July 20, 2026

Clayton Eversen
LS Power Grid California, LLC
Via email: CEversen@lspower.com

Re: CPUC Approval of LSPGC Minor Project Refinement 3 for the Manning 500/230 kV Substation Project

Mr. Eversen,

On July 10, 2026, LS Power Grid California, LLC (LSPGC) requested California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approval of LSPGC's Minor Project Refinement 3 (MPR-3) for the Manning 500/230 kV Substation Project (Project). The request was revised and resubmitted on July 17, 2026. Pursuant to CPUC Decision 25-09-013, the CPUC Energy Division may approve requests by LSPGC for minor project refinements if the refinements are located within the geographic boundary of the study area of the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) adopted for the Project and do not: (1) result, without mitigation, in a new significant impact based on the criteria used in the Final IS/MND; (2) substantively conflict with any mitigation measure or applicable law or policy; or (3) trigger an additional discretionary permit requirement.

In the MPR-3 request (see Attachment 1), LSPGC proposes the following refinements, resulting in an increase in overall temporary and permanent ground disturbance by approximately 1.1 acres compared to the Final IS/MND design:

- Shifting the 230 kV transmission line alignment north by approximately 60 feet along the eastern portion of the route, including associated changes to the locations of work areas and permanent access roads;
- Adjusting the structure design from six-pole dead-end structures to two-pole dead-end structures at structures 1/3, 5/1, and 7/1, and from a monopole dead-end structure to a two-pole dead-end structure at structure 1/1;
- Relocating temporary access roads to travel within the transmission line right-of-way, and in turn removing certain permanent access roads; and
- Removing two guard structure work areas within the Interstate 5 (I-5) median and refining the guard structure access route options for the I-5 crossing to use existing roads and the I-5 right-of-way.

These refinements would have the potential to impact Aesthetics, Agriculture, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise and Vibration, Transportation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire. However, these impacts would be consistent with those analyzed in the Final IS/MND, and would be sufficiently addressed by existing measures in the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program (MMCRP) adopted for the Project. The impacts would not result in a new significant impact based on the criteria used in the Final IS/MND, substantively conflict with any mitigation measure or applicable law or policy, or trigger any new discretionary permit requirement.

Therefore, I approve LSPGC's requested MPR-3, provided that these activities are carried out in accordance with the applicable methods and measures set forth in the Final IS/MND and MMCRP.

Please feel free to contact me at tommy.alexander@cpuc.ca.gov with any questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Thank you,

Tommy Alexander, Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission

Attachment:

1. Manning 500/230 kV Substation Project LSPGC MPR-3 Request

Attachment 1

Manning 500/230 kV Substation Project LSPGC MPR-3 Request

MANNING 500/230 KV SUBSTATION PROJECT

CPUC MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT FORM

Minor project refinements *are strictly limited to changes that will not trigger an additional permit requirement, do not substantially increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact, create a new significant impact, would clearly and strictly comply with the intent of the IS/MND mitigation measures, and that don't conflict with any applicable law or policy.*

Date Requested: 7/17/2026

Report No.: 3

Date Approved: 7/20/2026

Approval Agency: California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

Property Owner(s): LS Power Grid California, LLC (LSPGC)

Location/Milepost: 230 Kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line

Land Use/Vegetative Cover: Mapped in Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) primarily as agricultural, disturbed, and developed lands.

Sensitive Resources: Seasonal stream channel.

Modification From:

☐ **Permit** ☐ **Plan/Procedure** ☐ **Specification** ☒ **Drawing**

☐ **Mitigation Measure** ☐ **Other:**

Proposed Action(s):

LSPGC requests a slight northern shift of the 230 kV Transmission Line (TL) alignment compared to the TL alignment design in the Final IS/MND for the Manning 500/230 kV Substation Project (Project). The TL alignment will shift north by approximately 60 feet along the eastern portion of the TL alignment compared to the Final IS/MND design. The TL shift will result in minor shifts and changes to workspaces along the entire TL alignment. Minor shifts in the locations of permanent access roads will also occur.

Additionally, LSPGC requests two-pole dead-end structures at structures 1/3, 5/1, and 7/1 rather than the six-pole dead-end structures in the Final IS/MND design. LSPGC requests a two-pole dead-end structure at structure 1/1 rather than a monopole dead-end structure in the Final IS/MND design. LSPGC also requests temporary access roads that primarily travel within the TL right-of-way (ROW), giving flexibility for access during construction, and the removal of certain permanent access roads.

