And Bay		ta Request #1 June 4, 2018		E-Wall
Request #	Text of request as presented	Response	Section	Page
1	Existing Setting PEA, Section 2.2.1 uses the terrns "underserved", "unserved", and "partially served" when describing existing internet access in the project area. Provide a source or definitions for these terms and/or confirm these are intended to be as defined in the California Broadband Map?	These are intended to be used as defined in the California Broadband Map	2.2.1	2-1
2	PEA, Section 2.2.2, page 2-1 states the communities' internet access status as of the end of 2015. Confirm any known changes or updates to the project area's existing access to broadband services along with source references for the Karuk tribes estimate of the percentages provided in the PEA.	Please see revised section 2.2.2, provided as a separate document.	2,2.2	2-1
3	PEA, Section 2.2.2, page 2-2 states: "A few households in these communities have limited access to U.S Cellular or Verizon Wireless 3G service, but this is generally not available throughout these communities due to limited signal transmission through dense forests and as a result of cell towers being located more than 20 miles away. Orick: In May 2015, Tsunami Wireless expanded services into Orick. They offered speeds of 6.5 mbps download and 1.6 mbps upload. A few households in this community are served by Verizon Wireless 3G or 4G services, but these services are generally not available throughout the community." Confirm why not available, e.g. limited transmission etc. Also, confirm existing (geographic) signal area for the Tsunami Wireless towers.	VERSION CONTROL: The PDF and the Word version identified with the date 18DEC2017 in their titles vary from the wording quoted. The submitted PEA states in Section 2.2.2, "Orick: In May of 2015, Tsunami Wireless expanded services into Orick. They offered speeds of 6.5 Mbps download and 1.6 Mbps upload. A few households in this community may have been served by Verizon Wireless 3G or 4G services, but these services are not available to the community as a whole."  Please see revised section 2.2.2, provided as a separate document.	2.2.2	2-2
	Project Description			_
4	Confirm that the Weitchpec Regeneration Station is no longer part of the project- this was described in a redlined version of the revised 2017 PEA but is not in the PDF version	VERSION CONTROL: There is no regeneration station at Weitchpec nor mentioned in the PEA that was formally submitted in December 2017.		
5	PEA, page 2-95 states that new overhead poles are anticipated to be needed in various locations It is not clear from the PEA or the GIS data which poles are new and which are existing. Provide additional details for each segment to clarify. Please provide specific quantities, details and locations for all new poles proposed to be installed as part of the project.	The PEA lists the known location of new poles on page 2-95 and states: "The KRRBI project anticipates setting two new poles for the Klamath River crossing at Orleans (Segment 1) and two new poles for the Klamath River crossing at Martins Ferry (Segment 2), each immediately adjacent to an existing Frontier crossing. Two poles will be set in Segment 4 to cross Redwood Creek immediately adjacent to an existing Frontier crossing. There may be a need to set two poles on Green Diamond Resource lands in Segment 5 to avoid any impact to the Luffenholtz Creek water supply for the town of Trinidad. Avoidance may also be achieved by use of a bridge hang. None of these crossings has yet been engineered but are anticipated to be very similar to the poles supporting the existing crossings; that is, of wood, less than 60', tall with guys to support the weight and direction of the fiber optic cable. Spans are estimated at 680' (Orleans) and 705' (Martins Ferry) for the two crossings of the Klamath River, at 455' for Redwood Creek in Orick, and at about 100' if needed for the crossing of Luffenholtz Creek on GDR lands." Page 2-51 further clarifies, "New pole installation may be needed in some instances where existing poles are overburdened or where the impacts of a water crossing could be reduced by using an overhead installation." The PEA specifies location of known new poles and specifies where other new poles may be required by existing pole owners. No further detail is available.	2.4.8.1	2-95, also 2-51



KRRBI Data Request #1 June 4, 2018						
Request #	Text of request as presented	Response	Section	Pag		
6	Approximately 3.8 miles from the origin of Segment 2, a 1.1 mile spur would be installed on new pole(s) which would be erected immediately adjacent to the existing joint use utility pole- how many new poles would be required?	Two new poles, immediately adjacent to the existing Frontier cable crossing of the river, will be used for the KRRBI Klamath River bridge crossing. As stated in the text (which does contain a repeated phrase), the only new poles are the two needed to cross the Klamath River. The remaining 1.1-mile spur will utilize existing poles.	2.4.5.2	2-67		
7	As part of the Project, an overhead electric distribution system using wooden poles and following the 5-mile long access road would be constructed to serve the existing McKinnon Hill wireless tower. These poles would also carry a fiber optic cable from the main fiber optic system along Highway 169 to the McKinnon Hill tower. Please provide more details or refer to the section of the PEA where these are provided e.g. new poles, number of poles	VERSION CONTROL. There is no overhead line to McKinnon Hill. The power system for McKinnon Hill Tower is solar and generator. This is clearly stated in the PDF and the December 2017 Word version of the document. See also Figure 2.4-37.	2.4.6.2	2-87		
8	PEA table 2.4-1 (page 2-63) states 106.2 miles as the overall length of segments. Table 2.4-2 on the next page states 103.9. Clarify which is correct or explain the difference, e.g. does the higher number include spur routes?	Page 2-63 specifies "Table 2.4-2 totals do not reach the full Project length because a portion of the Project crosses overhead on private lands not adjacent to roads."	Table 2.4- 1 Table 2.4- 2	2-63 2-64		
