

ERRATA SHEET
PG&E JEFFERSON – MARTIN 230KV TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

An errata sheet is necessary when factual corrections need to be made to the Environmental Assessment (EA). The EA, together with the FONSI (including the mitigation table) and this errata sheet comprise the full and complete record of the environmental impact analysis/conservation planning for this project. The corrections in this errata sheet do not change the project activities or increase the degree of impact described in the EA. Changes to the text and justification are provided below. There were no substantive public comments on the EA.

CHANGES TO TEXT

Since the time the Environmental Assessment was released for public review, PG&E has provided more detailed information regarding the number of trees to be removed from the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed and additional mitigation measures have been received from regulatory agencies. Existing text to remain is in *italics*, additions to the text are underlined and deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~.

Page 29, 2.4.1 Baseline Conditions, 4th paragraph, last sentence:

In addition, CPUC General Order 95, Rule 35 and SFPUC forest management requirements mandate that the existing ROW be regularly maintained to remove trees that are within the “blow-out” zone, present a hazard to the line or forestry health risk, or raise safety concerns related to the transmission line. The “blow-out” zone refers to the lateral area adjacent to the transmission line. This year, regular, ongoing maintenance requires that approximately 428 trees be removed from within the blow-out zone. Only two of these trees are native. Another 282 hazard trees need to be pruned outside the blow-out zone in order to prevent them from contacting the conductors in the event of tree failure. Between 50-100 trees may be damaged as a result of this tree removal/pruning and may need to be removed or pruned.

Page 31, Table 4: Mitigation Measures:

Several more specific conservation measures have been added to the mitigation table as a result of regulatory agency consultation and permitting are preceded by an asterisk (*). The revised mitigation table is located in Appendix A of the FONSI.

Page 54, Special-Status Wildlife

~~Additional surveys were conducted in 2004 for potential habitat for the Mission blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides missionensis*); a single patch of perennial lupines was found along the lakeshore north of Tower 13/84, in an area not affected by the Proposed Project.~~

Page 54, Special-Status Wildlife

Mission Blue butterfly (Federal Endangered Species, Federal Register 41: 22041 22044; June 1, 1976)

The action area contains suitable habitat for Mission blue butterflies near tower 11/75 and near tower 13/84. Approximately 0.72 acre of grassland containing *Lupinus formosus* var. *formosus*, a host plant for the species, is present near tower 11/75, and a small patch of *L. formosus* is present on an eroded bank of the lake near tower 13/83. In general, all *L. formosus* will be staked, flagged, and avoided. At tower 11/75, construction activities were modified to avoid impact to host plants. During de-conductoring, linemen will avoid flagged plants and walk to the tower from the existing paved access road which is located approximately 300 feet east of the tower. Once at the tower linemen will install pulling blocks (travelers) to allow for wire removal. During tower removal, linemen will avoid flagged plants, walk to the tower, and disconnect tower sections. A helicopter will remove the tower sections and transport off

site. Additional conservation measures were identified in the FWS biological opinion; these measures are included in the mitigation table, located in Appendix A.

The CPUC required re-routes for visual mitigation (FEIR, V-16A, D.3-129) that included removal of structure 11/75 and relocation of structures 12/82 through 13/85. *L. formosus* was not detected during early surveys; an increase in rainfall may have encouraged growth in these areas. Ongoing surveys continue to find no Mission blue butterflies. The potential impacts due to the re-route were addressed through consultation with the FWS and additional conservation measures were included to minimize effects to the species. These potential impacts are not significant.

Page 58, 3.6.3.2 Alternative 1 Cumulative Impacts, 1st paragraph:

Impacts to visual resources could result from the combination of tree removal related to both ongoing maintenance activities and construction of the Jefferson-Martin Transmission Line Project. Vegetation management will occur in an additional 50 feet due to the expanded 100-foot ROW, and therefore a greater area will be cleared; however, this area will already be degraded visually due to the presence of the structures. There are extensive stands of trees nearby – the overall number of trees that need to be removed as part of the project constitute approximately 1% of the estimated total of 24,000 trees within the forested portion of the overhead area. In addition, the trees that will be removed are non-native and currently re-establish themselves naturally. It is expected that this limited natural revegetation would continue after project implementation or normal maintenance activities. Removed trees will be replaced at a ratio to be determined by local jurisdictions; protected trees would be placed at a 3:1 ratio. The cumulative impact to visual resources as a result of ongoing maintenance-related tree removal would be adverse, but not collectively significant.

Page 70, Loss of or Damage to Trees (Impact B-2 in FEIR), 3rd sentence:

~~A limited number of trees (to be determined based on final project design) would be permanently removed or trimmed beyond existing maintenance practices to install the new tower footings and to clear the ROW. During construction, temporary impacts to trees will occur both within and outside of the ROW as well as areas such as cable pull sites, access roads, and staging areas due to clearing or grading. as~~ mandated by three aspects of the Jefferson-Martin project: 1) rerouting the existing line to comply with visual mitigation measures, 2) construction on certain access roads, and 3) construction work areas for installation and removal of structures. The overall number of trees that need to be removed as part of the project constitute approximately 1% of the estimated total of 24,000 trees within the forested portion of the overhead area.

Thirty-two non-native trees need to be removed as part of necessary road modifications necessary to allow passage of large equipment required for structure installation and removal. Six non-native trees are expected to be removed within the 50-foot work areas around the new 230kV structures. Every effort will be made to minimize damage to trees outside the blow-out zone, but PG&E estimates that up to another 25 to 50 trees will be damaged and thus need removal.

An estimated 222 trees will require removal within the blow-out zone; only two live oak and one madrone are native. These trees need to be removed because the new line is in a different alignment due to visual re-routes mandated by mitigation measures in the FEIR.

Page 79, Chapter 3, Alternative 1 Cumulative Impacts for Biological Resources:

Temporary impacts to biological resources could result from the combination of tree removal related to both ongoing maintenance activities and construction of the Jefferson-Martin Transmission Line Project. There are extensive stands of trees nearby – the overall number of trees that need to be removed as part of the project constitute approximately 1% of the estimated total of 24,000 trees within the forested portion of the overhead area. In addition, the trees that will be removed are non-native and currently re-establish

themselves naturally. It is expected that this limited natural revegetation would continue after project implementation or normal maintenance activities. Removed trees will be replaced at a ratio to be determined by local jurisdictions; protected trees would be placed at a 3:1 ratio. The cumulative impact of ongoing maintenance-related tree removal would be adverse, but not collectively significant.

Page 80, 3.7.3.4 Alternative 2: No Action Alternative, after first sentence:

This year, regular, ongoing maintenance requires that approximately 428 trees be removed from within the blow-out zone. Only two of these trees are native. Another 282 hazard trees need to be pruned outside the blow-out zone in order to prevent them from contacting the conductors in the event of tree failure. Between 50-100 trees may be damaged as a result of this tree removal/pruning and may need to be removed or pruned.

The CPUC, PG&E, and NPS agree that no supplemental environmental review is required because clarification on the number of trees slated for removal/pruning does not result in substantial changes or major revisions to the project. Tree removal was considered in both the EA and FEIR. Mitigation measures were imposed in both original documents and will be implemented by PG&E and its contractor.