Lastly, LSPGC is requesting refinements to the guard structure work areas and three route options to access guard structures located on Interstate (I-) 5. LSPGC requests the elimination of the two guard structure work areas located in the median of I-5. The first requested route option would be to access the guard structure work areas directly from I-5 by pulling onto the shoulder of I-5 to access the guard structure work areas. This option will also require approval from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The second option involves the use of existing access roads located south of the TL alignment and a short segment of overland travel to access the guard structure work areas. The existing access roads that would be utilized in the second option are outside of the Project's survey area. However, the roads are existing, and no road improvements or ground-disturbing activities will be conducted. A brief section of overland travel would be required to reach the guard structure work areas, and the area of overland travel is located within the Project's survey area. The overland travel would not occur within the nearby stream channel and would primarily extend from the existing access roads into the Caltran's ROW. The third access option would be using a combination of existing routes approved in the Final IS/MND or requested temporary access within the TL ROW, a short segment of an existing road located west of and parallel to I-5, and a short segment of overland travel to access the guard structure work areas. The existing road located west of and parallel to I-5 has a low water crossing, and Project travel on the existing road would only occur when water is not present. In accordance with the Caltrans encroachment permit for the aerial crossing of I-5, and under Caltrans guidance, a short stint of the ROW fences on each side of the highway would be temporarily opened/removed for access to the guard structure areas. Once the aerial crossing is complete, and the guard structures are removed, the fencing would be returned to pre-construction conditions as required by Caltrans.

The requested refinements will result in an increase in overall temporary and permanent ground disturbance by approximately 1.1 acres compared to the Final IS/MND design.

Describe how project refinement deviates from current project. Include photos:

Original Condition: The current site conditions of the requested refinements consist of agricultural, disturbed, and developed lands. In the Final IS/MND, the refinement areas were analyzed for the LSPGC 230 kV transmission line, work areas, pulling sites, transmission structures, permanent access roads, temporary access roads, and the use of existing access roads.

Justification for Change: Discussions with nearby solar developers and ongoing discussions with landowners led to the requested TL alignment shift. The shift will locate the LSPGC ROW closer to the Pacific Gas and Electric Company ROW. Further engineering of the TL led to changes in structure types at some locations. Discussions with the contractor led to refinements to guard structure work areas, refinements to permanent access roads, requests for driving through the ROW, and requests for access options to the guard structure work areas.

Maps & Figures: The current site conditions are depicted in Attachment A: Photographs. Attachment B: Project Change Map depicts the following requested refinements:

- Minor shifts of structure work area locations;
- Minor shifts in the locations of pulling sites;
- Structure design changes from six-pole dead-end structures to two-pole dead-end structures at structures 1/3, 5/1, and 7/1;
- Structure design change from a dead-end monopole to a two-pole dead-end structure at structure 1/1;
- Relocation of temporary access roads to travel within the 230 kV TL ROW;

- Removal of certain permanent access roads and minor shifts in the locations of other permanent access roads;
- Removal of two guard structure work areas; and
- Potential routes for accessing the guard structure work areas using existing roads and the I-5 ROW.

Environmental Impact: The requested refinements will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impact based on the criteria used in the Final IS/MND.

Concurrence (if appropriate):

Resources:

Biological	☒	No Resources Present	☐	Resources Present	☐	N/A, Change would not affect resources

Previous Biological Survey Report Reference:
Insignia Environmental. 2024. Biological Resources Technical Report.
Insignia Environmental. 2025. Biological Resources Technical Report Addendum.

Cultural	☒	No Resources Present	☐	Resources Present	☐	N/A, changes would not affect resources

Previous Cultural Survey Report Reference:
Chronicle Heritage. 2024. Cultural Resource Assessment for the Manning 500/230 kV Substation Project, Fresno County, California.
Chronicle Heritage. 2025. Cultural Resources Technical Report Addendum. Manning 500/230 Kilovolt Substation Project.
ASM Affiliates. 2026. Cultural Resources Supplemental Survey and Addendum Report for the LSPGC Manning 500/230 kV Substation, Fresno County, California.
ASM Affiliates conducted an archaeological survey on June 24, 2026 of the I-5 corridor within the Project area. Findings were negative. An addendum report was submitted to the CPUC on July 8, 2026.

