



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 29, 2017

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #2 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 **November 1 to 30, 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 the 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 November 2, 9, 16, and 22, 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, the 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; the 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 report for November 2017 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from November 1 to 30, 2017; a detailed look-ahead construction schedule; a summary of compliance with project commitments (MMs/APMs) for biological, 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 November 2017 reporting period, several compliance incidents occurred. Compliance incidents include:

- November 2, 2017: A biologist observed a Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew trimming trees and vegetation before a biologist conducted a pre-construction sweep. The incident was on Segment 3A and within disturbance limits. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-2, which requires pre-construction sweeps.
- November 3, 2017: A biologist observed an H&M crew mobilize and stage a wire spool truck on an access road that had not had a pre-construction clearance sweep. The incident was on Segment 1 within disturbance limits and in coastal sage scrub. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-2, which requires pre-construction sweeps.
- November 12, 2017: A biologist observed materials staged outside of the approved work area. The incident was on Segment 1 and the materials were placed on native vegetation. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-1, which requires the storage of materials to be restricted to approved areas, and APM BIO-2, which requires the minimization of impacts to native vegetation.
- November 20, 2017: A biologist observed H&M equipment staged outside of the approved work area. The incident occurred west of Carver Summit Road and was outside of disturbance limits in non-native grassland. Previous to this incident, the H&M crew had been informed that they could not stage equipment in the area. This conflicts with MM BIO-1, which requires the storage of materials to be restricted to approved areas.
- November 21, 2017: A biologist observed a 450-foot road bulldozed outside of the disturbance limits. The incident occurred on Segment 3B within protected oak woodland; tree roots were impacted. The landowner requested the road be established and excess soil from Construct 70 be deposited on his property for personal use. The onsite biologist informed the crews that grading this road would be a compliance incident. SCE later informed the CPUC that a stand down was issued on the day of the incident. The CPUC has requested follow-up information on the incident. This incident is in conflict with APM BIO-2, which requires limiting impacts to native vegetation, MM BIO-1, which restricts project activities to approved areas, and MM BIO-4, which requires limiting the removal of native plants, trees, and natural communities and requires an arborist to be present to preserve root zones of native trees.
- November 21, 2017: A biologist observed both a parked H&M bulldozer and equipment tracks within the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) buffer of Rincon Creek. The parked bulldozer was in potential habitat for California red-legged frog and adjacent to habitat for Plummer's baccharis and Fish's milkwort ESAs. There were multiple sets of equipment tracks, and the bulldozer appeared to have been staged overnight. Two ESA stakes were run over. The CPUC has requested follow-up information on the incident. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-1, which restricts project activities to approved areas, and MM BIO-8, which requires a 50-foot buffer from jurisdictional features.

Additionally, several minor spills/leaks were self-reported by SCE. These incidents were dealt with in a timely manner.

Minor Approvals

During November 2017, no minor or email approvals were issued.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jenny Vick', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jenny Vick
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:
Kenneth Spear, SCE
Marcus Obregon, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Report
November 2, 9, 16, and 22, 2017



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	November 2, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS005
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Overcast, cool, and calm
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1300
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)

Segment 1

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 conducted at the Highway 150 Yard. Afterwards, I met with John Hindley, Rincon environmental project manager, and the alternate lead monitor Matt Schaap (BRC).

I drove to the Teen Challenge Yard where I traveled with Matt Schaap (BRC) to check the work being conducted along Segment 1. We used the Canada Larga access road to enter the Segment 1 portion of the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP). Our first stop was at Constructs MG1 and MG2 where work was planned for a crane pad and a helicopter landing spot (Photo 1). Matt Schaap conducted a preconstruction survey of the area and found nothing to report.

A medium-sized crane was parked at the entrance to one of the approved access roads for Segment 1 (Photo 2).

We drove Segment 1 to check the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) signs (APM BIO-1) and arrived at the Getty Tap (Photo 3). There were approximately 15 vehicles at the Getty Tap, and all of the work was being conducted by crew members on the poles. Fire trucks were with this crew (MM HZ-2).

Further east along Segment 1, we encountered biological monitor Mark Bellini (Rincon Consultants, Inc. [Rincon]) who was conducting sweeps and checking on the Henkels & McCoy (H&M) line crews (APM BIO-3).

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, installation and maintenance of best management practices (BMPs) is important (APM BIO-7).

