CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

REPORT OF CONVERSATION ***Page 1 of 1***

Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Division

FILE: 11-AFC-04

PROJECT TITLE: Rio Mesa SEGF

☒ **E-mail**		☐ **Meeting Location:** NA	
NAME:	Andrea Koch	**DATE:** 8/2/12-8/13/12	**TIME:**
WITH:	Todd Stewart, Brightsource		
SUBJECT:	Traffic Questions (See also the attached e-mails)		

PHONE CONVERSATION:

I had various questions about the traffic information presented in the Applicant's Supplemental Data Response Number Four, Set 1A (#16 and #26): Applicant's Environmental Enhancement Proposal (11-AFC-04). In this ROC, I will refer to this document simply as the Project Supplement.

The most major question I had concerned the traffic data provided in Table 5.12-8 of the Project Supplement. This data was not fully consistent with proposed construction traffic routes and did not reflect the fact that a significant percentage of workers would access the site via Lovekin Boulevard. In response to my questions, the applicant submitted revised traffic data. See the attached e-mails for this data.

I had other miscellaneous questions, many regarding clarification of inconsistencies in and between the Project Supplement and AFC. In response, the applicant clarified the truck route, details of the FAA Determination of No Hazard, and the largest shift of employees at various areas of the site. See the attached e-mails for this information.

cc:	**Signed:**
	Name: Andrea Koch

Email: pierre.martinez@energy.ca.gov

From: Koch, Andrea@Energy
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2012 1:48 PM
To: Martinez, Pierre@Energy
Cc: Flores, David@Energy
Subject: Rio Mesa Traffic Numbers

Hi Pierre.

I've finally had a chance to get back to Rio Mesa traffic, and I've started reviewing the traffic numbers. Unfortunately, some of them do not make sense given the routes that traffic would be taking. I'm going to try to resolve this via an e-mail to the applicant (and all communications would be docketed), unless you would prefer me to submit a data request.

Let me know the suggested course of action, or if you have any questions. I don't think it's a big deal, but I definitely need revised numbers.

Thanks!

Andrea

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II, Traffic and Land Use
CA Energy Commission
(916) 654-3850

From: Todd Stewart [tstewart@brightsourceenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 3:39 PM
To: Koch, Andrea@Energy
Cc: Martinez, Pierre@Energy; Flores, David@Energy
Subject: RE: A few more Rio Mesa Traffic Questions

Andrea,

Below are a couple of your questions answered. I will get the rest of them answered ASAP.

Todd

From: Koch, Andrea@Energy [mailto:Andrea.Koch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 3:02 PM
To: Todd Stewart
Cc: Martinez, Pierre@Energy; Flores, David@Energy
Subject: A few more Rio Mesa Traffic Questions

Hi Todd.

I have a few more questions for you regarding the latest Rio Mesa submittal. I think that some of the questions are the same as those I had about the original submittal. Could you provide me with the answers as soon as you can? Thanks! I've listed the questions at the end of this e-mail.

Also, I'll be out of the office for a few days starting on August 31st. I'm hoping that Bechtel can provide the revised traffic numbers by tomorrow or Wednesday at the latest so that I'll have sufficient time before I leave to complete the draft report, have it reviewed by my supervisors, and then make the necessary corrections. Let me know if this isn't possible, and I'll try to work something out with Pierre. Have you heard anything about Bechtel's timeline?

Thanks!

Andrea

Questions:

1) The Project Refinement shows no changes to Section 5.12.3.2 (Existing Traffic Conditions). This section of the original AFC, on page 5.12-17 under "Goods Movement", states that truck traffic would use 34th Avenue or Bradshaw Trail to access the site.

In the Project Refinement, pages 5.12-4, 5.12-5 and 5.12-6 include statements that truck traffic

would only use Bradshaw Trail.

Please clarify whether truck traffic would only use Bradshaw Trail, or whether it would use both Bradshaw Trail and 34th Avenue. I'm assuming that the trucks would probably just use Bradshaw Trail.

Answer: Project related truck traffic would use only Bradshaw Trail. The exception would be that TransCanada would most like use the secondary access (34th Avenue) to access their facilities once it is built since it would be a more direct access route to the tap and meter station location.

2) How did you come up with the conclusion that a large percentage of construction workers would carpool? What were your assumptions? How would they meet to carpool?

Answer: I will defer to URS/Bechtel for this answer.

