PART 1

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Text

Part 1. COB Energy Facility Final Environmental Impact Statement Text

Summary

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Proposed Federal Action	S-1		***Revision, first paragraph, first sentence.*** COB Energy Facility, LLC, a subsidiary of Peoples Energy Resources ~~Corporation~~ Company (PERC), proposes to construct a natural gas-fired, combined-cycle electric generating plant near Bonanza, Oregon.
Purpose and Need for Action	S-1	28E	***Revision, first paragraph, last sentence.*** BLM will grant the rights-of-way if they are determined to be ~~will authorize~~ appropriate uses of public land consistent with applicable planning documents. ***Additional paragraph****:* PERC's purpose for the proposed the action is to produce electricity for sale to load serving entities in the Pacific Northwest and California. To meet the purpose, PERC would construct, and operate a combined-cycle, gas-fired power plant strategically located along a major electrical transmission line and natural gas pipeline, where a power plant could economically and efficiently generate electrical power. PERC specifically seeks a generation plant site from which it can provide maximum market response to regional power demands, at a "trading hub" location on the Western power grid, having sufficient transmission and substation capacity to meet this objective. The siting of the proposed project and interconnection to the Captain Jack substation is linked to the original purpose of the California-Oregon Transmission Project (COTP). As stated in the COTP FEIS (1988), the transmission line "is to expand the bidirectional capability of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie transmission system and to help serve California's need for economical power, the Pacific Northwest's desire to sell surplus power, and the need for maintaining and increasing the reliability of the existing transmission system."
Related State Actions	S-1		***Revision, first paragraph, after last sentence.*** A Draft Proposed Order was issued on December 20, 2003 and a proposed order was issued on March 16, 2004. The Proposed Order recommends that the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council issue a site certificate with conditions.
Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement	S-2	2E, 27G	***Revision, second paragraph.*** In addition, process wastewater would be managed by one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial reuse of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in a 20-acre, onsite lined evaporation pond ~~• Temporary storage onsite and hauling to a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) for offsite disposal~~
Components of the Proposed Action	S-3		***No changes***
Major Conclusions	S-3	28F	***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Geology, Soil, and Seismicity	S-3		***No changes***
Hydrology and Water Quality	S-4	2E, 4B, 27G, 28G	***Revision, third paragraph***: ~~Three~~ Two alternatives for managing process wastewater are proposed: 1) beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture~~,~~ and 2) evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond~~, or 3) temporary storage onsite and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal~~. Sanitary wastewater from Energy Facility operations would be treated and managed using an onsite septic drainfield. There would be no direct discharge of process water or wastewater to surface water or groundwater.
Vegetation and Wildlife	S-4	28H	***No changes***
Impacts to Wildlife Habitat	S-4	28I	***No changes***
Impacts to Agricultural Land	S-4		***No changes***
Temporary Impacts	S-5		***No changes***
Mitigation for Permanent Disturbance	S-5		***No changes***
Biological Assessment	S-5		***No changes***
Fish	S-5	28J	***No changes***
Traffic and Circulation	S-6		***No changes***
Air Quality	S-6		***No changes***
Scenic and Aesthetic Values	S-6	28K, 28L, 28M	***Revision, fourth sentence:*** The elements of the proposed Energy Facility that could affect the visual and aesthetic quality of the environment would be four stacks ~~and~~, 38 electric transmission towers, and transmission line corridor clearing and access roads. The visual impacts would affect both private land and BLM-administered land.
Cultural Resources	S-6		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Land-Use Plans and Policies	S-7	28N	***After existing paragraph, the following paragraphs added.*** The proposed project involves the location of electrical transmission facilities on approximately 44 acres of land administered by the BLM. This would involve the issuance of a right-of-way or easement to the project proponent. The easement objective from the Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (RMP), pages 66 to 67, calls for making rights-of-way available where consistent with local comprehensive plans, Oregon statewide planning goals and rules, and avoidance/exclusion areas identified in the RMP. The proposed facilities do not cross any lands identified as easement avoidance or exclusion areas. The RMP encourages, but does not require, new utility corridors to be located within existing corridors. For new corridor creation, the project proponent must demonstrate that the use of an existing route or corridor is not technically or economically feasible and that the proposed corridor minimizes damage to the environment. The proposed location for transmission corridors falls outside of existing corridors designated in the RMP. The proponent's reasoning for not using existing corridors is found in Section 2.5.2.4, Alternative Electric Transmission Line. The proposed project is also consistent with the goals and objectives of the National Energy Policy (2001) because it would contribute to modernization and expansion of the national energy supply.
Socioeconomics	S-7		***No changes***
Public Services and Utilities	S-7	2E, 27G	***Revision, second paragraph.*** ~~Three~~Two alternatives are being considered for the disposal of process wastewater: 1) beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture~~,~~ and 2) evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond~~, or 3) temporary storage onsite and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal. If process wastewater is managed by storage and hauling to a WWTP for disposal, the proposed action would have a minor impact on the treatment capacity at the WWTP~~.
Health and Safety	S-7		***No changes***
Areas of Controversy	S-8		***No changes***
Issues to Be Resolved	S-8		***No changes***

Chapter 1 Introduction

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
1.1 Proposed Action	1-1		***Revision, first paragraph, first sentence.*** COB Energy Facility, LLC (the project proponent), a subsidiary of Peoples Energy Resources Company (PERC), proposes to build and operate a natural gas-fired, combined-cycle electric power generation plant near Bonanza, Oregon. ***Revision, third and fourth paragraphs.*** ~~Because these Federal actions are necessary for development of the COB Energy Facility, BPA and BLM would assess~~ To inform BPA and BLM decisionmakers and the public of the potential environmental impacts of the ~~entire Facility before taking any action~~ proposed actions by BPA and BLM related to the proposed project, this environmental impact statement (EIS) has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Because the actions are integrally related and both necessary for ultimate construction of the Facility, they are considered together as one combined Proposed Action. The following terms are used in this ~~environmental impact statement (~~EIS~~)~~:
1.2 Purpose and Need for the Action	1-2		***No changes***
1.2.1 Underlying Need for Action	1-3		***Revision, fifth paragraph.*** Generation resources typically require interconnection with a high-voltage electrical transmission system for delivery to purchasing retail utilities. Bonneville Power Administration owns and operates the Federal Columbia River Transmission System (FCRTS), comprising more than three-fourths of the high-voltage transmission grid in the Pacific Northwest and including extra-regional transmission facilities. BPA operates the FCRTS, in part, to integrate and transmit "electric power from existing or additional Federal or non-Federal generating units."~~-~~[7] BPA has adopted an Open Access Transmission Tariff for FCRTS consistent with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) *pro forma* open access tariff.[8] Under BPA's tariff, BPA offers transmission interconnection to the FCRTS to all eligible customers on a first-come, first-served basis, with this offer subject to an environmental review under NEPA. Interconnection with the FCRTS is essential to deliver power from many generation facilities to loads both within and outside the Pacific Northwest. ***Revision, fifth paragraph.*** In summary, electrical consumers served by the Northwest Power Pool and in other western states need increased power production to serve increasing demand, and high-voltage transmission services to deliver that power. ~~Because the project proponent has requested to integrate power from its proposed COB Energy Facility into the FCRTS at the Captain Jack Substation, BPA must decide whether and how to grant that request.~~ In addition, BPA and BLM need to respond to PERC's request for authorizations required from these agencies for PERC to construct the proposed project. More specifically, BPA needs to respond to PERC's request for an interconnection of the proposed project to the FCRTS at BPA's Captain Jack Substation and integration of the power from the project into the FCRTS. BLM needs to respond to PERC's request for a grant of easement across BLM land.
Footnote for 1.2.1 Underlying Need for Action	1-3		***Revision, additional footnote.*** [8] Although BPA is not subject to FERC jurisdiction, BPA follows the open access tariff as a matter of national policy. This course of action demonstrates BPA's commitment to nondiscriminatory access to its transmission system and ensures that BPA would receive nondiscriminatory access to the transmission system of utilities that are subject to FERC jurisdiction.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
1.2.2 Purpose of the Action	1-3		***No changes***
1.2.3 Peoples Energy Resources Corporation Project Purpose	1-4		***Additional section.*** **1.2.3 Peoples Energy Resources Company Project Purpose** PERC is a diversified energy company including power generation, midstream services, retail energy services, and oil and gas production. The COB project is a continuation of PERC's business to construct and operate power generation plants for wholesale customers in the United States. As a natural gas and electrical energy provider, the focus of power generation is on natural gas-fired, single-cycle, and combined-cycled power plants. The purpose of PERC's proposed action is to produce electricity for sale to load-serving entities in the Pacific Northwest and California. To meet the purpose, PERC would site, construct and operate a combined-cycle, gas-fired power plant. The selected site would be strategically located along a major electrical transmission line and natural gas pipeline where a power plant could economically and efficiently generate electrical power. PERC specifically seeks a generation plant site where it can provide maximum market response to regional power demands, at a "trading hub" location on the Western power grid having sufficient transmission and substation capacity to meet this objective. The siting of the proposed project and interconnection to the Captain Jack substation are linked to the original purpose of California-Oregon Transmission Project (COTP). As stated in the COTP FEIS (1988), the transmission line "…is to expand the bidirectional capability of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie transmission system and to help serve California's need for economical power, the Pacific Northwest's desire to sell surplus power, and the need for maintaining and increasing the reliability of the existing transmission system." Other key siting criteria are described in more detail in Section 2.3.1**.**
1.3 National Environmental Policy Act Review	1-4		***No changes***
1.3.1 Public Involvement	1-4		***No changes***
1.3.2 Comments Received	1-5 and 1-6		***Revision, header to 1.3.2.*** **1.3.2 Scoping Comments Received** ***Revision, second paragraph, first sentence.*** To address the concern about impact on groundwater, the project ~~propenent~~ proponent has committed to switching from wet cooling to air cooling. This switch reduces water requirements by 97 percent. On July 25, 2003, the project proponent filed an amendment to the site certificate application (SCA) dated September 5, 2002, documenting the switch to air cooling.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
1.3.3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments Received	1-6		***Additional section.*** **1.3.3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments Received** Notice of the availability of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) was published in the Federal Register on page 66825 on November 28, 2003. On January 22, 2004, two public meetings were held in conjunction with the hearing conducted by the Oregon Department of Energy. One meeting was held in Lorella, Oregon, where approximately 80 people attended, and the second meeting was held in Klamath Falls, Oregon, where approximately 20 people attended. The public comment period for the DEIS closed on February 13, 2004. A total of 29 comments letters were received, 27 from private citizens and two from regulatory agencies. Generally, comments were received on the following topics: • Management and handling of stormwater • Disposal and management of process wastewater • Potential impacts to air quality, wildlife, visual and aesthetic resources, and recreation • Water rights, availability, and source • Impacts to roads and traffic • Location of the proposed project compared to other potential sites • Siting of the proposed project on exclusive farm use (EFU)-zoned land • Concerns about PERC A meeting was held with the Department of Interior and BLM on April 14, 2004, to review and discuss their comments. Comments on the DEIS submitted during the comment period were considered in preparation of the FEIS. Responses to comments were prepared according to regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing procedural provision of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 40 CFR 1503.4.
1.4 State of Oregon Review	1-5		***Revision, second paragraph.*** The project proponent submitted an application for a site certificate on September 5, 2002. The SCA was deemed complete on April 30, 2003. On July 25, 2003, an amendment was filed with EFSC to switch to air cooling from wet cooling. A Draft Proposed Order was issued on December 20, 2003, and a proposed order was issued on March 16, 2004. The Proposed Order recommends that EFSC issue a site certificate with conditions. Review of the application by state agencies would proceed concurrent with the NEPA review process. EFSC has no involvement with BPA's siting and construction of its transmission lines and appurtenant facilities.
1.5 Scope and Organization of the EIS	1-5		***No changes***

