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:	Report No.:
16 Oct 2024	11
Date Approved:	Approval Agency:
11/6/24	Caltrans, in addition to CPUC
Property Owner(s):	Location/Milepost:
Caltrans (State Route 395 ROW)	PM M-0.45 to L-136.55 (N to S)
Land Use/Vegetative Cover:	Sensitive Resources:
Ruderal (maintained highway shoulder near edge of pavement)	Waterways at culverts to be avoided by boring underneath culverts. Rare plant populations being avoided by change in running line. Cultural resources present, being avoided.(See project webmap.)

Modification From:

The proposed change is a shift of the fiber optic running line from previously submitted engineering drawings. The change entails bringing the running line closer to the highway edge of pavement to avoid construction on slope faces and avoid tree driplines in accordance with the approved Caltrans Encroachment Permit. A portion of the change is being made to avoid a rare plant population.

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
- <u>Maps and Figures</u>: 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
 - 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.

Resources:			
Biological	□ No Resources Present	Resources Present	N/A, Change would not affect resources
Previous Biological Survey Report Reference:			
August 2020, c conducted a w of lands adjace	apturing bloom period	s of all target species. of the Action Area, inc during September 201	luding a visual inspection
Cultural	□ No Resources Present	Resources Present	N/A, changes would not affect resources
Previous Cultura	al Survey Report Referen	ce:	
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 2024 during resource flagging. There are cultural resources near MP L-138.0.			
Disturbance Acr	eage Changes:	Yes 🔲 No	
Original disturbance acreage: 1.04 (45,6	7 acres 604 sq ft)	New disturbance acreage: no cha	nge in disturbance acreage

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,	□ Yes	Erosion risk is reduced by moving line from steep slope to flat toe of slope near edge of pavement	
and Seismic	No No		
Agency	I Yes	Caltrans concurrently consulted for approval of changed conduit location within Caltrans f	
Consultation?	🗆 No		
Hazardous Materials and	□ Yes	No additional hazardous materials or waste will be produced by the proposed change.	
Waste	🔳 No		
Agency	□ Yes		
Consultation?	🔳 No		
Hydrology	□ Yes	No adverse impact to hydrology will result from the proposed design change.	
ny aronogy	🔳 No		
Agency	□ Yes		
Consultation?	🔳 No		
Cultural Resources	□ Yes	No cultural resources present in location of design change.	
	No	no cultural resources present in location of design change.	
Agency	I Yes	Caltrans staff were consulted during project planning.	
Consultation?	🗆 No		
Traffic and Circulation	I Yes	Construction on road shoulder will likely require lane closure and traffic control.	
Circulation	🗆 No		
Agency Consultation?	I Yes	Consulting with Caltrans regarding need for lane closure and traffic control	
Consultation?	🗆 No	Consulting with Caltrans regarding need for lane closure and traffic contro	
Air Quality	□ Yes	No alteration of impacts to air quality will be caused by the proposed change.	
	🔳 No	The alteration of impacts to an quality will be caused by the proposed change.	
Agency	□ Yes		
Consultation?	🔳 No		
Noise and	□ Yes	No increase in noise and vibration will occur owing to the proposed change.	
Vibration	🔳 No		
Agency	□ Yes		
Consultation?	🔳 No		
Aesthetics/ Visual Resources	□ Yes		
v isuai Resources	🔳 No	Proposed change may decrease visual resource impact (less temp. vegetation remov	
Agency Consultation?	□ Yes		
Consultation?	No No		
Vegetation and Wildlife	□ Yes		
w nume	🔳 No	Shift of running line likely to decrease potential for impacts to vegetation and wildlife.	
Agency Consultation?	□ Yes		
Consultation?	🔳 No		

Approvals	Date	Name (print)	Signature	
Zayo Project Manager	10/15/24 ₽	Brianna Daniels	Digitally signed by Daniels, Brianna DN: CAl=Daniels, Brianna DN: CAl=Daniels, Brianna", OH-Internat, OH-Justern, OH-Internat, OH-Justern, OH-Justernat, OH-Justern, OH-Justernat, OH-Justern, OH-Justernat, OH-Justernat, OH-Juste	Reviewed
CPUC Project Manager	11/08/24	Connie Chen	connis chen	X Approved with conditions (see below) Denied

For CPUC Compliance Manager Use Only		
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.

Evidence of Caltrans approval to be supplied to CPUC prior to construction in this area.

Prepared by: ECORP Consulting	Date: 11/6/24
-------------------------------	---------------





















