTP-3). P-41 Fill Site (NTP-2), PS-42 Fill Site, P-32 Fill Site (NTP-3), and the Natural Substation (NTP-3 and NTP-A). TSPs 2 through 42 (NTPs A, C, and D) and the SCE 210 Freeway Yard. Telecommunications Route 2 (NTP-E).		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

WEATP Training	Yes	No	N/A
Has WEATP training been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures properly installed and functioning?	X		
Is mud tracked onto paved public roadways cleaned up in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Is excessive fugitive dust leaving the work area?		X	
Equipment			
Are all vehicles observed maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are all vehicles/equipment observed arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas			
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		

Are vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are all excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology			
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas?		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)?		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? List:		X	
Are there wetlands or water bodies present near construction activities?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources?		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?	X		
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources?		X	
Hazardous Materials			
Are hazardous materials stored appropriately?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are appropriate fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Is contaminated soil properly handled or disposed of, if applicable?	X		
Work Hours and Noise			
Are night lighting reduction measures in place, as needed?			X
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are noise control measures in place within 100 feet of sensitive receptors as needed?			X

AREAS MONITORED (i.e., structure numbers, yards, or substations)

I checked on the access roads to TSPs 7, 21, 24/25, and 26 and at the TSP 32 site. At the Aliso Storage Field, I checked the PS-42 Fill Site work, the Natural Substation, TSP 49, the new Admin/IM Building, and the CCS.

DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES (i.e., mitigation measures of particular focus or concern, construction activity, any discussions with first-party monitors or construction crews)

My first stop of the day was TSP 7, where I checked the access road and verified the location of the stockpiled topsoil. The access road continues to have erosion issues, with a fairly large rill developing down the steep section of the road – see photo. I also noted the topsoil stockpile within the staging area above the pole site – see photo. SCE's lead monitor, Todd White (Arcadis), indicated that the crew would be using the topsoil to restore portions of the access road after road repair work. While I do not know the exact schedule for repairing this road and the TSP 24/25 access road, Todd White had indicated that SCE is finalizing plans.

I drove to TSP 32 and noted that rainwater runoff continues to erode the dirt access road and mostly bypasses the McCarthy drain – see photo. At this site and the TSP 7 site, there are numerous metal “T” posts and pieces of exclusion fencing remaining; these items will need to be collected and disposed of (APM PS-1).

It was too muddy to drive on the access road between TSP 27 and TSP 32. I noted some mud tracked out onto the frontage road below the TSP 26 access road – see photo. I sent a note to Todd White regarding the mud on the frontage road and he stated that Lucy Cortez (SCE) was sending a crew over to take care of the issue. The entrances to the TSP 24/25 and TSP 22-12 access roads were in good condition, with no mud noted on the paved roads (APM AQ-7).

I arrived at the Aliso Storage Field at 1015 and checked in at the office. While driving in past the Guard House, I noted that the spoil pile (pulled from the lower sedimentation basin/newt pond) covering was shredded and portions of the silt fence and orange construction fence were down – see photo. When I checked in with Seth Rosenberg (SCG) at the office, I mentioned my observations to him and he repaired the downed fencing (APM BR-1b). I spoke with both Seth Rosenberg and SCG's lead monitor, Amandeep Singh (AECOM), about ACTR Project status and oversight. Night work had started this week, and the biological monitor provided by AECOM had been conducting work using night vision goggles in order to observe newts in the dark. Amandeep Singh stated that two newts had been captured and relocated by the biological monitor during the recent 0.75-inch rain event (APM BR-7). Amandeep Singh also stated that nesting bird surveys had started; however, only the red-tailed hawk nest along Limekiln Creek appeared to be occupied (APM BR-1c).

At the Natural Substation, crews continued to trench for and install conduit and grounding wire. I spoke with Dave Wehman (SCE) about the ongoing work – see photo. I checked on the oak swale, but nothing had changed since my last visit, and I did not note any new erosion from the latest storm. The revegetation of the slopes below the Natural Substation is doing well, and I noted extensive amounts of well-established cover – see photo.

I walked to TSP 49 to check on the erosion issues I had previously noted; these issues remained – see photo. Water traveling down the access road had destroyed some of the BMPs and had created a fairly deep (2 feet) rill down the steep slope below the TSP. It appears that equipment may be needed to fix the erosion; however, no access road to the pole site currently exists.

