



April 17, 2018

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

Re: Monthly Report Summary #6 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 **March 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 March 8 and 19, 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 March 2018 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from March 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 March 2018 reporting period, several minor compliance incidents occurred, as detailed below:

- March 7, 2018: Two SCE biologists observed two sets of tracks outside of disturbance limits near Construct 81 on Segment 4. The impacted area was approximately 400 square feet of grassland and coastal sage scrub vegetation and consisted of one set of tracks from a heavy metal-plated tracked piece of equipment (e.g., an excavator) and a second set of tracks from a dual rear-wheel truck. It is **unknown if this incident was project- or non-project-related**. The incident conflicts with MM BIO-1, which requires project boundaries and sensitive areas to be clearly marked. The biologist added additional environmentally sensitive area (ESA) signs and flagging to discourage any future incidents.
- March 29, 2018: A Henkels & McCoy (H&M) drill rig became stuck on the corner of an access road on Segment 4 between Constructs 131 and 133. An excavator was used to pull the drill rig back onto the road. The incident was partially outside of disturbance limits inside California red-legged frog habitat and coastal sage scrub habitat. The disturbance was approximately 30 feet in length and resulted in four 5-gallon buckets of soil being displaced 6 feet down slope. The incident conflicts with MM BIO-1, which requires project equipment to stay within approved project areas. A U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-approved California red-legged frog approved biologist surveyed the affected area and determined there were no California red-legged frog present.
- March 30, 2018: An SCE biologist observed two California Traffic Control (CTC) personnel onsite who had not received WEAP training. The CTC personnel stated they were aware they had entered the site without training. This incident conflicts with APM GEN-1, which requires all personnel receive WEAP training before entering the project area. The biologist provided WEAP training for the personnel.

Additionally, the Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP) reported a pH Numerical Action Limit (NAL) exceedance at Construct 70 during a storm on March 2, 2018. The exceedance does not constitute a violation of the Construction General Permit. The 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 track-out and working near active nests as being attributed to these non-project emergency crews. Four minor spills/leaks of hydraulic fluid, anti-freeze, or motor oil were self-reported by SCE. These incidents were dealt with in a timely manner.

Minor Approvals

During March 2018, no Minor Project Refinements or email approvals were issued. An Amendment for NTP-2 was approved during March 2018 (see Table 1).

Table 1: Minor Approvals for March 2018

Description	Approval Date
Amendment 1 for NTP-2: addition of helipad at Ventura Service Center for helicopter storage.	March 15, 2018

Sincerely,

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

Jenny Vick
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:
Kenneth Spear, SCE
Marcus Obregon, SCE

ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Report
March 8 and 19, 2018



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	March 8, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS014
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Partly cloudy with mild temperatures and calm winds
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1330
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, NTP-2, NTP-3		

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

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

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

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

Segments 3, 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)

I met with BRC lead monitor Matt Schaap at Carpinteria Yard B for the 0700 tailboard meeting. Caitlyn Teague, the Rincon Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) inspector, was at the tailboard meeting and planned to tour the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) sites in anticipation of severe storms that were predicted for the weekend. GANDA paleontological monitor Andrew Paden was also at the tailboard meeting and would be spot-checking excavation activities (MM CR-13). Matt Schaap said there were eight environmental crew members at the SBCRP site on the day of my site visit (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4, MM BIO-10).

I drove with BRC lead monitor Matt Schaap into the foothills behind Carpinteria along Segment 4. There were large quantities of vegetation growing in areas that had been burned by the Thomas Fire, including numerous mariposa lilies (Photo 1). BRC biological monitors Asher Dietch and Chuck Schade were at Constructs 126 and 127.

At Construct 128, a crew member was using an excavator to prepare a pad for the new tubular steel pole (TSP) (Photo 2). BRC lead monitor Matt Schaap said it was going to be a lattice steel tower. Reinforced best management practices (BMPs) (i.e., silt fencing and straw wattles) had been installed below the pad area to prevent soil from sloughing down the slope.