3) It appears that the numbers in Table 5.12-6 of the Project Refinement are actually one-way trips, not roundtrips. Please confirm.

Answer: I will defer to URS/Bechtel for this answer.

4) I noticed that the submittals to the FAA were for structures of 820 feet AGL. Why is this taller than the ultimate tower height of 760 feet? Is it to accommodate taller construction cranes?

Answer: This was done for conservativeness early on in our permitting phase. The towers are still 750 feet with a 10 foot lightning rod.

5) I wanted to confirm the number of parking spaces for operations in the common area and at each power plant. From Figure 2-3 in the Project Refinement, it looks like there are 24 regular parking spaces and 2 accessible parking spaces at each power block. Is this correct? Also, from Figure 2-8, it looks like there are 79 spaces and possibly 2 accessible spaces. Is this correct?

Answer: I will defer to URS/Bechtel for this answer.

6) What is the largest shift of employees at a) the common area and b) each power plant.

Answer: I will get the answer directly.

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II, Traffic and Land Use

CA Energy Commission
(916) 654-3850

From: Todd Stewart [tstewart@brightsourceenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 3:41 PM
To: Koch, Andrea@Energy
Subject: RE: One more question

That is correct.

From: Koch, Andrea@Energy [mailto:Andrea.Koch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 3:40 PM
To: Todd Stewart
Cc: Martinez, Pierre@Energy
Subject: One more question

Hi Todd.

I just wanted to confirm that trucks carrying hazardous materials would use the Bradshaw Trail access and not the 34th Avenue access. Thanks!

Andrea

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II, Traffic and Land Use
CA Energy Commission
(916) 654-3850

From: Todd Stewart [tstewart@brightsourceenergy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2012 4:58 PM
To: Koch, Andrea@Energy
Cc: Leiba, Angela; Andrea@agrenier.com; Kevin Bertrand; Martinez, Pierre@Energy
Subject: Traffic Questions - Responses
Attachments: RMS Daily Construction Model Summary.pdf; RMS Traffic Response to CEC (Andrea Koch) (2).docx; Tables for Traffic Discussion_8 3 12_URS_Review.docx

Andrea,

Attached are our responses to your questions on the traffic issues. URS found that they had some errors which you uncovered (thank you) and have instituted processes to prevent recurrence in the future.

There are three Attachments here

1. Tables for Traffic Discussion 8 3 12 URS Review .docx is your "commented" table to which our responses are based upon. Our response letter uses the designation in the comment balloons to assure proper cross reference between the two documents.
2. RMS Traffic Respons to CEC (Andrea Koch) (2).docx is our response letter
3. RMS Daily Construction Model Summary.pdf is the supporting model run for the responses.

I hope this addresses your questions. Please call if you have any issues what so ever.

Best Regards,

Todd Stewart P.E.
Senior Director - Project Development
Project Manager - Rio Mesa Solar
BrightSource Energy Inc.

O 510-550-8908 C 925-200-0629 F 510-899-6768
tstewart@BrightSourceEnergy.com

www.BrightSourceEnergy.com

Traffic and Transportation Table 1

Daily Construction Worker Trip Generation during Peak Construction

Construction Worker Vehicles	Daily Trips	One-Way AM Peak Hour Trips	One-Way PM Peak Hour Trips
1,370 [1]	1,370 roundtrips = 2,740 one-way trips	754 inbound [2]	754 outbound [2]

[1] The peak workforce would be approximately 2,200 workers. Assuming that some of them carpool, the construction workers would use approximately 1,370 vehicles daily to commute.

[2] This analysis assumes that 55% of worker vehicles would arrive during the morning peak hours (7-9 AM) and leave during the evening peak hours (4-6 PM).

The applicant anticipates that the majority of the Rio Mesa SEGF construction workforce would commute from locations near the project site, regionally or locally. The following is a breakdown of the approximate percentage of worker traffic traveling on each route to the Rio Mesa SEGF site:

- 60% from the west via I-10
- 30% from the east via I-10
- 5% from Blythe and Ripley
- 5% from the south via SR-78

For local access to the project site, approximately 50% of workers would travel on SR-78 and turn westbound onto 30th Avenue/Bradshaw Trail into the site. The remaining approximately 50% of workers would travel south on Lovekin Blvd., turn west onto 28th Ave., which continues as SR-78, and then continue to follow SR-78, finally turning westbound onto 34th Ave. into the site. See **Traffic and Transportation Figure X** for a map of project access routes.