Chapter 2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
	Pages are not applicable because of reorganization		***Chapter 2 has been reorganized, and clarifying information on the site selection process and alternatives considered has been added. The entire chapter, in track mode (redline) format, is attached as Part 4 of this errata document. Major changes are summarized below.***
2.1 Introduction			
2.2 Site Selection	15E, 17E, 18A, 23L, 29B, 29D, 29E, 29F, 29G		***Additional Section***
2.2 No Action			***Moved to Section 2.4 and retitled No Action Alternative.***
2.3 Proposed Action	2-4	28O, 28P	***Revision, second paragraph, second sentence:*** The locations of the Energy Facility and its related or supporting facilities are shown in Figure 2-1, and Figure 2-2 shows the BLM-managed ~~owned~~ parcels.
2.3 Proposed Action	2-2	2E, 27G	***Revision, second paragraph, third sentence.*** ~~Three~~ Two alternatives for disposal of the process wastewater are proposed: 1) beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture, and 2) evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond~~, or 3) temporary storage onsite and hauling to an offsite wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) for disposal.~~
2.3.1 Electric Power Generation Facility			
2.3.1.1 Site Location			***Revision, third paragraph, first bullet.*** **Electric transmission interconnect.** The Energy Facility site would connect to the existing BPA Captain Jack Substation, which is part of the California-Oregon Intertie ~~known as the "Super Highway Crossroads" of Energy for the Pacific Northwest and California~~ and near the California-Oregon border trading hub (geographic location where multiple participants trade power), one of three key power marketing price reference points in the West.
2.3.1.2 Power Generation Facilities			***No substantive changes***
2.3.1.3 Site Facilities			***No substantive changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
2.3.1.4 Water Supply			***No changes***
2.3.1.5 Fuel and Chemical Storage Facilities			***No substantive changes***
2.3.1.6 Laydown and Storage Areas	2-6		***No changes***
2.3.1.7 Fire Prevention and Control	2-7		***No changes***
2.3.1.8 Wastewater Management, Beneficial Use, and Disposal	2-7	2E, 27G	***Revision, Operation subhead, second sentence and bullets.*** Process wastewater from the Energy Facility would be managed by one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond • ~~Temporary storage onsite and hauling to an offsite WWTP for disposal~~
2.3.1.8 Wastewater Management, Beneficial Use, and Disposal	2-10	28Q	***Revision, Irrigated Pasture Beneficial Use***: If process wastewater is managed by beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture, water generated ~~developed~~ during the winter months would be stored in onsite tanks and combined with process water produced ~~in the~~ during summer months to irrigate onsite acreage.
2.3.1.8 Wastewater Management, Beneficial Use, and Disposal	2-11	2E, 27G	***Revision, Irrigation Pasture Beneficial Use subhead, second paragraph.*** The process water would be used to improve grazing forage yield in areas currently without irrigation, and possibly to enhance the wildlife forage yield in habitat mitigation areas. This activity represents a beneficial use of the water that would not be made if it were evaporated ~~or hauled offsite for disposal.~~

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
2.3.1.8 Wastewater Management, Beneficial Use, and Disposal	2-11 to 2-12	2E, 27G	***Remove the entire subsection titled Storage and Hauling to Wastewater Treatment Plant:.***
2.3.1.9 Stormwater Management	2-12	2A, 2B, 28C, 28Y2, 28L4	***Revision, Stormwater Sewer System:*** The stormwater sewer system is designed to accommodate a 100-year, 24-hour storm event and would collect stormwater from rooftops, parking lots, and landscaped areas. This storm sewer system would consist of ditches, culverts, and piping, as required, routed to the 1.5-acre stormwater pond. ~~Two alternatives are available for managing the stormwater~~ ~~d~~Discharge from the stormwater pond~~. The preferred alternative~~ would ~~discharge the stormwater into~~ be routed to a 4.7-acre infiltration basin. The infiltration basin is designed to allow the stormwater to infiltrate into the ground. ~~The second alternative~~ ~~would discharge the stormwater into the West Langell Valley Road drainage ditch~~ ~~From the point where the stormwater is discharged into the drainage ditch, the stormwater would travel approximately 8,000 feet before it discharges into the High Line Levee Ditch. The High Line Levee Ditch discharges into the Lost River~~.
2.3.1.10 Solid Waste Management	2-13	2D, 27F	***Revision, first paragraph in subsection Operation.*** The proposed Energy Facility would generate approximately 50 tons per year of conventional solid waste consisting of office trash, packing materials, and nonrecyclables. Solid wastes generated during operation would be recycled as much as feasible. Recyclable materials would be separated from the solid waste stream. Solid waste would be stored in onsite roll-off bins. Any solid waste removed from the sumps or drains would be placed in barrels. Solid waste would be collected periodically by a private contractor and hauled to a licensed disposal facility. The nearest licensed facility is the Klamath County Landfill, located about 35 miles from the Energy Facility site. This landfill and the regional landfill, Roosevelt Regional Landfill in southern Washington, would accommodate solid waste generated by operation of the Energy Facility.
2.3.1.11 Electric Transmission Line	2-14	28R, 28S	***Revision, fourth paragraph, last sentence:*** Where temporary roads are used, any disturbed ground would be regraded to preconstruction contours, erosion control methods implemented, and revegetation initiated.
	2-15	28T, 28U, 28V, 28W, 28X	***Add, end of first complete paragraph:*** Mitigation measures are described in Section 3.4.2.
2.3.3 Natural Gas Pipeline	2-15		***No substantive changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
2.3.4 Water Supply Well System	2-16		***No substantive changes***
2.3.5 Construction Schedule and Activities	2-17		***No changes***
2.4 Other Projects Potentially Contributing to Cumulative Impacts	2-26	28Y	***Moved and renumbered: Section 2.6.*** ***Add:*** An additional paragraph on ongoing evaluations for a wind project in the vicinity of Bryant Mountain has been added to the text.
2.5 Other Alternatives			
2.5.1 Alternative Strategies for Electrical Supply and Demand Management	2-20		***No changes***
2.5.2 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated From Further Analysis	2-21	3A, 9B, 9C, 15C, 15E, 17C, 17E, 18A, 21B, 23L, 23N, 29B, 29D, 29E, 29F, 29G	***Additional text added to the introductory part of this subsection. Figure 2-3, an addition to the FEIS, is cited to illustrate alternative locations considered for potential development. Table 2-2, an addition to the FEIS, cited to show other potential sites and vicinities for development.***
2.5.2.1	2-22		***Additional subsection: Alternative Energy Facility Sites in the Vicinity of Bonanza, Oregon***
2.5.2.2 Alternative Natural Gas Pipeline	2-23		***No substantive changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
2.5.2.3 Alternative Water Supply Pipeline	2-24	28A1, 28U1	***No substantive changes***
2.5.2.4 Alternative Electric Transmission Line	2-24	28A1	***Add, fourth paragraph, after third sentence:*** The additional corridor width for the alternative transmission line is for extra workspace required for adequate separation from the existing transmission line.
		28B1	***Revision, fourth paragraph, last sentence:*** The easement alternative would require 52 acres of BLM-~~own~~managed land, while the preferred route would require 44 acres of BLM-~~own~~managed land.
		28C1	***Revision, fifth paragraph, second sentence:*** Land features observed along the alternative electric transmission line route include existing electric transmission lines, fallow agricultural fields used for cattle grazing, ~~residents~~ residences, a lake, woodland for selective historical harvesting of ponderosa pine, open rangeland/woodlands managed by federal and private landowners, and the ~~PG&E~~ GTN interstate gas pipeline system.
2.5.2.5 Alternative Cooling Scenario	2-26		***No substantive changes***
2.5.2.6 Stormwater Discharge to Road Ditch	2-26	2A, 2B, 2C, 27E, 27H, 28C	***Additional section.*** **2.5.2.6 Stormwater Discharge to Road Ditch** An alternative to manage stormwater that falls inside the fenceline of the Energy Facility was considered in the DEIS. This alternative was referred to as the second alternative in the DEIS. That second alternative would route stormwater from the stormwater pond to a ditch adjacent to the Energy Facility access road into the West Langell Valley Roadside ditch, where it would eventually enter the High Line Levee Ditch and then the Lost River. This second alternative is no longer under consideration.
2.5.2.7 Temporary Storage and Hauling Process Wastewater to WWTP	2-27	2E, 27G	***Additional section.*** **2.5.2.7 Temporary Storage and Hauling Process Wastewater to WWTP** Three alternatives were considered in the DEIS for management of process wastewater. The third alternative described in the DEIS would manage of process wastewater by temporarily storing onsite and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal. The project proponent has contacted the two municipal WWTPs in Klamath Falls—the South Suburban Sanitary District and the City of Klamath Falls Sanitary District. According to managers at both facilities, each would be required to evaluate whether they can meet the EPA categorical standard to accept industrial waste or whether local ordinance provides for acceptance of truck-hauled wastewater. Neither of these WWTP is presently permitted to accept trucked wastes. Therefore this third alternative is no longer under consideration.
Table 2-1	2-28 to end of table		***Revision to entire table.*** Insert specific mitigation measures for each resource area. This addition affects the column titled "Impact of Proposed Action/Mitigation." Revise table title to "Summary of Affected Environment, ~~and~~ Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
		2E, 27G	***Revision, Impact of Proposed Action/Mitigation Column*** **3.3.2** Wastewater and stormwater discharge during Facility construction and operation could affect surface and groundwater quality. BMPs for management of stormwater would be used to safeguard water quality during construction and operation. Onsite stormwater would be recycled (plant drains system) or discharged to an infiltration basin (storm sewer system) Wastewater management would be by one of ~~three~~ two options: beneficial reuse of the water for irrigated pasture~~,~~ or an evaporation pond~~, or storage and hauling to an offsite wastewater treatment plant (WWTP)~~.
		28G1, 28H1	***Revision, Existing Conditions column:*** Surface waters within the project area support various species of fish, including ~~one~~ two federal and state-listed endangered species. ~~Construction and operation of the Facility would not affect fisheries resources in the area.~~
		28L1	***Delete, Existing Conditions column, fourth sentence.*** ~~No exceedance of the annual PM_{10} standard has occurred in the last 10 years.~~
		28M1, 28N1	***Revision, Impact of Proposed Action/Mitigation, 3.8.1:*** Visual impacts to scenic and aesthetic resources could potentially result from the stacks and transmission towers for the electric transmission line; however, these facility features would be in the background of any views. Impacts could also occur from the clearing of the easement and access roads. The proposed Energy Facility would not impact designated scenic areas as described in Section 3.8.1. ***3.8.2:*** No mitigation measures ~~for impact 3.8.1~~ are recommended
		28S1	***Add, Impact of Proposed Action/Mitigation, 3.13.20:*** If vegetation is not maintained within the transmission easement, under certain atmospheric conditions, arcing or torching of the vegetation may occur, resulting in wildfires.
		28T1	***Add, Impact of Proposed Action/Mitigation, 3.1.3:*** The proposed project facilities and transmission towers may impact scenic views for recreational users in the vicinity of the project but would not affect recreational public or private facilities.
Chapter 2 Figures			***Revised Figure 2-2.*** Figure 2-2 will be revised to show BLM-managed land. Figures 2-3 and 2-6 will be added. Figures 2-4 and 2-5 will be renumbered. See Part 3 New and Revised Figures.

