



## ecology and environment, inc.

Global Environmental Specialists

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

May 17, 2018

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

### **Re: Monthly Report Summary #7 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 **April 1 to 30, 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 April 5, 12, 20, 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 April 2018 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from April 1 to 30, 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 April 2018 reporting period, one minor compliance incidents occurred, as detailed below:

- April 14, 2018: An SCE biologist observed a forklift parked within an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) buffer for an active bushtit nest (#106). The vehicle was staged on the side of a project access road approximately 40 feet northeast of the nest. The operator of the forklift was not within the vicinity during the initial observation, but later moved the forklift outside of the nest buffer. The bushtits at the nest showed no signs of disturbance, including due to the presence of the personnel, the forklift, or the biologist. It is **unknown if the incident is project or non-project related**. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-10: Prepare and Implement a Nesting Bird Management Plan.

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 track-out and working near active nests as being attributed to these non-project emergency crews. These crews have also been removing fire-damaged trees, including coast live oaks. On April 17, 2018, a biological monitor observed five dead tree frogs and one dead western toad in Harmon Canyon drainage and noted an oily sheen on the water surface; however, this incident was not project related. Six 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 April 2018, two email approvals and one Minor Project Refinement (MPR) were issued (see Table 1).

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

Description	Approval Date
Email approval for access road near Construct M8-T7 on Segment 5.	April 5, 2018
Email approval for alternative access road near Construct 107 on Segment 4.	April 10, 2018
MPR B: Removal of 63 idle poles along Segments 3, 4, and 5.	April 12, 2018

Sincerely,



Jenny Vick  
Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:  
Kenneth Spear, SCE  
Marcus Obregon, SCE

# ATTACHMENT 1

CPUC Site Inspection Report  
April 5, 12, 20, and 27, 2018



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	April 5, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS016
<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>	Cool and foggy with no wind
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1300
<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 and Segments 2, 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. It was cool and foggy, and rain was predicted for the weekend. Lead biological monitors James Rasico (Rincon) and Matt Schaap (BRC) were at the meeting. I accompanied Matt Schaap for the day.

Our first stop was along Segment 4 near the Carpinteria Substation. At tubular steel pole (TSP) 131, a crew was using an excavator to remove the old lattice steel tower. At TSP 132, the hand crew was digging the foundation holes. At TSP 133, the foundation had been poured and the crew anticipated setting the new pole later in the day.

At TSP 134, a crew was constructing the crane pad (Photo 1). Soil was being delivered, spread, and compacted for the crane pad. The soil at the site was not adequate for building the crane pad; therefore, crews removed this soil and it was stockpiled near Highway 192 (Photo 2). BRC biological monitor Chris Titus was onsite spot-checking the construction activities in this area (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4).

BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap heard there was an issue with water/mud on the access road to Constructs 85 and 86, so we drove to this location. An agricultural pipe had leaked the previous night and resulted in a muddy access road (Photo 3). Crews were setting up to drill the tower foundation on the day of my site visit, and the trucks were driving through the mud. A sweeper truck was assigned to keep Highway 150 clear of mud since there were no rumble plates or other best management practices (BMPs) at the entrance to the access road. While we were onsite, a crew member arrived on a small bobcat to clear the access road. Rincon lead biological monitor James Rasico was overseeing the access road cleanup, and Rincon biological monitor Yuling Huo was checking on the drilling activities.

A drilling rig was set up at Construct 85 (Photo 4). The site required a Hilfiker wall and extensive grading for the access road. Anchored silt fencing had been installed below the road's shoulder to capture soil and rocks. The fog began to burn off around 1000.

At Construct 83, a crew was installing the new TSP (Photo 5). Rincon biological monitor Mike Moss was onsite. Mike Moss said they had gotten approval to reduce the nest buffer at TSP 84 so the crew could move over and set the pole at that site (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10). Mike Moss was overseeing the installation of the BMP checklist generated the day before by Rincon Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP inspector Caitlyn Teague (APM BIO-7).

Crews were pouring the TSP foundation at Construct 80. It was a large pour, and five concrete trucks were lined up with crews ready to begin the work (Photo 6).

Along Segment 2, near the Casitas Substation, a helicopter crew was working. At the time of my site visit, they were dropping a crew member onto Tower 445239 to remove the fire-damaged marker balls from the wires (Photo 7). BRC biological monitors Peter Gaede and Asher Dietch were observing the various helicopter activities and watching for California condors.

