

3

Errata

CHAPTER 3. ERRATA

This chapter identifies errors and corrections to the text of the Phase 1 Draft EIS and Phase 2 Draft EIS. Potential errors in the Draft EIS documents were identified based on comments received during both Phase 1 and Phase 2, as well as through additional analysis that occurred throughout preparation of the EIS documents. Information in this chapter is focused on factual errors in the two Draft EIS documents and is organized by phase, chapter or section, and page number. The Phase 1 Draft EIS is a programmatic document, and therefore the need for more specific information was not considered to be an error unless it changed the significance findings. In general, comments received that provided clarification regarding particular issues or topics did not necessitate Errata entries; rather, such information was incorporated as appropriate into the new analysis in the Final EIS, and/or acknowledged in the response to comments (see Chapter 6, Appendix J, and Appendix K of this Final EIS).

3.1 PHASE 1 DRAFT EIS ERRATA ITEMS

Page	Location	Change
Chapter 1 – Introduction and Summary		
Page 1-2	Paragraph 2, Lines 11–12	The reference to Figure 1-1 incorrectly states that there is no 230 kV transmission line that reaches the center of the Eastside area. The reference should read that there is no 230 kV transmission line that provides the necessary capacity to the center of the Eastside area.
Page 1-3	Figure 1-1	The legend should read “Customers potentially affected by rotating outages” rather than “Customers affected by rotation outages.”
Page 1-5	Paragraph 1, Line 7	Incorrect reference to Appendix A. The information referred to is in the Stantec memo Energize Eastside Project Memorandum from Keith DeClerck to Mark Johnson, dated July 31, 2015, and is not in any appendix. This memo is available on the EIS project website.
Page 1-6	Paragraph 4, Lines 6–7	The text incorrectly states that “once equipment is in an overload condition the options are to let it fail or take it out of service.” NERC requires that utilities prevent overloads of bulk transmission elements such as lines and transformers.

Page	Location	Change
Page 1-31	Paragraph 2	PSE has stated that HPFF would not be used in underground lines. Therefore, the following text: “Hazardous materials are likely in electrical infrastructure (e.g., oil-containing transformers, High Pressure Fluid-Filled (HPFF) power lines used in some underground lines)” should have stated “Hazardous materials are likely in electrical infrastructure (e.g., oil-containing transformers).”
Page 1-32	Bullet One	PSE has stated that their transformers would not use SF ₆ . Therefore, the following text: “use vegetable-based oil for transformers rather than petroleum based oil or SF ₆ ,” should have said “use vegetable-based oil for gas-insulated circuit breakers rather than petroleum-based oil or SF ₆ .”
Page 1-50	Table 1-2	This summary table incorrectly states that there would be “Minor to Moderate” construction impacts to Historic and Cultural Resources under the No Action Alternative. Table 1-2 should have said there would be “Negligible” impacts to reflect the findings of the Historic and Cultural chapter.
Page 1-51	Table 1-2	Construction impacts to historic and cultural resources for the Energy Storage and Peak Power Generation components should have been classified as "Minor to Significant" as both of these components have the potential for minor impacts to historic properties and significant impacts to archaeological resources, if present.
Page 1-54	Table 1-3	Impacts to Recreation under most Alternative 2 components were incorrect and should have been stated as “Minor to Moderate” to reflect the findings of the recreation chapter. Impacts for peak power generation for Alternative 2 should have been “Minor to Significant.”
Chapter 2 – Description of Project and Alternatives		
Page 2-40	Paragraph 2	When using the term "storing," the text should have referred to the MWh rating (225.6), rather than the power rating of 121 MW.
Page 2-41	Headings	The heading numbering scheme for the Peak Generation Plant Component and Construction subsections is incorrect. The headings should have been numbered as “2.3.3.1 Peak Generation Plant Component” and “2.3.3.3 Construction” to “2.3.3.5 Peak Generation Plant Component” and “2.3.3.6 Construction,” respectively.