Chapter 3 Affected Environmental and Environmental Consequences

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.1 Introduction	3.1-1		***No changes***
3.1.1 Electric Power Generation Facility	3.1-1		***No changes***
3.1.2 Environmental Impacts of the No Action Alternative	3.1-1		***No changes***
3.1.3 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts 3.1.3.1 Geology, Soil, and Seismicity	3.1-2		***No changes***
3.1.3.2 Hydrology and Water	3.1-2		***No changes***
3.1.3.3 Vegetation and Wildlife	3.1-2		***No changes***
3.1.3.4 Traffic and Circulation	3.1-2		***No changes***
3.1.3.5 Air Quality	3.1-2		***No changes***
3.1.3.6 Scenic and Aesthetic Values	3.1-2		***Add additional bullet:*** The transmission line and easement would be visible from adjacent lands and from some scenic areas.
3.1.3.7 Socioeconomic	3.1-3		***No changes***
3.1.3.8 Health and Safety	3.1-3		***No changes***
3.1.4 Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity	3.1-3		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.1.4.1 Proposed Action	3.1-3	28Z1	***Revision, second paragraph, last sentence.*** No wastewater or stormwater would be discharged directly to surface or ground waters.
3.1.4.2 No Action Alternative	3.1-4		***No changes***
3.1.4.3 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commit-ments of Resources	3.1-4		***No changes***
3.1.4.4 Proposed Action	3.1-4		***No changes***
3.1.4.5 No Action Alternative	3.1-5		***No changes***
3.2 Geology, Soil, and Seismicity	3.2-1		***No changes***
3.2.1 Affected Environment	3.2-1		***No changes***
3.2.1.1 Topography	3.2-1		***No changes***
3.2.1.2 Geological Features	3.2-2		***No changes***
3.2.1.3 Soil	3.2-4	28C2	***Revision, second paragraph, last sentence:*** Table 3.2-1 presents a summary table of soil properties and chemistry.
3.2.1.4 Seismicity	3.2-7		***No changes***
3.2.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.2-10		

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Impact 3.2.1 Recommended Mitigation Measures	3.2-12	28B2	***Revision to seventh bullet:*** Use of Oregon-certified seed or equivalent for revegetation in consultation with ODFW and BLM. See Section 3.4-1.
Impact 3.2.3 Assessment of Impact	3.2-13	28C2	***Add, first paragraph, after first sentence:*** In addition, all road construction on BLM-managed lands would be constructed in conformance with BMPs described in Appendix F of the KFRA-RMP.
Impact 3.2.3 Assessment of Impact	3.2-14	28D2	***Add, end of fourth paragraph, additional sentence:*** All roads and drainage crossing constructed on BLM-managed lands would be in conformance with BMPs described in Appendix F of the KFRA-RMP.
Impact 3.2.4 Assessment of Impact	3.2-14	28F2	***Delete, third paragraph, last sentence.*** ~~If the alternative of stormwater disposal into the West Langell Valley Road side ditch is selected, NPDES General Stormwater Permit 1200-Z and an erosion and sediment control plan would specify BMPs to use.~~
Impact 3.2.6 Assessment of Impact	3.2-15	28G2	***Revision, first paragraph, third sentence.*** ~~Irrigation would not be conducted~~ ~~d~~ To prevent erosion and generation of surface runoff during periods of frozen or saturated soil, wastewater would be stored in a tank onsite, and ~~I~~irrigation would not be conducted. ***Revision, first paragraph, fourth sentence.*** The process wastewater quality would generally be equal to or better than the shallow groundwater and Lost River water used for irrigation to lands around the beneficial use area (see Table 3.3-5). ***Add additional Figure to Chapter 3.3***. Table 3.3-5 Water Quality Comparison
3.2.2 Cumulative Impacts	3.2-17		***No changes***
3.3 Hydrology and Water Quality	3.3-1	2E, 27G	Process wastewater from the Energy Facility would be managed by one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond • ~~Temporary storage onsite and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal~~
3.3.1 Affected Environment	3.3-1		***No changes***
3.3.1.1 Surface Water	3.3-2	28K2,	***Additional paragraph, after sixth paragraph.*** **Other Water Bodies.** Other water bodies in the overall study area of the project include lakes and reservoirs that could indirectly be affected by air emissions from the Facility, such as McFall and Harpold Reservoirs and Alkali Lake.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Lost River	3.3-2	28L2, 28M2	***Revision, paragraph titled "Lost River."*** The Lost River watershed is a closed, interior basin covering approximately 3,000 square miles of the Klamath River watershed in southern Oregon and Northern California. The headwaters originate east of the Clear Lake Reservoir in Modoc County, California, and flow approximately 75 miles to the Tulelake Sump. Seasonal flows in the Lost River are controlled by releases from the Clear Lake Dam and by irrigation district water management. Historical channel modification, water diversion, and wetland drainage associated with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Klamath Project have resulted in a highly altered system. Historically, the Lost River received flows from the Klamath River but is currently connected to the Klamath River via the Lost River Diversion Canal. Water from the Lost River is currently used for domestic and industrial water supply, irrigation, and livestock. The Lost River is the only fish-bearing perennial habitat in proximity to the analysis area. The closest section of the Lost River is approximately 2 miles north of the Energy Facility site. The Lost River is approximately 0.4 miles north and east of the Babson well.
Surface Water Quality	3.3-2	28N2, 28O2	***Revision, Surface Water Quality paragraph.*** ODEQ is required by Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act to identify water bodies that do not meet standards for conditions, such as temperature, pH, and toxics. The standards set by ODEQ are designed to protect such beneficial water uses as drinking, agricultural use, recreation, industrial water supply, and ~~cold water fisheries~~ resident fish and aquatic life. The Klamath Basin has portions of 46 different rivers and lakes, which, for one reason or another, have failed to meet these standards. While the area's high ~~summer~~water temperatures account for many of the listings, water bodies such as the Klamath and Lost Rivers fail several different standards, some of which persist throughout the year.
3.3.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.3-4		
Impact 3.3.1 Assessment of Impact	3.3-5	28P2	***Revision, fifth paragraph, first sentence.*** Aquifer and borehole tests (see Section 3.3.1.2) ~~have~~ indicate~~d~~ that the shallow and deep systems are likely not hydraulically connected.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.3.2.1 Process Wastewater	3.3-6 to 3.3-8	2E, 27G	***Revision, first paragraph.*** Process wastewater from the Energy Facility would be managed by one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial reuse of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond • ~~Temporary storage onsite and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal~~ ***Revision, third paragraph, lines 3 to 5.*** This activity represents a beneficial use of the water that would not be made if it were evaporated ~~or hauled offsite for disposal~~. ***Revision, sixth paragraph.*** ~~**Storage and Hauling to Wastewater Treatment Plant.** If this alternative is selected, process wastewater would be managed by temporarily storing wastewater onsite in two 5.0-MG tanks and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal. The project proponent has contacted the two municipal WWTPs in Klamath Falls – the South Suburban Sanitary District and the City of Klamath Falls Sanitary District. The ability of these two WWTPs to accept wastewater from testing and commissioning of the Energy Facility and the wastewater from operation of the Energy Facility is presently being evaluated. According to managers at both facilities, each would be required to evaluate whether they can meet the EPA categorical standard to accept industrial waste or whether local ordinance provide for acceptance of truck-hauled wastewater. Over the life of the Energy Facility, other WWTPs may be constructed or considered for management of wastewater generated at the Energy Facility. The project proponent would arrange with a trucking company to routinely haul the wastewater stored in the wastewater storage tanks at the Energy Facility to the WWTP.~~
3.3.2.2 Sanitary Sewage	3.3-8		***No changes***
3.3.2.3 Stormwater	3.3-9	2D	***Additional text, add to end of second paragraph.*** Any solids or sludge left in the sump would be periodically removed and disposed of by a licensed disposal operator.
Storm Sewer System	3.3-9	28S2	***Revise, first paragraph.*** Stormwater that falls inside the fence line of the Energy Facility and is not routed to the plant's drain system described above would be collected in the storm sewer system. The collection of rainfall runoff in this system would be limited to parking lots, roof drains, graveled areas, and vegetated areas. This storm sewer system would consist of ditches, culverts, and piping that are routed to the stormwater pond. ~~From the stormwater pond, there would be two alternatives for stormwater discharge. The preferred alternative would be to discharge the stormwater into a 4.7-acre infiltration basin. The second alternative would be to discharge the stormwater through a ditch adjacent to the Energy Facility access road into the West Langell Valley Roadside ditch, where it would eventually enter the High Line Levee Ditch and then the Lost River. These alternatives are described in more detail below.~~
	3.3-10	28S2	***Revise, second paragraph, heading.*** Infiltration Basin ~~Alternative~~
	3.3-11	28U2	***Delete, second complete paragraph.*** ~~West Langell Valley Road Drainage System Alternative: In this alternative, the outflow from the stormwater pond would go to a Klamath County drainage ditch along the east side of West Langell Valley Road. This drainage ditch discharges to an irrigation canal, labeled High Line Levee Ditch on the U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle map. High Line Levee Ditch eventually discharges to the Lost River. The drainage ditch along the east side of West Langell Valley Road is approximately 8,000 feet long and the irrigation canal to the Lost River is approximately 32,000 feet long. Therefore, stormwater from the Energy Facility site would travel approximately 40,000 feet before it reaches the Lost River.~~

