

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



November 25, 2025

Ms. Lori Iles-Rangel
Senior Advisor, Major Projects Division – OU Projects
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

RE : Minor Project Modification #4 for the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project

Dear Ms. Iles-Rangel:

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) prepared a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for Southern California Edison's (SCE's) Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP; A. 15-04-013). The City of Riverside previously prepared and certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on February 5, 2013, approving components of the RTRP that would be owned and operated by the Riverside Public Utilities. On March 18, 2020, the CPUC issued a decision to certify the Final SEIR and grant SCE a Decision Granting a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) for the CPUC-preferred project alternative, Alternative 1 (Decision D.20-03-001). The CPUC adopted the mitigation measures (MMs) and applicant proposed measures, referred to as "environmental protection elements" (EPEs) identified in the EIR and SEIR as conditions of project approval, as well as a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to ensure compliance with the MMs and EPEs pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21081.6 and § 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines (Section 9 of the certified SEIR).

A detailed Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan (MMCRP) was developed for the project with direct participation with SCE staff. The MMCRP defines specific procedures that are part of the adopted program including the Minor Project Refinement (MPR) process, which requires SCE to obtain CPUC authorization for any deviations from the approved project.

On November 19, 2025, SCE submitted MPR #4 to the CPUC requesting authorization for work at structure M1-T3 to plumb the insulator assembly at the structure, which was not identified in the EIR or SEIR. A copy of the MPR request materials are enclosed as Attachment 1. The CPUC conducted a CEQA consistency review for MPR #4 following the procedures set forth in the MMCRP. A completed review form and summary of findings is provided in Attachment 2. This letter serves to inform you that the CPUC has reviewed and approved SCE's request for MPR #4 on the basis that no new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

Please direct any questions related to this MPR response letter to me at (408) 915-7434 or boris.sanchez@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "B Sanchez". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Boris Sanchez
California Public Utilities Commission

cc: Rita Wilke, Panorama Environmental

Attachment 1: SCE Request for MPR #4

Attachment 2: CPUC Review of MPR #4

Attachment 1: SCE Requests for MPR #4

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REQUEST FORM



Part A: Request Description

MPR Request

Request Number: 04
Date Requested: 11/19/2025
**Proposed Duration/
Timing of Use:** 12/01/2025 to 12/31/2028
M-F; 6:00 am - 6:00 pm
Location: Private industrial property, Jurupa Valley, CA
0.25 acres of work area required.
Attached Map? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Proposed Action(s)

Wilson Construction needs access to structure M1/T3 to plumb the insulator assembly at the structure.

Purpose(s)

Due to installation of the ESP pole, the adjacent structure (M1/T3) will require plumbing of the insulators to avoid tension pushing the insulators.

Part B: Existing Conditions

Existing Land Uses: Private industrial property
No mitigation considerations
Surrounding Land Uses: Private industrial property
No mitigation considerations
**Sensitive Receptors
within 500 feet:** N/A
No mitigation considerations
**Environmental Recourses
within 500 feet:** N/A
No mitigation considerations
**Has landowner approval
been granted?** ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Landowner: SCE Easement

Surveys

List any new survey reports under Part D and attach a copy.

Biological Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for biological resources with the potential to occur in the area? If so, were survey results positive or negative? Were surveys completed during the appropriate timing and season to detect resources?

N/A. Biological surveys were not conducted within the private industrial property because the area is a developed and disturbed site that does not provide suitable habitat for sensitive plant or wildlife species.

Cultural Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for cultural resources (records search and pedestrian survey)? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

N/A. Cultural resource surveys were not conducted within the private industrial property because the area has been previously graded, compacted, and disturbed by past construction activities.

Jurisdictional Waters. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for hydrologic resources? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

N/A. Hydrologic resource surveys were not performed within the private industrial property because the sites are previously disturbed, developed, and maintained industrial areas.

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REQUEST FORM

Part C: Permits, Agency Approvals, and Environmental Protection Measures

List any new permits or agency approvals under Part D and attach a copy.

Have all required permits, permit amendments/authorizations, or agency approvals been issued by resource agencies with applicable jurisdiction? Describe if necessary.

N/A

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with permit conditions or agency approvals? Describe if necessary.

N/A

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with environmental protection elements (EPEs) or mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)? Describe if necessary.

N/A

Part D: Attached Materials

List any attached materials (e.g. surveys, maps, photos, memos, agency authorizations, etc.) below. Materials should be attached to the end of this form.

See attached maps and photos of requested work area.

To complete this scope of work, Wilson will mobilize one bucket truck, one crane, and 2-3 crew trucks to the base of the structure. The work will take approximately 4 hours. The scheduled date of the work is currently unknown. All staging of equipment and material will be confined to the structure work area.



