

CHAPTER 3

Revisions to the Draft EIR

A. Introduction

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, this section presents the changes that were made to the Draft EIR to clarify or amplify its text in response to received comments. Such changes are insignificant as the term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b), in that the changes merely clarify or amplify or make insignificant modifications.

The following text changes are made to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). The changes are grouped by DEIR chapters and are then shown by page number in the DEIR and identified as to the location of the change in the body of the text or table. Clarification to mitigation measures, in addition to being listed here, are included in an updated Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting, and Compliance Program (MMRCP) in Appendix A of the FEIR.

Where changes are shown inserted in the existing DEIR text, revised or new language is underlined, deleted language is indicated by ~~strikethrough text~~, and the original text is shown without underline or strikethrough text. Where not ambiguous, new or replacement text is shown without markings.

B. Text Changes

Page **Identification / Text Change:**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES-9 *The first full paragraph under the heading “Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative” is changed as follows to reflect an amended version of this alternative:*

Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative (as amended)

Description. This alternative was developed by the EIR team to achieve construction of the transmission line upgrade entirely within PacifiCorp’s existing ROW. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would upgrade the existing 69 kV line from Pole 15/44 south to Pole 8/45. At Pole 8/45 the 115 kV single circuit line would continue south with pole-for-pole replacement to Pole 19/45, where the alignment would veer east within an existing 69 kV line ROW following generally along Highway 97 approximately 1.7 miles until

reaching the Weed Junction Substation. For this alternative, ~~a temporary 115/69 kV transformer of approximately 20 MVA (megavolt ampere) capacity would be required~~ the temporary 69/12.5 kV substation that would be part of the Weed Segment upgrade of at the Weed Substation would be used to serve existing load to Weed and the International Paper substation. Once the temporary transformer Weed Segment upgrade is installed and operational, and the temporary 69/12.5 kV substation is switched over to serve the Weed and International Paper substation loads, the 69 kV line between the Weed and Weed Junction Substations could be de-energized, thus allowing construction of the new double circuit line in the centerline of the existing ROW. At the conclusion of the new line construction, the temporary 69/12.5 kV substation at the Weed Substation would be removed.

ES-17 *The last sentence of the first paragraph on page ES-17 has been clarified to read as follows:*

The Proposed Project's incremental contribution to the cumulative adverse visual impact is cumulatively considerable and thus significant and unavoidable.

ES-40 *The first full paragraph in Section ES.4.3 is changed as follows:*

Table ES-3 summarizes the environmental impact conclusions of the Proposed Project/Weed Segment and the alternatives. Although the Proposed Project and the three route alternatives would each have significant unmitigable visual impacts, the degraded visual character of the Proposed Project is afforded more weight in this analysis than the visual impacts of the alternatives along approximately 0.5 miles of Highway 97; thus, all three route alternatives are environmentally superior to the Proposed Project. The principal basis for this determination is that the degraded views along Highway 97 would be visible to passing motorists for less than a minute. Although fewer people (mostly local residents and visitors driving on Hoy Road) would be affected by the cumulative visual impact created by constructing the new 1.2-mile ROW, the degraded visual character would be of longer duration and, in the case of local residents, a constant experience. Among the three route alternatives, the differences in environmental impacts are generally subtle. ~~However, the~~ The Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B alternative would keep the new transmission line within the existing ROW, and would avoid most of the mature tree removal associated with the PacifiCorp Option 4 alternative, but would still involve some tree trimming and removal along and just outside the southern edge of the ROW to accommodate the temporary pole line and would reduce the risk of electricity curtailments that would be possible with the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A alternative. The Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative as refined by PacifiCorp in their DEIR comment letter dated September 14, 2007, would keep the new transmission line within the existing ROW, and could be constructed in less time than Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B because it would not require construction of a

temporary pole line. Therefore, the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A B alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

ES-41 *The first full paragraph in Section ES.4.4 is changed as follows:*

The environmentally superior alternative (the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A B alternative) would keep the new transmission line within an existing ROW and would have minimal long-term impacts on residences or other sensitive land uses. In comparison, the most significant impacts of the No Project alternative would be its likelihood of creating long-term air emissions and noise impacts. In addition, the No Project alternative has the potential to result in electric service disruption. Overall, the environmentally superior alternative is preferred over the No Project alternative.

