## **Appendix A** Environmental Checklist Form

1.	Project Title:	Looking Glass Networks' Application for a Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience for the Metropolitan Area Network Serving Areas of the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles Basin.
2.	Lead agency name and address:	California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness Avenue, Fourth Floor San Francisco, California 94102
3.	Contact person and phone number:	Mr. John Boccio California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness Avenue, Fourth Floor San Francisco, California 94102
4.	Project location:	San Francisco and Los Angeles metropolitan areas.
5.	Project sponsor's name and address:	Looking Glass Networks, Inc. 1111 West 22nd Street Suite 600 Oak Brook, IL 60523
6.	General plan designation:	See Section 4.10 (Land Use).
7.	Zoning:	See Section 4.10 (Land Use).
8.	Description of project:	See Section 3 (Project Description).
9.	Surrounding land uses and setting:	See Sections 3 (Project Description) and 4.10 (Land Use).
10.	Other public agencies whose approval is required:	See Section 3 (Project Description).

## **Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" and requiring implementation of mitigation as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

$\boxtimes$	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources	$\boxtimes$	Air Quality
$\boxtimes$	Biological Resources	$\boxtimes$	Cultural Resources	$\boxtimes$	Geology / Soils
$\boxtimes$	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	$\boxtimes$	Hydrology / Water Quality	$\boxtimes$	Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	$\boxtimes$	Noise		Population / Housing
$\boxtimes$	Public Services	$\boxtimes$	Recreation	$\boxtimes$	Transportation / Traffic
$\boxtimes$	Utilities / Service Systems	$\boxtimes$	Mandatory Findings of Significance	e	

## **Determination:** (To be completed by lead agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

 $\square$ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project may have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

/s/ Robert Feraru, for

Paul Clanon, Director Analysis Branch, Energy Division California Public Utilities Commission Date

## **Environmental Impacts:**

T		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	
Issues	s (and Supporting Information Source): AESTHETICS — Would the project:	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		$\square$		
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		$\boxtimes$		
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		$\boxtimes$		
II.	<b>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assess- ment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?				
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				$\square$
III.	<b>AIR QUALITY</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <b>Would the project:</b>				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		$\boxtimes$		
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				$\boxtimes$

Issues	s (and Supporting Information Source):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:	<b>F</b> and <b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	7	, in the second s
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			$\square$	
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conserva- tion Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?		$\boxtimes$		
v.	CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in \$15064.5?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to \$15064.5?		$\boxtimes$		
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		$\boxtimes$		
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		$\boxtimes$		
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:				
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	<ul> <li>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</li> </ul>				

Issues	(and )	Supporting Information Source):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GEO	DLOGY AND SOILS (cont.) — Would the project:	_	_		
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?			$\boxtimes$	
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			$\boxtimes$	
	iv)	Landslides?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Resul	t in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	would poten	cated on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that d become unstable as a result of the project, and tially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral ding, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				
d)	the U	cated on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of inform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks e or property?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	septic where	soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems e sewers are not available for the disposal of water?				$\square$
VII.		ARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ld the project:				
a)		e a significant hazard to the public or the environment gh the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous ials?			$\square$	
b)	throu	e a significant hazard to the public or the environment gh reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions ving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		$\boxtimes$		
c)	hazar	hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely dous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter of an existing or proposed school?		$\boxtimes$		
d)	mater Sectio	cated on a site which is included on a list of hazardous rials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code on 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a signif- hazard to the public or the environment?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	such airpor	project located within an airport land use plan or, where a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public rt or public use airport, would the project result in a safety d for people residing or working in the project area?				
f)	the pr	project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would roject result in a safety hazard for people residing or ing in the project area?				$\boxtimes$
g)		r implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted gency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		$\boxtimes$		
h)	injury wildla	se people or structures to a significant risk of loss, y or death involving wildland fires, including where ands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where ences are intermixed with wildlands?				

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Significant	
	(and Supporting Information Source):	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere sub- stantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre- existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site?		$\boxtimes$		
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			$\square$	
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		$\boxtimes$		
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				$\boxtimes$
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			$\boxtimes$	
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			$\square$	
j)	Inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\boxtimes$
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?		$\boxtimes$		

Issues	e (and Supporting Information Source):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				$\square$
XI.	NOISE — Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				$\square$
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				$\square$
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessi- tating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$

Issues	(and S	Supporting Information Source):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	PUBI	LIC SERVICES	_	_		
a)	impac altered altered could mainta	<b>d the project</b> result in substantial adverse physical ts associated with the provision of new or physically d governmental facilities, need for new or physically d governmental facilities, the construction of which cause significant environmental impacts, in order to ain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other mance objectives for any of the public services:				
	i)	Fire protection?		$\boxtimes$		
	ii)	Police protection?		$\boxtimes$		
	iii)	Schools?				$\boxtimes$
	iv)	Parks?				$\square$
	v)	Other public facilities?		$\square$		
XIV.	REC	REATION				
a)	and re substa	d the project increase the use of existing neighborhood egional parks or other recreational facilities such that initial physical deterioration of the facility would occur accelerated?				
b)	constr	the project include recreational facilities or require the ruction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				$\boxtimes$
c)	impac	d the project result in permanent and/or temporary ts, such as possible disruption of recreational activities, ing the recreational value of existing facilities?		$\boxtimes$		
XV.		NSPORTATION / TRAFFIC — d the project:				
a)	the ex (i.e., vehicl	an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to isting traffic load and capacity of the street system result in a substantial increase in either the number of e trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or stion at intersections)?				
b)	servic	d, either individually or cumulatively, a level of e standard established by the county congestion gement agency for designated roads or highways?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	increa	t in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an use in traffic levels or a change in location that results stantial safety risks?				$\boxtimes$
d)	sharp	antially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible e.g., farm equipment)?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	Result	t in inadequate emergency access?		$\boxtimes$		
f)	Result	t in inadequate parking capacity?		$\boxtimes$		
g)		ict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting ative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				$\boxtimes$

Issues	(and Supporting Information Source):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				$\square$
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				$\square$
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				$\square$
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\boxtimes$	
g)	Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		$\boxtimes$		
XVII	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are consid- erable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		$\boxtimes$		