



## ecology and environment, inc.

Global Environmental Specialists

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

February 27, 2018

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

### **Re: Monthly Report Summary #4 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 **January 1 to 31, 2018**, 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 January 5 and 23, 2018. 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's) 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 January 2018 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from January 1 to 31, 2018; 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 January 2018 reporting period, two compliance incidents occurred. Compliance incidents include the following:

- January 12, 2018: A Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew drove on an unapproved access road for approximately 1,800 feet within Segment 4 near Construct 105. The truck became stuck in the mud and damaged a cherimoya tree by breaking off three branches. The access road was entirely outside of the project disturbance limits and was not within special status species habitat. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-1, which restricts all vehicles to approved areas. The crew was put on probation and will be suspended for three days if they have another compliance incident.
- January 19, 2018: An H&M civil crew mobilized equipment through a 150-foot-long unapproved access road that had been created for post-Thomas Fire restoration efforts. The incident occurred on Segment 4 between Construct 105 and M18-T5. The area had been burned by the Thomas Fire and the incident was partially within a drainage and a burned coast live oak woodland. The incident conflicts with MM BIO-1, which restricts all vehicles to approved areas. The crew was called off the site and work was put on hold. Access/no access signs were installed and the crew had a tailboard meeting to discuss the incident before work was released to resume.

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

### Non-Compliance Report

On January 8, 2018, the CPUC issued SCE Non-compliance Report (NCR) #1. NCR #1—a Level 2 NCR—was issued for repeated incidents of contractors working or staging materials outside of approved areas and working prior to pre-construction clearance sweeps. Two of the eight incidents put sensitive resources at risk. The incidents that resulted in NCR #1 occurred from September to November 2017 and are documented in previous monthly reports. The CPUC has requested that SCE prepare a response plan outlining how and when they will remind contractors about their responsibilities and the actions SCE will take to prevent or reduce future incidents. SCE submitted the response plan by January 31, 2018, as requested.

### Minor Approvals

During January 2018, one email approval was issued (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Minor Approvals for January 2018**

Description	Approval Date
Approval for use of a parked bucket truck as a guard structure.	January 12, 2018

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jenny Vick', with a stylized, cursive script.

Jenny Vick  
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:  
Kenneth Spear, SCE  
Marcus Obregon, SCE

# ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Report  
January 5 and 23, 2018



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	January 5, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS010
<b>Lead Agency:</b>	California Public Utilities Commission	<b>Monitor(s):</b>	Vince Semonsen
<b>CPUC PM:</b>	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	<b>AM/PM Weather:</b>	Partly cloudy with mild temperatures and a slight breeze
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1030
<b>Project NTP(s):</b>	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)

<b>Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training</b>	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		
<b>Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)</b>	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		
<b>Equipment</b>	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		
<b>Work Areas</b>	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
<b>Biology</b>	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		
<b>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>	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	
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>	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		
<b>Work Hours and Noise</b>	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 4.

**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 at 0700 for the tailboard meeting being held at the Highway 150 Yard. Environmental project manager John Hindley and lead biological monitor James Rasico, both from Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon), were at the tailboard meeting. Discussion topics included the scheduled work and safety on the job. One of the Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew discussed the replacement of best management practices (BMPs). He stated that the supply of BMPs had been depleted but that more had been ordered.

I went with James Rasico to Segment 4 where regular work activities had kicked off again after the Thomas Fire. The H&M crews had been assisting Southern California Edison (SCE) with emergency work along all of the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) segments; these activities had not been overseen by the environmental crews because the work was not project related. Neither James Rasico nor I had been in this portion of Segment 4. We drove to Construct 105, which was within the burned area. No work was being conducted and no BMPs were in place (Photo 1).

Crews were working at Constructs 103 and 104, which were also within the burned area. The access road to these towers was very steep and dusty (Photo 2). The H&M crew used a bulldozer to push the water truck up the steep road to the site. Rincon biological monitors Yuling Huo and Paulette Loubet (APM BIO-3) were onsite, along with GANDA paleontological monitor Andrew Paden (MM CR-13). An excavator was at Construct 104 (Photo 3) and crews were installing a crane pad. At Construct 103, the survey crew had reestablished the impact area, and the BMP crew had arrived to begin installing the wattles (Photo 4).

Since many of the construction sites had been burned during the Thomas Fire, I spoke with James Rasico about BMP installation. He stated that the crews would reinstall the BMPs as if the area had not been burned (APM BIO-7).

I rode with James Rasico to Rincon Mountain and Segment 3B where crews were working at Construct 64. Extensive roadwork was being conducted on the roadway and we were unable to access the site. James Rasico said that biological monitor Dave Wappler (BRC) was onsite.

**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
1/5/18	Segment 4		<p>Photo 1 – Construct 105 is within the burn area. No work was being conducted. Photo facing north.</p>
1/5/18	Segment 4		<p>Photo 2 – Steep access road leading to Constructs 103 and 104.</p>

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/5/18	Segment 4		Photo 3 – A crew is ready to begin work at Construct 104, but is waiting on the arrival of a water truck.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/5/18	Segment 4		Photo 4 – The newly staked area around Construct 103, which is ready for BMP installation.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	January 23, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS011
<b>Lead Agency:</b>	California Public Utilities Commission	<b>Monitor(s):</b>	Vince Semonsen
<b>CPUC PM:</b>	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	<b>AM/PM Weather:</b>	Sunny and cool with a slight breeze
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1230
<b>Project NTP(s):</b>	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)

<b>Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training</b>	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		
<b>Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)</b>	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		
<b>Equipment</b>	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		
<b>Work Areas</b>	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
<b>Biology</b>	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		
<b>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>	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	
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>	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		
<b>Work Hours and Noise</b>	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 4.

