



ecology and environment, inc.

Global Environmental Specialists

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

December 18, 2017

Jensen Uchida
Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #1 for the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project

Dear Mr. Uchida,

This report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **September 18 to October 31, 2017**, for the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) in Ventura County and Santa Barbara County, California. Compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by Southern California Edison (SCE) and its contractors are in compliance with the requirements of the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for SBCRP, as adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on November 5, 2015.

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

- NTP #1 (October 21, 2016): Establishment and operation of staging yards in Ventura County.
- NTP #2 (May 23, 2017): Construction of subtransmission, substation, and telecommunication related components in Ventura County.
- NTP #3 (May 23, 2017): Construction of subtransmission, substation, and telecommunication related components in Ventura County and Santa Barbara County, and staging yards in Santa Barbara County.

Onsite compliance monitoring by the Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E) compliance team during this reporting period focused on spot-checks of ongoing construction activities. Compliance Monitor Vince Semonsen visited the SBCRP construction sites on October 5, 13, 19, and 26, 2017. Site inspection reports that summarize observed construction activities and compliance events and verify mitigation measures (MMs) and applicant proposed measures (APMs) were completed for the site visit. The reports are attached below (Attachment 1).

Overall, SBCRP has maintained compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program's (MMCRP) Compliance Plan. Communication between the CPUC/E & E compliance team and SCE has been regular and effective; correspondence discussed and documented compliance events, upcoming compliance-related surveys and deliverables, and the construction schedule. Agency calls between CPUC/E & E and SCE, along with daily schedule updates and database notifications, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, SCE's monthly compliance status reports for September and October 2017 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from September 18 to October 31, 2017; a detailed look-ahead construction schedule; a summary of compliance with project commitments (MMs/APMs) for biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP),

noise, and the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP); environmental preparation for future work phases; and a list of recent SBCRP approvals and outstanding agency deliverables.

Compliance Incidents

During the September and October 2017 reporting period, three minor compliance incidents occurred. Compliance incidents included:

- On October 6, 2017, a biologist observed evidence of erosion and soil collapse as a result of grading. Sediment from grading activities built up on the existing berm and then collapsed down slope. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-1, clearly mark project boundaries and sensitive areas.
- On October 18, 2017, a biological monitor observed a Henkels and McCoy (H&M) crew trimming a dead coast live oak tree without an arborist present. The incident occurred on Segment 2 within disturbance limits. A convoy of H&M vehicles were travelling down the access road, including a crane that was too tall to be able to pass underneath the oak tree. The access road was too narrow to turn around and reversing down the road would have been unsafe. The crew decided to trim the tree. This incident conflicts with APM BIO-4, limit removal of native plants, trees, and vegetation communities.
- On October 18, 2017, a biologist observed an H&M crew welding brackets onto a tubular steel pole (TSP) prior to a biological clearance sweep occurring. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-2, pre-construction survey and clearance sweeps.

Additionally, several spills/leaks were reported during September and October, 2017. These were self-reported and quickly resolved by SCE.

Minor Approvals

During September and October 2017, one email approval was issued (see Table 1).

Table 1: Minor Approvals for September and October 2017

Description	Approval Date
Approval for non-PM10 certified sweeper with good faith effort from SCE.	September 25, 2017

Sincerely,



Jenny Vick
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:
Kenneth Spear, SCE
Marcus Obregon, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Report
October 5, 13, 19, and 26, 2017



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	October 5, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS001
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, sunny, warm, and calm
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End time:	0700 to 1430
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, NTP-2, NTP-3		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) properly installed (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	X		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways, in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are tarped, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	X		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are observed vehicles maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are wildlife escape ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?			X

Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?			X
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite, if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used on site properly managed?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are required fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or offsite disposal?	X		
Work Hours and Noise	Yes	No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?			X
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?	X		

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

Highway 150 Yard A, Teen Challenge Yard, Segment 3B, and Segment 2

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

This was my first site visit for the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP). Construction activities started earlier in the week; however, biologists from Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) had been onsite for several weeks staking Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) ahead of the equipment (APM BIO-1, APM BIO-2).

I arrived at 0700 for the tailboard meeting held at the Highway 150 Yard A. I met with Rincon biologist John Hindley (the project manager for the environmental team) and James Rasico (onsite lead biological monitor/coordinator). There were 10+ environmental monitoring personnel at the tailboard meeting. After the meeting concluded, the monitoring personnel joined various construction crews to check on noise issues and to oversee access road clearing, tree trimming, and the installation of best management practices (BMPs) (APM BIO-3). Fire crews were also at the meeting and will be monitoring construction activities (MM HZ-2).