Location of M1-T3

Orange = access road
Red = structure work area



M1-T3, located in previously disturbed and occupied car lot

Attachment 2: CPUC Review of MPR #4

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM



Part A: Summary of Minor Project Refinement Request

MPR Request

Request Number: 004
Date Requested: November 19, 2025
**Proposed Duration/
Timing of Use:** December 1, 2025 to December 31, 2028
Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Location: Private Industrial Property, Jurupa Valley, CA
Approximately 0.25 acres of work area required
Attached Map? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Proposed Action(s)

Southern California Edison (SCE) proposes access to structure M1/T3 to conduct plumbing work on the insulator assembly at the structure.

Purpose(s)

To provide access to M1/T3 for plumbing of insulators to avoid tension pushing insulators due to the installation of the ESP pole.

Existing Conditions

Existing Land Uses: Private industrial property.
Surrounding Land Uses: Private industrial property.
**Sensitive Receptors
within 500 feet:** Within 500 feet of the proposed project change, there are no sensitive receptors.
**Environmental Resources
within 500 feet:** Within 500 feet of the proposed project change, there are no sensitive receptors.
**Has landowner approval
been granted?** ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Landowner: The proposed project change would occur at an existing easement owned by SCE.
Point of Contact
Lori Illes-Rangel
Senior Advisor, Major Projects Division
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

Surveys

Biological Resources.

No new surveys have been conducted for biological resources. However, proposed project change is located within existing developed areas currently associated with power utility activities. All ground surfaces consist of developed/landscaped surfaces adjacent to an active roadway and parking lot.

Cultural Resources.

No additional surveys have been completed. This Minor Project Refinement includes access to structure M1/T3 to conduct plumbing work on the insulator assembly at the structure. No ground disturbance (vegetation clearing, grading, etc.) is required for this request.

Jurisdictional Waters.

No jurisdictional waters are present within the footprint of the proposed work area. The site is a previously disturbed, developed, and maintained industrial area. No waters are present adjacent.

Permits, Agency Approvals, and Environmental Protection Measures

Have all required permits, permit amendments/authorizations, or agency approvals been issued by resource agencies with applicable jurisdiction? Describe if necessary.

No permits, amendments, authorizations, or approvals from state or federal resource agencies are necessary for the proposed change.

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with permit conditions or agency approvals? Describe if necessary.

No, the proposed change does not conflict with any permit conditions or agency approvals.

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with project applicant proposed measures or mitigation measures listed in Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)? Describe if necessary.

No, the proposed change does not conflict with any permit conditions or agency approvals.

Part B: EIR/SEIR Consistency Summary

CPUC has prepared the EIR/SEIR Consistency Summary below to review the consistency questions for each resource category. The consistency questions were developed using the CEQA Checklist provided in the EIR and SEIR. Refer to the certified EIR and SEIR for the details on the project impact evaluation.

Would the proposed action(s) result in a new impact, or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on:	No Change	Potentially Significant Change	N/A
Aesthetics (e.g., damage scenic resources or vistas, degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, or create sources of light or glare)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>EIR and SEIR evaluation: Significant and Unavoidable</i>			
Construction materials and equipment at the project site would be temporary and limited to the duration of construction, which would be approximately four hours. Public views of the yard would be partially blocked by surrounding buildings. Environmental Protection Elements (EPEs) and mitigation measures identified in the EIR and SEIR would reduce temporary impacts limiting work hours (MM NOI-1 and NOI-2) and requiring restoration of construction impacts to pre-construction conditions (MM AES-01). The proposed activities would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on aesthetics as identified in the EIR and SEIR.			

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

Would the proposed action(s) result in a new impact, or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on:	No Change	Potentially Significant Change	N/A
Agriculture and Forestry Resources (e.g., convert Farmland to nonagricultural use, or create a conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EIR and SEIR evaluation: Significant and Unavoidable</i>			
<p>The proposed plumbing activities would not convert agricultural land to non-agricultural use, or result in the loss of agricultural land. The proposed activities would have no effect on agriculture or forestry resources.</p>			
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (e.g. produce additional emissions, or expose sensitive receptors to additional pollutants, generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>			
<p>Construction activities have been analyzed in the EIR and SEIR. The proposed activities are similar to those previously analyzed. The proposed activities would result in generation of the same air quality emissions and odors analyzed for construction activities in the EIR and SEIR. The proposed activities would implement MM AQ-01 (Fugitive Dust Control Plan) which requires implementation of the Fugitive Dust Control Plan. Additionally, MM AQ-02 (Exhaust Emissions Control) provides control measures for exhaust emissions generated by the Project and would be implemented during actions associated with the proposed activity. All construction activities would comply with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) requirements applicable to the project (EPE AQ-01). The proposed activities would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on air quality.</p>			
Biological Resources (e.g., cause an adverse effect to sensitive or special-status species, or impact riparian, wetland, or any other sensitive habitat, or conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>			
<p>As described under Part A (Surveys), surveys have not been completed for the proposed activities at the proposed work site. The footprint of the work area is fully developed, and there is no potential for special-status species to occur at the site. The developed land surrounding the work area provides low quality habitat for nesting birds, given the lack of trees and shrubbery and work would be conducted outside of the nesting bird season. No ground disturbance would be required for the proposed activities.</p> <p>As a result of these factors, the proposed activities would not have an impact on biological resources.</p>			
Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources (e.g., cause adverse change to a historical, archeological, or tribal cultural resource, cause adverse change to a paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>			
<p>The proposed activities would take place within an existing transmission structure, which is fully developed and disturbed. In addition, ground disturbance would not occur, therefore the proposed activities would not have an impact on cultural, tribal cultural, and paleontological resources.</p>			
Geology and Soils (e.g., cause or expose people or structures to geologic or soil hazards, including erosion or loss of topsoil)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant</i>			
<p>The proposed activities at the M1/T3 are located in developed and disturbed areas, and the proposed use of the area (plumbing of insulators) would be similar to the EIR and SEIR analyses. Additionally, no</p>			

