

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor



August 2, 2018

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. 2 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 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 15 calendar days (August 16, 2018). 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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Jensen Uchida'.

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 Yáñez, Project Manager, Ecology & Environment, Inc.

Attachment A: Data Request #2

Attachment A: TDS Olinda Last Mile Underserved Broadband Project Data Request # 2

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
Project Description		
1	PEA Section 3.5, page 5	The PEA states that “ <i>The majority of the proposed installations associated with the project would occur along County roads and would require ROW encroachment permits from Shasta County. The remaining installations located along private roadways would occur within existing easements that TDS currently holds grants for, and no additional ROW would be required.</i> ” Based on conference call on 7/26/2018, it appears this statement may not be accurate. Please revise this statement accordingly regarding TDS’s status for holding grants easements within private roadways. Confirm whether the project components would encroach into private parcels. If the applicant intends for the alignment to be entirely within the private roadway easement, please provide mapping and dimensions of the existing private roadway easements.
2	PEA Section 3.6.2.2, Page 6	The PEA states that “ <i>the depth of the bore would be a minimum of 5 feet below the bed of the waterway or surface of the road, and the bore lengths would be variable</i> ”. Confirm that <u>maximum</u> depth of excavation/subsurface disturbance.
3	PEA Section 3.3, page 2	Provide revised project design files for all modifications that have occurred since original 2015 PEA in GIS. The files should include linear feet dimensions, boring areas, buffer areas, areas of disturbance, construction vehicle parking, etc.
Cultural Resources		
4	PEA Section 4.5, page 56	Based on latest project design, confirm if APM CR-1 is still accurate? “ <i>APM CR-1: Happy Valley Ditch will be avoided via subsurface boring.</i> ” Will TDS bore underneath every crossing with the Happy Valley Ditch?
5	PEA Section 4.5, page 54	The PEA uses the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) terminology. Confirm we can apply findings to California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) as well, since this is a California/CEQA-only project.
6	PEA Section 4.5, page 54	Confirm that the Happy Valley Ditch, as a whole, is considered to be ineligible for listing and was also surveyed in all locations where the project alignment traversed.