I drove with BRC lead monitor Matt Schaap to Construct 129 where a number of oak trees had been previously removed or pruned; this activity was overseen by BRC arborist Steve Jones (Photo 4). While onsite, I observed a crew using a small excavator to load a dump truck with the pruned vegetation (Photo 3). BRC biological monitors Asher Dietch and Chuck Schade had come from Construct 128 to oversee this work. All of the work was within the approved construction workspace and BMPs were installed. Construct 128 is within a thickly vegetated oak woodland that did not burn during the Thomas Fire; therefore, monitoring for nesting birds is a top priority at this location.

Our next stop was the Mac Brown Yard where we met with BRC biological monitor Peter Gaede. The Mac Brown Yard has a gravel bed, but a proper entry/exit BMP still needs to be installed (Photo 5). Up the road from the Mac Brown Yard, a drilling crew was working on the foundation hole for Construct 94 (Photo 6). The drilling work was progressing slowly, since the crew was drilling into sandstone. The tailings from the drilling were loaded directly onto a truck and hauled offsite. We walked farther up the road to the location for Construct 95 (Photo 7). The drilling crew anticipated finishing Construct 94 on the day of my site visit and then would move to Construct 95.

I drove with BRC lead monitor Matt Schaap east on Highway 150 to check the work at Constructs 81, 82, and 83. Crews at Construct 81 had just finished pouring the new TSP foundation (Photo 8). BRC biological monitor Chris Titus was at Construct 81. At Construct 83, crews had cleared vegetation and were hauling it off site.

We then drove to Constructs 87, 88, and 89 where all of the TSP foundations had been previously drilled and poured. A crew had just finished setting the TSP at Construct 87 (Photo 11) and were preparing to set the TSP segments at Construct 88 (Photo 9). From there, the crew would head to Construct 89 where the TSP segments had already been stockpiled (Photo 10). BRC biological monitor Steve Jones was overseeing this construction activity.

When we drove out to the access road past Construct 90, we passed a stand of eucalyptus trees near Highway 150 and I noted a female great horned owl sitting on a stick nest in one of these trees. BRC lead monitor Matt Schaap called Rincon avian biologist Nathan Marcy who documented the nest location.

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 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
3/8/18	Access Road to Segment 4		Photo 1 – Revegetation of the burn area. Photo facing north.
3/8/18	Construct 128		Photo 2 – Preparation of the crane pad for the new TSP. Photo facing west.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/8/18	Construct 129		Photo 3 – Clearing pruned vegetation at Construct 129.
3/8/18	Construct 129		Photo 4 – Clearing the vegetation in and around the crane pad for Construct 129.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/8/18	Mac Brown Yard		Photo 5 – Equipment storage at the Mac Brown Yard.
3/8/18	Construct 94		Photo 6 – Drilling operation for the TSP foundation.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/8/18	Construct 95		Photo 7 – TSP location just prior to drilling. Photo facing west
3/8/18	Construct 81		Photo 8 – The TSP foundation has just been poured. Photo facing northeast.
3/8/18	Construct 88		Photo 9 – A crew is getting ready to set the TSP segments. Photo facing south.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/8/18	Construct 89		Photo 10 – TSP segments stockpiled at Construct 89. Photo facing west
3/8/18	Construct 87		Photo 11 – Crews have just set the TSP at Construct 87. Photo facing east



Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

Project:	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	Date:	March 19, 2018
Project Proponent:	Southern California Edison	Report #:	VS015
Lead Agency:	California Public Utilities Commission	Monitor(s):	Vince Semonsen
CPUC PM:	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	AM/PM Weather:	Clear, cool, and calm
E & E CM:	Jenny Vick	Start/End Time:	0700 to 1300
Project NTP(s):	NTP-1, NTP-2, NTP-3		

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

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

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

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

Segments 3, 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)

I arrived onsite for the 0700 tailboard meeting at Carpinteria Yard B. James Rasico (Rincon) was the lead environmental monitor on the day of my site visit. James Rasico reminded the crews that there were 25 active nests throughout the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) site and they should be mindful of the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) boundaries. Rincon Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) inspector Caitlyn Teague was also at the tailboard meeting and planned to tour the SBCRP sites in anticipation of severe weather that was forecasted to occur later in the week (APM BIO-7). This significant rain event was expected to shut down the SBCRP for a number of days.

