

December 3, 2018

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #13 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 **October 1 through 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 SBCRP 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, 18, and 30 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 each 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 October 2018 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from October 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 October 2018 reporting period, there were no major compliance incidents. However, biological monitors reported three observations of wildlife mortalities (one black-throated gray warbler, one Bottas pocket gopher, and one golden-crowned sparrow) with unknown causes of death. Biological monitors also observed several instances of non-project-related damage to vegetation, a coast live oak tree, and arroyo willow trees. In addition, other non-project related observations included a water leak, a hydraulic oil spill, installation of a McCarthy drain, and several post-Thomas fire restoration work on access roads.

Public Concerns

SCE continued discussions with landowners in the vicinity of project components. In October, SCE received approximately six new landowner requests for Natina treatment to structures. However, SCE must evaluate whether the structures meet criteria for Natina treatment. Mr. Dyer confirmed that SCE should apply Natina treatment to the structure on his property. Mr. Dyer's request to lower the structure in his property was not approved. A landowner requested that SCE apply Natina treatment to structures near C72-74 in order to reduce aesthetic impacts from their viewshed. An SCE public affair representative met with the concerned landowner to identify if treatment would be granted. SCE is working with the landowner to gather needed information for a determination.

Two landowners inquired about which institution will receive the two archaeological findings (make shark teeth) from their property. They requested SCE to deliver the findings to Ventura County museum or Santa Barbara county museum, rather than Los Angeles County museum. Of the two, SCE identified that the Santa Barbara County museum possesses the right archaeological curation credentials to receive the teeth. SCE must wait for their curation lead to initiate the process and prepare the required documentation.

A landowner is concerned that SCE is conducting work (installation of Hilfiker walls and other components) outside of the study limits outlined in the EIR. SCE is coordinating with the landowner and providing documentation and exhibits to help address their concern.

Minor Approvals

During October 2018, no email or minor approvals were issued.

Sincerely,



Fernando Guzman
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:

Kenneth Spear, SCE
Marcus Obregon, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Reports
October 5, 18, and 30 2018



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	October 5, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS031
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Sunny with warm temperatures and calm winds
E & E CM:	Fernando Guzman	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1130
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)

Carpinteria Yard, Segments 4 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 and met with lead environmental monitor, Matt Schaap at the Carpinteria Yard for the 0700 tailboard meeting. Biological monitors Mike Moss and Zeph Friedman-Sowden were also at the tailboard (APM BIO-3). There were discussions about the construction portions of the project that would be completed in mid-November.

We drove into a landowner property to observe the Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew removing existing tower foundations – Photo 2. We met with biological monitor Mark Bellini, who was overseeing this work. The access road was very dusty and the best management practices (BMPs) appeared to be in poor condition – Photo 1. Matt Bellini indicated that road maintenance was scheduled to occur after the foundations were removed; the BMPs would be completed at the same time.

There was a rain event that occurred earlier in the week. According to Matt Bellini, the project area received approximately 0.2 inch of rain. The biological monitoring crew conducted California red-legged frog surveys after the rain event; none were observed.

Near tubular steel pole (TSP) 116, a construction crew was working on a wall to shore up the access road – Photo 3.

Our next stop was at TSP 112, where five pieces of construction equipment were parked. The construction pad was recontoured with BMPs and included an isolated rectangle of caged rock that appeared to slow rainwater runoff – Photo 4. A notch of disturbed area was restored and had two pieces of construction equipment parked on it – Photo 5. I asked Matt Bellini about this and he verified it was within the disturbance limits of the project. This location was under an oak tree; therefore, this location should be restored and not used to park equipment. When the H&M crew arrived, Matt Bellini discussed moving the equipment and restoring this location. The drip pans under all of the parked equipment were flattened and bent and needed to be replaced – Photo 6. An different type of drip pan should be considered for their replacements.

We traveled on the Franklin Trail access road to TSP 120. The last very steep section of the access road to 120 TSP had wattles installed. It appeared that not enough wattles were installed, and none of them were keyed into the ground – Photo 7. I discussed this with Matt Bellini and biological monitor Mike Moss. I explained that proper BMP installation is particularly important at this location, especially since it is up in the hills away from paved roads. Additionally, if a rain event occurs in that area, no one would be able to access the location for days afterward.

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 completed Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training (APM GEN-1).

