



July 24, 2018

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

**Re: Monthly Report Summary #9 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 **June 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 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 June 1, 13, 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 June 2018 provided a compliance summary and included: a description of construction activities from June 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 June 2018 reporting period, several minor compliance incidents occurred, as detailed below:

- June 1, 2018: While an SCE crew was wrecking out wire from the tower span between Constructs 110 and 106, the conductor slipped through the bolt on the dead end shoe. This resulted in the TSP to be weighed down and slowly bent the TSP. The TSP was approximately 20 feet outside of the disturbance limits and resulted in approximately 3 feet of disturbed vegetation. There were no injuries and no impacts to resources. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-1: Limits of Construction Activities, which requires work to be restricted to approved areas.
- June 8, 2018: A kV Structures cement truck impacted a coast live oak tree and broke a branch on Segment 4 near Construct 112. The incident occurred within an active Costa's hummingbird nest buffer. An arborist and an avian biologist inspected the tree and nest, respectively. Environmentally sensitive area (ESA) signs were in place. This incident conflicts with MM BIO-4: Limit Removal of Native Plants, Trees, and Vegetation Communities, and MM BIO-10: Prepare and Implement a Nesting Bird Management Plan.
- June 27, 2018: A Henkels and McCoy (H&M) bucket truck was parked within an ESA buffer for an active house finch nest on Segment 3B near Construct 67. The truck was parked 15 feet west of the nest and the operator was not near the truck. The truck was moved about an hour after the biologist's first observation. The house finch nest was not noticeably impacted by the incident. 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 SBCRP area. Biological monitors have reported observations of project and non-project coast live oak trimming or broken branches. A non-project wooden pole that contained an acorn woodpecker nest was removed by non-project crews. A house finch nest was documented on a Summit fuel truck that was parked at the Teen Challenge Yard and SBCRP biologists installed ESA signs around the parked vehicle. The vehicle was moved by a crew working on the West of Carpinteria project and resulted in "take" of the active nest. One minor leak of hydraulic fluid was self-reported by SCE. The leak was dealt with in a timely manner.

## **Public Concerns**

SCE continued discussions with landowners in the vicinity of project components. The May 2018 monthly report documented a landowner concern about damage to the roads near her property, as well as aviation safety. SCE repaired the road near Constructs 66 and 67 and continued to respond to the landowner concerns about tower height.

SCE was contacted by the landowner near Construct 99. The landowner expressed concerns about the public accessing their property on the newly upgraded access road and potentially falling off the new Hilfiker wall that SCE was installing. SCE and the landowner have been discussing the installation of a fence and gate at the access road entrance off Highway 150.

SCE was contacted by the office of Das Williams, 1st District Supervisor, on behalf of a landowner. The landowner's concerns included compromising property value, no notification, viewshed impacts, large

industrial structures, and he threatened litigation. SCE followed up with the landowner and discussions are ongoing.

### **Minor Approvals**

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

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

June 1, 13, and 27, 2018



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	June 1, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS022
<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>	Clear, sunny, warm, and calm
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700to 1130
<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 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. Matt Schaap (BRC) was the lead biological monitor on the day of my site visit. BRC biological monitor Peter Gaede also attended the tailboard meeting. It was the first day the crews had access to the Vedder property, so construction personnel went over specific landowner requests.

Peter Gaede was going to the Vedder property to sweep for California red-legged frogs and to look for nesting birds (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4). Nesting birds are a significant compliance issue, as there are nearly 140 active nests at the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) site, with nine new nests found the previous day. Rincon biological monitors Mike Moss and Paulette Loubet were stationed at various construction locations.

The first stop was Construct 72 where a crew was working to install a Hilfiker wall (Photos 1 and 2). This was a difficult location because it had a steep and narrow access road and no parking. At the site, I observed the crews using two excavators to build the wall. Construction water was provided by a tank and a small gas-powered pump; the pump was well contained (Photo 3).

No construction activities were taking place at Construct 71 since there were a number of nests in this area. BRC avian biological monitor Brody Olson was monitoring the status of the various nests, which included a house wren, house finch, oak titmouse, black phoebe and an ash-throated flycatcher (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10). Brody Olson thought the house wrens had fledged, but planned to observe them longer before removing the nest from the list.