ES-42 *The “Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative” and the “Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B Alternative” columns in Table ES-3 for Aesthetics are changed to read:*

Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative (as amended)	Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B Alternative
<p>Would result in significant unmitigable visual impacts along Hwy 97.</p> <p><u>Preferred because the cumulatively significant unmitigable impact of the new 1.2-mile ROW would be avoided and would keep new line entirely in existing ROW, but would require longer to construct possibly resulting in local electricity curtailments in summer 2009.</u></p>	<p>Would result in significant unmitigable visual impacts along Hwy 97.</p> <p><u>Preferred because would keep new line in existing ROW, have less impact to mature trees, and reduces risk of electricity curtailments. Would take longer to construct and would result in disturbance to/removal of vegetation and mature trees along and just outside southern edge of the ROW.</u></p>

CHAPTER 3, ALTERNATIVES AND CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

3-8 *The “Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative” description in Table 3-2 is changed to read:*

Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A

- Entirely within existing ROW
- ~~Install temporary 115/69 kV transformer at Weed Sub~~
- Switch over local and International Paper substation loads to the temporary 69/12.5 kV substation
- De-energize 69 kV line; distribution remains energized
- Construct new 115 kV double circuit pole line with 69 kV and distribution on new poles; remove old poles as new are installed
- Re-energize 69 kV line; remove temporary ~~substation transformer~~

3-15 *The title for Section 3.4.2 is changed to read:*

3.4.2 Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A (as amended)

3-15 *The second full paragraph in Section 3.4.2 under the Description subheading is changed to read:*

For this alternative, ~~a temporary 115/69 kV transformer of approximately 20 MVA capacity would be required~~ the temporary 69/12.5 kV substation that would be part of the Weed Segment upgrade of at the Weed Substation would be used to serve existing load to Weed and the International Paper substation. Once the temporary transformer Weed Segment upgrade is installed and operational, and the temporary 69/12.5 kV substation is switched over to serve the Weed and International Paper substation loads, the 69 kV line between the Weed and Weed Junction Substations could be de-energized, thus allowing construction of the new double circuit line in the centerline of the existing ROW. The existing distribution underbuild in the ROW would need to remain energized to serve local residents; however, PacifiCorp has stated that construction of the new line could occur safely with the distribution lines energized.

3-17 *The first full paragraph at the top of page 3-17 is deleted in its entirety:*

~~This alternative would involve installing a temporary 115/69 kV transformer, transformer protection, and 69 kV circuit breaker at the Weed Substation. This equipment would require construction of a temporary pad area approximately 50 feet by 100 feet (5,000 square feet) which would need to be located outside of the Weed Substation footprint to allow room for the rebuild of the Weed Substation as described for the Weed Segment. Site preparation for the temporary pad area would likely require grading, import of crushed rock, installation of a ground grid, and installation of temporary fencing. These activities would be in addition to, but similar in nature as, the temporary substation construction described as part of the Weed Segment. Subsequent to completion of the line upgrade, the temporary transformer and related equipment would be removed and the temporary pad restored as described for the Weed Segment activities.~~

3-18 *The paragraph under the subheading Project Objectives is changed to read:*

Based on PacifiCorp's projected construction schedule, completion of this alternative could be accomplished prior to the projected time when Line 14 would exceed its thermal limit ~~would not occur until spring of 2009. This would fail to meet PacifiCorp's objective of having the project complete prior to summer 2008 peak loads. However, PacifiCorp has projected that Line 14 would be at its thermal limit in summer 2008 and would exceed it in summer 2009. So this alternative would increase the risk of outages during summer 2008 only if the load is greater than currently projected. Also, the EIR team's independent review of PacifiCorp's construction schedule for this alternative suggests that the projected completion date may be overly pessimistic. The EIR team has identified commercial sources that could substantially shorten the lead time for a temporary 115/69 kV transformer, thereby accelerating the construction~~

completion date for this alternative. Also, the proposed schedule shows “Right-of-way / property acquisition” would occur from November 2006 – April 2008, but there would be no permanent ROW easements required for this alternative. This alternative would therefore meet project objectives.