The Highway 150 Yard A is located along Rincon Creek. ESA areas had been staked. The Highway 150 Yard A had been delineated by wire-backed silt fencing (MM BIO-1), and the ground was covered with clean gravel (Photo 1).

I rode with James Rasico (Rincon) to discuss SBCRP oversight and to get acquainted with the many roads and gates that allow access to the site. He drove to a location in the hills where Segment 2 meets Segment 3 (known as the "Y") (Photo 2).. Much of the land around the "Y" is owned by the Haley family and is used for cattle; therefore, closing and securing gates is very important. Near the "Y," a noise monitoring crew was setting up at Construct 56 (APM NV-1, MM NV-1) (Photo 3). Photo 4 is an overview of Segment 2 looking east toward Lake Casitas.

I traveled with James Rasico (Rincon) along Segment 3B. We stopped at Construct 57 where potholing and BMP installation had been completed (Photo 5). The pothole had been backfilled, which eliminated safety issues and the potential for animals to become trapped (MM BIO-6). The BMPs were installed according to the environmental maps. We checked on a number of constructs to verify ESA staking and BMP installation. We also stopped at Constructs 60 and 61 and noted large stick nests that appeared to be abandoned by red-tailed hawk (APM BIO-4). We met the ranch manager watering fruit trees planted under the transmission lines. Photo 6 shows the access roads along Segment 3B, which runs up and over Rincon Mountain.

James Rasico (Rincon) and I drove the access road along Segment 2 from the "Y" and back to Lake Casitas and the Teen Challenge Yard. ESA stakes and flagging had been installed along the road, and it appeared that a motorgrader had been used on some portions of the road. We stopped at several constructs to look at the surrounding vegetation and the areas to be cleared (Photo 7).

The Teen Challenge Yard is the largest staging area. This yard has several trailers in place, along with border fencing, BMPs, gravel, and exit/entry rumble plates.

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

See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities descriptions.

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

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.

- New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- Non-Compliance Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-Compliance Level 3: An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/5/17	Highway 150 Yard A		<p>Photo 1 – The staging yard is the location for the 0700 tailboard meeting. ESA signs were posted, exclusion fencing was installed, and gravel had been laid out.</p>
10/5/17	The “Y” (where Segments 2 and 3B Intersect)		<p>Photo 2 – Access roads at the “Y.” Photo facing north.</p>
10/5/17	Construct 56 on Segment 3B		<p>Photo 3 – Equipment used during the noise evaluation at Construct 56. Photo facing west.</p>

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/5/17	The "Y" (where Segments 2 and 3B Intersect)		Photo 4 – Segment 2. Photo facing east
10/5/17	Construct 57		Photo 5 – BMPs installed.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/5/17	Segment 3B		<p>Photo 6 – The Segment 3B access road is long and steep. The Segment 3B line goes up and over Rincon Mountain, which can be seen in the photo. Photo facing west</p>
10/5/17	Segment 2		<p>Photo 7 – James Rasico (Rincon) checking the environmental constraints around one of the newer TSPs along Segment 2. Photo facing east, with Lake Casitas in the background.</p>



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	October 13, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS002
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear and cool in the morning; high winds predicted later in the day
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End time:	0700 to 1330
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, NTP-2, NTP-3		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) properly installed (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	X		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways, in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are tarped, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	X		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are observed vehicles maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are wildlife escape ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?			X

Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features?	X		
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?			X
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite, if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used on site properly managed?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are required fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or offsite disposal?	X		
Work Hours and Noise	Yes	No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?			X
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?	X		

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

Highway 150 Yard A, Mac Brown Yard, Segment 3B

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 attended the 0700 tailboard meeting that was held at the Highway 150 Yard A. Henkels & McCoy (H&M) stated that they would have four teams onsite during the day and were planning to work on Saturday, October 14, 2017. The fire crew gave a safety brief and reported on the potential for high winds in the afternoon (MM HZ-2). The Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) monitoring team included biological monitors, two arborists covering the roadwork, and two paleontological monitors checking on the excavation activities (APM BIO-3, MM BIO-4, MM CR-13).

I accompanied the onsite lead biological monitor/coordinator James Rasico (Rincon) as he made his rounds. We headed out along Segment 3B where James Rasico was checking on the staking of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) ahead of equipment arrival (APM BIO-1, APM BIO-2) and the installation of best management practices (BMPs) (APM BIO-7). Our first stop was at Construct 68, where BMPs were being installed (Photo 1). The tower location is near the top of Rincon Mountain and is within an existing orchard; therefore, there will be no impacts to native vegetation at this location.