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
11/2/17	Segment 1		<p>Photo 1 – Constructs MG1 and MG2 along Segment 1. Matt Schaap (BRC) is conducting preconstruction surveys for the crane pad and helicopter landing area. Photo facing east</p>
11/2/17	Segment 1		<p>Photo 2 – Parked crane at access road entrance.</p>

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/2/17	Segment 1 Getty Tap		Photo 3 – A Henkels & McCoy (H&M) line crew is working on numerous poles in the Getty Tap. Photo facing east



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	November 9, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS006
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy and cool with a slight breeze
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1300
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)

Segments 2 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 arrived onsite at the Teen Challenge Yard for the 0700 safety brief and Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training.

Helicopter work was expected during the weekend for stringing wire over Highway 33.

At 1000, I met with lead biological monitor Matt Schaap (BRC) at the Highway 150 Yard. We traveled to the intersection of Segments 2 and 3B (the "Y"), near Construct 80 (Photo 1). This area had undergone some extensive earthwork for the crane pad and the new tower location. We briefly spoke with Sandy Tager (the Henkels & McCoy [H&M] foreman). Best management practices (BMPs) had been installed on the bare slopes. An additional row of wattles is advisable on the slopes, and Matt Schaap said he would discuss this with Caitlyn Teague (Rincon Consultants, Inc. [Rincon] SWPPP inspector) (APM BIO-7).

A helicopter was stringing wire along Segment 2, and a stringing crew was noted on top of a number of towers along the segment (MM TT-2, MM TT-3) (Photo 2). Fire crews were onsite with the ground support crew (MM HZ-2). Biological monitor Paulette Loubet (Rincon) was stationed nearby and watching for California condors (APM BIO-3); she had a good view of Segment 2. Paulette Loubet said she had not seen a California condor, but had seen quite a few red-tailed hawks. If a California condor is spotted, she contacts the ground crew foreman who radios the helicopter pilot.

At Construct 56, the tower foundation had been drilled and poured, and a crew was stripping off the forms (Photo 3). According to the foreman, the hole was 6 feet in diameter by 30 feet deep. It took the crew only 2 hours to drill the hole and the tailings were then spread out over the pad area. The crew had driven the drill rig to Construct 57 in preparation for work at this location.

I drove with Matt Schaap (BRC) to Construct 58 where the H&M crew had finished the dirt work and recontoured the pad; the crew was ready for the drilling work (Photos 4 & 5). BMPs had been added to the slopes of the access road and pad.

My next stop with Matt Schaap (BRC) was Construct 62 where the wire wall had been installed and some BMPs had been added (Photo 6). Crews still had more work to do on the pad excavation and the access road (Photo 7). We walked up to Construct 62 and looked back at Constructs 59 and 60 (Photo 8), but access to Constructs 63 and 64 had been cut off due to an extremely steep road and by dump trucks that were moving dirt between the two locations. Work was ongoing at both of these locations (APM GEO-1).

My final stop with Matt Schaap (BRC) was Construct 68, which is located on Rincon Mountain. Work had been completed on the access road (Photo 9), and crews had nearly finished backfilling the pad for the new tubular steel pole (TSP) (Photo 10). More dirt was needed for the Construct 68 pad, so crews were taking the excavator and a dump truck to Construct 67, which had excess dirt.

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, installation and maintenance of best management practices (BMPs) is important (APM BIO-7).

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
11/9/17	Intersection of Segments 2 and 3B (the "Y") at Construct 80		Photo 1 – Construct 80 where earthwork has been finished and BMPs have been installed. Photo facing north.
11/9/17	Segment 2		Photo 2 – Helicopter work is being conducted along Segment 2. Photo facing south.
11/9/17	Segment 3B, Construct 56		Photo 3 – The new TSP foundation has been drilled and poured. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/9/17	Segment 3B, Construct 58		Photo 4 – BMP installation. Photo facing north
11/9/17	Segment 3B, Construct 58		Photo 5 – The TSP pad and access road have been finished with BMPs added. Photo facing west
11/9/17	Segment 3B, Construct 62		Photo 6 – The welded wire wall has been completed. Photo facing northeast.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/9/17	Segment 3B, Construct 62		Photo 7 – The access road and TSP pad still need to be finished. Photo facing northwest
11/9/17	Segment 3B		Photo 8 – Looking east from Construct 62 toward Constructs 59 and 60. Photo facing east

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/9/17	Segment 3B, Construct 68		Photo 9 – Access road work. Photo facing east.
11/9/17	Segment 3B, Construct 68		Photo 10 - Backfill and compaction of the crane pad and TSP site. Photo facing north.