3-19 *The schedule for Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A in Table 3-8 is changed to read:*

**TABLE 3-8
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE
FOR THE PROJECT WITH MACKINTOSH/ALJ VARIATION A ALTERNATIVE (AS AMENDED)**

Project Activity	Project with Mackintosh/ ALJ Variation A (as amended)	Weed Segment
Permit To Construct decision adopted and effective	October 2007	October 2007
Acquisition of required permits	August 2006 – April 2007	February 2006 – October 2007
Right-of-way / property acquisition	November 2006 – April 2008	August 2007 – November 2007
Final engineering completed	January 2008	September 2007
Construction begins	January 2009 <u>May 2008</u>	November 2007
Transmission line construction	January 2009 – March 2009 <u>May 2008 – July 2008</u>	February 2007 – May 2008
Temporary Substation Construction	N/A	November 2007 – December 2007
Substation construction	N/A	November 2007 – May 2008
115/69kV transformer	October 2008	N/A
Construction temporary 115/69kV substation at Lucerne or Weed Substation	August 2008 – December 2008	N/A
Remove temporary 115/69kV substation	April 2009 – May 2009	N/A
Project operational	April 2009 <u>August 2008</u>	June 2008
Clean up	May 2009 – July 2009 <u>August 2008 – October 2008</u>	May 2008 – September 2008

3-34 *The title of Table 3-12 has been corrected as follows:*

**TABLE 3-12
CUMULATIVE SCENARIO – APPROVED AND PENDING PROJECTS**

CHAPTER 4.1, AESTHETICS

4.1-10 *Mitigation Measure AES-PPWS-2b on page 4.1-10 has been clarified to read as follows:*

Mitigation Measure AES-PPWS-2b: In consultation with the 5026 Hoy Road property owner, and a certified arborist or landscape architect, PacifiCorp shall plant trees/shrubs either individually or in informal groupings on the 5026 Hoy

Road property to partially screen unobstructed views of the new poles. Planting shall be designed to substantially preserve views of the landscape features seen in the backdrop. Plant material shall be appropriate to the local/natural landscape setting and shall be consistent with Public Resources Code Section 4292 for vegetation located in proximity to transmission facilities.

4.1-15 *Mitigation Measure AES-PPWS-4b is revised as follows:*

Mitigation Measure AES-PPWS-4b: Pole 3/46 shall be redesigned to utilize a self-supporting steel TF285 structure which has a horizontal rather than vertical arm configuration and is lower in height compared to the proposed pole at that location. Final design and siting of Pole 3/46 shall be submitted, reviewed and approved by the CPUC prior to the commencement of construction. To lessen the degree of visual impact of Pole 3/46 in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood, PacifiCorp shall develop a landscape plan prepared by a licensed landscape architect or certified arborist and in consultation with property owners with unobstructed views of Pole 3/46. The plan shall include planting of trees and/or shrubs either individually or in informal groupings to partially screen close range unobstructed views of the new pole. Plant material shall be appropriate to the local/natural landscape setting and shall be consistent with Public Resources Code Section 4292 for vegetation located in proximity to transmission facilities. The landscape plan shall show the location, suggested species and size at planting for all proposed plant material, and shall show proposed landscaping in relation to the final placement of the pole. The plan shall be submitted to, reviewed and approved by the CPUC prior to commencement of construction.

4.1-27 *The following mitigation measure is added to DEIR page 4.1-27:*

Mitigation Measure AES-VAR/A-3b: PacifiCorp shall redesign and construct Poles 17/47 and 5/48 as double-circuit horizontal arm TF285 structures to reduce the visual impact of those structures from Highway 97.

4.1-33 *The following mitigation measure is added to DEIR page 4.1-33:*

Mitigation Measure AES-VAR/B-3b: PacifiCorp shall redesign and construct Poles 17/47 and 5/48 as double-circuit horizontal arm TF285 structures to reduce the visual impact of those structures from Highway 97.

CHAPTER 4.4, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.4-21 *The last sentence in the second full paragraph on, page 4.4-21 has been modified to the following:*

For overland access existing and new roads, incidental impacts to wildlife are reduced by requiring speeds less than 10 mph and other measures noted below.