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.3.2 Cumulative Impacts	3.3-13	28X2	***Add, additional paragraph, end of section.*** Temporary and permanent transmission line access roads would add to the overall impacts of runoff from roads in the area. This could result in more erosion and larger stormwater flows. However, the access roads would not be paved and would only be used intermittently for security and maintenance purposes.
Table 3.3-3	3.3-17	2E, 27G	***Final Disposition column, Reverse Osmosis Treatment row.*** Land Application evaporation~~, or haul offsite to WWTP~~.
3.4 Vegetation and Wildlife	3.4-1		***No changes***
3.4.1 Affected Environment	3.4-1		***No changes***
3.4.1.1 Vegetation Communities and Habitats	3.4-4	28D3	***Revision, second paragraph, under heading Aquatic Habitats.*** The Lost River watershed is a closed, interior basin covering approximately 3,000 square miles of the Klamath River watershed in southern Oregon and Northern California. The Lost River historically received flows from the Klamath River and is currently connected to the Klamath River via the Lost River Diversion Canal. The headwaters originate east of the Clear Lake Reservoir in Modoc County, California, and flow approximately 75 miles to the Tulelake Sump. Seasonal flows in the Lost River are controlled by releases from the Clear Lake Dam. The Lost River was the only fish-bearing perennial habitat observed in proximity to the analysis area.
3.4.1.1 Vegetation Communities and Habitats	3.4-6		***Revision, added to third paragraph under heading ODFW Habitat Category 2.*** High-density winter mule deer range is covered by Klamath County's Significant Resource Overlay (SRO), which is discussed in Section 3.10, Land Use Plans and Policies. Approximately 38,678 acres of the SRO are within 5 miles of the Energy Facility features.
3.4.1.2 Plant and Animal Species	3.4-7	28G3	***Add, under heading Noxious Weeds.*** • Leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula)*—A population documented by the Oregon Department of Agriculture occurs adjacent to the Captain Jack Substation. • Yellowstar thistle *(Centaurea solstitialis)*—Documented on public lands 1 mile west of the substation and on adjacent private lands. • Dalmatian toadflax (*Linaria dalmatica)*—Occurs in and adjacent to the proposed power lines on BLM-managed lands.
Federally and State Protected Threatened and Endangered Species	3.4-10	28I3, 28K3	***Revision, second paragraph, second sentence.*** The only ~~sensitive~~listed species observed in the field or known to occur at or near the proposed Energy Facility site or along the pipeline and electric transmission line easements is the bald eagle.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
	3.4-11	28B3, 28M4	***Add additional paragraph after paragraph top of page.*** A screening-level environmental risk assessment (ERA) was conducted as part of the biological assessment (see Appendix C) to address potential risk from the air emissions to aquatic organisms and to bald eagles. Upland areas around the Energy Facility also were evaluated for possible risks from deposition of air emissions and irrigation reuse of process wastewater to terrestrial plants, soil invertebrates, and terrestrial birds and mammals. The ERA concluded that, taking into consideration background levels of metals, deposition of air emissions from the Energy Facility to plants, soil invertebrates, birds, and mammals poses no or negligible risks, and deposition of air emissions on surface water poses no risk to aquatic organisms. In addition, the discharge of constituents evaluated in the process wastewater on irrigated pasture land poses no significant risk to ecological receptors.
	3.4-11	28J3	***Add, additional paragraph, after second paragraph under heading Bald Eagle.*** **Fish.** Two fish species, the shortnose sucker and the Lost River sucker, are also listed species. See Section 3.5 for more information on these species.
3.4.1.3 Wetlands	3.4-11		***No changes***
3.4.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.4-14		

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Impact 3.4.1 Assessment of Impact	3.4-15	7B, 28A3, 28E3, 28L3	***Add sentence to the end of the first paragraph.*** Approximately 38,678 acres of the SRO are within 5 miles of the Energy Facility features. ***Add paragraph after first paragraph.*** The Energy Facility and stormwater infiltration pond could potentially be hindrances to migrating deer during fall and spring periods. However, it is not likely that the Facility would block a migration route because undeveloped land with sufficient access all round the site would allow deer to go around the Facility. In addition, given the small footprint of the Facility, the length of time required for deer to go around the Facility would be of short duration. ***Add sentence after second sentence in second paragraph.*** During the winter months, wastewater would be stored in an onsite storage tank. ***Add paragraph after fifth paragraph.*** Vegetation management along the transmission line and access roads would concentrate on target vegetation that could fall or bend into the line, including noxious weeds and tall growing vegetation both in and off the right-of-way. With vegetation management, all large woody vegetation growth would be kept out of the easement, maintaining the area's grasses, forbs, and shrubs. Vegetation control may include manual, mechanical, or biological methods or combinations of all three. Use of these methods would be determined through guidelines established in consultation with the BLM and included in the vegetation management plan. Implementation of vegetation management would be through trained and licensed contractors. Impacts could also occur to nontarget species, including: • Trampling, crushing, or accidental removal • Increased exposure to direct sun • Change in plant community composition and diversity • Change in soil moisture and structure • Increase in noxious weeds Additional information on potential impacts can be found in the Transmission System Vegetation Management Program, *Final Environmental Impact Statement*, DOE/EIS-0285, May 2000.
	3.4-17	28U3	***Additional bullet after 5th bullet.*** Existing snags, less than 10 feet in height, would be left in place. In consultation with BLM, trees that have to be removed from the easement may be topped at less than 10 feet and girdled to create habitat.
Impact 3.4.2 Recommended Mitigation Measures	3.4-19	28W3	***Revision, fourth paragraph.*** Where feasible, construction would be limited in natural areas during the breeding and fawning period of deer and antelope (April through September) as well as the nesting period of raptors (May through September).

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Impact 3.4.3 Recommended Mitigation Measures	3.4-20	28Y3	***Delete existing sentence, replace with:*** ~~No mitigation measures beyond those described in the impacts section above are needed.~~ Proposed mitigation includes the following: • The proposed transmission line has been located to avoid known areas of bald eagle use. • The proposed transmission line has been located away from the three existing transmission lines to avoid creating a cluster of transmission lines that would pose additional obstacles to flight. • Colored bird flight diverters would be installed to allow for better avian visualization of the groundwires. • The conductors would be spaced greater than the wing span of large birds to prevent electrocutions.
Impact 3.4.3 Assessment of Impacts	3.4-20	28Y3	***Revision, second paragraph.*** A biological assessment has been developed for potential impacts to bald eagles, and an avian monitoring plan is included in Appendix E of Appendix B (the Biological Assessment)**.**
Impact 3.4.4 Recommended Mitigation Measures	3.4-20	28Z3, 28A4	***Revision, second paragraph.*** Fill material placed in the seasonal creek to facilitate vehicle access along the electric transmission line would be the minimum amount necessary to allow crossing of the channel and would be constructed according to the BMPs described in the Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan (KFRA RMP). A small-diameter c~~C~~ulvert would be placed under the roadway to facilitate and maintain existing drainage. The roadway crossings would be designed to be low profile to minimize the ponding or water upstream and allow water to flow over the road. Riprap would be installed to minimize erosion.
Impact 3.4.5	3.4.21	28D4a	***Revision, heading Impact 3.4.4.*** ~~Impact 3.4.4~~ Impact 3.4.5
3.4.3 Cumulative Impacts	3.4-21	28L3	***Add paragraph between first and third paragraphs***. There would be an impact of approximately 50.7 acres to the Klamath County high-density winter mule deer range designated as Category 2 habitat. Approximately 38,678 acres cover the area within 5 miles of the proposed project features. No cumulative impact to the high-density winter mule deer range would occur because the impacts would be 0.13 percent of the total high-density winter mule deer range within 5 miles of the proposed project.
Table 3.4-5	3.4-36	28G4	***Revision to the table, BLM Column, Pygmy rabbit line.*** ~~V~~ BAO
	3.4-37	28H4 to 28K4	***Revisions to the "Plants" portion of the table. See Part 2 New or Revised Tables.***
Table 3.4-8	3.4-52	28N4	***Revision to the table, third column head:*** ~~ODFW~~/ONHP ODA/ONHP