We stopped at Construct 69 where James Rasico (Rincon) "cleared" the area prior to BMP installation (Photo 2).

Next, we made stops at Constructs 70 and 71, where boundary stakes were in place but no BMPs had been installed. James Rasico (Rincon) tried to verify the environmental sensitivities at these locations, as there were numerous oak trees within the boundary stakes (APM BIO-2). A number of oaks had been flagged; however, many others had no flagging. We were unsure why all oaks had not been flagged (Photo 3).

An H&M crew was installing several water tanks near the high point of Rincon Mountain along Segment 3B (Photo 4). The crew will run piping and hose from these tanks to the various construction sites to provide water for dust control and compaction. The tanks were sitting on a gravel pad, and a large diesel pump had been brought in to move the water. James Rasico (Rincon) checked the pump's horsepower to determine its compliance with condition MM AQ-1.

We drove past Construct 62 where excavation had begun for the welded wire wall (Photo 5).

Welded wire wall excavation continues at Construct 58, with the excess soil being spread out on the access roads (Photo 6). Paleontological monitor John Minch (GANDA) was onsite with biological monitor Paulette Loubet (Rincon). At the time of my site visit, no animals had been impacted and no fossils had been found (MM BIO-6). There were numerous construction vehicles at this location, including a water truck (APM AQ-1) (Photo 7). We discussed the need for some wire-backed silt fencing below the welded wire wall excavation to keep dirt and rock from sloughing down the steep slope (MM BIO-1) (Photo 8).

Our last stop was at the Mac Brown Yard along Highway 150 A. The Mac Brown Yard had been delineated by wire-backed silt fencing (MM BIO-1), the ground was covered in clean gravel, and rumble plates were installed (Photos 9 & 10).

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

See the MM's listed in the observed activities descriptions.

All construction personnel appear to have gone through the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (APM GEN-1).

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

Verify oak tree pruning and/or removal at several construct locations.

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.

New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.

Non-Compliance Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.

Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.

Non-Compliance Level 3: An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.

Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/13/17	Segment 3B Construct 68		Photo 1 – BMPs being installed around the Construct 68 location. Photo facing north.
10/13/17	Segment 3B Construct 69		Photo 2 – Overview of Construct 69 within an avocado orchard. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/13/17	Construct 70 within Segment 3B		Photo 3 – Flagged oak tree within the boundary stakes.
10/13/17	Rincon Mountain on Segment 3B		Photo 4 – Water tanks being brought in to provide dust control and compaction.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/13/17	Construct 62		Photo 5 – Excavation work at the pole site.
10/13/17	Segment 3B Construct 58		Photo 6 – Excavation is ongoing at Construct 58; a dozer is spreading excess soil along the access road. Photo facing east.
10/13/17	Segment 3B Construct 58		Photo 7 – Excavators working on digging down to “competent” soil. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/13/17	Segment 3B Construct 58		Photo 8 – The slope below Construct 58’s wall is very steep. There were discussions regarding the addition of staked silt fencing to prevent soil from running downhill.
10/13/17	Mac Brown Yard		Photo 9 – Stockpiled BMP materials.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/13/17	Mac Brown Yard		Photo 10 – Gravel and rumble plates installed at the exit/entry location.



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	October 19, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS003
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, warm, and breezy
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End time:	0700 to 1400
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, NTP-2, NTP-3, NBMP, NIWCP		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) properly installed (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	X		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways, in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are tarped, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	X		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are observed vehicles maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		
Are wildlife escape ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?			X

Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features?		X	
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?			X
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite, if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used on site properly managed?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are required fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or offsite disposal?	X		
Work Hours and Noise	Yes	No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?			X
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?	X		

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

Highway 150 Yard A and the Highway 150 Yard C, Segments 1 and 3B

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 was onsite for the tailboard meeting at 0700. During the meeting, communication between the construction crews and biological monitors was productive, and there was a lot of discussion about timing and where crew members and monitors would be working. John Hindley, the project manager for the environmental team, and James Rasico, lead monitor biological monitor (both from Rincon Consultants, Inc. [Rincon]) were at the meeting. I connected with James Rasico so I could ride with him to the monitoring areas.

