



## ecology and environment, inc.

Global Environmental Specialists

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

March 21, 2018

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

### **Re: Monthly Report Summary #5 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 **February 1 to 28, 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 February 8, 2018. On February 22, 2018, Compliance Monitor Vince Semonsen, Project Manager Jenny Vick, Deputy Project Manager Caitlin Barns, and Planner Fernando Guzman met the SCE environmental team and Project Manager at the SBCRP construction site to tour the project area. 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 February 2018 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from February 1 to 28, 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 February 2018 reporting period, one compliance incident occurred, as detailed below:

- February 14, 2018: A Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew conducted soil removal at Construct 101 on Segment 4 before a pre-construction clearance sweep. The incident was within disturbance limits and no sensitive resources were in the area. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-2, which requires pre-construction sweeps. The crew was reminded of the requirement for pre-construction clearance sweeps.

Additionally, biological monitors reported several observations of non-project emergency crews conducting Thomas Fire restoration work within or near the project area. Biological monitors have reported observations of damaged oak trees and disturbed cultural resources that are attributed to these non-project emergency crews.

### Minor Approvals

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

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

Description	Approval Date
Approval for use of an alternative entrance to the Construct 105 access road.	February 2, 2018

Sincerely,



Jenny Vick  
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:  
Kenneth Spear, SCE  
Marcus Obregon, SCE

# ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Report  
February 8 and 22, 2018



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	February 8, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS012
<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 warm with a slight breeze
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0930 to 1400
<b>Project NTP(s):</b>	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)

<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)

At 0930, I met with the BRC lead monitor Matt Schaap at Highway 150 Yard C to check on construction activities. Rincon biological monitor Yuling Huo (APM BIO-3) was also at Highway 150 Yard C to oversee the upgrade of best management practices (BMPs) being completed at this location (APM BIO-7).

Matt Schaap drove east on Highway 150 toward Ojai and stopped near Construct 90 where a pair of red-tailed hawks had built a nest in a large sycamore tree. A 500-foot buffer was in place for this nest, and some of the buffer overlapped a small portion of an access road (APM BIO-4, MM BIO-10). Due to the presence of the nest, crews can no longer stop along this portion of the road; otherwise, this nest does not affect the construction effort. I observed a pair of red-shouldered hawks circling the area, but they did not reveal a nest site.

Matt Schaap and I stopped and spoke with BRC biological monitor Dave Wappler who was parked along Highway 150. Dave Wappler had "cleared" the area between Constructs 93 and 96. At the time of my site visit, crews were dropping the old lines and Dave Wappler was waiting to access the area once it was determined to be safe.

Matt Schaap drove us to Construct 104 where a crew with a dozer, backhoe, vibrating compactor, and water truck were building a crane pad (Photo 1). The new tubular steel pole (TSP) foundation had been drilled and poured. Because a biological monitor was not onsite, Matt Schaap called to have a biological monitor come to the area. From this location, we looked toward Construct 103 where segments of the new TSP had been stockpiled. Erosion blankets had been added to some of the impacted slopes (Photo 2).

At the Carpinteria Substation, a crew was drilling the hole for Construct 137 (Photo 3). This work was being monitored by Rincon biologist Dannique Aalbu and GANDA paleontologist Andrew Paden (MM CR-13). At the time of my site visit, the drilling depth was 13 feet; the final depth will be 31 feet (Photo 4). Earlier in the day, Dannique Aalbu had observed a peregrine falcon perched on one of the power poles.

As more work moved into the Carpinteria Substation area, a Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew was moving trailers and equipment to a new yard just east of the Carpinteria Substation (referred to as the Carpinteria Yard B). BMPs were surrounding the Carpinteria Yard B and gravel was being laid (Photos 5 and 6).

I stopped at Construct 106 where a crew was working on the crane pad (Photo 7). There was some discussion about the possible removal of a small oak tree, but the crew felt they could work around it. Rincon biological monitor Mike Moss was at this location (APM BIO-2, MM BIO-4).

At Construct 100, a tree trimming crew was onsite preparing the access road with BRC arborist Steve Jones monitoring the work. Some native trees lined the roadway, but the crew primarily trimmed back avocado trees. To allow equipment to reach the TSP site, road grading will be needed on this access road (APM GEO-1).