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
	3.4-52	28O4	***Revision to the table: Bakers globe mallow, Habitat Requirements.*** Ponderosa Pine
	3.4-53	28P4	***Revision to the table: Flaccid sedge, Habitat Requirements.*** Less than ~~2,500~~ 5,000 feet
	3.4-55	28Q4	***Revision to the table: Calochorturs longebarbatus.*** Calochorturs longebarbatus longebarbatus
3.5 Fish	3.5-1	28R4	***Deletion, last sentence, first paragraph.*** ~~Because there would be no withdrawals from surface water bodies, construction and operation of the Energy Facility would not affect fisheries resources in the area.~~
3.5.1 Affected Environment 3.5.1.1 Aquatic Environment	3.5-1	28S4, 28T4	***Revision, second paragraph***. The Lost River watershed is a closed, interior basin covering approximately 3,000 square miles of the Klamath River watershed in southern Oregon and Northern California. The headwaters originate east of the Clear Lake Reservoir in Modoc County, California, and flow approximately 75 miles to the Tulelake Sump. Historically, the Klamath River fed the Lost River but is now connected by a diversion canal. Seasonal flows in the Lost River are controlled by releases from the Clear Lake Dam and by irrigation use. The Lost River was the only fish-bearing perennial habitat observed in proximity to the analysis area.
3.5.1.2 Shortnose Sucker and Lost River Sucker	3.5-2 3.5-3	28V4, 28W4	***Revision, first sentence, after heading Shortnose Sucker.*** Change date from 1998 to 1988; add reference (53 FR 27130; July 18, 1988) ***Revision, first sentence, after heading Lost River Sucker.*** Change date from 1998 to 1988; add reference (53 FR 27130; July 18, 1988)
	3.5-3	28Y4, 28A5	***Add section.*** 3.5.1.3 Other Fish Species. Other fish species are likely present and potentially affected by project actions. Native species likely within the general project area include redband trout, largescale suckers, tui chub, blue chub, speckled dace, lamprey species, and sculpin species. Generally, the extent of movement of the native species into the intermittent tributaries and irrigation canals associated with the project area is unknown. Redband trout are known to move substantial distances into intermittent habitats to spawn or forage (Behnke, 1992). However, the presence of redband trout in the Lost River would be generally described as rare (ODFW, 1997). Thus, use of the intermittent habitat within the project area by redband trout would be unlikely or rare. Non-native species may also be present within the APE and may be affected by project actions. These species would likely include largemouth bass, yellow perch, brown bullhead, crappie species, sunfish species, and fathead minnow. The non-native species present in the project area generally are not expected to exhibit significant migrations into intermittent tributary habitats but may be present in irrigation canals near the project area.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.5.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.5-3	28Z4	***Revision, end of first paragraph.*** See Appendix C, Biological Assessment, for additional information on potential impacts.
3.5.3 Cumulative Impacts	3.5-5		***No changes***
3.6 Traffic and Circulation	3.6-1		***No changes***
3.6.1 Affected Environment 3.6.1.1 Roadway Systems and Levels of Service	3.6-1		***No changes***
3.6.1.2 Truck Traffic	3.6-1		***No changes***
3.6.1.3 Railway Facilities	3.6-1		***No changes***
3.6.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.6-2		***Revision, Recommended Mitigation Measures for Impact 3.6.1.*** ~~No measures beyond those included in the proposed project are recommended.~~ To minimize impacts, Facility-related construction activities would be scheduled so that construction traffic would occur during off-peak hours; a carpool program would be offered to minimize single-occupancy vehicle use by construction workers. In addition, a bus service would be provided for workers living in Klamath Falls.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.6.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.6-2 and 3.6-3	2E, 27G	***Revision, first and third paragraphs in Assessment of Impact for Impact 3.6.3.*** ~~Traffic during operation of the Energy Facility would depend on the alternative selected for process wastewater management. Traffic during operations would be the same with either of the following alternatives: evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond or beneficial reuse of the water for irrigated pasture. If the storing and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal alternative is selected, additional truck trips would be required.~~ Operation of the Facility would generate less than four truck trips per week ~~(not including truck trips for process wastewater disposal)~~ and approximately 20 PM peak-hour worker trips daily (Tables 3.6-4 and 3.6-5). To assess potential impacts, a traffic analysis was performed and evaluated against standard levels of service. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.6.5, which summarizes the LOS for local roadways during the construction period. As shown in Table 3.6-5, traffic during Facility operation would not substantially reduce the LOS on the roadways or create a substantial impact on local traffic. ~~An additional 5 to 9 truck trips per day would be required if the storing and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal alternative is selected. The proposed route for these wastewater trips into and out of the Energy Facility would be along West Langell Valley Road, Harpold Road (north of West Langell Valley Road), Oregon Highway 70 (west of Harpold Road), and Oregon Highway 140 (west of OR 70). Accounting for a two-way trip, this would generate an additional 10 to 18 trips per day along each of the roads. Although, these trips can reasonably be assumed to occur throughout the day, to be conservative it was assumed that all of these trips occur in the PM peak hour. This change is expected to not cause any noticeable impacts and the roadway level of service would not substantially reduce the LOS on the roadways or create a substantial impact on local traffic.~~
Table 3.6-4	3.6-8	2E, 27G	***See Part 2 New or Revised Tables.***
Table 3.6-5	3.6-9		***See Part 2 New or Revised Tables.***
3.7 Air Quality	3.7-1		***No changes***
3.7.1 Affected Environment	3.7-1		***No changes***
3.7.1.1 Climate	3.7-1		***No changes***
3.7.1.2 Odor	3.7-1		***No changes***
3.7.1.3 Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.7-2		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.7.1.4 Existing Air Quality	3.7-3		***No changes***
3.7.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.7-3		
Impact 3.7.2	3.7-4	28I5	***Revisions to first paragraph.*** Combustion turbines and duct burners associated with the HRSGs at the proposed Energy Facility would use natural gas as the only fuel. Combustion of natural gas results in emissions of criteria pollutants that include PM_{10}, NO_X, SO_2, CO, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The features listed below, which are incorporated into the Energy Facility design, would be employed to reduce air emissions:
3.7.3 Cumulative Impacts	3.7-9		***No changes***
3.7.3.1 Class II Impacts	3.7-9		***No changes***
3.7.3.2 Other Potential Projects	3.7-9		***No changes***
3.7.3.3 Class I Impacts	3.7-9		***No changes***
3.8 Visual Quality and Aesthetics	3.8-1		***No changes***
3.8.1 Affected Environment	3.8-1		***No changes***
3.8.1.1 OC&E Woods Line State Trail	3.8-1		***No changes***
3.8.1.2 Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway and Modoc Volcanic Scenic Byway	3.8-1	28K5	***Revision, title and text***. Volcanic Legacy ~~Scenic Byway~~ All-American Road and Modoc Volcanic Scenic Byway The Volcanic Legacy ~~Scenic Byway~~ All-American Road and Modoc Volcanic Scenic Byway have been designated as National Scenic Byways by the U.S. Secretary of Transportation. This designation is based on a roadway's archeological, cultural, historic, natural, recreational, and scenic qualities.
3.8.1.3 State Routes 161 and 139	3.8-2		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.8.1.4 Miller Creek Area of Critical Environmental Concern	3.8-2		***No changes***
3.8.1.5 Lava Beds National Monument	3.8-2		***No changes***
3.8.1.6 Lower Klamath Lake National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and Tulelake NWR Wildlife Overlooks	3.8-2		***No changes***
3.8.1.7 Bloody Point, Petroglyphs, and Battle of Scorpion Point Vista Points	3.8-2		***No changes***
	3.8-2	28L5	***Add section.*** **3.8.1.8 Emigrant Trails Scenic Byway** The Emigrant Trails Scenic Byway was designated on March 31, 2003, by the U.S. Forest Service as part of its scenic byway system. At the time the visual analysis was conducted, this route was not a designated scenic highway. The following description of the Emigrant Trails Scenic Byway will be included in Section 3.8.1 of the FEIS: "The Emigrant Trails Scenic Byway connects to the existing Outback and Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byways in Oregon and California, and the Modoc and Shasta Volcanic Scenic Byways in California. "The route starts in the northeast corner of Modoc County at New Pine Creek, where the Outback Scenic Byway ends. The route travels south down US Highway 395 to Alturas and then heads west on State Highway 299 to Canby, CA. At Canby, the route turns northwest along State Highway 139 to Tulelake, where it will connect with the existing Modoc Volcanic Scenic Byway and Shasta Volcanic Scenic Byway, which are part of the Volcanic Legacy All American Road (North Cal-Neva Resource Conservation and Development Council, 2003)." Based on the distance from the project site and transmission easement, a significant impact on visual resources from locations along the Emigrant Trail Scenic Byway would not occur.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
	3.8-2	28M5	***Add section*** **3.8.1.9 Other Areas of Significance** Alkali Lake is a wetland and shallow lake located between Dairy and Bonanza. The area does not have public access but is subject to grazing. This area encompasses approximately 150 acres and was previously evaluated as a special botanical and habitat area. Yainax Butte is an isolated mountain 8 miles south of Beatty, Oregon. This area consists of approximately 720 acres and is designated as an area of critical environmental concern. The area receives limited use by recreationists and is relatively steep, which naturally protects it from surrounding land uses. It contains significant populations of threatened and endangered plant species. The Bumpheads are rimrocked volcanic tabletops that support a healthy bunchgrass and western juniper community that has been naturally isolated from grazing.
3.8.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.8.2	28N5	***Add, after third paragraph, last sentence.*** In addition to the transmission towers, the cleared easement would be visible on both private and BLM-managed land.
Impact 3.8.1 Assessment of Impact	3.8-3	28Y1, 28N5, 28O5	***Add the following, after first paragraph.*** The proposed electric transmission line would extend 7.2 miles from the proposed power plant site to Captain Jack substation, traversing an open, upland landscape that is, in most areas, covered with a mixture of juniper and sagebrush (see Figure 3.4.1, Habitat Types). Although much of the land in this area is privately owned, there is a mosaic of parcels under the jurisdiction of the BLM (Figure 3.2) and three places in which the alignment crosses BLM parcels. Out of the total 7.2-mile alignment, 1.4 miles would cross BLM lands, and a total of 44.1 acres of BLM land would fall within the alignment (using a 250-foot-wide easement width, less for the 154-foot-wide operating easement). Under the BLM's Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan, all the BLM lands in the landscape area through which the project would pass have been designated as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class IV lands, a management class that allows "major modifications of the existing character of landscapes" (Klamath Falls RMP/ROD, page 43). The more specific management direction for VRM Class IV lands in this area is to "[m]anage Visual Resource Management Class IV lands for moderate levels of change to the characteristic landscape. Management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the effect of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture" (Klamath Falls RMP/ROD, page 44). The siting and design of the proposed electric transmission line are consistent with the VRM Class IV objectives. Towers would be carefully sited, access roads would be designed to minimize the visual contrast they create, and areas disturbed during the construction process would be regraded and reseeded. However, tower locations can be altered during final alignment to avoid unforeseen environmental impacts. The three parcels of BLM land that the proposed transmission alignment would cross are visible in more detail on Figure 3.8-4. The parcels that are crossed at the points indicated A and B on this map are in areas with a juniper/sage landscape. On these lands, in response to both the need to maintain clearances and the BLM's interest in eliminating junipers, many of the junipers would be removed from the easement. Although this would create a corridor with a contrasting vegetative pattern, the degree of contrast in color and texture with the surrounding landscape pattern would be reduced to a great degree by the fact that the underlying sage cover would be retained. At the point indicated as C on Figure 3.8-4, a small area of ponderosa pine would need to be cleared to accommodate the line. The tree clearing in this area would be kept to the minimum required for safe operation of the transmission line.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
	3.8-3	28V5	***Revise, second paragraph.*** Three sets of visual analyses were performed to determine visual impacts to scenic and aesthetic resources within the 30-mile project area. These analyses were based on lines of sight from the scenic and aesthetic resources to the stacks and transmission lines. Figures 3.8-1 and 3.8-2 show the concentric line of sight to the stacks and transmission towers, respectively.
3.8.2 Cumulative Impacts	3.8-5	28P5, 28T5	***Revise.*** The project study area was established by EFSC as a radius of 30 miles around the project site. However, for purposes of cumulative impacts, the visual resource impact area is determined by scenic locations from which the proposed Facility can be viewed. These locations are described in Section 3.8.2. ~~. The proposed Facility would not have any adverse effect on aesthetic or scenic resources~~. There are existing transmission lines in the vicinity of the project, and the proposed transmission line would result in cumulative impacts. In addition, the construction of the access roads and clearing of the easement would add to existing impacts of roads and other corridors in the area. ~~Consequently, the project would not contribute to past or current actions resulting in cumulative impacts on this element of the environment. If additional electric transmission lines were constructed in proximity to the proposed Facility's transmission lines, they could have a cumulative negative effect on aesthetic resources by creating a cluttered appearance that detracted from the natural environment.~~
