



## ecology and environment, inc.

Global Environmental Specialists

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

August 31, 2018

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

### **Re: Monthly Report Summary #10 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 **July 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 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 **July 11 and 27, 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 July 2018 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from July 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 July 2018 reporting period, several compliance incidents occurred, as detailed below:

- July 17, 2018: A water truck backed off an access road onto the bank of Franklin Creek on Segment 4 near Construct 130. The truck disturbed an area of approximately 10 feet by 12 feet (0.003 acre) outside the approved disturbance area, some within California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdiction, and caused approximately 3 gallons of soil from the road berm to slough into Franklin Creek. Franklin Creek is protected under Fish and Game Code Section 1602 and MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-8. The incident violated the 1602 permit because it caused temporary impacts in excess of what was authorized for Franklin Creek at this location. MM BIO-1 requires sensitive areas, including drainages such as Franklin Creek, to be clearly marked and limits construction activities from occurring within these sensitive areas. By encroaching into a delineated sensitive area, SCE violated MM BIO-1. MM BIO-8 requires that SCE establish and maintain a minimum exclusionary buffer of 50 feet from the delineated extent of all jurisdictional features during construction and restoration. SCE received a 1602 permit, which authorized approved construction activities to occur within 50 feet of the jurisdictional feature; however, the permit does not allow for encroachment into the jurisdictional features for unapproved activities. Because the incident deviated from permit requirements and mitigation measures and had the potential to cause minor impacts on environmental resources, the CPUC issued a Level 2 Non-Compliance Report (NCR-002).
- July 24, 2018: A coast live oak on Segment 3B near Construct 71 was trimmed without an arborist present.
- July 27, 2018: A crane leaked diesel fuel onto an access road on Segment 4 near Construct 129.
- July 27, 2018: A civil crew recontoured and compacted outside approved disturbance limits on Segment 3B near Construct 77.

Additionally, biological monitors reported one observation of a wildlife mortality and several instances of non-project-related damage to vegetation and oak trees. SCE also self-reported several minor spills which were cleaned up immediately.

## **Public Concerns**

SCE continued discussions with landowners in the vicinity of project components. In July, SCE received several inquiries from landowners requesting Natina treatment to structures that are in their viewshed. SCE is investigating these inquiries and will determine if treatment should be applied.

SCE finalized the access agreement with the Veddars and began work on their property.

The Vandercars, located near Constructs 65-69, requested removal of a pole in their front yard. SCE is in discussions with them about the issue, but have not agreed to modify the pole.

The County of Santa Barbara recently received a complaint from a resident (Burwell) in Carpinteria between Segments 4 and 5 related to the visual impact caused by a nearby pole.

The Dyers claimed that they were not notified of the project and have concerns related to the visual impacts of the property. Project notifications were sent to the primary owner of the property, but since the Dyers are not the primary owners, it is likely they did not receive the notification regarding the project.

The Dibbles are concerned about project-related damage to the road near their property, aviation safety, and aesthetics impacts. SCE issued a letter of response to their concerns.

### **Minor Approvals**

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Caitlin M. Barns".

Caitlin Barns  
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:

Kenneth Spear, SCE  
Marcus Obregon, SCE

# ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Reports  
July 11 and 27, 2018



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	July 11, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS025
<b>Lead Agency:</b>	California Public Utilities Commission	<b>Monitor(s):</b>	Vince Semonsen
<b>CPUC PM:</b>	Jensen Uchida, Energy Division	<b>AM/PM Weather:</b>	Partly cloudy, cool in the morning, and calm
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1230
<b>Project NTP(s):</b>	NTP-1, NTP-2, NTP-3		

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)

Carpinteria Yard B, 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 for the 0700 tailboard meeting at Carpinteria Yard B. The lead biological monitor on the day of my site visit was Mike Moss (Rincon Consultants, Inc. [Rincon]); also at the tailboard meeting were biological monitors Paulette Loubet (Rincon) and Barrett Holland (BRC) and paleontological monitor Kim Luyties (Rincon) (APM BIO-3, MM CR-13). Construction personnel asked some questions about the status of a number of bird nests and Mike Moss was able to answer most of these questions; however, until he received updates from the avian biologists conducting morning nests checks, he had to hold off on some of the answers (APM BIO-4).

Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) drove us to Segment 3B and tubular steel pole (TSP) 70 where avian biological monitor Dave Wappler (BRC) was checking the status of a nearby Phainopepla nest. Dave Wappler assumed the nest was predated that morning; he had seen a pair of ravens near the nest when he drove up and when he set up his spotting scope he could not see any chicks in the nest. Also, the female bird appeared stressed and was flying around and calling in an excited manner. Mike Moss asked Dave Wappler to continue monitoring the nest until he felt certain that the chicks were gone, after which time he would notify the construction teams. A Henkels & McCoy (H&M) crew arrived to conduct oak tree trimming around TSP 70; this work was outside of the nest buffer. Biological monitor Barrett Holland (BRC) was onsite and overseeing the tree work (MM BIO-4).

At TSP 71, an H&M crew was setting up to lower additional sections of the rebar cage into the foundation hole (Photos 1 and 2). The hole had been drilled the previous day and was covered overnight with a heavy tarp to prevent animals from falling in (MM BIO-6). The foundation pour was scheduled to take place within the next several days.

Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) drove us to back down the hill and stopped at Highway 150 Yard C where he spoke with the construction crews. Avian biologists Peter Gaede (BRC) and Nathan Macy (Rincon) were at this location.

Along Segment 4 at TSP 97, a crew had removed vegetation near the tower location and were beginning to grade a new road to the tower site (Photos 3 and 4). Best management practices (BMPs) were in place and appeared to be in good condition, but the construction zone needed dust control.

Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) drove to the "Y" Yard where some of the material (i.e., soil and vegetation) from the TSP 97 work was being stockpiled (Photo 5). These stockpiles and portions of the access road near the "Y" Yard needed dust control (APM AQ-1). I inquired as to whether the this material was covered when it was being transported in trucks; Mike Moss was not sure (APM AQ-1). We encountered biological monitor Peter Gaede (BRC) near the "Y" Yard doing nesting bird surveys.

We continued down the access road until we met up with biological monitor Brody Olson who was overseeing the wire removal work along the old line between TSPs 60 and 62. The H&M trucks were parked at TSP 60 (Photo 6). The crew was trying to work around the newly inactive red-tailed hawk nest and asked to remove the nest from the old tower. Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) told them that the nest could not be removed until they had official approval.

An H&M crew was installing McCarthy drains along the access road between TSPs 87 to 90, specifically at Civil ID #65 and #66 (Photo 7). Support equipment was parked at TSP 88; biological monitor Dave Wappler (BRC) had moved to this area and was spot-checking the work. There were no concerns, and Mike and I signed into the Job Safety Analysis (JSA).

At the Vedder property, I checked on the wire pulling crew setting up at TSP 112 (Photo 8). Biological monitor Asher Dietch (BRC) was stationed along this portion of the site. Dust control from multiple water trucks was needed near TSP 112. Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) made some calls to get this accomplished and then spoke with a water truck driver on

our way off the property. I noted that a truck was left idling and I mentioned this to Asher Dietch (APM AQ-2). Photo 9 looks west from TSP 112 toward newly installed TSPs 114 and 115.

**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 and follow up on dust control.

**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: N/A**





**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, TSP 71		Photo 1 – H&M crew setting additional rebar cage in the drilled hole. Photo facing south.
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, TSP 71		Photo 2 – Cage installation. Photo facing west.
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 97		Photo 3 – Vegetation clearing and road construction to the tower location. Photo facing northwest.






**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 97		Photo 4 – Initial road construction. Photo facing south.
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, the “Y” Yard		Photo 5 – Stockpiled soil and vegetation.
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, TSP 60		Photo 6 – H&M crew removing wire from the old towers M6/T1-M4/T4. Photo facing east.