On Segment 4, we stopped at Construct 98 where a crew was building a Hilfiker wall (Photo 8). This was a very steep site located within an avocado orchard. Reinforced silt fence had been installed below the construction site to capture soil and rocks coming off of the work area. The work was being spot-checked by Rincon biological monitor Yuling Huo.

We looked at the great horned owl and red-tailed hawk nests located along the TSP 90 access road. We could see two large hawk juveniles in the nest, which appeared ready to fledge. No owlets were observed.

**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
4/5/18	Segment 4, TSP 134		Photo 1 – Crane pad construction. Photo facing south.
4/5/18	Carpinteria Substation		Photo 2 – Large amounts of soil from Construct 134 to be hauled offsite.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/5/18	Segment 4, Access Road to Construct 85		Photo 3 – Muddy access road. Monitors Matt Schaap (BRC) and James Rasico (Rincon) are onsite.
4/5/18	Segment 4, Construct 85		Photo 4 – Drilling rig is onsite; note the steep road shoulder and the reinforced silt fencing at the bottom of the slope.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/5/18	Segment 4, Construct 83		Photo 5 – New TSP installation. Photo facing south.
4/5/18	Segment 4, Construct 80		Photo 6 – Concrete pour of the TSP foundation. Photo facing northwest

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/5/18	Segment 2, Tower 445239		Photo 7 – Helicopter dropping off workers on the new TSPs. Photo facing south.
4/5/18	Segment 4, Construct 98		Photo 8 – Excavation for a Hilfiker wall. Photo facing east.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	April 12, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS017
<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>	Cool and clear, but windy
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1300
<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 and Segments 2, 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 where I met up with BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap. Also at the meeting were biological monitors Yuling Huo (Rincon) and Chris Titus (BRC) and paleontological monitor Andrew Paden (GANDA).

I accompanied BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap for the day. Our first stop was the access road near the Carpinteria Substation. BRC avian biologist Dave Wappler was stationed at the entrance to the access road and monitoring the activity of a bush-tit nest near the intersection of Highway 192 and the access road (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10). Dave Wappler was checking on the status of the bush-tit nest and he believed the adult birds were feeding the chicks. Signs were posted directing project personnel not to stop in this area.

We drove to tubular steel poles (TSPs) 128 and 129 where crews were attempting to install the tower foundations (Photo 1). Crews were at the site, but it was a very windy morning and they were unsure if they could work in the current conditions (Photo 2). It was very dusty at the site due to the winds and lack of dust control around the work areas. BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap said they had to relocate a rattlesnake from this area; he had moved the snake several miles up into the mountains. Large patches of wildflowers were growing within the burned areas along the access road.

Where the Franklin Trail connects to the access road, I met Rincon biological monitor Tamara Bryant who was checking on the two-person crew that was hand-digging the foundation holes at TSP 132 (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4). The completed holes were sealed with boards, plastic, and gravel bags and then surrounded by stakes and caution tape (MM BIO-6).

We headed toward TSPs 73, 74, and 75, which is a new area for the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP). Environmental crews that were waiting to access this area included biological, archaeological, and Native American monitors. I met Rincon biological monitor Bryant Reynolds and we discussed the status and conditions for the SBCRP. Construction crews were attempting to work out equipment access, and BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap did not predict that much work could be accomplished on this day.

At TSP 101, a crew was preparing to pour the tower foundation, and a crew with a small piece of equipment was prepping the pad for the cement trucks (Photo 3). The crew said the hole was 7 feet in diameter by 42 feet deep and would require 64 cubic yards of concrete, or approximately eight to nine cement trucks. Due to the windy conditions, it was dusty; however, crews did not want to put water on the access road because it could make the road too slippery for the concrete trucks (APM AQ-1, MM HZ-2). I spoke with BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap about the dust and recommended that a water truck should wet down these areas first thing in the morning before the crews arrive.

A crew was drilling the foundation hole at TSP 102 (Photo 4). Drilling was progressing slowly, as the crew was now drilling into rock; however, the crew hoped to finish before the end of the day. GANDA paleontological monitor Andrew Paden was monitoring the tailings (MM CR-13). The previously identified red-shouldered hawk nest in the nearby sycamore tree was abandoned during the nest-building phase and was no longer an issue.