Table 3.8-1	3.8-7	28U5	***Revisions to the Table. See Part 2 New or Revised Tables.***
Figure 3.8-1 and 3.8-2	3.8-8 3.8-9	28W5	***Revisions to the Figure. See Part 3 New or Revised Figures.***
3.9 Cultural Resources	3.9-1	28Y5	***Revisions to third paragraph.*** Cultural resource investigations have been conducted in cooperation with the Klamath Tribes. A Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) would be prepared in consultation with the tribes that describes monitoring activities during construction of the Facility and the actions to be taken if an unanticipated cultural resource site were discovered during construction or operation ~~would be managed and protected.~~ of the project.
3.9.1 Affected Environment 3.9.1.1 Prehistoric Background	3.9-1		***No changes***
3.9.1.2 Ethnographic Background	3.9-2		***No changes***
3.9.1.3 Historical Background	3.9-3		***No changes***
3.9.1.4 Investigations Result	3.9-4		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.9.2 Affected Environment Impact 3.9.1 Assessment of Impact	3.9-5	28A6	***Revision to second paragraph, second sentence.*** A CRMP would be developed in coordination with the Klamath Tribes.
3.9.3 Affected Environment	3.9-5		***No changes***
3.10 Land Use Plans and Policies	3.10-1		***No changes***
3.10.1 Affected Environment 3.10.1.1 Land use Characteristics of the Energy Site and Vicinity	3.10-1		***No changes***
3.10.1.2 Local Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning	3.10-4	28C6	***Add to end of paragraph at top of the page.*** Existing roads would need no or very minor changes to accommodate construction traffic, and the impacts would be related to the construction traffic on the existing roads. However, the impacts for new roads would include clearing and grading to allow construction equipment access to the electric transmission line easement.
3.10.1.3 Plans and Policies	3.10-5	28D6	***Delete first paragraph, replace with the following.*** ~~No Federal land use management plan is applicable to the Facility.~~ The proposed action is subject to the BLM's KFRA ROD and RMP with respect to the location of easements across BLM-managed lands. The proposed facilities do not cross any lands identified as easement avoidance or exclusion areas. The RMP encourages, but does not require, new utility easements to be located within existing easements. However, the project proponent must demonstrate that the use of an existing route or easement is not technically or economically feasible and that the proposed easement minimizes damage to the environment. The proposed easement locations fall outside of existing easements designated in the RMP. The project proponent's reasoning for not using existing easements is stated in Section 2.5.2.4, Alternative Electric Transmission Line.
3.10.1.4 Consistency with Local Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning	3.10-5		***No changes***
3.10.1.5 Conformance with Plans and Policies	3.10-6		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.10.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.10-8		***No changes***
3.10.3 Cumulative Impacts	3.10-17		***No changes***
Tables			***No changes***
Figures			***No changes***
3.11 Socioeconomic	3.11-1		***No changes***
3.11.1 Affected Environment	3.11-1		***No changes***
3.11.1.1 Population	3.11-1		***No changes***
3.11.1.2 Employment	3.11-1		***No changes***
3.11.1.3 Housing	3.11-2		***No changes***
3.11.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures			
Impact 3.11.3	3.11-3	28G6	***Add paragraph, after paragraph titled Assessment of Impact:*** Bonanza is the closest community to the project site. The analysis indicates that, within reasonable commuting distance of the project site, there is sufficient housing available for the labor force that would temporarily move to the area. It is likely that the community of Bonanza would house some of the temporary workforce. However, it is unlikely that significant impact on the infrastructure of the community would occur. It is also likely that there would be increased opportunities and business activities in the community as a result of the project construction and operation, but the needs and or viability of the opportunities would be determined by the private business sector.
3.11.3 Cumulative Impacts	3.11-4		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Tables			***No changes***
3.12 Public Services	3.12-1	2E, 27G	***Revision, first paragraph.*** The following section discusses the provision of water, sewer, stormwater, solid waste, police, fire, health care, and school services in the project area. The Facility would use its own raw water supply well system and would manage its own wastewater through one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond • ~~Temporarily storing onsite and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal~~
3.12.1 Affected Environment	3.12-1		***No changes***
3.12.1.1 Utilities	3.12-1		***No changes***
3.12.1.2 thru 3.12.1.4	3.12-1 3.12-3		***Heading level 4 changed to heading level 5***
3.12.1.2 Sewers and Sewage Treatment	3.12-2	2E, 27G	***Revision, third paragraph.*** ~~For the alternative of storing and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal, the project proponent has contacted the two municipal WWTPs in Klamath Falls – the South Suburban Sanitary District and the City of Klamath Falls Sanitary District. According to managers at both facilities, each would be required to evaluate whether they can meet the EPA categorical standard to accept industrial waste or whether local ordinance provide for acceptance of truck-hauled wastewater. Over the life of the Energy Facility, other WWTPs may be constructed or considered for management of wastewater generated at the Energy Facility. The project proponent would arrange with a trucking company to routinely haul the wastewater stored in the wastewater storage tanks at the Energy Facility to the WWTP.~~
3.12.1.3 Water Supply	3.12-2	28I6	***Revise second paragraph as follows after second sentence.*** Some wells in the vicinity of Bonanza reportedly are contaminated, but because the Energy Facility would be withdrawing water from the deep aquifer, the Facility would not impact or be affected by potential contamination in the upper aquifer or spring water in the vicinity of Bonanza. Construction and demolition waste would continue to be accepted for another 20 years, which would be the majority of waste generated during construction of the project. Household waste generated during construction and operation of the Facility would be collected by a private waste vendor and handled by one of the following three methods: • Hauling to the Chemult Landfill • Hauling to a proposed transfer station in Klamath County • Placing in waste rail containers onsite and taken to an intermodal facility for direct placement on rail cars
3.12.1.5 Solid Waste	3.12-3		***Heading level changed to 3.12.1.2***
	3.12.3	28J6	***Revision, second paragraph, last sentence.*** The Klamath Falls Landfill ~~would cease~~ ceased ~~to accept~~accepting household waste in 2004.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.12.1.6 Transfer Station	3.12-3		***Heading level changed to 3.12.1.3***
3.12.1.7 Police and Fire Protection	3.12-4		***Heading level changed to 3.12.1.4***
3.12.1.8 Health Care	3.12-5		***Heading level changed to 3.12.1.5***
3.12.1.9 Schools	3.12-5		***Heading level changed to 3.12.6***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
	3.12-5	28D, 28O1	***Section added.*** 3.12.1.10 Recreation The recreation analysis area evaluated for potential permanent impacts is 5 miles from the COB Energy Facility site boundary and includes the proposed Facility and supporting features, such as the electric transmission line. There are no county, state, or federally designated recreational lands or any designated recreational facilities on the Facility site, which is predominantly privately owned and in agricultural use. However, the project would directly and indirectly impact some publicly owned land managed by BLM. The following potential recreational opportunities exist in the 5-mile analysis area: • Bonanza City Park • Malin City Park • A primitive BLM campsite • A proposed BLM backcountry byway • A proposed BLM trail • Fremont National Forest In addition, to these designated recreational opportunities, the BLM-managed lands offer dispersed recreational opportunities, including hiking, hunting, horseback riding, and snowmobiling. More information on recreation on BLM-managed land can be found in the KFRA RMP. To assess the importance of identified potential recreational opportunities, these opportunities were reviewed against the five criteria in the EFSC regulations. Methods included review of management plans, written descriptions of the resources, and telephone interviews with agencies responsible for management of the potential recreational opportunity. Based on the information obtained, none of the potential recreational opportunities meets the importance test in the EFSC rule. None of them has special designations, none is considered by the managing agency or local government to be important in terms of outstanding or unusual qualities, and none of the sites has a high degree of use. Several primitive BLM campsites with limited access are located within 5 miles of the Energy Facility at the Bryant Mountain Reservoirs, and BLM has proposed the location of a trail and byway within the 5-mile radius. However, BLM is uncertain when these proposed additions would be developed, if at all, according to a BLM representative (Senter, 2002). The primitive campsites are used infrequently (Senter, 2002). The Fremont National Forest provides important recreational and scenic opportunities, and a small portion of the Fremont National Forest is located within 5 miles of the Energy Facility. According to the most recent management plan, this management area does not include the important recreational opportunities (Fremont NF, 1989). The area is managed as important mule deer habitat and permits timber harvests and livestock grazing on appropriate lands. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) has confirmed that there is no recreational use of the land within 5 miles of the Facility site and that the Energy Facility and electric transmission line locations do not present any concerns to the National Forest management (Egeline, 2002). Bonanza City Park and Malin City Park are both located within 5 miles of the Energy Facility or electric transmission line. The parks are primarily used by local residents and are not considered important recreational resources. From Bonanza City Park, the Energy Facility could be visible from 3 miles in the distance, and from Malin City Park, transmission towers could potentially be visible from 5 miles in the distance. In addition to the 5-mile analysis area, potential temporary impacts could occur during construction. It is anticipated that much of the construction workforce would live in the vicinity of Klamath Falls. The City of Klamath Falls park system consists of 22 parks totaling 602 acres. These are mini, neighborhood, and regional parks, with special-use areas, natural open space, and landscaped areas.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.12.2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures	3.12-5 3.12-11	28D	***Additional section under.*** Impact 3.12.2 The Energy Facility would not affect the level of service provided by local public services. *Recreation* There would be no direct impacts on designated important recreational opportunities within the analysis area; however, there could be indirect impacts to dispersed recreational users on BLM-managed lands from the construction and operation of the electric transmission line. In any event, construction and operation of the Facility at distances of several miles from the identified recreational opportunities would not cause the direct or indirect loss of recreational use at the two parks, the primitive campsites, the proposed road and trail, or the National Forest. There could be temporary impacts on city parks in Malin, Bonanza, and Klamath Falls from construction workers, but because the workforce is temporary, is usually not accompanied by dependents, and is transitory because of the different construction phases, the impacts would be dispersed and would not likely be significant.
3.12.3 Cumulative Impacts	3.12-11	2E, 27G	***Revision, first paragraph, second sentence.*** The Energy Facility would be largely self-sufficient, providing its own utilities and security services; therefore, it would not affect the capacity of services provided to the local community in the future. ~~If process wastewater is managed by storing and hauling to a WWTP, agreements would be put in place to ensure the WWTP has the capacity to manage the Energy Facility's volume of process wastewater.~~ The Energy Facility would employ 30 people, many of whom would be hired from local communities. Given the limited number of new residents to the project area, the low growth rate, and the existing capacity of public services and utilities, cumulative impacts to utilities and other public services would not be significant.
Tables			***No changes***
3.12 Health and Safety	3.13-1		***No changes***
3.12.1 Construction and Operation of the Proposed Energy Facility 3.13.1.1. Occupational Health and Safety	3.13-1		***No changes***
3.13.1.2 Fuel Management	3.13-2		***No changes***
3.13.1.3 Hazardous Nonfuel Substances	3.13-3		***No changes***
3.13.1.4 Fire Protection	3.13-3		***Add text after last sentence.*** The transmission easement would be maintained to remove tall, growing vegetation. The vegetation would eliminate or reduce (1) the potential for fires from transmission lines, and (2) impacts of range fires on the transmission lines.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
3.13.1.5 Electrical Shock Hazard	3.13-3		***No changes***
3.13.1.6 Electric and Magnetic Fields	3.13-3		***No changes***
3.13.1.7 Noise	3.13-7	17D	***Add paragraph, top of page, after end of sentence.*** **Electric Transmission Line.** Noise can be produced by the corona associated with electric transmission lines; audible sounds are normally associated with 345-kV and higher voltages. The proposed electric transmission line is 500-kV, but noise levels would be expected to be low because modern electric transmission lines are designed, constructed, and maintained so that during dry conditions, they would operate below the corona inception voltage, meaning that the electric transmission line would generate a minimum of corona-related noise. Given the distance of receptors from the easement (approximately 3,000 feet), the impact of corona-generated audible noise is not expected to be significant. Based on data from BPA, the estimated L50 electric transmission line noise under worst-case conditions was tabulated for several distances. The estimated maximum L50 estimated for the closest residence is 27 dBA. A quiet bedroom is 30 dBA (see Table 3.13-1).
3.13..2 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures Impact 3.13.5 Assessment of Impact	3.13-9		***Add, paragraph after second paragraph.*** A fire could occur from sagging transmission lines during high temperature, high humidity, and no-wind conditions if vegetation is not properly maintained in the transmission easement.
3.13.3 Cumulative Impacts	3.13-13		***No changes***
Tables			***No changes***
Figures			***No changes***