Page	Location	Change
Chapter 3 – Earth		
Page 3-2	Paragraphs 2–4	It should have been noted that Washington State Building Code exempts electrical transmission equipment and structures in a utility right-of-way from its requirements. Section 4.11 of the Final EIS provides an expanded discussion of applicable standards (see Section 4.11.1).
Page 3-11	Paragraph 1	“Section 3.3.3.1, Other Hazards,” should have been called “Section 3.3.3.5, Other Hazards.”
Page 3-11	Paragraph 1	Renton should have been included in the following sentence: “Other hazards could include coal mining areas and tunnels such as those present in southern Bellevue and Newcastle.” Although there are no active coal mines in Renton, there are four mapped abandoned coal mines, and smaller unmapped mines may also exist. Historical coal mining areas in Renton are primarily in the vicinity of South Puget Drive, Renton Hill, south of Cedar River Park, and east of Benson Drive (City of Renton Hazard Mitigation Plan, April 2010).
Page 3-16	Paragraph 2, Lines 3–4	This section should have stated that water and sewer pipelines may also need to be provided. The statement “Depending on location, this could include replacing major gas mains to increase natural gas supply capacity” should have been “Depending on location, this could include replacing major gas mains (to increase natural gas supply capacity) and providing water and sewer pipelines.”
Page 3-17	Paragraph 5, Lines 5–7	The text incorrectly states that “PSE would be required to retain a Washington-licensed geotechnical engineer to design the project facilities to withstand probable seismically induced ground shaking at each location.” PSE would be required to retain a system designer that would integrate information and recommendations prepared by a geotechnical engineer to ensure that appropriate design considerations are made. The geotechnical engineer would provide the foundation design of the project facilities.
Page 3-17	Paragraph 5, Lines 8–12	The text incorrectly referred to seismic requirements of the Washington State Building Code and any local building code amendments as “recommendations.”

Page	Location	Change
Page 3-17	Paragraph 5	Section 3.7.1.3, Seismic Hazards, does not discuss the fact that the existing 115 kV transmission line and Olympic Pipeline system cross the Seattle Fault Zone. A major earthquake of the magnitude expected on the Seattle Fault could cause pipeline rupture in certain areas on the Eastside (Earthquake Engineering Institute and Washington Military Department Emergency Management Division, 2005). This is evaluated further in Section 4.11.3 of the Final EIS.
Page 3-22	Paragraph 2	The following mitigation measures should have been listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use appropriate stormwater management (detention) facilities to reduce stream flow velocities and flooding. • Conduct additional seismic engineering.
Chapter 4 – GHG		
Page 4-12	Paragraph Lines 1 and 2	4, The text incorrectly states that: “Using an existing 115 kV corridor for Alternative 1, Option A could require up to an additional 50 feet of lateral clearing along the length of the alignment.” The text should have said: “Using an existing 115 kV corridor for Alternative 1, Option A could require up to a 120 to 150 foot wide corridor (approximately 30 to 40 feet wider than a 115 kV line).”
Chapter 5 – Water		
Page 5-3	Table 5-1	WAC 173-201A should have been included under “State Regulatory Program or Policies.” It includes the rules for how to implement RCW 90.48.
Chapter 6 – Plants and Animals		
Page 6-10	Paragraph 1, Line 4	The text should have included amphibians as a class of animal that utilizes aquatic systems in the Eastside.
Page 6-11	Paragraph 2	The text should have included amphibians and reptiles as classes of animals that utilized forest habitat in the Eastside.
Page 6-12	Paragraph 3	The following species of local importance should have been noted under the “City of Bellevue’s Land Use Code 20.25H.150” bullet: Western big-eared bat, Keen’s myotis, long-legged myotis, and long-eared myotis.