Wire pulling was being conducted between TSPs 81 and 83 (Photo 5). Traffic control had been set up along Highway 150, as they were pulling wire across the road. BRC biological monitor Asher Dietch was in the area overseeing the wire pulling activities.

BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap said that BRC biological monitor Peter Gaede was checking activities near the Teen Challenge Yard.



**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:**

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/12/18	Segment 4, TSP 129		Photo 1 – Crane pad construction. Photo facing south.
4/12/18	Segment 4, TSP 128		Photo 2 – Windy conditions at TSP 128. Photo facing southeast
4/12/18	Segment 4, Construct 101		Photo 3 – Final earthwork before concrete trucks arrive to pour the foundation. Photo facing southeast



**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/12/18	Segment 4, TSP 102		Photo 4 – Drilling rig is onsite and working. Photo facing west.
4/12/18	Segment 4, TSP 81		Photo 5 – Wire pulling work.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	April 20, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS018
<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>	Cool and clear with a slight breeze
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1330
<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 and Segments 2, 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 was onsite for the 0700 tailboard meeting at Carpinteria Yard B. BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap discussed the increase in nesting birds and the protocol for removing nest material from equipment and/or stockpiled materials. Only approved biologists can remove the nest material of certain species and only if there are no eggs. Also attending the meeting were Rincon biological monitors Yuling Huo and Mike Moss and GANDA paleontological monitor Andrew Paden. Avian biologists were clearing the construction sites listed on the Plan of the Day (POD). Construction representatives let attendees know that they would be using a helicopter to fly materials to tubular steel pole (TSP) 132 the following week.

I accompanied BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap for the day and we drove into the Carpinteria foothills as crews were planning to pour the foundation for TSP 128. We passed by the bushtit nest location. Matt Schaap said the chicks had fledged; therefore, the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) signs were removed. He also said a pair of kingbirds were trying to nest in a pole within the Carpinteria Substation and the nest material has been removed three times.

At TSP 129, concrete trucks were traveling on the access road, a pumper truck had been set up, and inspectors were onsite (Photo 1). A water truck was wetting down the access road to reduce dust (MM HZ-2).

BRC biological monitor Dave Wappler was stationed at the Franklin Trail. We walked to TSP 132 where a two-person excavation team continued to chip away at the rock within the last foundation hole (Photo 2). This crew had finished three foundation holes and had nearly completed the fourth (Photo 3). All of the holes were well covered and had caution tape around them. The rocks from the foundation excavation were piled next to the holes; I asked BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap about their plan for the tailings and he was not sure at that time. During the day of my site visit, Dave Wappler would be headed up the hill to check on the work at TSP 128 (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4).

We met Rincon avian biologist Nathan Marcy along Highway 150 near the access road to TSP 100. He was checking on nesting birds (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10). There was extensive bird activity in the area, especially along Rincon Creek (yellow warblers, warbling vireos, and a black-throated gray warbler).

At TSP 99, crews were preparing to set the cage in the foundation hole and planned to pour the foundation on the day of my site visit (Photo 4). Rincon biological monitor Emily Chase was onsite and said that the work was going well. BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap and I noticed that the parked drill rig was leaking an oily fluid. Pans had been placed under the equipment, but it was parked on a slope and the fluid was running off the pans into the soil. Matt Schaap spoke with the foreman who said they had a mechanic in route to fix the leak but that he would assign someone to clean up the impacted soil.

At TSP 100, a small crew was cleaning up after the foundation pour. They were stripping the forms and conducting final checks of the foundation (Photo 5).

We drove to TSP 63 where BRC biological monitor Asher Dietch was parked so he could observe the wire pull operation. Both the TSP 63 and 62 foundation holes had been drilled in 2017 before the fire. They had been covered with steel plates and sealed with plastic and gravel bags. Through the winter, the gravel bags and plastic had pulled away from the steel plates. This left openings where animals could enter and become trapped (Photo 6). I asked BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap to request that the construction crews reseal these holes.

At Construct 61, an excavator was removing a fairly large oak tree that was within the disturbance limits (Photo 7). The work was monitored by Rincon biological monitor Yuling Huo.

