Power Santa Clara Valley Project
Final Environmental Impact Report Errata

Introduction

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) published the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project in December 2026. The CPUC has re-reviewed a comment regarding Section 4.9 in the Final EIR and determined that a minor clarification is warranted. Therefore, the CPUC makes the following changes to the body of the Final EIR. Note that the edits below do not result in significant new information as described in Section 15088.5(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and do not require recirculation of the document.

Changes to Section ES.7 of the Final EIR

Modifications to Section ES.7 (p. ES-31, ES-33) of the Final EIR are shown below in underline and ~~strikeout~~.

> However, placing the Grove HVDC Terminal within the existing PG&E Metcalf Substation is anticipated to have significant and unavoidable ~~potential~~ impacts related to cultural resources, even with the implementation of ~~which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with~~ mitigation measures. Further, AC-1 would have similar impacts related to tribal cultural resources, which would be significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation measures, as there is high potential for unrecorded subsurface archaeological remains. Furthermore, it is expected at this stage of the ~~Draft~~Final EIR that AC-1 would have similar impacts to utilities as the Project, with particular consideration to the utilities at the northern portion of the Project, in the vicinity of downtown San José. It is anticipated that, compared to the Project, AC-1 would result in similar to lesser impacts across most resource areas discussed in Chapter 3. For these reasons, AC-1 is considered the environmentally superior alternative.
>
> ~~Additional information received in or developed during the agency and public review period for the Draft EIR, or during the Project approval process, could affect the balancing of the respective benefits and consequences of the alternatives. Accordingly, while a preliminary determination has been made that AC-1 would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, it would be premature to formally designate it as such at this stage.~~ The~~is~~ preliminary determination as to which alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative is ~~will be~~ confirmed ~~or corrected~~ in ~~the~~this Final EIR.

Changes to Section 4.3.3 of the Final EIR

Modifications to Section 4.3.3 (p. 4-4) of the Final EIR are shown below in underline and ~~strikeout~~.

> The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources. Further, the Project may result in potentially significant impacts that would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels associated with air quality, biological resources, ~~cultural resources,~~ noise and vibration, transportation, and utilities and service systems (see Table 4-11~~5~~, *Summary of Impacts of the Project and Alternatives*). No other significant impacts associated with the Project have been identified that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Changes to Section 4.9 of the Final EIR

Modifications to Section 4.9 (p. 4-32, 4-33) of the Final EIR are shown below in underline and ~~strikeout~~.

However, placing the Grove HVDC Terminal within the existing PG&E Metcalf Substation is anticipated to have significant and unavoidable ~~potential~~ impacts related to cultural resources, even with the implementation of ~~which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with~~ mitigation measures. Further, AC-1 would have similar impacts related to tribal cultural resources, which would be significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation measures, as there is high potential for unrecorded subsurface archaeological remains. Furthermore, it is expected at this stage of the ~~Draft~~Final EIR that AC-1 would have similar impacts to utilities as the Project, with particular consideration to the utilities at the northern portion of the Project, in the vicinity of downtown San José. It is anticipated that, compared to the Project, AC-1 would result in similar to lesser impacts across most resource areas discussed in Chapter 3. For these reasons, AC-1 is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

~~Additional information received in or developed during the agency and public review period for the Draft EIR, or during the Project approval process, could affect the balancing of the respective benefits and consequences of the alternatives. Accordingly, while a preliminary determination has been made that AC-1 would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, it would be premature to formally designate it as such at this stage.~~ The~~is~~ preliminary determination as to which alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative is ~~will be~~ confirmed ~~or corrected~~ in ~~the~~this Final EIR.