Paleontological	☒	No Resources Present	☐	Resources Present	☐	N/A, Change would not affect resources

Previous Paleontological Survey Report Reference:
Chronicle Heritage. 2024. Cultural Resource Assessment for the Manning 500/230 kV Substation Project, Fresno County, California.
Chronicle Heritage. 2025. Cultural Resources Technical Report Addendum. Manning 500/230 Kilovolt Substation Project.

Disturbance Acreage Changes: ☒ Yes ☐ No

The following table includes environmental analysis representative of the CEQA Appendix G Checklist Sections addressed in the Final IS/MND as it relates to MPR-3. MPR-3 would have no potential to impact the following environmental resource areas and therefore are not included in the table below: Forestry Resources, Energy, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, and Recreation.

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
Aesthetics	☒ Y ☐ N	No designated scenic vistas or state scenic highways are located within the vicinity of the Project analyzed in the Final IS/MND or requested refinements. Viewers of the requested refinements will be the same as those analyzed in the Final IS/MND: motorists, workers, and few residents. The requested change from a six-pole dead-end structure to a two-pole dead-end structure at structures 1/3, 5/1, and 7/1 will reduce the overall structure footprints and eliminate the need for guy wires at those structures. The requested changed from a monopole dead-end structure to a two-pole dead-end structure at structure 1/1 will result in a negligible change in visual impact as the two poles will be located in close proximity to each other. The requested changes in temporary and permanent access roads will not constitute an appreciable change in visual impacts from construction analyzed in the Final IS/MND. Vehicles and equipment will continue to primarily travel in close proximity to the temporary and permanent access roads included in the Final IS/MND design. To access the guard structure work areas, vehicles may travel on the existing roads located south of the TL or on the existing road with the low water crossing (if no water is present) depicted on page 24 of Attachment B: Project Change Map. Such travel will only occur for a few days during installation of guard structures and during stringing activities. The other option to access the guard structure work areas is directly from I-5 (if approved by Caltrans). The guard structure work area access options will create minimal visual impact due to the short duration of guard structure construction activities and because existing roads would be primarily used. The requested minor TL ROW shift and associated shift in structure work areas will not appreciably change visual impacts from construction or operations and maintenance (O&M) of the Project analyzed in the Final IS/MND as the requested work area shifts are minor and the TL is within approximately 60 feet of the TL analyzed in the Final IS/MND. As a result, Minor Project Refinement (MPR) #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to aesthetics as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
Agriculture Resources	☒ Y ☐ N	The requested refinements will increase temporary impacts to designated farmland by approximately 1.8 acres and decrease permanent impacts by approximately 0.4 acre compared to the Final IS/MND design. Topsoil will be salvaged from the refined work areas, and impacted farmland will be restored following the completion of construction. As described in the Final IS/MND, the County of Fresno's agricultural zoning permits electrical transmission infrastructure. Therefore, requested refinements will not conflict with zoning. As a result, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to agriculture as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.
Air Quality	☒ Y ☐ N	Construction activities associated with the requested refinements will be consistent with those discussed in the Final IS/MND. The minor shifts in work areas and access roads will not require equipment or operational hours beyond what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. Access to the guard structure work areas was not mapped in the Final IS/MND. However, the option to use the existing roads located south of the TL or segment of existing road with the low water crossing (if no water is present) as depicted on page 24 of Attachment B: Project Change Map and the option to access the guard structure locations directly from I-5 would not result in additional emissions because the number of vehicles and operating hours would not increase beyond what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The overall temporary and permanent disturbance from the Project will increase by approximately 1.1 acres due to the requested refinements. The increase in disturbance will result in a nominal increase in fugitive dust emissions compared to what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The construction crews will implement air quality best management practices (BMPs) for the requested refinements in accordance with the requirements of Mitigation Measure (MM) AQ-1 and Applicant-Proposed Measure (APM) AIR-2. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to air quality as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	Revisions to the Dust Control Plan will be submitted to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for approval. No specific agency consultation is required.