We stopped at Highway 150 Yard where extensive amounts of construction equipment and materials were located (Photos 4 and 5). A crew was loading a large drill rig to be taken into the Vedder property. The silt fencing was in good condition.

At Construct 98, the tubular steel pole (TSP) foundation was scheduled to be poured on the morning of my site visit, but the crew was having some difficulty with equipment and the work was delayed (Photo 6). The access road to Construct 98 is directly across Highway 150 from Highway 150 Yard, and traffic control personnel were in place along Highway 150 (Photo 7). Rincon biological monitor Emily Chase was onsite; she planned to spot-check the work at Construct 67. The access road was very dusty and I spoke with the monitors and construction personnel about conducting dust control before the concrete trucks arrived (APM AQ-1). I noted a dead adult alligator lizard that had been run over on the access road. The robin nest in an avocado tree immediately next to the access road entrance had failed. It was difficult to determine why the nest failed, as both landowner activity and project construction occurred in this area.

I rode with BRC biological monitor Matt Schaap to Construct 60 where the Henkels & McCoy (H&M) survey crew wanted to verify the accuracy of the 500-foot buffer around the red-tailed hawk nest in an existing tower. The red-tailed hawk chicks could be seen in the nest, but were assumed to be close to fledging. The survey results determined that the buffer stakes were farther than 500 feet from the nest, so we restaked the construction boundary. The H&M crew was anticipating they could pull wire a few days after my site visit. Looking west from Construct 60, I could see Constructs 62, 63, and 64 going up eastern side of Rincon Mountain (Photo 8).

**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
6/1/18	SBCRP – Construct 72		Photo 1 – Construction of the Hilfiker wall. Photo facing southeast.
6/1/18	SBCRP – Construct 72		Photo 2 – Construction of the Hilfiker wall. Photo facing west.
6/1/18	SBCRP – Construct 72		Photo 3 – Water delivery system with a tank and pump.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/1/18	SBCRP – Highway 150 Yard		Photo 4 – Drill rig being loaded for transport to the Vedder property.
6/1/18	SBCRP – Highway 150 Yard		Photo 5 – Stockpiled Hilfiker wall materials at Highway 150 Yard.
6/1/18	SBCRP – Construct 98		Photo 6 – Equipment at the Construct 98 crane pad.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/1/18	SBCRP – Construct 98	 An aerial photograph showing a valley with a winding road. The foreground shows a dark, rocky slope. The road curves through a valley with green vegetation. In the background, there are hills and a clear blue sky.	Photo 7 – Looking back toward Highway 150 Yard from Construct 98. Photo facing east.
6/1/18	SBCRP – Construct 60	 A photograph of a person wearing a white hard hat, a plaid shirt, and a yellow safety vest. The person is standing next to a white pickup truck on a dirt road. In the background, there are hills with a dirt path and some vegetation.	Photo 8 – BRC lead biological monitor Matt Schaap. Photo looking west toward the eastern side of Rincon Mountain and Constructs 62, 63, and 64.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	June 13, 2138
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS023
<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>	Thick marine layer in the morning, then clear with mild temperatures and no wind
<b>E &amp; E CM:</b>	Jenny Vick	<b>Start/End Time:</b>	0700 to 1100
<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, Segment 4

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

I arrived onsite for the 0700 tailboard meeting at Carpinteria Yard B. James Rasico (Rincon) was the lead biological monitor on the day of my site visit and he gave a brief account of environmental concerns at the Santa Barbara County Reliability Project (SBCRP) site. Rincon environmental project manager John Hindley arrived shortly after the tailboard meeting and we briefly discussed the SBCRP status. Most of the work was taking place on the Vedder property, where a concrete foundation pour at Construct 119 was scheduled for the morning of my site visit. Other work included ongoing Hilfiker wall construction at Constructs 67 and 72.