9		No additional design or engineering has occurred on this project as of 6/27/18.				
10	The PEA refers to a connection with service providers in Orleans and Dows Prairie pg 2-93. Provide more details so that this can be properly described in the project description. In general, more detail is needed as to how last mile components would be constructed/installed	Please see new section 2.4.6.7, attached as separate document.	2.4.8	2-93		
	optic cable where the PG&E powerline goes underground and also on the bridge hang, which could facilitate future installation of Project fiber optic cable. This means that there would be minimal ground disturbance for the Project at those underground or bridge locations, because the PG&E plans also call for additional vault installation at each end of the extra underground and bridge hang conduits'. Confirm if this the bridge hang on the Pecwan Creek Bridge is part of the Project or a separate PG&E action. If separate confirm if it will be in place before the project is constructed.	The bridge hang on the Pecwan Creek Bridge was separately permitted by PG&E and is being constructed in July 2018. By the time the KRRBI project goes to construction, the bridge hang and the extra conduit will be completed by PG&E crews. Therefore, the bridge hang is not part of the KRRBI project. By the time KRRBI goes to construction there will be an existing extra conduit on the Pecwan Bridge and an extra conduit in the underground portions, all permitted and installed by PG&E. KRRBI will utilize those conduits.	2.4.5.2	2-66		
	General Construction PEA page 2-59 states that compaction standards will					
12	he met before the saw cut is renaved What specific	Compaction standards shall meet CAL216 Standard or as directed by local road owner.	2.4.4.4	2-59		



	KRRBI Data Request #1 June 4, 2018						
Request #	Text of request as presented	Response	Section	Page			
13	PEA page 2-61 provides information for directional drilling excavation, including quantities of excavated materials. More specific information is needed including the locations for the entrance and exit pits (bore sites) and the likely destination for excavated soils containing lubricants.	Bore locations and length of bores are identified in GIS files provided to the CPUC and ESA. Excavated soils will not contain lubricants because excavation occurs prior to the directional drill. Excavated soils in excess of material used to backfill the pits after use will be hauled to an approved disposal site. Caltrans and Humboldt County Public Works maintain a list of approved disposal sites, but it varies over time depending on availabilty. Wet soils containing bentonite lubricant will be hauled in vacuum trucks from drill pits to a CalTrans or Humboldt Co Public Works site capable of managing the mud disposal. Disposal site will likely utilize a mud pit to drain the mud and allow evaporation of the water. Resultant nontoxic clay residue will be added to other soil materials at the disposal site. All sites are previously disturbed areas commonly used for this purpose. Exact locations cannot be known until construction.	2.4.4.4	2-61			
14a	Provide additional details regarding the quantities of material that will be excavated and exported during construction. This should include all materials and also construction solid waste and excavated soil.	An approximation of material excavated was provided on page 2-58, which further states, "Actual amount of material hauled will not be known until the quality of the native material for backfill is tested with compaction." No further information is available. The project does not anticipate that substantial quantities of excavated material will be disposed off-site, because most will meet compaction standards and be used to backfill the trenches.	2.4.4.4	2-58			
14b	Provide additional details regarding the amount of concrete to be imported to the site, particularly for the Orick tower.	At this time, the only planned use of concrete will be for the construction of the Orick Tower. This has not yet been engineered but will be similar to the Orleans Tower. Construction of the Orleans Tower used approximately 10 cubic yards of concrete.	2.4.6.2	2-82			
15	Construction traffic, provide details of peak daily round trips to site and staging yards and total daily round trips for hauling. What would be the maximum number of truck trips?	The construction contractor will be responsible for completing construction within the time periods and conditions specified by permitting agencies, and will likely field multiple crews over the 106 project miles. While the number and location of crews at "peak" is unknown, we estimate at peak 8 crew-cab pickup truck trips daily. Estimated maximum daily round trips for hauling are three dump trucks per day from trenching site to agency-approved dump site.	Not in PEA				
16	Confirm hours of construction (i.e., Monday through Friday 7:00 am to 4:00 pm)	We will have highly constrained work schedules due to limited operating seasons. When permitted to operate, crews will work 7 days a week, Monday through Sunday, 0600 to 1800 hours where at least one mile from a residence or school, or where otherwise limited by the road manager. Note that construction hours include needed pauses for traffic to pass on various one-lane roads and for traffic control on two-lane roads where equipment must take one of the lanes for safety purposes. Hours of construction may be more limited near schools or where otherwise limited by permitting agencies.	2.4.8	2-93			



HE BI	KRRBI Data Request #1 June 4, 2018						
Request #	Text of request as presented	Response	Section	Page			