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
Biological Resources	☒ Y ☐ N	The requested refinement areas were surveyed for sensitive vegetation communities, special-status plant and wildlife species, and jurisdictional wetlands and other waters during initial Project surveys on October 17 and 18, from November 6 to 8, and on November 13 in 2023, as well as from March 24 through 27 in 2025. The potential access route to the guard structure work areas using existing roads located south of the TL and depicted on page 24 of Attachment B: Project Change Map was not fully covered by previous survey efforts. However, most of the route consists of existing roads and the short segment of overland travel to reach the guard structure work areas from the existing road will occur on developed land adjacent to I-5. Another access option for the guard structure work areas is to use the existing road located parallel to and west of I-5 with the low water crossing of a stream channel. Access using the existing road with the low water crossing would only occur when water is not present and the stream channel is dry. No overland travel would occur in the stream channel. Work within the requested refinement areas will be conducted near waters of the state and/or waters of the U.S., which is consistent with the analysis in the Final IS/MND Of the requested refinement areas that fall within the Final IS/MND habitat assessment survey area, approximately 86 percent of the requested refinement areas were mapped as agricultural, developed, and disturbed land in the Final IS/MND. The remaining refinement areas that fall within the Final IS/MND habitat assessment survey area consist of the following vegetation communities: *Amsinkia* (*menziesii*, *tessellate*) *Phacelia* spp. Hebaceous Alliance, *Brassica nigra* – *Centaurea* (*solstitialis*, *melitensis*) Herbaceous Semi-Natural Alliance, and *Bromus rubens* – *Schismus* (*arabicus*, *barbatus*) Herbaceous Semi-Natural Alliance. Overall, the requested refinements will result in a net increase of approximately 1.6 acres of temporary ground disturbance impacts and net decrease of approximately 0.4 acre of permanent ground disturbance impacts. Of the requested refinement areas that fall within the Final IS/MND biological resources survey area, no sensitive vegetation communities are present. Additionally, no special-status species or United States (U.S.) Fish and Wildlife Service-designated critical habitat occur within the requested refinement areas that fall within the Final IS/MND biological resources survey area.

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
		All applicable BIO MMs and APMs defined in the Project's Mitigation, Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program (MMCRP), as well as all other permit and plan conditions, will be implemented as applicable to minimize or mitigate for any additional impacts resulting from the use of the requested refinement areas. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to biological resources as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required as no sensitive resources are in the requested refinement areas.
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources	☒ Y ☐ N	A records search was conducted on August 28, 2023 and November 13, 2023 through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center within a 0.5-mile search radius around the linear TL components, which includes the requested refinement areas. No records of cultural or tribal resources were identified in the refinement areas. In addition, intensive pedestrian surveys that included the requested refinement areas were conducted by Chronicle Heritage and ASM Affiliates, Inc. between November 6 and November 28, 2023; from March 24 to April 1, 2025; on April 22 and 23, 2026; and on June 24, 2026. No new cultural or tribal cultural resources were identified during the pedestrian surveys. All applicable MMs and APMs identified in the MMCRP will be implemented. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to cultural or tribal cultural resources as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required as no sensitive resources are in the refinement areas.
Geology and Soils	☒ Y ☐ N	The same geological conditions and hazards present throughout the Project alignment will be encountered within the requested refinement areas. No new permanent structures are requested as part of these refinements, and geologic hazards to the refinements will be similar to those encountered throughout the Project. MRP #3 will require more temporary ground disturbance, loosening topsoil and increasing erosion potential. However, BMPs will be implemented for all activities associated with the refinement areas in accordance with the requirements of APM GEO-1. Implementation of BMPs will reduce erosion and loss of topsoil. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
		severity of a previously analyzed impact to geology and soils as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒ Y ☐ N	As previously discussed for air quality, the requested refinements will not result in equipment or operational hours beyond what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. Access to the guard structure work areas was not mapped in the Final IS/MND, but the number of vehicles and operating hours would not increase beyond what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The Final IS/MND found that impacts associated with the Project's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will be less than significant based on statewide emission-reduction goals of the 2022 Scoping Plan. The refinements remain consistent with the emission reduction goals of the 2022 Scoping Plan. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to GHG emissions as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☒ Y ☐ N	The requested refinements will have the same level of impact on hazards and hazardous materials as analyzed in the Final IS/MND. Construction and O&M of the requested refinements will not require hazardous materials beyond what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The Project alignment and a 1-mile radius of the Project was screened for nearby hazardous sites, which included the majority of the requested refinement areas. No hazardous materials sites were identified. Review of the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database and the Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database did not identify any open or closed hazardous sites within or in the vicinity of the potential access routes to the guard structure work areas depicted on page 24 of Attachment B: Project Change Map. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously analyzed impacts on hazards and hazardous materials.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.
	☒ Y	

