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.

| Report No.: |
|-------------------------------------|
| Approval Agency: |
| Approval Agency. |
| Location/Milepost: |
| Sensitive Resources: |
| |
| ☐ 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
 - 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 Biologi | ical Survey Report Refere | ence: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Cultural | ☐ No Resources Present | ☐ Resources Present | □ N/A, changes would not affect resources | | | | | | |
| Previous Cultural Survey Report Reference: | | | | | | | | | |
| | • • | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Disturbance Acreage Changes:</u> ☐ 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 Waste | ☐ Yes | |
| | □ No | |
| Agency Consultation? | ☐ Yes | |
| | □ No | |
| Hydrology | ☐ Yes | |
| | □ No | |
| Agency Consultation? | ☐ Yes | |
| | □ 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 Vibration | ☐ Yes | |
| | □ No | |
| Agency | ☐ Yes | |
| Consultation? | □ No | |
| Aesthetics/ Visual Resources | □ Yes | |
| | □ No | |
| Agency Consultation? | ☐ Yes | |
| | □ No | |
| Vegetation and | □ Yes | |
| Wildlife | □ No | |
| Agency | ☐ Yes | |
| Consultation? | □ No | |

| Approvals | Date | Name (print) | Signa | nture | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------|--------|--------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Zayo Project Manager | | | | | ☐ Reviewed | | | | |
| CPUC Project Manager | | | | | ☐ Approved with conditions (see below) ☐ Denied | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| For CPUC Complia | _ | er Use Only ☐ Refinement | Danied | □ Royo | nd Authority | | | | |
| Conditions of Approval or Reason for Denial: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Prepared by: | | | Date: | | _ | | | | |



RFI 338-340

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 only one bore was extended
- Environmental Additional avoidance of wetlands