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

Would the proposed action(s) result in a new impact, or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on:	No Change	Potentially Significant Change	N/A
substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would occur, as ground disturbance would not occur. The proposed activities would not have an impact on geology and soils.			
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (e.g., create or increase the exposure of people or structures to hazardous materials or wildland fires, involve the use of additional hazardous materials or equipment, or interfere with an adopted emergency plan)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation</u>			
Proposed activities would require use and storage of the same types of equipment and hazardous materials that were analyzed in the EIR and SEIR. In addition, ground disturbance would not be required and the proposed areas do not contain known hazardous materials sites (Department of Toxic Substance Control, n.d.; Regional Water Quality Control Board, n.d.). Vehicles and equipment involved with the proposed actions would use hazardous materials (such as fuels and oils) that would be consistent with the types of materials analyzed in the EIR and SEIR. Potential hazards associated with the proposed activities would be addressed through implementation of EPE HAZ-01 (Health and Safety and Emergency Response Procedures), EPE HAZ-03 (Environmental Management Program), and EPE HAZ-04 (Worker Environmental Awareness Training) to ensure that hazardous materials stored or transported from the staging yards are properly handled to avoid a significant impact. The proposed activities would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on hazards and hazardous materials.			
Hydrology and Water Quality (e.g., degrade water quality, discharge waste or sediment, deplete groundwater, alter the existing drainage pattern, create additional runoff water or polluted runoff, place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area, or expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Final EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation</u>			
The existing sheet flow hydrology at the M1/T3 structure would remain unaltered because the proposed activities would not involve ground disturbance and the project is located within a developed industrial setting. Therefore, the proposed activities would not have an impact on hydrology and water quality.			
Land Use (e.g., conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, or conflict with a habitat conservation plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Final EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</u>			
The proposed activities would occur within a developed industrial area and would be consistent with the land use and ongoing activities of the site. The proposed activities would have no effect on land use or zoning designations, and would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on land use and planning.			
Noise (e.g., expose sensitive receptors to additional noise or vibration)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Final EIR and SEIR evaluation: Significant and Unavoidable</u>			
The proposed activities would not require ground disturbance and would not produce long term noise impacts. Noise sensitive receptors are not located within 500 feet of the proposed activity. Noise generated from plumbing work on the insulator assembly at the structure would not be unusual for the area, given the surrounding industrial land uses near a main roadway that likely have similar equipment operating. Noise from the proposed activities would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of noise impacts previously analyzed for the project.			

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

Would the proposed action(s) result in a new impact, or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on:	No Change	Potentially Significant Change	N/A
Population and Housing (e.g., induce substantial population growth in an area, or displace substantial numbers of people or housing)? <i>Final EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant</i> <p>The proposed activities would consist of access to structure M1/T3 to conduct plumbing work on the insulator assembly at the structure and would not result in population growth or the displacement of people or housing. The proposed activities would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on population and housing.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Recreation (e.g., increases the use of, or cause adverse effects to, parks or other recreational facilities)? <i>Final EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation</i> <p>The proposed activities would not be located adjacent to or within a park or recreational facility. The proposed activity would have no impact on recreation.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Transportation and Traffic (e.g., increase traffic congestion or degrade performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, or increase hazards due to a design feature)? <i>Final EIR and SEIR evaluation: Significant and Unavoidable</i> <p>The proposed activities would occur on private land and would not occur within public roads. No lane closures would be required as part of the proposed activities. The proposed activities would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on transportation and traffic.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utilities and Public Services (e.g., result in construction of new, or expansion of existing, water facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, require additional water entitlements, or creation of new solid waste disposal needs)? <i>Final EIR and SEIR evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation</i> <p>The proposed activities would not involve the construction of new, or expansion of existing, permanent water facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, and/or require water entitlements, or creation of new solid waste disposal needs. No power outages or other utility interruptions are anticipated as a result of the proposed activities. The proposed activities would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on utilities and public services.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>