4.4-22 *The fourth bullet of Mitigation Measure BIO-PPWS-1 is clarified to read as follows:*

The biological monitor shall delineate and mark for avoidance in the field all known sensitive resource locations. In addition, any newly-observed areas considered suitable habitat for special-status plant species shall also be marked for avoidance during the spring preceding construction. The marker shall be coordinates obtained from a Global Position System (GPS) with sub-meter accuracy, presuming the special-status plant species may be present but not visible at the time installation occurs. If special-status species are located immediately prior to or during work activities, construction personnel shall contact the biological monitor. If the monitor determines that the project activities may adversely affect a species, a ~~50~~ 10-foot buffer shall be established around any those sensitive resources ~~unless it can be shown that no individual plants or animals are at risk (e.g., in the case of a burrow, probing with an endoscope to ensure the burrow is unoccupied, then closing with a sandbag until project work is complete in the area).~~

4.4-24 *Mitigation Measure BIO-PPWS-4 on page 4.4-24 has been clarified to read as follows:*

Mitigation Measure BIO-PPWS-4: ~~PacifiCorp shall implement the project during the non-nesting season, which for purposes of this project shall be deemed to be September 15 through February 15. In the event that construction cannot be completed during this period, the work shall stop until such time as pre-construction nest surveys are conducted by a qualified biologist. Pre-construction nest surveys must occur within 1000 feet of the project areas (i.e., transmission line corridors, pole sites, access roads and work areas) with all nests identified during these surveys to be located by GPS. No construction activities shall occur within 500 feet of active nests from February 15 through July 15. Any nest site disturbance between July 15 and August 15 must be approved by CDFG.~~

PacifiCorp shall avoid disturbing active nests of raptors and other nesting birds by performing preconstruction surveys and creating no-disturbance buffers.

If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (defined for this project as August 16 through February 14), no mitigation is required.

If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the breeding season (February 15 through August 15), PacifiCorp shall implement the following measures to avoid potential adverse effects on nesting raptors and other nesting birds:

- During the breeding season, and no more than two weeks prior to construction, PacifiCorp shall use a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys of all potential nesting habitat within 500 feet of project areas where active construction is scheduled to occur (i.e., transmission line corridors, pole sites, access roads and work areas).

- If active nests are found during preconstruction surveys, PacifiCorp shall record nest location coordinates using GPS and shall create a no-disturbance buffer (acceptable in size to the CDFG) around active raptor nests and other nesting birds for the duration of the breeding season, or until it is determined by a qualified wildlife biologist that all young have fledged. Typical buffers include 500 feet for raptors and 250 feet for other nesting birds. The size of these buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted in these areas may be further modified through consultation with the CDFG and will be based on existing noise and human disturbance levels in the project area site.
- If preconstruction surveys indicate that nests are inactive during the construction period, no further mitigation is required.

CHAPTER 4.6, HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

4.6-13 *Mitigation Measure HAZ-PPWS-1d on page 4.6-13 has been clarified to read as follows:*

Mitigation Measure HAZ-PPWS-1d: Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). PacifiCorp shall ensure that an environmental training program is established and implemented to communicate environmental concerns and appropriate work practices to all construction field personnel. The training program shall emphasize site-specific physical conditions to improve hazard prevention, and shall include a review of the Health and Safety Plan and the Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan. PacifiCorp shall submit documentation to the CPUC mitigation monitor prior to the commencement of construction activities that each foreman and field supervisor ~~worker~~ on the project has undergone this training program. Each field crew member shall also participate in the WEAP training, either prior to or within 48 hours of starting work on the project, and such documentation shall be submitted to the CPUC mitigation monitor. An abbreviated (approximately 20-minute) safety and environmental awareness “tail gate” training shall be required on their first day for any field crew member who does not participate in a pre-construction WEAP training, followed by the full WEAP training within 48 hours of starting work on the project.

CHAPTER 4.7, HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

4.7-18 *Bullet 1 and bullet 2 of Mitigation Measure HYD-PPWS-1 on page 4.7-18 is clarified to read as follows:*

- Silt fencing, straw wattles, and/or hay bales or other appropriate sediment control shall be placed at all construction site boundaries (work areas, the staging area, pull and tension sites, and areas for the substation modification work).

- New Permanent and temporary access roads shall be sloped to provide effective overland flow pathways (i.e., convex in cross section) and avoid formation of erosive gullies caused by concentrated runoff. Where necessary, all-weather roads shall be covered with gravel base material.

4.7-23 *The first bullet under Mitigation Measure HYD-PPWS-4a on page 4.7-23 of the DEIR is clarified to read as follows:*

- If groundwater is encountered during the auger or excavation process, then 1) the depth to first water shall be recorded, and 2) completion of the hole to final depth shall proceed by means of auger only (or other such means that results in a cylindrical hole). The depth to water shall then be recorded at (a) the end of the augering process, and (b) the end of a 24-hour period.

