

# Gateway West Transmission Line Draft EIS Errata Sheet

## Executive Summary

Page ES-17: “Projected local and non-local employment totals are summarized for average weekly and peak employment by EPC Analysis Area in Table 3.4-20 of the Draft EIS.” The correct reference is Table 3.4-22.

## Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need

Page 1-3: “The Proponents have identified a public need (described in Section 1.5).” The correct reference is Section 1.3.

Page 1-3: “Subpart 2804 describes the process for filing applications for a ROW grant, which was followed by the Proponents in submitting the applications described in Section 1.1.” The correct reference is Section 1.4.

Page 1-10: “The capacity ratings of the paths are based on maintaining established reliability criteria (see Section 1.3.2.3 below for further information).” The correct reference is Section 1.3.3.3.

Page 1-23: “Section 2.2.1 identifies whether an amendment would be needed for each Proposed Route and Route Alternative and what sections of Chapter 3 would be affected if a plan amendment were required.” The correct reference is Table 2.2-1.

Page 1-23: “The Final ROD is available online at <http://corridoreis.anl.gov/eis/guide/index.cfm>.” This is the link to the Final PEIS. The correct link for the ROD is <http://corridoreis.anl.gov/index.cfm>.

Page 1-23: “Further discussion regarding the use of the WWE corridors for the Project is found in Section 2.4.13.” The correct reference is Section 2.4.12.

Page 1-38: “Monitoring and mitigation are addressed in each resource section in Chapter 3 and measures are summarized in Chapter 2 (Table 2.2-2).” The correct reference is Table 2.7-1.

## Chapter 2 – Alternatives

Page 2-23: “Section 2.4.13 and Table 2.4-2 describe use of the WWE corridor by alternative.” The correct reference is Section 2.4.12. The reference to Table 2.4-2 is correct.

Page 2-26: The text reads “Table 2-9 and Appendix 25 or the RNP.” The text should say “Appendix 25 of the RNP.”

Page 2-115: “The proposed Anticline Substation is located about 2.5 miles southeast of the Jim Bridger Power Plant, along the east side of Deadman Draw, approximately 30 miles east of Rock Springs, Wyoming, as shown on Appendix A, Figure A-14.” The correct reference is Figure A-4.

Page 2-115: “The proposed substation would consist of a new 500-kV yard constructed southeast of the power plant occupying a fenced area of about 125 acres on private land (Appendix A, Figure A-4).” The correct reference is Figure A-14.

Page 2-117: “Approximately 45 acres would be developed and fenced (Appendix A, Figure A-15).” The correct reference is Figure A-16.

Page 2-139: “Details of substation contents are found in Appendix B, Section 1.6.” The referenced section appears incorrectly numbered as “Section 1.5 Substations” in Appendix B. It

should be numbered 1.6 (as referenced on page 2-139 of Chapter 2) as there is already a Section 1.5 “Access Roads” in Appendix B.

Page 2-207: “Alternative 7J would deviate from Alternative 7I at point 7r.3 and continue through point 13 where the relocated Cedar Hill Substation would be located and reconnect with the Segment 9 Proposed Route at point 9a.6 (see Appendix A, Figure A-9).” The correct reference is Appendix A, Figures A-9 and A-11.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.4 – Socioeconomics**

Page 3.4-13: Table 3.4-9, footnote 1: this footnote refers to footnote 1 of Table 3.4-5, for self-employed individuals. The footnote should refer to Table 3.4-7, footnote 1.

Page 3.4-27: “There is a Design Variation involving use of two single-circuit structures proposed by the Proponent for Segments 2, 3, and 4 (see Section 2.2 for details)...” The correct reference is Section 2.1.2.

Page 3.4-27: “The Proponents have also proposed a Schedule Variation, analyzed in Section 3.4.2.5...” The correct reference is Section 3.4.2.6.

Page 3.4-38: “Livestock dominates the agricultural sectors of most of the affected counties in terms of total market value of agricultural products sold, with some exceptions, including Bannock, Oneida, and Power counties in Idaho and Elko County, Nevada (Table 3.4-7).” The correct reference is Table 3.4-8.

Page 3.4-45: “Approximately 10 percent of workers relocating to the Project area are assumed for the purposes of analysis to be accompanied by their families (see Tables 3.4-23 and 3.4-24).” The correct reference is Table 3.4-22.

Page 3.4-64: “However, almost half the Proposed Action would be constructed on public lands that are not subject to local property taxes, and an estimated 99.4 percent of the land use Analysis Area crosses land that is currently rangeland, agricultural, forest, water and wetlands, and existing ROW (see Section 3.17 – Land Use and Recreation, Table 3.17-2)...” The correct reference is Table 3.17-3 and Table 3.17-4.

Page 3.4-70: “This would also be the case with the projected relative net increases in the other Wyoming counties (Table 3.4-34).” This table reference should be removed.