**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 at 0700 for the tailboard meeting being held at the Highway 150 Yard (Photo 1). Environmental project manager John Hindley and lead biological monitor James Rasico, both from Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon), had attended the tailboard meeting. John Hindley discussed issues with nesting birds and the use of unapproved access roads. Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crews were completing their work at Construct 64 in Segment 3B; however, most of the work was taking place along Segment 4.

I rode with James Rasico to Segment 4. Our first stop was at Construct 106 where an H&M crew had finished the site preparation and were preparing to drill the tubular steel pole (TSP) foundation hole (Photos 2 and 3). Best management practices (BMPs) were in good condition (APM BIO-7), and Rincon biological monitor Paulette Loubet (APM BIO-3) was onsite. I examined the unapproved access road with James Rasico. The access road runs between Constructs 105 and 106, through a creek drainage between the constructs, and appears to have been cleared by fire crews. According to James Rasico, the road was also used to transport H&M equipment; however, this unapproved access road has now been staked with No Entry/Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) signs (Photo 4). Paleontological monitor Kim Luyties (Rincon) was also at Construct 106 and waiting for the drilling operation to begin (MM CR-13).

No work was being conducted at Construct 105; however, a grader was parked in this location in anticipation of clearance to use an alternative access road to exit the site.

At Construct 100, a tree trimming crew was onsite preparing the access road (Photo 5). Native trees lined the roadway, but the crew was primarily trimming back the avocado trees; arborist Steve Jones (BRC) was monitoring this work (APM BIO-2, MM BIO-4). Road grading will be needed on this access road to allow equipment to reach the TSP site (APM GEO-1).

Access road preparation was also ongoing at Construct 99 where road grading was actively being conducted (Photos 6 and 7). BMPs were in place, and biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) was overseeing the work. Several wire walls will need to be built along this access road, and H&M crews said they would need to remove around 100 cubic yards of non-compactable soil. Since this access road merges onto a long straight stretch of Highway 150 where vehicles travel at high rates of speed, a traffic control crew was being brought in (MM TT-1).

I rode with James Rasico back to Constructs 103 and 104 where an H&M crew was stripping forms off of the new TSP foundation at Construct 103 (Photo 8); some earth work was being conducted at Construct 104 (Photo 9). Biological monitor Dave Wappler (BRC) was onsite and checking both constructs. I examined the BMPs with James Rasico and Dave Wappler and I suggested the installation of additional wattles for the area above the construction site; these wattles would prevent mud from entering the work area (this entire area had been burned during the Thomas Fire).

No work was being conducted at Construct 102, as a pair of red-shouldered hawks were building a nest in a small stand of trees along the access road (APM BIO-4, MM BIO-10). A 300-foot buffer had been set up with ESA signage, but the Construct 102 construction area was outside of this buffer (Photo 10). However, because crews had to travel through the buffer to get to the site, monitors would observe the crews as they drove equipment past the nest. I did not see the birds while I was onsite.




At Construct 101, two excavators, a compactor, and a water truck were working on the access road (Photo 11). The area around Construct 101 was burned. Biological monitor Paulette Loubet (Rincon) and paleontological monitor Kim Luyties (Rincon) had moved to this area to oversee the construction activity. Photo 12 was taken from the Construct 101 site looking west back toward Constructs 102, 103, and 104. The hawk nest was being built in the stand of sycamores seen in the lower left corner of the photo.

<p><b>MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED</b> (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><b>RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP</b> (i.e., items to check on next visit, minor issues to resolve)</p> <p>Check on approved access roads and verify oversight and compliance with nesting buffers.</p>
<p><b>COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS</b> (i.e., suggestions to improve compliance on-site, environmental observations of note)</p> <p>In the burn areas, it is recommended that additional BMPs be installed above the construction sites to prevent mud from entering the work area.</p>
<p><b>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY</b></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 &amp; E Compliance Manager. Inform E &amp; 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
1/23/18	Highway 150 Yard		Photo 1 – 0700 tailboard meeting at the Highway 150 Yard.
1/23/18	Segment 4 Construct 106		Photo 2 – Drill rig is onsite. Photo facing west.
1/23/18	Segment 4 Construct 106		Photo 3 – The new TSP location is ready for drilling. Photo facing south.



**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/18	Segment 4 Constructs 105 and 106		<p>Photo 4 – Access road used during emergency work between Constructs 105 and 106; no entry signs have been installed. Photo facing southeast.</p>
1/23/18	Segment 4 Access Road for Construct 100		<p>Photo 5 – Tree trimming crew is clearing the access road.</p>
1/23/18	Segment 4 Access Road to Construct 99		<p>Photo 6 – The crew is exporting soil from this area and bringing in more compactable soil.</p>

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/18	Segment 4 Access Road to Construct 99		Photo 7 – This portion of the access road will need welded wire walls installed. Photo facing west
1/23/18	Segment 4 Construct 103		Photo 8 – H&M crew stripping forms off of the TSP foundation at Construct 103. Photo facing southeast

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/18	Segment 4 Construct 104		Photo 9 – Earthwork taking place; this area was badly burned. Photo facing west.
1/23/18	Segment 4 Construct 102		Photo 10 – Access road with ESA nesting buffer signs. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
1/23/18	Segment 4 Construct 101		Photo 11 – Equipment being used on the Construct 101 access road.
1/23/18	Segment 4 Construct 101		Photo 12 – Looking west at Constructs 102, 103 and 104. The hawk nest is in the stand of sycamores in the lower left corner of the photo.