Page	Location	Change
Page 6-14	Paragraph 4, Lines 1–2	Figure 6-6 (now Figure 6-7) should not have been referenced when referring to PSE’s Vegetation Management Program for the No Action Alternative. In addition, PSE’s Vegetation Management Program removes mature trees equal or greater than 25 feet, not 15 feet. The statement: “PSE’s Vegetation Management Program would continue under the No Action Alternative (Figure 6-6). This program includes removal of mature trees greater than 15 feet tall that are located within the transmission right-of-way (typically including the area directly under the wires (the wire zone), and 10 feet from the outer transmission wires (border zones))” should have stated: “PSE’s Vegetation Management Program would continue under the No Action Alternative. This program includes the removal of mature trees equal to or greater than 25 feet in height that are located within the transmission right-of-way, typically including the area directly under the wires (the wire zone), and 10 feet from the outer transmission wires (border zones).”
Page 6-15	Figure 6-6	Figure 6-6 “PSE Vegetation Management Program Zones” should have been numbered as Figure 6-7 and should have been located in Section 6.6.3. In addition, Figure 6-6 as cited on page 6-16 should have been cited as Figure 6-7.
Page 6-17	Paragraphs 4 and 5	Approximately 9 miles of additional 230 kV line would need to be reconductored north of the Sammamish substation as part of Alternative 1, Option B (SCL Corridor), which could include clearing associated with construction access. This was not evaluated in the Phase 1 Draft EIS.
Chapter 8 – Environmental Health and Safety		
Chapter 8	Use of SF6 (throughout Chapter 8)	It was incorrectly assumed that PSE uses SF6 (a gas sometimes used for insulation of electrical equipment) in transformers. SF6 is used by PSE in high-voltage circuit breakers, which are designed to protect an electrical circuit from damage caused by overcurrent/overload or short circuit.
Page 8-9	Sidebar	The text incorrectly states that SF6 is a highly toxic gas. However, it is a contributor to GHG emissions and is further evaluated in that respect in the Phase 2 and Final EIS documents.
Page 8-11	Paragraph 2, Line 1	from the text incorrectly references “Section 8.1.1.” “Section 8.3.1” should have been referenced.
Page 8-35	Paragraph 5, Line 3	The text incorrectly states that NESC guidelines direct PSE how to shield lines with lightning protection.

Page	Location	Change
Page 8-40	Paragraph 3, Lines 6–8	The text incorrectly states that: “state public utility commission has adopted seismic standards that utilities must follow, with structural requirements for poles that would be sufficient to resist anticipated earthquake ground motions.” PSE would meet the structural requirements set by the IBC, ASCE, and ACI.
Chapter 9 – Noise		
Chapter 9	Use of “maintenance yards” (throughout Chapter 9)	Throughout the chapter, the term “maintenance yards” should be “utility yards.” Utility yards is the more commonly used term.
Page 9-8+	Paragraph 2, Lines 1-2; Page 9-15, Paragraph 2, Lines 1–2; Page 9-17, Paragraph 2, Lines 4–5; and Page 9-17, Paragraph 4, Line 1	The text incorrectly states that: “electrical substations are exempt from the maximum permissible noise levels established in Chapter 173-60 of the Washington Administrative Code.” According to WAC 173-60-040(2)(b), electrical substations are subject to the state noise limits between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM; however, they are not subject to the 10 dBA reduction.
Page 9-16	Paragraph 5, heading	Heading “9.6.4.1 Peak Generation Plant Component” should have been “9.6.4.5 Peak Generation Plant Component.”
Page 9-16	Paragraph 5, Lines 7–10	The text incorrectly says that: “...local noise levels could be elevated, especially during nighttime hours, and represent a moderate noise impact.” The text should have said that under such conditions the peak generation plant component could result in a significant noise impact.
Chapter 10 – Land Use		
Page 10-5	Figure 10-2	Figure incorrectly labels most of the park lands and open space (including Lake Sammamish State Park, Squak Mountain State Park and Natural Area, and Cougar Mountain Regional Wildland Park, among others) as planned “institutional lands.”
Page 10-13	Figure 10-5	Figure mislabels the Issaquah Highlands, the area surrounding the Lake Tradition substation, and the parklands on Cougar and Squak as vacant land.