Since access was an issue, I rode with Rincon lead biological monitor James Rasico to Construct 119 before the concrete trucks arrived. This was my first site visit to the Vedder property. On the way in, we noted water trucks conducting dust control (APM AQ-1) and a crew coordinating traffic. Parking was very limited, so we stopped at Construct 116 and walked to Construct 119, which was at the end of the access road. The access road crosses a number of steep drainages (Photo 1) that James Rasico said will be "upgraded" after most of the tubular steel pole (TSP) installation work is completed. This could include culverts, riprap, and McCarthy drain installation. Photo 2 is looking northwest toward Construct 119 where the vehicles were located. Behind the vehicles and across the canyon is Construct 120, which is another tower location at the end of an access road. At Construct 119, the hole had been drilled, the rebar was installed, and the concrete forms were in place (Photo 3). Barrett Holland (BRC) was the biological monitor onsite, and he had cleared the area and would be monitoring construction activities between Constructs 116 and 119 throughout the day (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4). The first concrete truck arrived at 0845, with seven additional concrete trucks scheduled to follow (Photo 4).

At Construct 118, some site preparation had been completed, including cutting back the slope north of the TSP site. Some foundation equipment had been staged at this location (Photo 5), but no drilling work had been conducted, yet.

At Construct 117, some site preparation had been conducted, but no drilling work had been done. Crews in concrete trucks were waiting at this location to head to Construct 119.

A crew with a small excavator was working at Construct 116 and preparing the site for the TSP installation (Photo 6). A drill rig was parked at Construct 115 (Photo 7).

The Construct 114 location had the pole foundation poured. Because this location provided more space, a number of vehicles were parked there; it is also documented as a helicopter landing area (Photos 8 and 11).

Along the Construct 112 access road, a crew was trimming some oak tree branches, with Rincon arborist and biological monitor Yuling Huo monitoring the work (Photo 9). A hummingbird nest was located in a low-hanging branch along the access road; this branch's height allowed vehicles to pass under it, but any tree trimming would have to wait until the two chicks fledged (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10). The chicks appeared to be close to fledging, and they did not seem disturbed by our presence on the access road. At the Construct 112 site, earthwork was being conducted by a crew using a large excavator; a water truck was standing by (Photo 10). BRC biological monitor Asher Dietch was overseeing this construction activity. Photo 11 is looking back toward Construct 114.

We drove by locations for Constructs 111 to 107. At Construct 110, a crew was removing an old metal pole (Photo 12). Photo 13 shows the Construct 108 location, but no work has been done at this location.

**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
6/13/18	SBCRP – Vedder Property Access Road		Photo 1 – A drainage coming down onto the access road located between Constructs 116 and 119.
6/13/18	SBCRP – Construct 119		Photo 2 – Looking northwest toward Construct 119 (where the vehicles are) and 120 in the distance.
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 119		Photo 3 – Foundation set to pour.





**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 119		Photo 4 – Concrete truck arrives at Construct 119 to pour the pole foundation. Photo facing west
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 118		Photo 5 – Stockpiled equipment at Construct 118.
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 116		Photo 6 – Small excavator digging out the pad at Construct 116. Photo facing northwest.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 115		Photo 7 – Drill rig sitting at the Construct 115 site. Photo facing northwest.
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 114		Photo 8 – Equipment staged at Construct 114, which has already been poured. Photo facing west.
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 112		Photo 9 – Tree trimming along the Construct 112 access road. Photo facing east.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 112		Photo 10 – Earthwork at the Construct 112 site. Photo facing east.
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 114		Photo 11 – Looking back at the Construct 114 site, which is an approved helicopter landing area. Photo facing northwest.
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 110		Photo 12 – TSP foundation has been poured; equipment is being used to remove an old metal pole.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/13/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 108		Photo 13 – Old lattice-work towers at the Construct 108 site.



## Santa Barbara County Reliability Project CPUC Site Inspection Form

<b>Project:</b>	Santa Barbara County Reliability Project	<b>Date:</b>	June 27, 2018
<b>Project Proponent:</b>	Southern California Edison	<b>Report #:</b>	VS024
<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, cool, 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 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 and met with the Rincon lead biological monitor James Rasico. Other environmental staff at the meeting included biological monitors Paulette Loubet (Rincon) and Barrett Holland (BRC) and the Rincon Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) inspector Caitlyn Teague (APM BIO-3, APM BIO-4). Caitlyn Teague was conducting her weekly SWPPP inspection. James Rasico informed the assembled construction personnel that dust control has been approved through the nesting bird buffer zones, but the water should only be sprayed onto the road.