Chapter 4 Environmental Consultation, Review, and Permit Requirements

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
4.1 National Environmental Policy Act	4-1		**No changes**
4.2 Endangered and Threatened Species and Critical Habitat	4-1	28O6	***Add after third paragraph.*** In addition to the bald eagle, the following threatened or endangered species also occur in the vicinity of the project, but without experiencing direct emissions impact: *Shortnosed sucker (Chasmistes Brevirostris)* *Lost River sucker (Deltistes luxatus)* *Applegate's milkvetch (Astragalus applegate)* Potential indirect or cumulative impacts have been covered in a screening-level environmental risk assessment (see Appendix C of Appendix C).
4.3 Fish and Wildlife Conservation	4-2		***No changes***
4.4 Heritage Conservation	4-2		***No changes***
4.5 State, Areawide, and Local Plan and Program Consistency **4.5.1 Land Use**	4-2		***No changes***
4.5.2 Notice to the Federal Aviation Administration	4-3		***No changes***
4.5.3 Construction Related Permits	4-3		***No changes***
4.6 Coastal Zone Management Consistency	4-3		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
4.7 Floodplains	4-3		***No changes***
4.8 Wetlands	4-4		***No changes***
4.9 Farmlands	4-4		***No changes***
4.10 Recreational Resources	4-4	28P6	***Revision to paragraph.*** There are no established ~~No~~ public recreation facilities ~~occurs~~ at the proposed locations of the Energy Facility site, water supply well and pipeline, electric transmission line, and natural gas pipeline. There are six established potential recreational opportunities within a 5-mile radius of the Energy Facility: • Bonanza City Park • Malin City Park • Primitive BLM campsite • Proposed BLM backcountry byway • Proposed BLM trail • Fremont National Forest In addition to these established recreation facilities, there is a substantial amount of dispersed recreation that occurs in the vicinity of the project, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, off-road vehicle use, and sight-seeing. Construction and operation of the Energy Facility at distances of several miles from the ~~identified~~ established recreational opportunities would not cause the direct or indirect loss of recreational use. Dispersed recreation opportunities on BLM-managed lands may be impacted by the transmission line easement in the form of gates across access roads and visual impacts.
4.11 Global Warming	4-4		***No changes***
4.12 Permit for Structures in Navigable Waterways	4-4		***No changes***
4.13 Permit for Discharges into Waters of the United State	4-5		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
4.14 Permits for Right-of-Way on Public Lands	4-5		***No changes***
4.15 Energy Conservation at Federal Facilities	4-5		***No changes***
4.16 Pollution Control	4-5		***No changes***
4.16.1 Air	4-5		***No changes***
4.16.2 Water	4-5		***No changes***
4.16.3 Solid and Hazardous Waste	4-6		***No changes***
4.16.4 Safe Drinking Water	4-6		***No changes***
4.16.5 Noise	4-6		***No changes***
4.16.6 Pesticides and Asbestos	4-6		***No changes***
4.16.7 Comprehensive Environmental Response, compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)	4-7		***No changes***
4.16.8 Radon	4-7		***No changes***
4.17 Permits	4-7		***No changes***

Chapter 5 List of Preparers

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Jim Thornton	5-1	28D	***Add after Environmental Planner.*** Recreation
Dorothy DeVaney	5-2	28D	***Add after Socioeconomic Lead.*** Recreation
Connie Thoman	5-3	28D	***Add after Visual Quality and Aesthetics Lead.*** Recreation

Chapter 6 List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons to Whom Copies of the EIS Are Sent

NOTE: The mailing list database has been updated when notification has been received that individuals or addresses have changed.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
6.1	6-1	28S6	***Move Burns District Area Office from Section 6.2 State Agencies to 6.1 Federal Agencies and list as Bureau of Land Management, correct address.*** Bureau of Land Management—Burns District Area Office c/o Miles Burns 28910 Highway 20 W Hines, OR 97738

Chapter 7 References

SECTION	DEIS PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Chapter 2	7-1		***Add after fifth reference.*** Energy Facility Siting Council, Oregon Department of Energy. 2004. *In the matter of the Application for a Site Certificate for the COB Energy Facility – Proposed Order.* Bonneville Power Administration. 1988. *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the California-Oregon Transmission Project and the Los Banos-Gates Transmission Project*.
Chapter 3			
3.10 Land-Use Plans and Policies	7-7		***Add.*** Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1994. *Klamath Fall Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*. September 1994. ***Add.*** Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 1995. *Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary*. June 1995.
3.12 Public Services	7-9		***Add.*** Senter, Scott. 2002. Bureau of Land Management, Klamath office. Personal communication on April 11, 2002.

Chapter 8 Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

Acronyms

Add. KFRA RMP Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan

Terms

Revise. **Best Management Practices (BMP).** A practice or a combination of practices that are recognized by government or industry as methods or activities that, when used properly, are the most effective and practical means of preventing or reducing the potential for adverse environmental impacts~~amount of pollution generated by nonpoint sources~~ to a level compatible with ~~water quality~~established environmental goals, objectives, or regulations.

Appendixes

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
Appendix A Notice to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement			
			No changes
Appendix B Water Supply Supplemental Data Report: Executive Summary			
			No changes
Appendix C Biological Assessment			
1 Introduction **1.1 Purpose**	1-1		***No changes***
1.2 List of Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species Potentially Affected by the Proposed Project	1-2	28T6	***Revision to sixth bullet.*** • The bald eagle is known to occur in the project area, and suitable nesting habitat was identified within the isolated stand of ponderosa pine habitat along the southern portion of the electric transmission line easement; however, no nests were observed. Known bald eagle nest territory and winter roosts exist in the Significant Impact Area for PM_{10}, and another nesting territory occurs near the proposed electric transmission line.
1.3 Critical Habitat	1-2		***No changes***
1.4 Consultation to Date	1-3		***No changes***
1.5 Current Management Direction	1-4		***No changes***
1.5.1 Bonneville Power Administration	1-4		***No changes***
1.5.2 Bureau of Land Management	1-5		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
1.5.3 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	1-5		***No changes***
2 Description of Proposed Action **2.1 History**	2-1		***No changes***
2.2 Facility Description	2-2		***No changes***
2.2.1 Process Wastewater Management	2-2	2E, 27G	***Revision to bulleted text.*** Process wastewater from the Energy Facility would be managed by one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond • ~~Storage and hauling to a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) for offsite disposal~~
2.2.2 One- or Two-Phase Combined Cycle Operations	2-2		***No changes***
2.2.3 Facility Location	2-3		***No changes***
2.2.4 Permanent Facility Components	2-3	2E, 27G	***Revisions to bulleted text.*** The principal components of the proposed action are listed here with more detailed descriptions in Section 2.2.7: • A new 1,160-MW air-cooled, natural gas-fired combined-cycle electric power generation plant on 50.6 acres of land • A 31-acre irrigated pasture area • A designated process wastewater management alternative – If a lined evaporation pond is the selected process wastewater management alternative, it would permanently impact 20 acres. – If land application is the selected wastewater disposal alternative, ~~is either trucking offsite or land application,~~ two 5-million-gallon (MG) wastewater tanks would be constructed on the Energy Facility site.
2.2.5 Temporary Facility Components	2-4		***No changes***