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

Verify oversight and compliance with nesting bird buffers.

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

In the burn areas, additional BMPs could be installed to prevent mud from being deposited in the work area.

**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
2/8/18	Segment 4 – Construct 104		Photo 1 – Crews are preparing a crane pad for Construct 104. Photo facing west
2/8/18	Segment 4 – Construct 103		Photo 2 – TSP segments are onsite and the slopes have had erosion blankets installed. Photo facing east



**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/8/18	Segment 4 – Construct 137		Photo 3 – A crew is drilling the foundation hole for Construct 137, which is located just outside of the Carpinteria Substation. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/8/18	Segment 4 – Constructs 137		Photo 4 – Foundation hole for Construct 137. Photo facing north.
2/8/18	Carp B Yard		Photo 5 – A crew is spreading gravel around the new Carpinteria Yard B. Photo facing north.
2/8/18	Carp B Yard		Photo 6 – BMPs are installed around the new Carpinteria Yard B. Photo facing south.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/8/18	Segment 4 – Construct 106		Photo 7 – Crews work on the crane pad at Construct 106. Photo facing west.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	February 22, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS013
<b>Lead Agency:</b>	California Public Utilities Commission	<b>Monitor(s):</b>	Vince Semonsen, Jenny Vick, Caitlin Barns, and Fernando Guzman
<b>CPUC PM:</b>	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	<b>AM/PM Weather:</b>	Sunny and cool
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0900 to 1400
<b>Project NTP(s):</b>	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)

<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 4 and 5.

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

At 0900, I met Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E) Compliance Manager Jenny Vick and other members of the E & E/California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) team at the Teen Challenge Yard. After a brief safety training, the CPUC team and Southern California Edison (SCE) and Henkels & McCoy (H&M) representatives visited a number of locations where approvals for new access roads were to be evaluated.

Our first stop was along Segment 5 at Tower M7-T4. The approved access road would require extensive road improvement work, whereas the alternative route would be much simpler to prepare. Both roads run through an avocado orchard. The tower was slated for removal; therefore, only minimal equipment would be needed. Rincon lead biological monitor James Rasico was monitoring Tower M7-T4 because a pair of red-tailed hawks was nesting in the tower (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4, MM BIO-10) (Photo 1).

We drove toward Tower M8-T2, parked on Highway 150, and walked to the proposed alternative access road. The proposed access road would eliminate a portion of the approved access road that leads to Towers M8-T3 and M8-T2 (Photo 2). We then drove to tower M8-T5 so the SCE representatives could show us a location where geographic information system (GIS) data do not match the road.

Our next stop was tower M8-T7, which was also slated for removal. The landowner had recently installed an access road that provides direct access to the tower. SCE is proposing to use this access road to reduce agricultural impacts (Photo 3).

After a brief stop at the new Carpinteria Yard B, we drove to the foothills above the city of Carpinteria to look at Constructs 126 and 127 along Segment 4 (Photo 4). The area around the TSPs had been burned during the Thomas Fire, but new vegetation was slowly growing back (Photo 5). The access road to this location was scheduled for minor improvements; however, emergency crews for the Thomas Fire widened and graded this road. As a result, SCE no longer needs to make the improvements, but BMPs (e.g., water bars and gravel bags to stabilize the area) will still be necessary.

**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)

Verify oversight and compliance with nesting bird buffers.

**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
2/22/18	Segment 5 – Tower M7-T4		Photo 1 – Red-tailed hawk nest in the tower to be removed. Photo facing east.




REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/22/18	Segment 4 – Tower M8-T2		Photo 2 – Evaluation of alternative access road. Some trimming of the large oak would be needed. Photo facing southwest

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/22/18	Segment 4 – Tower M8-T7		Photo 3 – SCE is proposing to use this access road recently installed by the landowner. Photo facing north.
2/22/18	Segment 4 – Constructs 126 and 127		Photo 4 – TSPs in the burned foothills above the city of Carpinteria. Photo facing west.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
2/22/18	Segment 4		<p>Photo 5 – View from Construct 126 south toward the city of Carpinteria. Photo facing south.</p>