
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

Mr. Jeffrey Durocher
Wind Permitting Manager
Iberdrola Renewables
1125 NW Couch Street, Suite 700
Portland, OR 97209
(sent via email: Jeffrey.Durocher@iberdrolausa.com)

May 5, 2010

Subject: Tule Wind Project - Data Request No. 4

Dear Mr. Durocher:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) requests additional information in support of the Tule Wind noise analysis for the East County Substation, Tule Wind, and Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects EIR/EIS. Please provide requested information in Attachment A regarding the Tule Wind Project noise technical report that was submitted May 2, 2010. We would appreciate your response to this data request no later than May 12, 2010.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or need additional information, please contact me at 415.355.5580 or aei@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Iain Fisher
Energy Division
California Public Utilities Commission

Cc: Greg Thomsen, BLM (GThomsen@blm.gov)
Thomas Zale, BLM (Thomas_Zale@blm.gov)
Jeffery Childers, BLM (Jeffery_Childers@blm.gov)
Shannon D'Agostino, HDR (Shannon.D'Agostino@hdrinc.com)

Noise and Vibration

1. Please provide the vehicle truck mix percentages used to determine the existing exterior CNEL along the roads in the noise study report Table 5 and the rationale for selecting the existing truck percentages.
2. 138 kV Transmission line corona noise—Please explain how it was determined that the proposed 138 kV line has been properly designed so the corona noise does not to exceed the County’s noise ordinance requirements at the proposed right-of-way setback distance. Please provide the proposed right-of-way setback distance.
3. Substation operational noise—Please explain how it was determined that the proposed substation has been properly designed so as not to exceed the County’s noise ordinance requirements.
4. Construction noise—Please determine the construction noise impacts at the property lines (rather than at the homes) per County noise ordinance requirements.
5. 138 kV Transmission line construction noise—Please evaluate the construction noise impacts at the nearby residences along the transmission line alignment south of I-8. Also, are the 138 kV transmission line construction noise impacts for the receptors north of I-8 included in the noise report Table 13?
6. Cement batch plant noise—Please discuss the noise impacts associated with the cement batch plant.
7. Construction Noise Mitigation—Please demonstrate the preliminary feasibility of the noise mitigation measures by quantifying the anticipated noise reduction associated with the recommended mitigation. For example, how high a noise barrier will be required to mitigate the noise to 75 dBA Leq(8) at the receptors Home 6 and Home 7, and what will be the associated noise level reduction? Where will the noise barriers be placed? If a noise barrier will not fully mitigate, or other mitigation alternatives are anticipated, please identify and quantify the anticipated noise reduction that would result from other noise mitigation measures.
8. Vibration—Please determine the construction vibration levels at the closest receptors.
9. Blasting—Please evaluate blasting noise impacts at the closest property lines and compare to the County’s impulsive noise criteria.

10. Alternatives Transmission Line #1, #2, #3—At locations where the transmission line alternative alignments are appreciably closer than the Proposed Project alignment, please quantify the construction noise and vibration levels at adjacent properties associated with the alternatives. Also, please demonstrate that the corona noise will comply with the County’s noise ordinance criteria.