Page	Location	Change
Page 10-20	Paragraph 4	The text states that “PSE confirms that due to safety regulations, transmission lines would never be placed directly over homes (Strauch, telephone conversation).” PSE asserts in a letter that occupied structures have been constructed under the existing 115 kV transmission lines. While no homes are under any of the existing lines, the EIS text should have mentioned that up to three non-residential structures appear in aerial photos to be under the existing lines, all of which appear to be commercial or agricultural uses.
Page 10-24	Paragraph 1, Lines 1–2	The text incorrectly states that PSE would need to purchase the land adjacent to the Lakeside substation if the Lakeside site were chosen. PSE owns the land that would be used for the Lakeside substation expansion. However, PSE would need to develop the land.
Page 10-26	Paragraph 1, Table 10–2	The Newcastle Use Restriction information was incorrect. Utility facilities would be allowed in mixed use, urban residential, and neighborhood business zoning districts.
Page 10-27	Paragraph 3, Lines 1–3	It is unknown whether or not introducing a 230 kV line would be considered a new hazardous use if lower voltage transmission lines already exist. The following sentences have been deleted: “This option would have some of the same zoning consistency issues as Option A (Table 10-2) including potential for co-location with a high consequence land use, since it also crosses the OPL Company (OPLC) pipeline in places and is parallel to it in other locations.”
Page 10-30	Paragraph 2, Line 6	The text incorrectly states that PSE would need to acquire additional property for the expansion of the substations under Alternative 3. It is possible that no additional property acquisition would be required.
Chapter 11 – Views and Visual Resources		
Page 11-20	Paragraph 3, Lines 2–5	Based on research conducted by the EIS Consultant Team, the section states that 12.5 kV lines are commonly on wood poles up to approximately 60 feet tall. PSE has since provided locally specific information. On the Eastside, 12.5 kV lines are commonly on wood poles up to approximately 34 to 40 feet tall.

Page	Location	Change
Page 11-20	Paragraph 4, Lines 1–3	Based on research conducted by the EIS Consultant Team, the section states that 115 kV lines are suspended on single wood poles and are generally 70 to 90 feet above ground. PSE has since provided locally specific information. On the Eastside, 115 kV lines are suspended on single wood poles and are generally 60 to 80 feet above ground.
Page 11-21	Paragraph 4, Line 2	The text incorrectly refers to Westminster substation as an existing substation. It is a proposed substation.
Page 11-37	Paragraph 4, Line 4	The text incorrectly states that SCL has one 230 kV line within its existing transmission corridor. SCL has two 230 kV lines in its existing corridor.
Chapter 12 – Recreation		
Page 12-2	Table 12-1	Table 12-1 should have included Redmond’s Transportation Master Plan (2013) under “Parks and Recreation Plans for Study Area Communities.” This plan includes pedestrian and bicycle system plans.
Page 12-15	Paragraph 1, Lines 1–3	The text incorrectly states that vaults and permanent access roads would be located on the shoreline every 1,500 to 2,500 feet to provide access for maintenance and repair of the underwater cables. Vaults and access roads would only be required at the entrance and exit points to the lake.
Chapter 13 – Historic and Cultural Resources		
Page 13-11	Paragraph 4, Lines 4–5	The section incorrectly states that: “no ground disturbance is expected under the No Action Alternative...” Ground disturbance would occur under the No Action Alternative as part of routine pole replacement activities, and over time all of the poles along the existing Sammamish to Talbot Hill 115 kV corridor would be replaced again. This has been clarified in Section 3.7.4 of the Phase 2 Draft EIS.
Chapter 14 – Transportation		
Page 14-13	Paragraph 6	The text incorrectly states that a few hundred truck trips per day would be required if petroleum products needed to be transported by vehicle, rather than the pipeline. This is corrected in Section 4.9.6 of the Final EIS.