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ N	The potential access route to the guard structure work areas using existing roads located south of the TL and depicted on page 24 of Attachment B: Project Change Map was not fully covered by previous survey efforts. However, most of the potential route consists of existing roads and the short segment of overland travel to reach the guard structure work areas from the existing road will occur on developed land adjacent to I-5. Another access option for the guard structure work areas is to use the existing road located parallel to and west of I-5 with the low water crossing. Access using the existing road with the low water crossing would only occur when water is not present. Because the crossing is existing, and all travel will use the crossing, this access option will not alter drainage patterns. The proposed refinements would increase the amount of temporary ground disturbance during construction. Construction activities, in general, loosen topsoil and create potential for erosion and siltation, adversely impacting water quality. However, the Project Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be updated with the proposed refinement areas once MPR #3 is approved, and appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during construction activities within the refinement areas. BMPs are designed to prevent soil erosion and siltation of surface waters, as well as other water quality impacts. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to hydrology and water quality as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	A Change of Information for the Project's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be submitted to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board for approval. No specific agency consultation is required.
Noise and Vibration	☒ Y ☐ N	Construction-related noise and vibration will be generated within the requested refinement areas due to equipment mobilization, clearing of access roads, structure assembly, structure installation, site preparation, grading and paving, and foundation excavation and installation. A residence is located at the corner of Manning Avenue and South Hudson Avenue, where vehicles will turn from Manning Avenue onto South Hudson Avenue to follow the access route to the guard structure work areas. Noise from vehicles traveling on Manning Avenue is anticipated to be brief as the vehicles will turn onto South Hudson Avenue. The other requested refinement areas are not located within 100 feet of any sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptor to the 230 kV TL is located

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
		approximately 200 feet north of the refinement areas, which is approximately 10 feet farther north than what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. Use of the refinement areas may result in temporary increases in noise and vibration levels; however, the construction activities will be consistent with those presented in the Final IS/MND and will be short-term and temporary. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to noise and vibration as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N ☐ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.
Transportation	☒ Y ☐ N	The requested refinements will not result in an increase in vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) compared to the vehicle trips and VMT analyzed in the Final IS/MND. Neither the use of the access routes to the guard structure work areas depicted in Attachment B: Project Change Map nor the access via I-5 are anticipated to result in an increase in the overall Project vehicle trips and VMT because the number of vehicles and operational hours will not increase beyond what was analyzed in the Final IS/MND. While the guard structure access option using existing roads south of the TL is a longer access route than considered in the Final IS/MND, the total length of this option is approximately 5 miles, and this would be traveled only several times for the temporary duration of the guard structures. Therefore, the VMT from this specific access option would not be substantial. The other requested refinements will be accessed via the same network of existing roadways analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The requested refinements to temporary access roads will not affect transportation as the requested refinements to temporary access roads will primarily locate access within the TL ROW. As a result, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact to transportation as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☒ Y ☐ N	Approval from Caltrans is required to pull onto the shoulder of I-5 to access the guard structure work areas.
Utilities and Service Systems	☒ Y ☐ N	The requested refinements will be consistent with the utilities and service systems analysis in the Final IS/MND and will not require new or expanded public facilities or services. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in

CEQA Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why CEQA section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and avoidance/minimization measures to be taken.
		a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to utilities and service systems as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.
Wildfire	☒ Y ☐ N	A majority of the requested refinements are located in a low Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ), while the remaining requested refinements, located west of I-5, are located in a moderate FHSZ. Compared to the Final IS/MND, the requested refinements will not result in the construction of additional Project infrastructure in either FHSZ. The requested refinements will not introduce any structures or equipment that may increase the risk of wildfire ignition as analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The potential risk of wildfire ignition and spread will be managed in compliance with the Construction Fire Prevention Plan. Therefore, MPR #3 will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously analyzed impact to wildfire as identified in the Final IS/MND.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Y ☒ N	No agency consultation beyond submittal of the MPR to the CPUC is required.