Our first stop was a new construction yard (Highway 150 Yard C) located immediately upstream from the Highway 150 Yard A. A Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew was prepping the site using an excavator to clear rock and debris around the perimeter of the yard where the silt fencing will be installed (Photo 1). The exclusion fencing was being placed at the edge of the riparian vegetation dripline (APM BIO-1, APM BIO-2, APM BIO-3, MM BIO-1). A water truck was onsite for dust control (APM AQ-1).

James Rasico (Rincon) and I travelled along Segment 3B up to Construct 58 where we met paleontological monitor Andrew Paden (GANDA) (MM CR-13) who showed us a fossilized mako shark tooth found along the road near Construct 58 (Photo 2). The tooth was about 1.75 inches long and still quite sharp. Andrew Paden thought it had come from the excavation area and had been dropped along the road as the soil was spread out along the access road. A number of oyster fossils had also been found.

Construction activities included installing drain pipes, soil compaction (Photo 3), and installation of wire-backed silt fencing below the steep portion of the pad construction (Photo 4). Paulette Loubet (Rincon) was the onsite biological monitor. Numerous pieces of equipment were onsite, including two excavators, a bulldozer, a backhoe, a dump truck, and a water truck.

We drove to the H&M water tank/water pump area; everything had been installed and connected, so water could be delivered to the construction areas (Photo 5). The water pump was sitting in a plastic secondary containment structure, but was filling with water from a leaking hose (Photo 6). James Rasico (Rincon) pointed this out to the H&M crew and they stopped the leak. The crew was burying the water line where it crossed the road (Photo 7). While we were there, biological monitor Sarah Termondt (BRC) arrived to check in with the H&M crew.

James Rasico (Rincon) and I drove a portion of Segment 1 to find the welding crews. We encountered the crews as they were moving between sites; there were numerous support vehicles, including two fire crew trucks (MM HZ-2).

Our last stop was the Teen Challenge Yard, where fencing had been installed (MM BIO-1), trailers had been set up, and generators were connected with secondary containment underneath (Photos 8 & 9).

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

See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities descriptions.
All construction personnel appear to have gone through the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (APM GEN-1).

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

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.

- New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- Non-Compliance Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-Compliance Level 3: An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/19/17	Highway 150 Yard C		Photo 1 – An additional area near the Highway 150 Yard A is being prepared as a storage yard. Photo facing southwest
10/19/17	Segment 3B Construct 58		Photo 2 – A fossilized mako shark tooth was found near Construct 58.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/19/17	Segment 3B Construct 58	 <p>A photograph showing a construction site on a hillside. In the foreground, a worker in an orange shirt and white hard hat stands with his back to the camera. To his right, another worker in a yellow safety vest and white hard hat stands facing him. In the background, a yellow excavator is visible, and a small yellow roller is compacting the ground. The terrain is a mix of dirt and sparse vegetation, with hills in the distance under a clear sky.</p>	Photo 3 – Construction crew is backfilling and compacting the area where the wire wall is being built. Photo facing east.
10/19/17	Segment 3B Construct 58	 <p>A photograph of a steep, eroded hillside. A black wire-backed silt fence is stretched across the slope, supported by wooden stakes. A tall, silver light pole stands in the foreground. The background shows a valley with green trees and hills under a clear sky.</p>	Photo 4 – Wire-backed silt fence has been installed below the steep portion of the earth work. Photo facing north.
10/19/17	Segment 3B, Water Tanks	 <p>A photograph showing two large, dark-colored water tanks installed on a gravel access road. A black utility vehicle is parked nearby. Two workers in safety gear are visible in the foreground. The background features a clear blue sky and some trees.</p>	Photo 5 – Water tanks have been installed along the access road. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/19/17	Segment 3B, Water Pump		Photo 6 – The water pump has been placed in a secondary containment structure.
10/19/17	Segment 3B, Water Line		Photo 7 – Portions of the water line are buried where they cross the access road. Photo facing east.
10/19/17	Teen Challenge Yard		Photo 8 – Generators at the Teen Challenge Yard

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/19/17	Teen Challenge Yard		Photo 9 – Trailers at the Teen Challenge Yard. Photo facing north.