I checked in with paleontological monitor Dave Schroeder who was overseeing the SCE crew installing the telecommunication poles and their anchors along the Natural Substation access road (MM CR-8) – see photo. The crew had just completed installation of the last pole anchors and were headed offsite; I did not note any issues at this location.

The PS-42 Fill Site remained unchanged since my previous site visit, with no visible damage to the BMPs (APM GE-2); however, ponded water was observed on the top layer after the recent rain event – see photo.

There was some trenching occurring within the upper portion of the new Admin/IM Building, along with substantial paving work – see photos.

An extensive amount of work was being conducted within the CCS site, with crews working on the installation of the infrastructure. Cassion installation was taking place for the 12-kV power plant line. A helicopter was installing the marker balls on the wires over the CCS. This operation uses a two-person crew dangling below the helicopter – see photo. I spoke briefly with biological monitor Juan Miranda (SCG) near the CCS (APM BR-1d and APM BR-6).

MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)

Onsite monitors were in place and overseeing the construction activities; all construction personnel appear to have gone through the training (APM HZ-6).

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

Erosion repairs at Drainage #4 along the TSP 24/25 access road, at TSP 7, and at TSP 49 need to be checked.

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




COMPLIANCE SUMMARY




Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries (compliance level 0) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3 fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to E & E Compliance Manager. Inform E & E CM of any non-compliance incidents.



- ☐ Compliance Level 0: New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 1: Violates the project's environmental requirements but does not immediately put environmental resources at risk. Applicant will need to correct the action and/or prevent repeat incidents of the same issue. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 2: (Minor Incident) Level 2 should be those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, minor risk to environmental resources such as activities that result in a deviation from the mitigation measure requirements that result in minor, short-term impact to resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 3: (Major Incident) Level 3 are those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, major risk to environmental resources such as: major environmental incident that is not in compliance with the applicant mitigation measures, mitigation measures, permit condition, approval (e.g., variances, addendums) requirements, and/or environmental construction specifications; violation of the law; or documented repetitive occurrences of Level 2 Minor Incident events. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- ☐ Non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SoCalGas or SCE report identification number.




Date	Non-compliance issue and resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #



PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCE ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/19/16	TSP 7 access road		Some significant erosion rills were noted on the steep section of the TSP 7 access road.
2/19/16	TSP 7		Stockpiled topsoil in the TSP 7 staging area.
2/19/16	TSP 32		Erosion remains an unresolved issue, and rainwater runoff continues to bypass the McCarthy drain.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/19/16	TSP 26		Mud tracked out onto the roadway.
2/19/16	Guard House area		The covering over the mud and debris that was removed from the lower sedimentation basin/newt pond is shredded and the silt fencing is down.
2/19/16	Natural Substation		Trenching continues for conduit and the grounding wires.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/19/16	Aliso Storage Field		Overview of the ACTR Project taken from the Natural Substation. Note the successful revegetation of the slope below the Natural Substation
2/19/16	TSP 49		Erosion channel below the pole.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/19/16	TSP 49		Erosion around TSP 49; BMPs require maintenance and/or upgrades.
2/19/16	Natural Substation access road		Crews have installed telecommunication poles and anchors along the Natural Substation access road.
2/19/16	PS-42 Fill Site		Due to the recent rainfall, there is some ponded water on top of the PS-42 Fill Site.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/19/16	New Admin/IM Building		Crews conducting trenching and paving work.
2/19/16	New Admin/IM Building and CCS		Paving at the lower portion of the new Admin/IM Building, and an overview of CCS area. Note the helicopter installing marker balls on the lines over the CCS.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/19/16	Wire between TSPs 46 and 47		Helicopter with two-person crew installing marker balls on the wire.
2/19/16	CCS		Cassion installation for 12-kV power plant line.



Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement	Date:	February 25, 2016
Project Proponent:	Southern California Gas Company and Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS093
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear and warm with a slight breeze.
E & E CM:	Lara Rachowicz	Start/End time:	2130 to 2200 at the Aliso Storage Field.
Project NTP(s):	The new Admin/IM Building (NTP-2) and Central Compressor Station (CCS) (NTP-3). P-41 Fill Site (NTP-2), PS-42 Fill Site, P-32 Fill Site (NTP-3), and the Natural Substation (NTP-3 and NTP-A). TSPs 2 through 42 (NTPs A, C, and D) and the SCE 210 Freeway Yard. Telecommunications Route 2 (NTP-E).		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

WEATP Training	Yes	No	N/A
Has WEATP training been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures properly installed and functioning?	X		
Is mud tracked onto paved public roadways cleaned up in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Is excessive fugitive dust leaving the work area?		X	
Equipment			
Are all vehicles observed maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are all vehicles/equipment observed arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas			
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		

Are all excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?	X		
Biology			
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas?		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)?		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? List:		X	
Are there wetlands or water bodies present near construction activities?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources?		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?	X		
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources?		X	
Hazardous Materials			
Are hazardous materials stored appropriately?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are appropriate fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Is contaminated soil properly handled or disposed of, if applicable?	X		
Work Hours and Noise			
Are night lighting reduction measures in place, as needed?	X		
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are noise control measures in place within 100 feet of sensitive receptors as needed?			X

<p>AREAS MONITORED (i.e., structure numbers, yards, or substations)</p> <p>The CCS.</p>
<p>DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES (i.e., mitigation measures of particular focus or concern, construction activity, any discussions with first-party monitors or construction crews)</p> <p>Night work has begun at the CCS, with a crew working from 1730 to 0330. According to SCG's lead monitor, Amandeep Singh (AECOM), night work is ongoing and being conducted by a small crew. The crew is working on the installation of the above ground facility only, and no ground disturbance activities are part of this work. This was confirmed during my site visit. Biological monitor Jose Lopez (SCG) was onsite and we briefly spoke about his oversight activities during the night shift (APM BR-1d and APM BR-6). He stated that he spends most of his time along the roadway between the CCS and Limekiln Creek and had caught and relocated several newts during the last rain event. Tree frogs were actively calling from the creek corridor.</p> <p>The night lighting seemed quite bright, with the largest array located on the east side of the facility pointing toward Limekiln Creek – see photo. Condition APM AE-1 states that crews should, “orient the lights to minimize their effect on any nearby sensitive receptors,” and “The lighting will be directed downward and shielded to eliminate offsite light spill at times when the lighting might be in use.” To better meet these conditions, reorientation of the lighting is suggested if it is safe to do so.</p>
<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BR-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)</p> <p>Onsite monitors were in place and overseeing the construction activities; all construction personnel appear to have gone through the training (APM HZ-6).</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)</p> <p>Review of night lighting during the night shift.</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance on-site, environmental observations of note)</p> <p>Positioning the large lighting system within the CCS to face away from the riparian corridor if safe to do so.</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY</p> <p>Below please describe any non-compliance issues or new biological/cultural discoveries (compliance level 0) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a non-compliance issue in the field, please note this on the monitoring datasheet, and for non-compliance Level 2 or 3 fill out and submit a separate Non-Compliance Report Form to E & E Compliance Manager. Inform E & E CM of any non-compliance incidents.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Compliance Level 0: New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Compliance Level 1: Violates the project's environmental requirements but does not immediately put environmental resources at risk. Applicant will need to correct the action and/or prevent repeat incidents of the same issue. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Compliance Level 2: (Minor Incident) Level 2 should be those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, minor risk to environmental resources such as activities that result in a deviation from the</p>

mitigation measure requirements that result in minor, short-term impact to resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.

- ☐ Non-Compliance Level 3: (Major Incident) Level 3 are those actions that have the potential to cause or cause immediate, major risk to environmental resources such as: major environmental incident that is not in compliance with the applicant mitigation measures, mitigation measures, permit condition, approval (e.g., variances, addendums) requirements, and/or environmental construction specifications; violation of the law; or documented repetitive occurrences of Level 2 Minor Incident events. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- ☐ Non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SoCalGas or SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SoCalGas or SCE report identification number.

Date	Non-compliance issue and resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	NC Report #

PREVIOUS NON-COMPLIANCE ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY:

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/25/16	CCS		Night lighting.
2/25/16	CCS		The CCS looking up from the roadway along Limekiln Creek.