Page	Location	Change
Chapter 15 – Public Services		
Page 15-13	Paragraph 1, Lines 1–2	Text does not note that water and sewer pipelines may also need to be extended to the peak generation plants.
Chapter 16 – Utilities		
Page 16-12	Paragraph 3, Line 1	An outdated franchise agreement with OPLC was cited. The most recent agreement between the City of Bellevue and OPLC is from 2016.
Page 16-16	Last paragraph, Line 1	The text incorrectly states that two substations may be needed. It should have stated that two transformers may be needed.
Page 16-17	Paragraph 1, Lines 4–5	Reference to the Bothell-SnoKing double-circuit 230 kV line should be to the Maple Valley-SnoKing double-circuit 230 kV line.
Page 16-20	Paragraph 4, Lines 1–2	The text incorrectly implies that the Westminster and Vernell substations are existing facilities.
Page 16-20	Paragraph 5, Line 3	The text incorrectly limits the discussion of foundations to just transformer foundation.
Page 16-32	Paragraph 2, Line 1	The text incorrectly states that an additional 230 kV transmission line would be located along SCL’s easement. Under Alternative 1, Option B, the new PSE 230 kV transmission lines would replace the existing SCL 230 kV transmission lines.
Appendix B – Potential Construction Equipment		
Table B-1	Alternative 1 (Options A and B) and Alternative 3, removal of existing wooden poles	Cranes and helicopters should have been listed as equipment being considered for Alternative 1 (Options A and B) and Alternative 3 for the removal of existing wooden poles.

3.2 PHASE 2 DRAFT EIS ERRATA ITEMS

Page	Location	Change
Fact Sheet		
Page III	Under the “Federal” heading	The following should have been listed: “Coastal Zone Management Consistency Determination under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, Washington State Department of Ecology.” This information has been added to the Final EIS (under the State heading).
Chapter 2 – Alternatives		
Pages 2-2 to 2-3	Section 2.1.1	The text incorrectly states that the No Action Alternative would not require issuance of state or local permits. The text should have described the No Action Alternative as: “those actions PSE would undertake to maintain the existing line if the proposed project is not approved.” See Section 2.1.1 of the Final EIS.
Page 2-7	Figure 2.1-2	The “Proposed 115 kV Corridor” should be labeled “Existing 115 kV Corridor.” See Figure 2-2 in the Final EIS for a revised site plan for the Richards Creek substation site based on refined design details.
Section 3.1 – Land Use		
Page 3.1-45	Section 3.1.5.15	The <i>Existing Land Use Pattern and Neighborhood Character</i> bullet for the Renton Segment analysis should have included vacant land as not being impacted (in addition to single-family residential, as listed). This land use has been added to the Final EIS.
Page 3.1-3	Section 3.1.1	A discussion about NMC 18.44.052.C.1 and 18.44.052.D should have been provided. Text has been added to the Final EIS (see Section 4.1.1 of the Final EIS).
Section 3.2 – Scenic Views and the Aesthetic Environment		
Page 3.2-3	Paragraph 2, Line 2	The text incorrectly states that for the Energize Eastside project, the study area is defined as the area within 0.25 mile from the edge of the existing and new corridor. It is from the centerline of the existing and new corridor. This statement has been corrected in the Final EIS.
Page 3.2-38	Paragraph 5, Line 2	The text incorrectly states that the multi-family housing would be 700 feet from the new substation. It would actually be approximately 450 feet. This has been rectified in Section 4.2.5.2 of the Final EIS.
Page 3.2-77	Paragraph 1, Line 4	Text incorrectly states that the poles would be closer to neighboring residences. Text has been revised in the Final EIS (see Section 4.2.5.7 of the Final EIS).