A crew was building a lattice steel tower within Carpinteria Yard B (Photo 1). Rincon lead environmental monitor James Rasico said this tower will be flown to one of the more difficult locations to access. I rode with James Rasico to check on the construction activities and monitoring crews (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4).

Along Segment 4, near the Carpinteria Substation, we connected with Rincon avian biologist Monica Jacinto who was conducting nesting bird surveys. We observed a peregrine falcon sitting on one of the Segment 4 towers near the Carpinteria Substation.

I rode with Rincon lead environmental monitor James Rasico east on Highway 150 and stopped to check Construct 85, located just north of Highway 150. The access roads were too muddy to enter this site; therefore, crews had parked the equipment along the access roads (Photo 2).

Farther east on Highway 150, we turned off at the "Y" and traveled south toward Segment 4 and Construct 77. The drilling crew had finished the foundation hole for Construct 77 during the previous week and were headed to Construct 79. The foundation hole was 44 feet deep and was covered with a metal plate and plastic (Photos 3 and 4). The crew anticipated they would drop the cage into place during the day of my site visit and then pour the foundation the following day, ahead of the storms. A crew was using a small loader/backhoe to spread the foundation hole tailings around the crane pad, in addition to prepping access to the hole. BRC biological monitor Dave Wappler was at this location.

At Construct 78, a crew was stripping the forms off of the newly poured tower foundation (Photo 5). Rincon biological monitor Dannique Albu was at this site. When the drilling rig arrived at Construct 79, the crew began to set up (Photo 7).

At Construct 80, the grading work had been finished a few months prior and the open ground site was stabilized with jute netting and wattles. At several locations, rainwater runoff had passed under the jute and washed out some of the slope (Photo 6). When Rincon SWPPP inspector Caitlyn Teague arrived at Construct 80, Rincon lead environmental monitor James Rasico and I discussed with her how to further stabilize the slope in preparation of the upcoming severe storms.

At Construct 84, the tubular steel pole (TSP) foundation had been poured and materials were stockpiled onsite (Photo 8). A bush tit nest was found north of the construction area, and ESA buffer signs had been posted (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10). The buffer encompasses most of the TSP pad; therefore, unless the buffer is reduced, crews must wait until the nest is inactive to continue their work in this area.

The foundations for Constructs 94 and 95 had been drilled and poured (Photos 9 and 10). No work was being conducted at these towers, but Rincon avian biologist Paulette Loubet was walking the road during a nesting bird survey.

I rode with Rincon lead environmental monitor James Rasico on the Segment 4 access road behind Carpinteria to its intersection with the Franklin Trail. We then walked on the trail to Construct 132 (Photo 11). Other than the trail, there is no access to this tower; therefore, all work at this location must be completed by hand.

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 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
3/19/18	Carpinteria Yard B		Photo 1 – Tower construction in the yard.
3/19/18	Construct 85		Photo 2 – Equipment parked along the access road; it is too muddy to access to Construct 85.
3/19/18	Construct 77		Photo 3 – Foundation hole has been dug and the site is ready for the cage installation. Photo facing east.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/19/18	Construct 77		Photo 4 – Foundation hole covered with a steel plate and plastic. Photo facing east.
3/19/18	Construct 78		Photo 5 – Stripping the forms off of the new tower foundation. Photo facing west.
3/19/18	Construct 80		Photo 6 – BMP maintenance is needed at this location.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/19/18	Construct 79		Photo 7 – TSP location just prior to drilling. Photo facing east.
3/19/18	Construct 84		Photo 8 – TSP foundation has been drilled and poured. A nest buffer now covers the construction area. Photo facing north.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/19/18	Construct 94		Photo 9 – The foundation has been drilled and poured.
3/19/18	Construct 95		Photo 10 – Foundation has been drilled and poured.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
3/19/18	Construct 132		<p>Photo 11 – This tower has very limited access located along the Franklin Trail. Photo facing south.</p>