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	October 26, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS004
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, warm, and breezy
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End time:	0700 to 1400
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, NTP-2, NTP-3, NBMP, NIWCP		

SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all new hires (construction and monitors)?	X		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) been installed?	X		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) properly installed (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	X		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways, in accordance with the project's SWPPP?	X		
Is dust control being implemented (i.e., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are tarped, streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	X		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	X		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	X		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are observed vehicles maintaining a speed limit of 15 mph on unpaved roads?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment or plant debris?	X		
Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	X		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	X		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources?	X		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	X		
Are excavations and trenches covered at the end of the day?	X		

Are wildlife escape ramps installed at 100-foot intervals with ramps not exceeding 2:1 slopes?			X
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have preconstruction surveys been completed for biological (wildlife, nesting birds, coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo) resources, as appropriate?	X		
Are biological monitors present onsite?	X		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, biological monitor, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	X		
Have wildlife been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		X	
Have impacts occurred to adjacent habitat (sensitive or non-sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		X	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		X	
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features?		X	
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are identified cultural/paleo resources that will not be relocated/salvaged clearly marked for exclusion?			X
Are archaeological and paleontological monitors onsite, if needed?	X		
Are appropriate buffers maintained around sensitive resources (e.g. cultural sites)?			X
Have there been any work stoppages for cultural/paleo resources? If yes, describe below.		X	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used on site properly managed?	X		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	X		
Are required fire prevention and control measures in place?	X		
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or offsite disposal?	X		
Work Hours and Noise	Yes	No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?			X
Is construction occurring within approved hours?	X		
Are required noise control measures in place?	X		

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

Highway 150 Yard, Segments 1 & 3B

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 was onsite for the 0700 tailboard meeting. I met with Caitlyn Teague who is the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) inspector for Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon). She was headed out into the field to evaluate the best management practices (BMPs) in place (APM BIO-7). I accompanied Rincon's lead biological monitor James Rasico on his morning rounds.

Our first stop was near the intersection of Segments 2 and 3B (the "Y") where crews had been working on a large pad; however, no crew members were onsite when we passed through (Photo 1).

James Rasico (Rincon) and I then headed to Carver Summit Road, a private gated entrance across Highway 150 from the "pigeon ranch." This road leads up into the walnut orchard and the Sausus Creek drainage between two of the steeper sections of Segment 3B. Up the hill to the west is Construct 61; soil has been stockpiled and appropriately covered at this location (Photo 2).

Construct 62, located immediately up the hill, was being worked on by a Henkels and McCoy (H&M) crew run by the foreman Jamie Tager (Photo 3). The crew was installing drainpipe and compacting soil in preparation for building a wire wall (Photo 4). H&M had a water hose coming down the hill from the newly installed tanks providing moisture for compaction and dust control (APM AQ-1).

We did not drive up the hill past Construct 62 to access the Construct 66 work because the road was blocked by equipment; however, I was able to watch the construction effort from across the canyon with binoculars. Crews were working on building pads using an excavator, dump trucks, and a water truck, with work being conducted in compliance. James Rasico (Rincon) said that biological monitor Paulette Loubet (Rincon) and paleontological monitor John Minch (GANDA) are overseeing this work (APM BIO-3, MM CR-13).

At Construct 58, a crew was completing the final grading of the access road and the construction pad (Photos 5 & 6).

We drove to the southern end of Segment 1 and entered the access road at the Santa Clara Substation. We drove the entire Segment (Photo 7) and checked on Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) signs, a number which had been knocked down (APM BIO-1). We found biological monitor Asher Deitch (BRC) near the Getty Tap area where crews were conducting overhead welding on the existing poles in preparation for wire stringing (Photo 8). Fire trucks were with this crew (MM HZ-2).

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

See the mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the observed activities descriptions.
All construction personnel appear to have gone through the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (APM GEN-1)

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

With the onset of the rainy season, BMP installation and maintenance is important.

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.

- New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.
- Non-Compliance Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.
- Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-Compliance Level 3: An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.
- Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/26/17	Construct 80		<p>Photo 1 – Pad work near Construct 80. This will be a large pad because it is at the intersection of Segments 2 and 3B. Photo facing northwest.</p>
10/26/17	Segment 3B, Construct 61		<p>Photo 2 – Soil stockpiled and covered. Photo facing east.</p>
10/26/17	Segment 3B, Construct 62		<p>Photo 3 – Construction crew is backfilling and compacting the area where the wire wall is being built. Photo facing north.</p>

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/26/17	Segment 3B, Construct 62		Photo 4 – Wire wall materials and BMPs at Construct 62; note how steep the hill is. Photo facing east
10/26/17	Segment 3B, Construct 58		Photo 5 – Finish work being conducted on the access road. Photo facing northeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/26/17	Segment 3B, Construct 58		Photo 6 – Finish work being conducted on the construction pad. Photo facing west.
10/26/17	Segment 1		Photo 7 – Overview photo looking south from the access road.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/26/17	Segment 1 Getty Tap Location		Photo 8 – Crews working on the towers at the Getty Tap. Photo facing south.