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	November 16, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS007
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Overcast and cool with some light drizzle
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)

Segments 2 and 3B and the Carpinteria Substation

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 at the Highway 150 Yard for the 0700 tailboard meeting. Light rain was in the area during the early morning hours, so the use of caution was urged for those driving on the dirt roads. Lead biological monitor Matt Schaap (BRC) informed the crews that the wet weather could bring out amphibian species. Biological monitors Sarah Termondt (BRC) and Paulette Loubet (Rincon Consultants, Inc. [Rincon]) were at the tailboard meeting along with biological monitor/arborist Steve Jones (BRC) and paleontological monitor John Minch (GANDA) (APM BIO-3, MM CR-13).

I went with Matt Schaap (BRC) to check the Highway 150 Yards (A and C) for any needed repairs and for animals (APM BIO-1, APM BIO-2, APM BIO-3, MM BIO-1). We also walked Rincon Creek along the stretch next to the Highway 150 Yards (A and C) looking for animals, primarily California red-legged frogs. There was no creek flow, and the light rain did nothing more than wash off some dust; no frogs were observed. There was a small pool downstream of an access road culvert.

I rode with Matt Schaap (BRC) to the Carpinteria Substation, which is located near the Carpinteria High School, as a crew was setting up to install four new tubular steel poles (TSPs) (Photo 1). The crew brought in a baker tank since they expected to hit ground water during the drilling (Photo 2). While we were at the Carpinteria Substation, a concrete truck arrived to pour shallow foundations.

I checked the construction activities along Segment 3A at TSP 047E (Photo 3). The crew was painting the TSP, and all vehicles were parked within a cleared field. A fire crew was on standby in the event that the crew needed to conduct welding (MM HZ-2). Rincon biological monitor Mike Moss was onsite.

I headed up Rincon Mountain and Segment 3B where a crew was preparing a pad for the new Construct 69 (Photo 4). The crew had broken a previously unknown water line and were in the process of repairing it. The crew was using landowner water to wet down the area (APM AQ-1). A dump truck arrived to haul off the excess dirt. Biological monitor/arborist Steve Jones (BRC) was overseeing this work and said all was going well. We briefly discussed the placement of best management practices (BMPs) on this steep slope when the work is complete (APM BIO-7).

Due to the wet weather, Matt Schaap (BRC) walked along Sacus Creek looking for California red-legged frogs (MM BIO-9) (Photo 5). There was some creek flow, but the frogs' preferred habitat (i.e., deep pools) was not present, and no frogs were observed.

The drill rig was parked at Construct 59. I headed east with Matt Schaap (BRC) toward Construct 58 where the Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew was preparing to drop the foundation cage into the hole (Photo 6).

Work was ongoing at Constructs 62, 63, and 64, but access was difficult and we did not travel into those areas (APM GEO-1). I was able to scan the construction activities from across the canyon with my binoculars.

We passed by the location where Segment 2 meets Segment 3 (the "Y"), which was being prepared for use (Photo 7). Silt fencing was already up and the area was partially covered in gravel.

Helicopter work was being conducted along Segments 2 and 3B (MM TT-2, MM TT-3), including placing the indicator balls on the wires (Photo 8). Biological monitor Asher Deitch (BRC) was overseeing this work and looking for California condors (APM BIO-3). At the time of my site visit, no issues were reported and no California condors had been observed.



A crew was at Construct 56 and installing the new TSP.

<p>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED (Refer to MMCRP, e.g., MM BIO-5. Report only on MMs pertinent to your observations today)</p> <p>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)</p>
<p>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)</p> <p>With the onset of the rainy season, installation and maintenance of best management practices (BMPs) is important (APM BIO-7).</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance on-site, environmental observations of note)</p> <p>N/A</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"/> New biological or cultural discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc. If checked, please describe discovery and documentation/verification below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Compliance Level 1: An action that deviates from project requirements or results in the partial implementation of the mitigation measures, but has not caused, or has the potential to cause impacts on environmental resources. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and follow-up to ensure correction.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Compliance Level 2: An action that deviates from project requirements or mitigation measures that has caused, or has the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources. A non-compliance Level 2 situation may occur when Level 1 incidents are repeated, and show a trend toward placing resources at unnecessary risk. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Compliance Level 3: An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the APMs, mitigation measures, permit conditions, approval requirements (e.g. minor project changes, notice to proceed), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. Examples include irreparable damage to archaeological sites, destruction of active bird nests, and grading of unapproved vegetated areas. A non-compliance Level 3 may also be issued if Level 2 incidents are repeated. If you checked this box, please fill out a Non-Compliance Report.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-compliance issues reported by SCE: Were there any new non-compliance issues reported by SCE monitors since your last visit? If so, describe issues and resolution and include SCE report identification number.</p>