Page	Location	Change
Page 3.2-80	Figure 3.2-22	Figure 3.2-22 shows an outdated pole configuration. The updated pole configuration simulation is provided in the Final EIS (see Figure 4.2-18).
Page 3.2-82	Paragraph 3	There is only one SCL crossing in the Renton Segment, just south of the intersection of 126th Ave SE with NE 25th St. The approach used in the Phase 2 Draft EIS conservatively portrays impacts as further engineering is required to determine if the project would require raising the existing SCL towers. A revised discussion is provided in Section 4.2.5.9 of the Final EIS.
Page 3.2-87	Section 3.2.6.1	Revised text to include regulatory requirements from Newcastle that would need to be complied with (NMC 18.44.052.C.1 and 18.44.052.D). See revised discussion in the Final EIS (see Section 4.2.6).
Section 3.3 – Water		
Page 3.3-12	Section 3.3.4	The discussion of the No Action Alternative should have acknowledged impacts associated with pole replacement. This discussion has been added to Section 4.3.4 of the Final EIS.
Page 3.3-14	Section 3.3.5.2	The information presented for the Richards Creek substation site is incorrect. It was based on preliminary, reconnaissance-level work. The Final EIS presents information based on a formal wetland delineation conducted in June 2017. Therefore, the wetland data presented in the Final EIS (e.g., names, locations, acreages, etc.) are different than what was presented in the Phase 2 Draft EIS. See Section 4.3.5.2 of the Final EIS.
Pages 3.3-19, 20, and 21	Tables 3.3-3 and 3.3-4	Tables 3.3-3 and 3.3-4 present incorrect numbers for the number of “Category I” wetlands impacted under each option. The numbers presented in the bulleted text for each option (see Sections 3.3.5.5 through 3.3.5.7 and Sections 3.3.5.9 through 3.3.5.12 of the Phase 2 Draft EIS) are correct and should have been used for the tables.
Page 3.3-27	Section 3.3.5.14	Text incorrectly states that “No poles would be located in wetlands or buffers...” Although PSE’s design did place all of the new poles along the corridor (excluding substation site) out of wetlands, a few poles would be in buffers.
Section 3.4 – Plants and Animals		
Page 3.4-8	Paragraph 3, Line 7	The term “Managed Right-of-Way” was misused when referring to tree removal. The text should have said “The Watershed Company 100-foot study area.”
Page 3.4-9	Paragraph 1, Line 1	Same as above regarding the term “Managed Right-of-Way.”

Page	Location	Change
------	----------	--------

Page 3.4-9	Figure 3.4-5	Same as above regarding the term “Managed Right-of-Way.”
------------	--------------	--

Throughout	Throughout	Some of the tree numbers presented in the Phase 2 Draft EIS were incorrect because they were based on a mixture of data sources that were generated at different points in the analysis, including reports prepared by The Watershed Company and georeferenced tree data points, and errors in data processing. The corrected numbers for options not carried forward into this Final EIS are listed in the table below. Section 4.4 of the Final EIS provides corrected numbers for the Redmond, Bellevue North, and Renton Segments. The analysis in Section 4.4 for the remaining segments includes revised tree numbers based on information in the permit applications submitted to the Cities of Bellevue and Newcastle. Appendix L provides corrected numbers for the Richards Creek Substation, Bellevue Central, Bellevue South, and Newcastle Segments (see Phase 2 Draft EIS column).
------------	------------	--

Option	Trees Subject to Removal	Significant Trees Subject to Removal	Total Trees Surveyed	% of Trees Removed	Trees Removed Per Acre	Significant Trees Removed Per Acre	Trees Removed From Critical Habitat	Trees Removed From Critical Habitat Buffers
Existing Easement	599	232	753	80%	17.6	6.8	50	152
Bypass Option 1	1,767	1,216	3,034	58%	38.4	26.4	241	920
Bypass Option 2	1,171	859	2,234	52%	21.5	15.7	172	604
Oak 1 Option	1,069	656	1,594	67%	24.5	15.0	2	74
Oak 2 Option	1,215	727	1,805	67%	15.0	9.0	2	74
Willow 1 Option	1,032	449	1,385	75%	25.8	11.2	4	76
Willow 2 Option	1,696	904	2,584	66%	25.4	13.6	4	81
Newcastle	301	33	366	82%	16.6	1.8	2	57

Section 3.5 – Greenhouse Gases

Page 3.5-8	Table 3.5-1	The table incorrectly states that under Bypass Option 2 there would be 39 MT CO ₂ e/year loss of GHGs from sequestration. There would be 40 MT CO ₂ e/year loss of GHGs from sequestration under the Bypass 2 Option.
------------	-------------	---

Page 3.5-9	Table 3.5-2	The table incorrectly states that under the Oak 2 Option there would be 28 MT CO ₂ e/year loss of GHGs from sequestration. There would be 29 MT CO ₂ e/year loss of GHGs from sequestration under the Oak 2 Option.
------------	-------------	---