**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Access Road to TSPs 87-90		Photo 7 – McCarthy drain installation at Civil ID #65-67. Photo facing east.
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 112		Photo 8 – Wire pull crew setting up at TSP 112. Photo facing southeast.
7/11/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 114		Photo 9 – Newly installed TSPs 114 and 115. Photo facing west.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	July 27, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS026
<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>	Overcast and cool with a slight breeze
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Caitlin Barns	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1230
<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 are 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)

Carpinteria Yard B, 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 for the 0700 tailboard meeting at Carpinteria Yard B. I met with lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon Consultants, Inc. [Rincon]).

We traveled up the Franklin Trail access road along Segment 4 toward tubular steel pole (TSP) 120. At one of the creek crossings along the way, I noted the location where, on July 17, 2018, a water truck had attempted to turn around and slid off the road. A portion of the road berm next to the culvert was impacted (Photo 1). Vegetation impacted by the truck appeared to be mostly weeds in addition to some mugwort. Best management practices (BMPs) were installed, but additional BMPs, and possibly some seed, will be needed to stabilize this area.

A water truck was traveling up the access road and providing dust control (APM AQ-1). Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) said he and his crew were reinforcing the need for more dust control.

TSP 120 is located at the very end of the access road; from this location, the wires span a deep creek canyon to TSP 119 and the Vedder property (Photos 2, 3, and 4). Parking was very limited at this location; therefore, equipment and vehicles were stockpiled and parked at a number of staging areas along the access road (Photo 9). BMP installation and maintenance was needed at all of these staging areas. One construction vehicle had a fuel spill in the bed of the truck that was leaking from the tailgate. Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) and avian biological monitor Brody Olson (BRC) spoke with the construction crew about this.

Avian biological monitor Brody Olson (BRC) had arrived first thing in the morning to sweep the area from TSP 124 to 120. Other BRC biological monitors that were onsite on the day of my site visit included Peter Gaede and Dave Wappler (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4). In general, nesting bird activity was greatly reduced throughout the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) site.

Two crews were using excavators at TSP 120; one crew was at the site, itself, and working on the Hilfiker wall, and the other crew was improving the access road (Photos 6 and 8). Water was being used at both locations for dust control and to stabilize the soil. A gas-powered water pump was being used and was well-contained with plastic and gravel bags (Photo 7). A paleontological monitor was scheduled on the day of my site visit at this location, but did not arrive in time for me to meet them. Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) informed me that the paleontological monitor was spot-checking several locations on that day (MM CR-13).

At the Carpinteria Substation, crews were working on the TSPs and wiring both inside and outside of the Carpinteria Substation (Photo 10). Biological monitor Dave Wappler (BRC) was stationed at this location.

Lead biological monitor Mike Moss (Rincon) drove me to Segment 3B and up the access road to near TSP 62. A crew was installing a McCarthy drain

**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 and follow up on dust control.

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

Numerous ground bee hives were noted within the access road up to TSP 120. They did not appear to be disturbed by our presence.

**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
7/27/18	SBCRP – Franklin Trail Access Road		Photo 1 – Impacts to creek area next to the access road culvert resulting from a truck leaving the roadway.
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 123		Photo 2 – Access road looking east from TSP 123 toward TSPs 122 and 121.
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 3 – Work at TSP 120 included upgrading the access road and excavation for a Hilfiker wall. Photo facing east.






**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**



Date	Location	Photo	Description
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 4 – TSP 120 is at the end of the access road; wire spans a deep canyon over to TSP 119. Photo facing southeast.
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 121		Photo 5 – Fuel spill in the bed of a construction vehicle is leaking out the back.
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 6 – H&M crew preparing the access road to TSP 120. Photo facing south.



**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 7 – The water pump is well contained.
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 120		Photo 8 – Excavator is prepping the site for installation of a Hilfiker wall. Photo facing southeast.
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, TSP 121		Photo 9 – Staging area along the access road; BMPs need maintenance. Photo facing northeast.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
7/27/18	SBCRP – Carpinteria Substation		Photo 10 – Crews are working on the TSPs in and outside of the Carpinteria Substation. Photo facing south.
7/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, Access Road near TSP 62		Photo 11 – McCarthy drain installation near TSP 62.