## ZAYO'S PRINEVILLE TO RENO PROJECT

## **CPUC MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT FORM**

[with instructions]

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 based on criteria used in the SB156 Exemption Report, create a new significant impact, are located within the geographic boundary of the study area of the SB156 Exemption Report, and that do not conflict with any environmental measure or applicable law or policy.

Date Requested: 6 June 2025	Report No.: 19/RFI 512
Date Approved: 8/25/2025	Approval Agency: Caltrans, in addition to CPUC. Caltrans approval on 5/30/2025
Property Owner(s): Caltrans	Location/Milepost: MP L104 - L105
Land Use/Vegetative Cover: Ruderal (maintained highway shoulder near edge of pavement) with small wetlands and drainages.	Sensitive Resources: Cultural site determined significant outside of ADI only. Wetland at MP L104.3 avoided with HDD.

## **Modification From:**

shifts th	osed reroute is based on unanticipated cultural resource discovery. The re running line to a more disturbed portion of the cultural site boundary. Pendogical site testing, the proposed reroute is intended to avoid intact cultural
deposits	and will avoid requirement of additional mitigation requirements. Site testin permit approval from the BLM state office, as well as tribal review and appr

☐ Other

☐ Permit ☐ Plan/Procedure ☐ Specification ☐ Drawing ☐ Environmental Measure

Describe how Project refinement deviates from current Project. Include photos.

## What to include in this section:

- <u>Original Condition</u>: A concise description of the existing condition as it is originally described and approved (NTP, engineering specifications, Final EA/ISMND, etc.)—i.e., how did the applicant originally intend to build this/do this?
- <u>Justification for change</u>: A concise description of and justification for the change requested i.e., what happened to make the change necessary?
  - These descriptions should be detailed enough and include enough background so that a person unfamiliar with the Project should be able to follow the narrative about what the original plan was and why the new plan is needed instead
  - The description should be in layman's terms to the extent possible. Be as specific as possible.
     The more vague the language, the more conditions may need to be added to account for omissions. Avoid logic leaps
- Maps and Figures: The exact location(s)/Project component(s) the change will affect. Include dimensions, if applicable. A map and/or figure is usually extremely helpful. Make sure the map is at a readable scale. Ideally, the map should be based on the most current Project map and show other Project components, survey areas, underlying topography, etc.
- <u>Environmental Impact</u>: Demonstrate that the applicant has considered how this change will affect environmental/cultural resources. List EMs, plans, permits, etc. that were reviewed in order to ensure that this change will not result in significant impacts
  - o Include analyses demonstrating that projected impacts will not be significant (e.g., narrative justification, tables, figures, calculations, etc.). Base this analysis on what was previously analyzed in the NTP, SB156 Exemption Report, etc.
- <u>Concurrence (if appropriate)</u>: Demonstrate that the applicant has considered whether other agencies, municipalities, utilities, etc. would need to provide concurrence with this MPM. If so, either provide anticipated contact/approval schedule, or provide dates/contact reports/emails with approvals.

Dasauraas							
Resources:							
Biological	☐ No Resources Present	☐ Resources Present	■ N/A, Change would not affect resources				
Previous Biological Survey Report Reference:							
Stantec conducted botanical surveys from May to August of 2019 and April to August 2020, capturing bloom periods of all target species. Stantec biologists conducted a wildlife reconnaissance of the Action Area, including a visual inspection of lands adjacent to the Action Area, during September 2019. A round of pre-construction surveys in 2025 has been completed during resource flagging. Another will occur prior to construction in the subject area.							
Cultural	☐ No Resources Present	Resources Present	□ N/A, changes would not affect resources				
Previous Cultural Survey Report Reference:  The APE, defined in the subject area as Caltrans ROW, was surveyed by Stantec archaeologists in June and July 2020. The proposed new alignment was surveyed in 2025. Testing is pending agency approval. Reroute is intended to avoid intact cultural resources.							
<u>Disturbance Acreage Changes:</u> ☐ Yes ■ No							
Original disturbance acreage:	1.45 acres	New disturbance acreage: No sul	bstantive change.				

SB156 Exemption Report Section	Applicable	(Y) Define potential impact or (N) briefly explain why SB 156 Exemption Report section isn't applicable. If (Y), describe original and new level of impact, and environmental measures to be taken. [Add notes to specify whether agency consultation is necessary, and if so, provide brief summary of that consultation.]
Geology, Soils, and Seismic	☐ Yes  ■ No	No change in risk of impacts to geology, soils, and seismic resources.
Agency Consultation?	☐ Yes	
	■ No	
Hazardous Materials and Waste	☐ Yes	
	■ No	No additional hazardous materials or waste produced by proposed change.
Agency	☐ Yes	
Consultation?	■ No	
I I	□ Yes	No about a in water tiel for improve to the water down and
Hydrology	■ No	No change in potential for impacts to wetland resources.
Agency	☐ Yes	
Consultation?	■ No	
Cultural Resources	■ Yes	Reroute intended to avoid intact cultural resource inadvertent discovery.
Cultural Resources	□ No	Neroute interided to avoid intact cultural resource madvertent discovery.
Agency	■ Yes	Consultations with BLM and CPUC.
Consultation?	□ No	Consultations with Belvi and Or Co.
Traffic and Circulation	☐ Yes	Construction likely will not require lane closure and traffic control.
Circulation	■ No	Constitution many will not require faile dissails and trains control.
Agency Consultation?	■ Yes	Consult with Caltrans regarding need for lane closure and traffic control.
Consultation:	□ No	Constitution Canada and a significant and a sign
Air Quality	☐ Yes	No alteration of impacts to air quality caused by proposed change.
	■ No	
Agency Consultation?	☐ Yes	
	■ No	
Noise and Vibration	☐ Yes	No increase in noise and vibration caused by proposed change.
	■ No	,,,,
Agency Consultation?	☐ Yes	
Aesthetics/	■ No	
Visual Resources	☐ Yes	No increase in impact to visual resources resulting from the change.
Agency	■ No	
Agency Consultation?  Vegetation and	☐ Yes	_
	■ No	
Wildlife	■ Yes	No substantive change in impacts to vegetation or wildlife.
Agency	□ No	
Consultation?	■ Yes	Demonstrate avoidance of wetlands on project webmap.
	□ No	

Approvals	Date	Name (print)	Signa	ature				
Zayo Project Manager	6/6/25	Steven Towers			■ Reviewed			
CPUC Project Manager	8/25/25	Ruchita Acharya	R.Acharya		X Approved with conditions (see below)  □ Denied			
For CDUC Comple	usa Mausa	an Hao Onla						
	X Refinement Approved       □ Refinement Denied       □ Beyond Authority							
Conditions of Approval or Reason for Denial:  The applicable Conditions of Approval from the Project Conditions, Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program apply to this request.								
Prepared by: ECOF	RP Consultir	ng, Inc.	Date:	8/25/2025				