CHAPTER 4.8, LAND USE, PLANNING, AND POLICIES

4.8-1 *The following sentence has been added to the end of the first paragraph under the Alternative heading on page 4.8-1:*

All alternative alignments from Pole 19/45 to the Weed Junction Substation would generally traverse within an existing ROW.

CHAPTER 4.9, NOISE

4.9-3 *The following text has been added to Section 4.9, Noise, under the subheading Existing Ambient Noise Environment, second paragraph:*

Much of the study area, including Hoy Road, experiences relatively low (40-55 dBA) noise levels due to the lack of loud noise sources. These ambient natural noise sources include wind, which is much more common than calm conditions throughout the study area. The main contributors to the noise environment along the corridors described above include vehicle traffic on SR 97 and local roads; airplane overflights; sounds emanating from residential neighborhoods, including voices, noises from household appliances, and radio and television broadcasts; and naturally occurring sounds such as wind and wind-generated rustling. Additional noise sources may include electrical and industrial devices and other man-made localized sources. Vehicle and overflight noises can range from approximately 50 to 80 dBA, depending on the distance from the source. Ambient natural noise sources such as wind, which is much more common than calm conditions throughout the study area, can be expected to generate noise levels in the range of 45 to 55 dBA.

4.9-16 *The significance level listed for criterion c) is corrected as follows:*

c) Permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. *Less than significant.* (Class III).

CHAPTER 4.10, PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

4.10-6 *Mitigation Measure PS-PPWS-1b is clarified as follows:*

Mitigation Measure PS-PPWS-1b: ~~Water tanks shall be sited in project areas and be available for fire protection.~~ All construction vehicles shall carry fire suppression equipment. PacifiCorp shall contact and coordinate with the CDF and Weed City Volunteer Fire Department to determine reasonable and prudent minimum amounts of fire prevention and control equipment to be carried on the project vehicles, and to determine the need for and, if needed, appropriate locations for the of stationary water tanks to be installed and maintained by PacifiCorp. PacifiCorp shall restrict driving in tall, dry vegetation, restrict smoking to cleared areas and vehicles, and require spark shields to be used during welding or other spark-producing activity. PacifiCorp shall submit verification of its consultation with the CDF and Weed City Volunteer Fire Department ~~local fire departments~~ to the CPUC.

4.10-6 *Mitigation Measure PS-PPWS-2 is changed to be numbered PS-PPWS-2a, and Mitigation Measure PS-PPWS-2b is added:*

Mitigation Measure PS-PPWS-2a: PacifiCorp shall . . .

Mitigation Measure PS-PPWS-2b: To ensure that emergency vehicle access is not restricted on the private driveway switchback at Pole 8/45, PacifiCorp shall coordinate with the landowner final placement of the steel pole so as to avoid any encroachment into the switchback that would violate the landowner's existing exception for curve width as granted by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

CHAPTER 4.11, TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

4.11-2 *The paragraph under heading Alternatives has been corrected to read as follows:*

The alternatives would not cross any one local public roadways, ~~Rainbow Way, near the location of Pole 13/48. Rainbow Way is a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders.~~ However, The alternatives would also cross several private roads, including roads near Poles 1/48, Pole 5/48, and Pole 7/48.

4.11-11 *The next to the last paragraph on page 4.11-11 has been corrected as follows:*

Installation of the PacifiCorp Option 4 alternative would require overhead crossings of several private roadways and ~~two~~ one public roadways, including a ~~transmission line crossing of Rainbow Way and~~ a span guy cable crossing over SR 97 from Pole 5/48 to a stub pole on the south side of the highway.

4.11-15 *The middle paragraph on page 4.11-15 has been corrected as follows:*

Installation of the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A alternative would require overhead crossings of several private roadways and ~~two~~ one public roadways, including a ~~transmission line crossing of Rainbow Way and~~ a span guy cable crossing over SR 97 from Pole 5/48 to a stub pole on the south side of the highway.