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
2.2.6 Protection and Mitigation Measures	2-4		***No changes***
2.2.7 Energy Facility Site	2-6	2E, 27G	***Revise fifth paragraph under Wastewater Management.*** Process wastewater from the Energy Facility would be managed by one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in an onsite in a lined evaporation pond ~~• Storage and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal~~
2.2.7 Energy Facility Site	2-8	2E, 27G	***Remove Paragraph titled Storing and Hauling to Wastewater Treatment Plant.*** ~~**Storing and Hauling to Wastewater Treatment Plant.** If this alternative were to be selected, process wastewater would be managed by storing and hauling to a WWTP for disposal. The project proponent has contacted the two municipal WWTPs in Klamath Falls – the South Suburban Sanitary District and the City of Klamath Falls Sanitary District. The ability of these two WWTPs to accept wastewater from testing and commissioning of the Energy Facility and the wastewater from operation of the Energy Facility is presently being evaluated. According to managers at both facilities, each would be required to evaluate whether they can meet the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) categorical standard to accept industrial waste or whether local ordinances provide for acceptance of truck-hauled wastewater. During the life of the Energy Facility, other WWTPs may be constructed or considered for management of wastewater generated at the Energy Facility. The project proponent would arrange with a trucking company to routinely haul the wastewater stored in the wastewater storage tanks at the Energy Facility to the WWTP.~~
	2-9	2A, 2B	***Revise text under heading Stormwater Sewer System.*** Stormwater Sewer System. Stormwater that falls inside the fence line of the Energy Facility that is not routed to the plant drain system described above, would be collected in the storm sewer system. The collection of rainfall runoff in this system is limited to parking lots, roof drains, graveled areas, and vegetated areas. This storm sewer system would consist of ditches, culverts, and piping, as required, routed to the stormwater pond. Discharge f~~F~~rom the stormwater pond~~ there are two alternatives for discharge of the stormwater. The preferred alternative is to discharge the~~ would be ~~discharged~~ into routed to a 4.7-acre infiltration basin. ~~The second alternative is to discharge the stormwater through a ditch adjacent to the Energy Facility access road and into the West Langell Valley Roadside ditch where it would eventually enter the High Line Levee Ditch and then into the Lost River. These alternatives are described in more detail below.~~
	2-10	2A, 2B	***Revise heading text.*** ***Infiltration Basin ~~Alternative (Preferred)~~***
2.2.8 Related or Supporting Facilities	2-11		***No changes***
Electric Transmission Line Conductors and BFDs	2-14	28U6	***Revision, last sentence.*** Annual monitoring of the lines would be conducted to determine if the transmission lines ~~are~~ have an ~~significant~~ impact on waterfowl and special-status birds that forage or nest in the area.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
2.2.9 Construction Schedule	2-15		***No changes***
Tables			***No changes***
Figures			***No changes***
3. Study Methods	41		***No changes***
4. Environmental Setting **4.1 Geological Setting**			***No changes***
4.2 Current Land Use	4-1		***No changes***
4.3 Habitat Types in the Study Area 4.3.1 Western Juniper Woodland	4-1		***No changes***
4.3.2 Ponderosa Pine	4-2		***No changes***
4.3.3 Sagebrush-Steppe	4-3		***No changes***
4.3.4 Rural Areas	4-3		***No changes***
4.3.5 Agricultural Lands	4-4		***No changes***
4.4 Hydrologic Resources 4.4.1 Klamath River Basin	4-4		***No changes***
4.4.2 Lost River	4-5	27A	***Revise second-to-last sentence in the paragraph.*** The Link River is a 2.5-mile river connecting Upper Klamath Lake to Lake Ewauna, which is drained by the Klamath River. ~~canal constructed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamantion to connect the Lost River to the Klamath River system as part of the Klamath Basin Project.~~

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
4.4.3 Water Conveyance Features	4-5		***No changes***
4.4.4 Wetlands	4-5	28V6 28W6	***Revision to second paragraph, third sentence.*** ~~A freshwater marsh is located approximately 1,200 feet southeast of the Babson well, and .~~ In addition to the marsh wetland described above, several irrigation ditches flow along the proposed water supply pipeline route. ***Revision, third paragraph, fourth line.*** Change wouldet to willet.
4.4.5 Sedge Wet Meadow	4-6		***No changes***
4.4.6 Wet Meadow	4-6		***No change***
4.4.7 Stock Ponds	4-6		***No change***
4.4.8 Agricultural Drainages	4-6		***No change***
Figures			***No changes***
5. Species Accounts and Status **5.1 Federally Listed Plant Species**	5-1		***No changes***
5.2 Federally Listed Animal Species	5-1		***No changes***
5.2.1 Bald Eagle Avian Collision	 5-7	28X6	***Delete, last sentence, second paragraph.*** ~~If monitoring results show that bald eagles are foraging at the water supply reservoir, remedial actions may be implemented as described in Appendix E.~~

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
5.2.2 Shortnose and Lost River Sucker Survey Results	5-9	28Y6	***Revision, fourth sentence.*** Greg White, a fisheries biologist with CH2M HILL, met with Leonard LeCaptain of USFWS on September 24, 2002, to investigate this drainage and determined that these fish were most likely ~~red shiners, a nonlisted minnow~~ in the species family *Cyprinidae.*
Improbable Worst-Case Connection	5-10	28Z6	***Addition, after first sentence, add paragraphs*** Because of the lack of other deep wells to provide information, the areal extent, recharge area, and recharge rate of the deep aquifer system are not well known. Accordingly, an assessment of the likely recharge area was performed (CH2M HILL, 2002a) and concluded that the recharge area probably is higher in altitude and located about 20 to 50 miles to the east and north of the Babson well. The assessment also concluded that the recharge area likely is regional in scope, with a minimum size of approximately 1,100 square miles. Based on these conclusions, and using local precipitation figures and the most likely range of known aquifer recharge rates in central Oregon, it is conservatively estimated (a minimum estimate) that the deep aquifer's annual recharge volume is between 134 billion and 241 billion gallons. An intensive 30-day aquifer test in 1993 at the Babson well (CH2M HILL, 1994) suggested that the deep groundwater-bearing zones below 1,580 feet are hydraulically isolated from the shallow aquifer system and surface water in the vicinity of the Energy Facility. For the test, the deep aquifer at the Babson well was pumped at a rate of 3,260 gpm for 30 days while water levels were monitored at 23 different locations within approximately 4 miles of the Babson well. Because no other wells are known to be completed in the deep aquifer within the project area, the monitoring locations consisted of numerous wells completed in the shallow aquifer system, two staff gauges along the Lost River, the Bonanza Springs, a well hydraulically connected with the Bonanza Springs, and a well in connection with a nearby marsh. No effects resulting from pumping the deep aquifer were observed at any of the monitored wells, the Lost River, Bonanza Springs, or the nearby marsh. Consequently, the results of the aquifer test indicated there is no observable hydraulic connection between the deep aquifer system at the Babson well and the shallow aquifer or surface water features. A second aquifer test was performed in the summer of 2002 (CH2M HILL, 2002b). The Babson well was pumped at an average rate of 6,800 gpm for approximately 30 days. An expanded observation well network (31 different locations) was used that included both shallow wells and deeper irrigation wells in Langell Valley, Yonna Valley, Swan Lake Valley, Malin, and Klamath Falls. A hydraulic response in the observation well network was attributed to a leaking well packer. This aside, the data do not indicate that the deep system is in hydraulic connection with a shallow aquifer system. A reconstructed well should eliminate the minor response observed. Deep aquifer response suggests extremely high aquifer transmissivity and supply; at the end of the 30-day pumping period, water levels recovered to the pretest static level within 5 minutes. These observations show that the roughly 294 million gallons withdrawn for this test were insignificant relative to the rate and volume of water available to the Babson well. Appendix B contains the Executive Summary from the *Water Supply Supplemental Data Report: Deep Aquifer Testing at the COB Energy Facility Water Supply* (CH2M HILL, 2002a).

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
5.2.2 Shortnose and Lost River Sucker. Project Impacts subhead.	5-10	2E, 27G	***Revision to Process Wastewater Management and Stormwater, first paragraph.*** **Process Wastewater Management and Stormwater.** Under the preferred alternative, the Energy Facility would not discharge to surface waters. Process wastewater from the Energy Facility (excluding the sanitary wastewater) would be managed by one of ~~three~~ two alternatives: • Beneficial use of the water for irrigated pasture • Evaporation in an onsite, lined evaporation pond • ~~Storage and hauling to a WWTP for offsite disposal~~
5.3 Cumulative Effects	5-11		***No changes***
6 Conclusion **6.1 Applegate's Milk Vetch**	6-1		***No changes***
6.2 Lost River Sucker and Shortnose Sucker	6-1		***No changes***
6.3 Bald Eagle	6-1	28A7	***Revision, second paragraph, last sentence.*** ~~Annual~~ Each year seasonal monitoring of the new lines would be conducted to determine if the lines cause substantial effects to the bald eagle population. For additional information, see Appendix E, Avian Monitoring Plan.
7. References			***No changes***
8. References	8-3		***Revision, under items listed in words beginning with the letter P.*** PERC Peoples Energy Resource ~~Corporation~~ Company
Tables			***No changes***
Figures			***No changes***
Appendix A to Appendix C			

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
	A-3	27D	***Revision, under heading "Water Supply Well System."*** In the last sentence, delete ~~sheep~~ and replace with livestock.
	A-8	28B7	***Revision to first paragraph, first sentence.*** During the year following each seeding, and the subsequent 3 years, a qualified botanist or restoration expert would examine a representative sample of the revegetated sites.
Appendix B **Plant and Wildlife Species Observed During Field Surveys in the Project Area**			***No changes***
Appendix C **Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment**	28G7 through 28S7		***Changes are made in the ERA Report in Track Changes format. See Part 5 Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment Updates.***
Appendix D **Literature Research on Potential Noise Impacts to Wildlife**			***No changes***
Appendix E **Avian Collision Monitoring Plan**			
3. Methods Monitoring for Bird Collisions Conducting Dead Bird Searches	3-1 3-2	28T7, 28U7	***Revision to last paragraph, last sentence.*** The USFWS and ODFW would be notified if any ~~bald eagles or other special status~~ birds are found dead or injured as a result of collisions with the transmission lines~~during the dead bird searches~~. ***Revision to third complete paragraph, last sentence.*** The USFWS and the ODFW would be notified if any ~~bald eagle of other special status~~ birds are found dead from collisions.

SECTION	PAGE	CMT#	CHANGES
4. Data Analysis	4-3	28U7	***Revision last paragraph.*** An ETC would be determined for each special-status species and averaged over the first 3-year monitoring period. The ETC would be compared to the ~~significance~~ criteria set forth by the USFWS Biological Opinion. If the results of the dead bird searches ~~are above the significance criteria~~ do not meet the conditions of the Biological Opinion after the first 3 years of monitoring, the monitoring program would continue on an annual basis. Remedial actions, as defined by USFWS, would likely be implemented, and consultation would be reinitiated. If monitoring results show a decrease in the number of special-status birds incidentally taken by the project during the first 3 years, or the following 3 years, the frequency of monitoring would be reduced, or monitoring would be discontinued upon approval of USFWS. If during the dead bird searches, large numbers of migratory ~~and/~~or special-status birds were to be recorded, the USFWS and ODFW would be notified immediately.