505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



April 24, 2017 SENT BY EMAIL

Gail Long Manager, State Government Affairs TDS Telecom PO Box 1004 Redmond, OR 97756

Email: Gail.long@tdstelecom.com

RE: Data Request No. 1 for the Olinda Last Mile Underserved Broadband Project in Shasta County, California Pursuant to Commission Resolution T-17411.

Dear Ms. Long,

The California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC's) Energy Division, Infrastructure Permitting & CEQA Unit, has completed its review of TDS Telecom application and associated Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the Olinda Last Mile Underserved Broadband Project.

The CPUC identified several data needs that do not rise to the level of deficiencies during its review of the Application, PEA, and responses to Deficiency Reports #1 (November 1, 2016) and #2 (January 17, 2017). Attachment A details the data needs.

Please send one set of responses to the Energy Division and one set to Ecology and Environment, Inc., in hardcopy and electronic formats. We request that TDS responds to this data request within 20 calendar days (May 15, 2017). Inform us as soon as possible if you cannot provide responses by this date. Delays in responding to this data request may cause delays to preparation of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The CPUC reserves the right to ask for additional information in the form of data requests at any point in the process. Please direct questions on the completeness review to Jensen Uchida at (415) 703-5484 or via email to Jensen.Uchida@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Jensen Uchida

Project Manager, Infrastructure Permitting and CEQA

CC: Mary Jo Borak, Supervisor, Infrastructure Permitting and CEQA, CPUC Gregory Heiden, Attorney, CPUC Xiao Selena Huang, Broadband, Policy, and Analysis Branch, CPUC

Silvia Yánez, Project Manager, Ecology & Environment, Inc.

Attachment A: Data Request #1

Jenson achal

## Attachment A: TDS Olinda Last Mile Underserved Broadband Project Data Request # 1

Data request for TDS Telecom's (TDS) Olinda Last Mile Broadband Project are described in detail in the table below.

No.	Reference	Description of data being requested	
Cultural Resources			
1	PEA Section 4.5.1.2, page(s) 41	Provide discussion of prehistoric setting (cultural context)	
		The PEA does not discuss the prehistoric setting or cultural context for the project area that is generally consistent in detail and information as discussions for Ethnography and Historic Context.	
		Provide a discussion that presents the setting or cultural context for understanding human settlement and use of the project area prior to the ethnographic period (that is, prior to the 1820s) that could be reflected in previously unrecorded archaeological resources or tribal cultural resources.	
2	PEA Section 4.5.1.2, page(s) 41	Provide expanded discussion of ethnographic setting (cultural context)	
		The PEA does not provide discussion of the ethnographic setting or cultural context for the project area that addresses the Pit-River and Yana Native American groups and is generally consistent in detail and information as the discussions for Ethnography of the Wintu.	
		Provide a discussion that presents the setting or cultural context for understanding ethnography of the Pit-River and Yana ethnographuman settlement and use of the project area during to the ethnographic period (that is, prior to the 1820s) that could be reflected in previously unrecorded archaeological resources or tribal cultural resources.	
3	PEA Section 4.5.1.2, page(s) 51	Provide discussion of Spanish Period historic setting (cultural context)	
	F-85(3) 51	The PEA does not discuss the Spanish Period historic setting or cultural context (ca. 1769-1821) for the project area that is generally consistent in detail and information as discussions for the Historic Era (A.D. 1848-1940) Context.	
		Provide a discussion that presents the setting or cultural context for understanding historic exploration, settlement, and use of the project area during the Spanish Period (that is, between ca. 1769 and 1821) that could be reflected in previously unrecorded archaeological sites, architectural resources, or other aboveground features such as roads or settlement patterns within or overlapping the Project area.	

No.	Reference	Description of data being requested	
Cultural Resources			
4	PEA Section 4.5.1.2, page(s) 51	Provide discussion of Mexican Period historic setting (cultural context)	
		The PEA does not discuss the Mexican Period historic setting or cultural context (1821-1848) for the project area that is generally consistent in detail and information as discussions for the Historic Era (A.D. 1848-1940) Context.	
		Provide a discussion that presents the setting or cultural context for understanding historic exploration, settlement, and use of the project area during the Mexican Period (that is, between 1821 and 1848) that could be reflected in previously unrecorded archaeological sites, architectural resources, or other aboveground features such as roads or settlement patterns within or overlapping the Project area.	
5	PEA Section 4.5.1.2, page(s) 53	Provide discussion of tribal cultural resources	
		The PEA does not discuss the potential for and/or nature of tribal cultural resources for the project area that is generally consistent in detail and information as discussions for other identified cultural resources (i.e., IOs, Happy Valley Ditch, Igo Inn, and Cloverdale Cemetery).	
		Provide a detailed discussion based on: (1) the types of tribal cultural resources defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 and identified in the most recent revision to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section V (Cultural Resources), question (e); and (2) that may be associated with lifeways and cultural practices discussed in the new Prehistoric subsection (see Item No. 2 above) and the expanded Ethnography subsection (see Item No. 3 above).	
6	PEA Section 4.5.1.2, page(s) 52	Provide expanded discussion of paleontological setting	
		The PEA includes a brief description of the paleontological setting or context for the project area. Provide a revised paleontological discussion that includes:	
		<ul> <li>Names and descriptions of the geological deposits are that are present in the project area;</li> <li>Depths below ground surface that these geological deposits are located/likely to be encountered (e.g., at ground surface, at depths of "XX" to "XX" feet below ground surface);</li> </ul>	
		Thickness of these geological deposits; which geological deposits are likely to contain paleontological resources; and	
		• Clarification on whether or not any paleontological resources that may be present in specific geological deposits would be considered significant.	