4.11-19 *The first full paragraph on page 4.11-19 has been revised as follows:*

Installation of the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B alternative would require overhead crossings of several private roadways and ~~two~~ one public roadways, including a ~~transmission line crossing of Rainbow Way and~~ a span guy cable crossing over SR 97 from Pole 5/48 to a stub pole on the south side of the highway.

CHAPTER 5, COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**5-4** *The first full paragraph on page 5-4 is changed to read:*

Among the three route alternatives, the differences in environmental impacts are generally subtle. The PacifiCorp Option 4 Alternative would shift the ROW 15 feet north for approximately 1.7 miles, requiring removal of several mature trees. This feature makes the PacifiCorp Option 4 Alternative less preferable than the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A and B Alternatives. ~~The Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative would keep the new transmission line within the existing ROW, but would require additional temporary disturbance at the Weed Substation for installation of a temporary transformer. Further, the additional lead time to procure the temporary transformer for the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative may push the construction schedule into summer 2009, past the time when PacifiCorp estimates that Line 14 would exceed its thermal limit and possibly resulting in local electricity curtailments. The Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B Alternative, on the other hand, would also keep the new transmission line in the existing ROW but would not require a temporary transformer and so would avoid the associated temporary disturbance and additional construction time. The Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B Alternative would require installation of a temporary pole line, which would require trimming and~~

possible removal of a few trees along and outside of the southern edge of the existing ROW and would lengthen the total construction schedule, ~~but these impacts would be minor.~~ The Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative as refined by PacifiCorp in their DEIR comment letter dated September 14, 2007, would keep the new transmission line within the existing ROW, would not require construction of a temporary pole line, and could be constructed in less time than Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B. Therefore, it is the conclusion of this EIR that the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A ~~B~~ Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

5-5 *The “Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative” and the “Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B Alternative” columns in Table 5-2 for Aesthetics are changed to read:*

Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative (as amended)	Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B Alternative
<p>Would result in significant unmitigable visual impacts along 0.5-mile portion of Highway 97.</p> <p><u>Preferred because the cumulatively significant unmitigable impact of the new 1.2-mile ROW would be avoided and Wwould keep the new line entirely in the existing ROW, but would require longer to construct because of temporary transformer needed at Weed Substation, possibly resulting in local electricity curtailments in summer 2009.</u></p>	<p>Would result in significant unmitigable visual impacts along 0.5-mile portion of Highway 97.</p> <p>Preferred because the cumulatively significant unmitigable impact of the new 1.2-mile ROW would be avoided, would have less impact to mature trees than PacifiCorp Option 4 Alternative, and would not require temporary transformer at Weed Substation. Would take longer to construct and would result in disturbance to/removal of vegetation and mature trees along and just outside southern edge of the ROW.</p>

5-7 *The first full paragraph in Section 5.4.2 is changed to read:*

The Environmentally Superior Alternative is defined in Section 5.3 as the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation ~~A~~ B Alternative. Impacts of the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation ~~A~~ B Alternative are defined in each resource area’s impact analysis in Sections 4.1 through 4.12. The Environmentally Superior Alternative would have one significant unmitigable (Class I) impact on visual character along a 0.5-mile portion of Highway 97, a National Scenic Byway, designated County Scenic Highway, and Eligible State Scenic Highway . The other following types of impacts would also occur with the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation ~~A~~ B Alternative, but they would be mitigable to less than significant levels:

5-8 *The first full paragraph in Section 5.4.3 is changed to read:*

The Environmentally Superior Alternative (the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation ~~A~~ B alternative) would keep the new transmission line within an existing ROW and

would have minimal long-term impacts on residences or other sensitive land uses. In comparison, the most significant impact of the No Project Alternative is its likelihood of creating long-term air emissions and noise impacts along with visual impacts from generation or transmission facilities. In addition, the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in electric service disruption. Overall, the Environmentally Superior Alternative is preferred over the No Project Alternative.

CHAPTER 6, CEQA STATUTORY SECTIONS

6-3 *The first paragraph under section 6.3 is corrected to read as follows:*

This section present the analysis of the potential for the Proposed Project and Weed Segment to create cumulative effects when the impacts of projects listed in Table 3-12~~4~~ are considered together with the impacts of the Proposed Project and Weed Segment.

6-3 *The last sentence in Section 6.3.1 is corrected to read as follows:*

Therefore, the effects of the Proposed Project and Weed Segment on visual resources, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would ~~not~~ be cumulatively considerable (Class II).