**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.  
Determine what is to become of the tailings from TSP 132.

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

Biologists should use flashlights to check the foundation holes at TSPs 62 and 63 for trapped animals when crews pull off the steel plates.

**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
4/20/18	Segment 4, Construct 129		Photo 1 – Foundation work continues. Photo facing southwest.
4/20/18	Segment 4, TSP 132		Photo 2 – Hand crews have dug three of the four foundation holes. Photo facing south.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/20/18	Segment 4, TSP 132		Photo 3 – A hand crew excavating the last foundation hole; other holes have been dug and sealed. Photo facing east
4/20/18	Segment 4 TSP 99		Photo 4 – A crane is setting the foundation cage.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/20/18	Segment 4, Construct 100		Photo 5 – Finish work on the new foundation.
4/20/18	Segment 4, Construct 63		Photo 6 – Partially covered foundation hole at TSP 63.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/20/18	Segment 4, Construct 61		Photo 7 – Removal of an oak tree within the disturbance limits.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	April 27, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS019
<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, and calm
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1330
<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 and Segments 2, 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. Helicopter work was taking place at several locations, with wire pulling at TSP 61 and transporting concrete to TSP 132 along the Franklin Trail. A larger helicopter was needed for hauling concrete and it was parked within Carpinteria Yard B. Notifications of the Franklin Trail's closure were distributed during the prior week (MM RE-1, MM TT-3).

I traveled with BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap to TSP 133 where concrete trucks would be filling hoppers for transport to TSP 132 (Photo 1). According to the crew, the helicopter dropped the foundation cages into place a day prior. The crew planned to fill two of the tower foundation holes with concrete and fill the remaining two holes the following day. They expected the helicopter to make approximately 60 trips to fill the two holes (Photo 5). As a result, Franklin Trail would be closed for most of the day. Rincon biological monitor Emily Chase was stationed near TSP 132, although the crew said it was not very comfortable around the pole site due to the dust and debris being spread by the helicopter (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4).

With the arrival of warmer weather, snakes were beginning to emerge. BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap said that a ring-necked snake found during the grading along Segment 1 had to be relocated, a striped racer was caught and moved, and a California kingsnake was seen crossing through a construction site (MM BIO-6).

A grader was working on the access roads along Segment 1; therefore, BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap and I headed for Ventura and then up into the backcountry (Photo 2). BRC biological monitor Peter Gaede was with the grader and watching for nesting birds and other animals (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10). The spring migration was taking place during the time of my site visit, we saw at least 12 species of birds near a small ephemeral drainage. Tadpoles were in some of the pools. Along the access road, Peter Gaede found a canyon wren nest in a small agricultural barn, and Matt Schaap noted a hummingbird building a nest in an adjacent oak tree. The wildflowers in this area were in bloom (Photo 3). A local landowner spoke with Matt Schaap and Peter Gaede about the grading work.

At Segment 4, we drove into the TSP 61 area where a helicopter was pulling wire (Photo 4). BRC biological monitor Asher Dietch was overseeing this work, with particular attention given to the nesting red-tailed hawks near the helicopter work site. According to Asher Dietch, the birds did not seem agitated by the activity.

We returned to Carpinteria Yard B where we watched the large helicopter carrying concrete to TSP 132 (Photo 5). Conditions were still fairly calm and the work appeared to be going smoothly.

**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)

Biologists should use flashlights to check the foundation holes at TSPs 62 and 63 for trapped animals when crews pull off the steel plates.

**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
4/27/18	Segment 4, TSP 133		Photo 1 – Concrete trucks will use the TSP 133 crane pad to fill the hoppers the helicopter will transport up to TSP 132. Photo facing south.
4/27/18	Segment 1		Photo 2 – Grader working the access roads.
4/27/18	Segment 1		Photo 3 – Wildflowers in bloom.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/27/18	Segment 4, TSP 61	 A photograph showing a small helicopter pulling a wire near a utility tower in a wooded area. The scene is outdoors with a clear blue sky and some clouds. A utility tower is visible in the background, and a large, leafless tree is in the foreground. The helicopter is positioned near the top of the frame, pulling a wire that extends towards the tower.	Photo 4 – A small helicopter is pulling wire near the new towers.



REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
4/27/18	Carpinteria Yard B		Photo 5 – A large helicopter returning to Carpinteria Yard B for fuel. Photo facing north.