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

Follow-up on BMPs and restoration work at TSP 112.

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

The drip pans used throughout the project site are damaged; it is recommended that this type of drip pan is replaced regularly or a different type of drip pan is used.

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
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4		Photo 1 – Landowner property access road near TSP 108. Photo facing east.
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4		Photo 2 – Existing foundations to be removed.
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4		Photo 3 – Road stabilization work near TSP 116.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 112		Photo 4 – BMPs near the TSP 112 pad. Photo facing north.
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 112		Photo 5 – Parked equipment on the construction pad.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 112		Photo 6 – Drip pan placed under equipment – note that it is flattened and bent.
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 7 – BMPs on access road to TSP 120. Photo facing south.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/5/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 8 – Restoration needed along the access road.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	10/16/18

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	10/17/18



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	October 18, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS032
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Sunny with warm temperatures and calm winds
E & E CM:	Fernando Guzman	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1130
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)

Carpinteria Yard, Segments 4 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 and met with lead environmental monitor Matt Schaap at the Carpinteria Yard for the 0700 tailboard meeting. Biological monitor Peter Gaede was also at the tailboard meeting (APM BIO-3). The Carpinteria Yard was being dismantled at this location. The fences were being removed and the trailers were cleaned out and closed. Despite the project winding down, there were over 20 people at the tailboard meeting.

After the tailboard meeting, we attempted to drive to a landowner property; however, the access road was temporarily closed due to power/telephone construction work. Road base and final grading was being completed around tubular steel poles (TSPs) 111 and 112.

We traveled to Segment 3B near TSP 60, where a crew was removing old towers and tower foundations. Several of these old towers and foundations had native vegetation growing up and around the structures – Photo 1. Construction crews were being careful during the removal process to minimize impacts to the plants. The old steel was being stockpiled along the road for eventual pick up and recycling – Photo 2. Peter Gaede was overseeing this work, and we looked at several other locations near TSPs 63 and 64, where crews would have to remove foundations – Photos 3 & 4. According to Matt Schaap and Peter Gaede, the towers were removed with a helicopter.

At TSP 67 staging area, the Henkels and McCoy (H&M) crew had stockpiled soil and road base for use during access road repair – Photo 5. An excavator and water truck were onsite to mix the soil with water to get the proper moisture content for compaction. A fence crew was working on a damaged portion of the landowner's fence/gate. Biological monitor Nathan Macy was overseeing the work and at TSP 76, where crews continued building a Hilfiker wall.

The area around TSP 67 was restored, recontoured, and stabilized with road base and best management practices (BMPs) – Photo 6. A few erosion rills caused by agricultural irrigation had developed under the jute netting. Matt Schapp and I examined the issue and noted that neither the jute netting nor the wattle were keyed in at the top of the slope. If crews dig in the jute netting and stake the wattle into a depression, then it would help to prevent water from running under the jute. The last step in the restoration was hydroseeding over the jute netting and on any open ground.

Photo 7 is a view from Rincon Mountain looking across the canyon toward TSPs 98, 99, and 100. No construction work was occurring at any of these locations.

We stopped at TSP 76, where traffic control was in place along Highway 150 and mud trackout was being cleaned. Trucks were being used to deliver soil and gravel to the site for construction of the Hilfiker wall – Photo 8

Our last stop was at the Franklin Trail access road, where construction crews worked on the access road to TSP 120 and were installing McCarthy drains. We traveled to TSP 128, where crews were stockpiling materials – Photo 9. They were only transporting materials today; therefore, we did not travel to TSP 120.

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

See the MMs listed in the observed activities descriptions.

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

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

Follow-up on BMPs and restoration work at TSP 112.

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

The drip pans used throughout the project are in poor shape – they should either be replaced regularly or a different type should be used in future projects.