Rincon lead biological monitor James Rasico said they had installed tubular steel poles (TSPs) 119, 118, and 117 on the Vedder property and were pouring the foundation for Construct 107 on the day of my site visit (Photo 1). We drove to Construct 107 where the crews had set up the forms and were waiting for concrete trucks (Photo 2). The pour was expected to take a while to complete, as it was a large (7 feet in diameter) and deep hole. BRC biological monitor Dave Wappler was stationed at this location and would be overseeing the concrete pour and other work in this area.

We drove past Construct 108 (Photo 3), and Construct 109 (Photo 4); tower segments were scheduled to be delivered to these sites. Along the access road to Construct 112, we looked at the hummingbird nest where two chicks had recently fledged (Photo 5). At Construct 112, the foundation had been poured and TSP segments had been dropped off (Photo 6). We saw a water truck, and the driver asked Rincon lead biological monitor James Rasico about the rules regarding dust control through nesting bird buffers. James Rasico gave him the latest information and told him that the hummingbird chicks at Construct 112 had fledged (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-10).

We drove to Segment 3B and the Construct 76 site where crews were working on installing a Hilfiker wall along the tower access road (Photo 7). Both a paleontological monitor and Native American monitor were spot-checking this location. The access road to this site joins Highway 150, so a traffic control team was in place. Trucks have been getting stuck on this access road, and there have been issues with soil being tracked onto Highway 150; therefore, crews were bringing in rock to stabilize the access road (Photo 8). The rock will reduce the need for dust control and, subsequently, will reduce mud tracked onto Highway 150.

At Construct 99, a new crew was mobilizing for work on the access road; the crew was bringing materials to the site (Photo 9). Rincon biological monitor Paulette Loubet was onsite and she had talked with the crew about the environmental conditions, emphasizing dust control and drip pans (APM AQ-1). This crew will be driving sheet pile to stabilize the steep slopes above the access road (Photo 10).

Crews were working their way back through the various segments to install culverts and McCarthy drains. We stopped at a newly installed culvert called Civil ID #69, which is located along the access road to Constructs 90 and 91 (Photos 11 and 12). The crew dug out the drainage crossing, leaving the culvert intake apron approximately 3 to 4 feet below the level of the existing drainage. This may create an erosion problem, as rainwater runoff will begin head-cutting back up the drainage.

Further up the road, we encountered the McCarthy drain crew and they were anchoring in a new drain (Photo 13). All looked good at this location.

**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. Review of the final design for culvert installation to better understand drainage pattern.

**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
6/27/18	SBCRP – Vedder Property Access Road		Photo 1 – Setting up for a foundation pour at Construct 107. Photo facing south.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Construct 107		Photo 2 – Rebar cage installed and concrete forms in place.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 108		Photo 3 – Tower foundation poured at TSP 108. Photo facing southwest.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 109		Photo 4 – Concrete foundation has been poured. Photo facing south.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property Access Road to Construct 112		Photo 5 – Old hummingbird nest.

**REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 4, Vedder Property, Construct 112		Photo 6 – The foundation has been poured and TSPs are stockpiled onsite.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, Access Road to Construct 76		Photo 7 – Installation of a Hilfiker wall along the access road. Photo facing east.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Segment 3B, Construct 76 Access Road		Photo 8 – Rock being spread out along the access road.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/27/18	SBCRP – Construct 99		Photo 9 – A new crew is mobilizing at this site. Photo facing west.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Construct 99		Photo 10 – Access road where sheet pile will be driven. Photo facing west.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Civil ID #69 along Access Road to Construct 90		Photo 11 – Culvert intake apron installed approximately 3 feet below the drainage.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
Date	Location	Photo	Description
6/27/18	SBCRP – Civil ID #69 along Access Road to Construct 90		Photo 12 – Downstream portion of the newly installed culvert.
6/27/18	SBCRP – Access Road to Constructs 90 and 91		Photo 13 – McCarthy drain installation along the access road. Photo facing southwest.