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

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




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/16/17	Carpinteria Substation		Photo 1 – Stakes indicate the location of the new TSPs. Photo facing southeast.
11/16/17	Carpinteria Substation		Photo 2 – Crew setting up a baker tank in the event they hit ground water. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/16/17	Segment 3A, TSP 047E		Photo 3 – A crew is painting the existing TSP.
11/16/17	Segment 3B, Construct 58		Photo 4 – Site preparation. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/16/17	Segment 3B, Sacus Creek		Photo 5 – Daytime survey for California red-legged frogs.
11/16/17	Segment 3B, Construct 58		Photo 6 – The rebar cage is being lowered into the hole. Photo facing east
11/16/17	Segment 3B, the “Y”		Photo 7 - BMPs and gravel are being brought into the “Y” Yard so the yard can be used. Photo facing northwest

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/16/17	Segment 3B		Photo 8 – Helicopter work near the intersection of Segments 2 and 3B (the “Y”). Photo facing south.



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	November 22, 2017
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS008
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Sunny, mild temperatures, and a slight breeze
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1030
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)

Segments 3B and the Carp Substation

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 at the Highway 150 Yard for the 0700 tailboard meeting. There was a small crew at the meeting because it was the day before Thanksgiving and crews were scheduled at only three locations. Lead biological monitor Matt Schaap (BRC) shared the details of an incident that occurred the previous day at Construct 70. A landowner had requested that excess soil be left on his property and asked that a new road be graded to his chosen soil deposition site. The onsite biological monitor shut down the work, but not before some of the road grading had been conducted. Matt Schaap informed the crews that any work conducted outside of the approved construction areas must go through the proper channels for approval before being performed. In this case, there was confusion as to what the "proper channels" were because the Henkels & McCoy (H&M) operator stated that his supervisor had instructed him to conduct the work that was requested by the landowner; therefore, the H&M operator assumed the request had already gone through the proper channels for approval.

I traveled with Matt Schaap (BRC) to the Carpinteria Substation where a crew was using a small backhoe to prepare an area for several new foundations (Photo 1). A small concrete washout catch basin had been set up at the site (Photo 2).

We drove up to Rincon Mountain and Segment 3B where an H&M crew was working on Construct 67 (APM GEO-1). The crew was using an excavator, backhoe, vibrating compactor, and water truck (APM AQ-1) (Photos 3 & 4). Biological monitor Paulette Loubet (Rincon Consultants, Inc. [Rincon]) was onsite overseeing this work (APM BIO-3).

At Construct 70, an excavator had built an access road and was removing dirt from the tower pad (Photo 5). Biological monitor Yuling Huo (Rincon) was overseeing work in this area. A crew had previously cut down a large oak tree, leaving several piles of branches, the trunk, and the stump along the access road. Several other large oaks had been flagged but, according to Yuling Huo, they were not to be removed. The excavation work was generating a large amount of dust. A water truck was onsite but was parked and not being used for dust control. Because it was only a two-person H&M crew working the area, one crew member was manning the excavator and the other crew member was switching off between manning the dump truck and operating the water truck. I mentioned the dust to Matt Schaap (BRC) and he spoke with the foreman about getting someone to man the water truck.

Matt Schaap (BRC) and I looked over the newly graded road located outside of the approved construction area. The road runs several hundred feet uphill along the west side of the landowner's home, ending where the landowner wanted the excess dirt deposited (Photos 6 & 7). The new road appears to run between an existing orchard and the adjacent oak woodland. It was difficult to determine how much damage had occurred to native vegetation, but the road runs under the dripline for several oaks. The construction crews are not allowed to use the new road, but the biological team did approve the spoil deposition site and dirt was still being trucked to the site via existing roads. If the newly graded road is to be abandoned, it will require best management practices (BMPs) (APM BIO-7).

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, installation and maintenance of best management practices (BMPs) is important (APM BIO-7). Check the newly graded access road at Construct 70.

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

N/A

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
11/22/17	Carpinteria Substation		Photo 1 – Crew working within the Carpinteria Substation on some small, shallow foundations.
11/22/17	Carpinteria Substation		Photo 2 – Washout location for the concrete trucks.
11/22/17	Segment 3B, Construct 67		Photo 3 – A crew is continuing the work on the TSP pad. Photo facing northwest

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/22/17	Segment 3B, Construct 67		Photo 4 – Work on the access road to the tower location. Photo facing west.
11/22/17	Segment 3B, Construct 70		Photo 5 – Access road to the new TSP location. Photo facing east.
11/22/17	Segment 3B, Construct 70		Photo 6 – New road cut near Construct 70 but outside of the approved impact area. Soil pile at the end of the road is coming from the tower pad. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
11/22/17	Segment 3B, Construct 70		Photo 7 – New access road looking back down the slope toward Segment 3B. Photo facing northwest.