17	Staging and Laydown areas are listed in Section 2.4.8.7 (on page 2-100) please confirm that these are the only laydown and staging area proposed to be utilized. Text states that 'The Karuk Tribe assumes that there are sufficient areas that are previously disturbed, were used for similar functions in the past, and are or can be fenced and gated to provide security for the stored items'. If others are proposed, please provide details including area of temporary disturbance and locations. Also "EMP G-7 states that if the construction contractor wishes to utilize other laydown areas or staging areas, it is up to the contractor to show to the satisfaction of agencies with jurisdiction prior to their use during construction that those areas provide similar or less disturbance than those shown in this document." In order to be included in the evaluation in the CEQA document all proposed/potential staging and laydown areas need to be identified and described.	All proposed staging and laydown areas are identified and described in the PEA. The language of the EPM G-7 was intended to put the contractor on notice that they could not be changed without CPUC permission.	2.4.8.7	2-100			
18	PEA page 2-59 describes 'compaction standards' for saw-cutting. Confirm which standards this refers to.	duplicate of question 12, see answer above	2.4.4.4	2-59			
19	It is estimated that approximately xx construction workers per day would be required to construct the Proposed Project at its peak, with up to approximately xx workers at one time. The peak of construction would occur xxx. Provide missing details.	It is estimated that approximately 24 construction workers per day would be required to construct the Proposed Project at its peak, with up to approximately 24 workers at one time. The peak of construction would occur about 1 month after construction start-up (estimated at August 15, 2019) and again in summer of 2020.	not in PEA				
	Orick Tower						
20	For construction of the Orick tower, Table 2.4.6 (page 2-97 of the PEA) provides estimates for crew and equipment for construction of most of the facilities, no information is provided for installation of the ice bridge. Please provide estimates for crew and equipment needed for the ice bridge construction.	The ice bridge is a minor component and is installed by hand. Two construction workers will use hand and hand-held power tools to install the ice bridge. Timing is 1 day. See Page 2-98, which states: After the hut has been installed, an ice bridge will be constructed and installed between the hut and the tower. This bridge allows for the hanging of communications lines below the bridge to protect the lines from high winds, heavy rains, snow, and ice accumulations. The 18-inch-wide ice bridge will be installed about 8 feet above the ground on an independent, grounded, galvanized pipe structure to allow for free pedestrian movement beneath it. Installation of the ice bridge will take about one day."	Table 2.4- 6	2-97			
	Please confirm if the existing structures on the proposed Orick Tower site (former gas station on the north side of Highway 101) are proposed to be altered or removed to facilitate placement of the Orick Tower. Also, if known, confirm final selection of site for this tower.	VERSION CONTROL. The former gas station is no longer the proposed site. The PDF and the Word version of the PEA submitted 12/21/17 does not contain any text calling out the gas station as the proposed site. The PEA specifies "The construction of the Orick Tower, presently planned for a non-exclusive occupancy easement on private lands outside the special Highway 101 commercial zone, does not require special permitting from Humboldt County Planning." The tower is not planned for the former gas station. No buildings at the current location are proposed to be altered or removed. Final site selection is not complete.	2.3.4.1	2-12			
22	PEA page 3-8 states that one of the proposed sites for the Orick Tower is a Caltrans storage yard. If the Caltrans storage yard is to be used as the Orick tower location, please provide more details e.g. precisely where, describe yard, access, construction methods if different from other proposed location	The Caltrans storage yard is not an active option at this time. Given the statement in the next question, that the ISMND will evaluate only one tower, please evaluate the tower on agricultural land south of Hwy 101	2.4.6.2	2-82			



Request #	Text of request as presented	Response	Section	Page
23	The ISMND will evaluate only one new Orick Tower. Confirm that only one new tower is proposed as language in the PEA states 'Wireless services would be provided by a series of antennae, either located on new towers built for the Project (Orick and others to be determined as engineering is completed)'.	VERSION CONTROL. Text quoted in this data request does not appear in PDF or Word version supplied on or after 12/21/17. Only one tower is proposed in Orick. See page 2-82 for location description	2.4.6.2	2-82
24	The Orick Tower includes a hut to enclose the power supply. Confirm the maximum size of the hut as text states '. The hut may be as small as 6' x 6' x 8' tall or may be larger '	VERSION CONTROL. No text in the PEA submitted on 12/22/17 contains this text. Further, there is no basis for assuming the hut encloses a power supply. Hut dimensions were not explicitly stated in the PEA, but are implicit from foundation description on page 2-97 which is 2' larger "all around" or 4' total dimension larger in each direction than the hut. Hut dimensions are 8' x 13' by 8' high.	2.4.6.2	2-97
25	Provide a reference for the specifications for the generator at the new Orick Tower- text refers to a noise level of 63 DBA at a distance of 23-feet from the generator.	Generator specifications from Generac (manufacturer) for 10KW propane-fired generator. Specifications provided in separate document.	2.4.6.2	2-86
26	Please confirm if tree removal is proposed as part of the project.	No tree removal is proposed as part of the Orick Tower component of the project. No tree removal is proposed for any part of the project as specified on page 2-57.	2.4.4.4	2-57