Page 3.4-77: “Projected increases would be lower under the Schedule Variation in Carbon, Converse, Lincoln, Natrona, and Sweetwater Counties, Wyoming (compare with Table 3.4-22).” The correct reference is Table 3.4-24.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.5 – Environmental Justice**

Page 3.5-7: “There is a Design Variation involving use of two single-circuit structures proposed by the Proponent for Segments 2, 3, and 4 (see Section 2.2 for details)...” The correct reference is Section 2.1.2.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Vegetation**

Page 3.6-1: “The Project crosses two major ecological zones (see Figures E.10-1 and E.10-2 in Appendix E).” Parenthetical should be deleted; no figure in Appendix E shows the ecological zones.

Page 3.6-10: “There is a Design Variation involving use of two single-circuit structures proposed by the Proponents for Segments 2, 3, and 4 (see Section 2.2 for details)...” The correct reference is Section 2.1.2.

Page 3.6-12: “Proposed EPMs and BMPs (as defined in Sections 2.8 and 2.12, respectively)...”  
The correct reference is Table 2.7-1.

Page 3.6-28: “Alternative 1E-C results in less maintenance of forest/woodland areas for the ROW and fewer permanent impacts to shrublands; however, Alternative 1E-C would permanently remove or alter more wetland/riparian vegetation (Table D.6-4).” The correct reference is Table 3.6-4.

Page 3.6-28: “Alternative 1W-A primarily crosses disturbed grassland and natural sagebrush whereas the comparison portion of the Proposed Route primarily crosses natural sagebrush and grassland vegetation (Table D.6-2 in Appendix D).” The correct reference is Table D.6-1 in Appendix D.

Page 3.6-41: The statement that “Alternatives 7H and 7I also cross the caribou-Targhee NF” is incorrect. These route alternatives cross the Sawtooth NF, as correctly stated in the paragraph above.

Page 3.6-49: “Construction of the Proposed Route and clearing of the ROW along Segment 10 would directly affect 549 acres for installation of the transmission line, primarily consisting of other cover types and disturbed grassland (Table D.6-3 in Appendix D).” The correct reference is Table 3.6-21.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.7 – Special Status Plants**

Page 3.7-21: “To avoid impacting ESA-listed or candidate plant species, the Proponents have proposed the following species-specific EPMs for blowout penstemon (PPC-1), Colorado butterfly plant (PPC-2), slickspot peppergrass (PPC-3), and Ute ladies'-tresses (PPC-4; Table 2.2-2)...” The correct reference is Table 2.7-1.

Page 3.7-19: “There is a Design Variation involving use of two single-circuit structures proposed by the Proponent for Segments 2, 3, and 4 (see Section 2.2 for details)...” The correct reference is Section 2.1.2.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.9 – Wetlands and Riparian Areas**

Pages 3.9-25 to 3.9-27: The numbers provided for impacts to RCZs on the Sawtooth NF are not correct. Only Alternatives 7H, 7I, and 7J would impact RCZs on the Forest; 7H would impact 52.6 RCZ acres, 7I would impact 78.9 acres, and 7J would impact 58.7 acres. Alternative 7H would have the fewest crossings of RCZs, whereas Alternatives 7I would have the most. Alternative 7H would cross 26 intermittent streams, 7I would cross 14 perennial and 28 intermittent streams, and 7J would cross 2 perennial and 29 intermittent streams.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.13 – Paleontological Resources**

Page 3.13-10: The reference to Table 2.2-2 should be Table 2.7-1.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.14 – Geologic Hazards**

Page 3.14-6 states: Table B-2 in Appendix B indicated that the majority of transmission tower foundations are “20 feet or less.” The text should have stated “20 feet or more.”

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.15 – Soils**

Page 3.15-29: Alternative 7J would also cross the Sawtooth NF, as discussed below.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.16 – Water Resources**

Page 3-16-37: "Alternative 7H would include 68 stream crossings on the Caribou-Targhee NF (Table 3.16-5). " The sentence should state there are 68 crossings on the Sawtooth NF not the Caribou-Targhee NF.

### **Chapter 3, Section 3.17 – Lands and Recreation**

Page 3.17-106: The statement that "Federal lands along Segment 7 are regulated in part by the by the Caribou Forest Plan" is incorrect. Lands along Alternatives 7H, 7I, and 7J are regulated in part by the Sawtooth Forest Plan.

### **Chapter 4 – Cumulative Effects**

Page 4-35: The reference to Section 3.18 – Land Use and Recreation should refer to Section 3.17.

Page 4-63: The reference to Section 4.4.6 (general vegetation) should refer to Section 4.4.7.

Page 4-73: The reference for mitigation measures to reduce effects on prey species should include Section 3.10 as well as Section 3.11.

Page 4-78: The reference to Table 3.11-3 (sage-grouse leks that cannot be avoided) should refer to Table 3.11-4.