## 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.:
Date Approved:	Approval Agency:
Property Owner(s):	Location/Milepost:
Land Use/Vegetative Cover:	Sensitive Resources:

## **Modification From:**

□ Permit □ Plan/Procedure □ Specification □ Drawing □ Environmental Measure □ Other

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.

<b>Resources:</b>			
Biological	No Resources Present	□ Resources Present	N/A, Change would not affect resources
Previous Biolog	ical Survey Report Refere	ence:	
Cultural	No Resources Present	Resources Present	N/A, changes would not affect resources
<b>Previous Cultur</b>	al Survey Report Referen	ce:	
Disturbance Act	eage Changes:	Yes 🗆 No	
Original		New disturbance	
disturbance		acreage:	
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	
and Seismic	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Hazardous Materials and	□ Yes	
Waste	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Hydrology	□ Yes	
Trydrology	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Cultural Resources	□ Yes	
Cultural Resources	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Traffic and	□ Yes	
Circulation	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Air Quality	□ Yes	
	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Noise and	□ Yes	
Vibration	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Aesthetics/	□ Yes	
Visual Resources	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	
Vegetation and	□ Yes	
Wildlife	🗆 No	
Agency	□ Yes	
Consultation?	🗆 No	

Approvals	Date	Name (print)	Signature	
Zayo Project Manager				□ Reviewed
CPUC Project Manager				<ul> <li>Approved with conditions (see below)</li> <li>Denied</li> </ul>

For CPUC Compliance Manager Use Only		
□ Refinement Approved	□ Refinement Denied	□ Beyond Authority

Conditions of Approval or Reason for Denial:		
Prepared by:	Date:	



## RFI 321-325

**Schedule:** This section will be constructed upon approvals from CPUC and Caltrans.

## **Resident Engineer Review and Approval:**

- Maintenance No change to maintenance
- Design Design is consistent with approved plans, just on the opposite side of the road
- Environmental Increased distance from running line to existing wetland will provide greater buffer