Page	Location	Change
Section 3.7 – Cultural and Historic Resources		
Page 3.7-3	Figure 3.7-1	The Safeway Distribution Center is in the wrong location on the figure. It should be located at intersection of 124th Ave NE, Bel-Red Road, and NE 12th St. This site is not adjacent to PSE’s Proposed Alignment, so it is not shown in the Final EIS.
Section 3.8 – EMF		
Section 3.8	Throughout	The text throughout incorrectly references “industry guidelines” when the term that should have been used was “reference guidelines.” This has been revised in Section 4.8 of the Final EIS.
Page 3.8-10	Paragraph 1, Lines 9-13	The text incorrectly uses the word “conductors” when the word “structures” should have been used.
Section 3.9 – Pipeline Safety		
Pages 3.9-12 to 3.9-14	Figure 3.9-1	Newport High School is incorrectly located on the Figure 3.9-1 series from pages 3.9-12 to 3.9-14. It is actually located west of the intersection of SE Newport Way and Factoria Blvd SE. This has been rectified in Chapter 4.9 of the Final EIS.
Page 3.9-48	Paragraph 4	The text incorrectly said that diesel, jet fuel, and gasoline would evaporate in a few days. While gasoline breaks down very quickly, usually lasting only days to weeks in the environment, jet fuel usually lasts days to weeks in the environment, and diesel fuel is somewhat persistent lasting 1 month to 1 year in the environment. This has been stated in Section 4.9 of the Final EIS.
Section 3.10 – Economics		
NA	Section 3.10	Tree numbers presented in the Phase 2 Draft EIS have been revised to reflect The Watershed Company’s 100-foot study area as used elsewhere. Section 4.10 of the Final EIS provides corrected numbers for the Redmond, Bellevue North, and Renton Segments. The analysis in Section 4.10 for the remaining segments includes revised tree numbers based on information in the permit applications submitted to the Cities of Bellevue and Newcastle. Appendix L provides updated numbers for the Richards Creek substation, Bellevue Central, Bellevue South, and Newcastle Segments (see Phase 2 Draft EIS column).

Page	Location	Change
Chapter 6 – Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts		
Page 6-2	Paragraph 4, Line 7	The text incorrectly states that the poles in the Newcastle Segment would be closer to residential streets and homes. This has been rectified in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.
Appendix A – Construction		
Page A-5	Paragraph 2, Line 5	The Phase 2 Draft EIS text incorrectly states that the depth of the holes for pole installation would be typically 10 percent of the pole height plus 2 feet. PSE subsequently clarified that it typically would be 10 percent of the pole height plus 4 feet. This has been rectified in Appendix A-1 of the Final EIS.
Page A-12	Preliminary Construction Access Routes – Renton Segment Map	The existing corridor line connects to the substation in the wrong location. The map shows the 230 kV entering Talbot Hill substation on the 115 kV (western) side of the substation instead of the 230 kV (eastern) side. This has been rectified in Appendix A-2 of the Final EIS, as well as other maps throughout the Final EIS.
Appendix C – Scenic Views and Aesthetic Environment Methodology		
Page C-3	Paragraph 3, Line 1	The text incorrectly states that for the Energize Eastside project, the study area is defined as the area within 0.25 mile from the edge of the existing and new corridor. It is from the centerline of the existing and new corridor. This statement has been corrected in the Final EIS.
Page C-29	Table C-9	Newcastle Municipal Code 18.44.052.C.1 and 18.44.052.D should have been included in Table C-9 under “Guidance for Reducing Visual Impacts.” These have been included in the Final EIS (see Appendix C, Table C-10 of the Final EIS)
Appendix I – Pipeline		
Page 57	Paragraph 1, Line 5	Reference to the “10 amps per square meter threshold” should have been to the “20 amps per meter threshold.”
Page 89	Section 9.3.7	Radius of impact area around each pole is shown in the Draft EIS as being 25 feet; however, based on information received from PSE, the impact area could be greater.