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
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 4		Photo 1 – Removal of old towers and foundations near TSP 60.
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 4		Photo 2 – Old lattice work tower stockpiled along the access road. Photo looking west.
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 4		Photo 3 – Old tower foundation removal to be completed along this ridge line near TSP 63.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 4		Photo 4 – Old foundation to be removed by hand near TSP 64.
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, TSP 67		Photo 5 – Staging area near TSP 67. Photo facing north.
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, TSP 67		Photo 6 – Recontoured and restored area around TSP 67. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B		Photo 7 – Overview showing TSPs 98, 99, and 100. Photo facing north.
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, TSP 76		Photo 8 – Hilfiker wall work. Photo facing east.
10/18/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 128		Photo 9 – Staging McCarthy drain materials. Photo facing west.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	10/23/18

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	10/25/18



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	October 30, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS033
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Sunny, warm temperatures, and calm winds
E & E CM:	Fernando Guzman	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1145
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 tarpred, 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)

Carpinteria Yard, Segments 4 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 and met with Mike Moss at the 0700 tailboard meeting at the Carpinteria Yard that is being dismantled. Mike Moss was the lead environmental monitor; other biological monitors included James Rasico, Peter Gaede, and Dave Wappler (APM BIO-3). James Rasico was with one of the hydroseeding crews, Peter Gaede was with another hydroseeding crew, and Dave Wappler was overseeing the work at tubular steel poles (TSPs) 97 and 99.

We examined the Highway 150 C Yard that was being closed out – Photo 1. All the equipment was removed, and the boundary fencing was being rolled up; according to the landowner agreement, the gravel would remain. James Rasico was at the Highway 150 C Yard overseeing the hydroseeding crew; they were loading up and would be traveling to Segment 3B and TSPs 80 through 91.

Our next stop was near a landowner's property to inspect TSP 112. The construction pad was restored, and wattles were installed along with a gabion/rock energy dissipater – Photo 2. The wattles were staked down; however, they were not keyed in; therefore, water would easily run under the wattle. No restoration was completed at the small parking pad at the western end of the disturbed area. During a previous site visit, I spoke with the lead monitor and the Henkels and McCoy (H&M) construction foreman about the need for restoration – Photo 3. During this site visit, I requested additional restoration work, especially under the oak trees.

At TSP 108, the steel and the foundation from the old tower were removed – Photo 4. Hydroseeding activities would soon follow.

We looked across at TSP 107 where an H&M crew was conducting "fire restoration" work. According to Mike Moss, since it was "fire restoration" work, there was no oversight from a biological monitor; however, I saw an excavator, bulldozer, dump truck, water truck, and several support vehicles around the TSP site – Photo 5. Mike Moss mentioned he thought they were putting in a "keyway" and had spoken to them about Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) issues around the work area. The Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) construction schedule states that "fire restoration" work is to be monitored "at Rincon's discretion."

We traveled from the landowner's property and to the Franklin Trail access road, heading out to the end of the road and to TSP 120. Cleaning work at the staging yard continued – Photo 6. Crews were laying down road base on the steep section of the access road – Photo 9. Rock and soil was sloughed down the slope west of the access road – Photo 8. Jute netting, wattles, and hydroseeding installation was expected in the areas with exposed soil – Photo 7.

Earthwork was completed at TSP 125. It appeared that this area could use a McCarthy drain – Photo 10. McCarthy drains were to be installed along the Franklin Trail access road.

Our last stop was along Segment 3B where we inspected the hydroseeding activities along the access road between TSPs 80 and 91. The McCarthy drain installations were complete – Photo 11 – in addition to disturbance from the culvert installations – Photo 12. The culvert in Photo 12 was described in an earlier site visit due to concerns with the below grade location of the upstream intake.

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

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

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

Follow-up on BMPs and restoration work at TSP 112.

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
10/30/18	SBCRP – Highway 150 C Yard		Photo 1 – Removal of equipment and fencing.
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 112		Photo 2 – Cut bank needs restoration. Photo looking west.
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 112		Photo 3 – Best management practices (BMPs) installed around the TSP 112 construction pad.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 108		Photo 4 – Cleaning needed at the old tower locations.
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 107		Photo 5 – “Fire restoration” work being completed at TSP 107. Photo facing east.
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 6 – Cleaning activities at the staging area, located above TSP 120. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 7 – Road work near TSP 120. Photo facing southeast.
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 8 – Soil and rock that has sloughed from the access road.
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 9 – Road base being compacted into the access road. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 125		Photo 10 –Final grading activities. Photo facing southwest.
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, near TSP 88		Photo 11 – Hydroseeding McCarthy Drains. Photo facing west.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
10/30/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B		Photo 12 – Hydroseeded culvert; this area may need regarding to reduce head cutting.

Completed by:	Vince Semonsen
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	11/8/18

Reviewed by:	Jeff Root
Firm:	Ecotech Resources, Inc.
Date:	11/12/18