Traffic and Transportation Table 2

Daily Truck Trip Generation during Peak Construction (in PCE units[1])

Trucks (Delivery/Haul Vehicles)	Daily Trips	One-Way AM Peak Hour Trips	One-Way PM Peak Hour Trips
8 trucks = 24 passenger car equivalent (PCE)	24 roundtrips = 48 one-way trips	12 inbound 6 outbound [2]	6 outbound [3]

[1] PCE, or passenger car equivalent, is a conversion unit for comparing the traffic impacts of a large truck with the traffic impacts of a smaller car. This analysis uses a PCE of 3 cars for every truck. This table reports daily trips, one-way AM peak hour trips, and one-way PM peak hour trips in PCE units.

[2] This analysis assumes that 50% of the 24 PCE trucks arrive and 25% depart during the morning peak hours (7-9 AM).

[3] This analysis assumes that 25% of the 24 PCE trucks depart during the evening peak hours (4-6 PM).

Overall, 50% of one-way truck trips would occur during the peak morning or evening hours:

12 inbound (AM peak) + 6 outbound (AM peak) + 6 outbound (PM peak) = 24 peak hour one-way trips

24 peak hour one-way trips/48 daily one-way trips = 0.50, or 50%

Construction truck traffic would access the site from I-10, turning south on SR-78 and traveling west on 30th Ave./Bradshaw Trail to access the project site. Truck deliveries would usually occur on weekdays between 7 AM and 5 PM, with approximately 50% occurring during the morning or evening peak hours.

Total Construction Traffic

The total workforce and truck trips generated during peak construction month would be 2,788 daily one-way trips (2,740 worker trips added to 48 PCE truck trips). Approximately 1,532 of these one-way trips would occur during peak hours: 772 during the morning peak and 760 during the evening peak. See **Traffic and Transportation Table 3** which is shown below. This table summarizes all peak construction traffic generated by the Rio Mesa SEGF, including construction worker trips and delivery/haul truck trips.

Traffic and Transportation Table 3

Total Daily Trips during Peak Construction

Vehicle Type	Daily Roundtrips	One-Way Daily Trips	One-Way AM Peak Hour Trips	One-Way PM Peak Hour Trips
Construction Worker Vehicles	1,370	2,740	754	754
Trucks (Delivery/Haul Vehicles) (PCE)	24	48	18	6

Total	1,394	2,788	772	760

Traffic and Transportation Table 4

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) during the Year 2015: A Comparison between Baseline and Peak Construction Conditions

Freeway/Road Segment	2015 – No Project ADT	Project-Added Trips	Year 2015 – Peak Construction ADT	Year 2015 – Peak Construction LOS	LOS
I-10, West of SR-78	24,300	1,657	25,957	C	
I-10, East of SR-78	25,704	~~514~~1,336	~~26,218~~27,040	C	
Neighbours Blvd., North of I-10	1,642	0	1,642	C	
SR-78, South of I-10	1,728	~~1,890~~1,350	~~3,618~~3,078	C	

[1] In several instances, there is more than one LOS standard which applies. In this column, staff has provided the most restrictive LOS standard.

Formatted Table

Comment [AK1]: 30% come from the east via I-10. That means they will be on I-10 east of SR-78 for both their arrival and departure trips, and I can use one-way trips to calculate. (0.30)(2,740) = 836.54 construction workers. This is much higher than the project enhancement's indicated number of 514. The project enhancement is missing construction trips and possibly truck trips, too.

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Superscript/ Subscript

Comment [AK2]: 50% of construction workers would travel on SR-78 and turn into the site from there. (Most of these would be from I-10, but some would be coming up from the south via SR-78 or would be coming down from Ripley, where they would not be traveling on SR-78 just south of I-10.) Those from Blythe might use Lovekin Blvd. and avoid SR-78 just south of I-10.

Even though some workers from Blythe would probably use I-10 and would therefore be on SR-78 just south of I-10, for simplicity's sake, I just assumed that half of the 90% of workers coming from I-10 (west or east) would use the SR-78 exit (not the Lovekin one).

60% of workers from the west via I-10 + 30% of workers from the east via I-10 = 90% of workers. (0.90)(2,740) = 2,466 one-way trips (0.50)(2,466) = 1,233 one-way trips over here.

Trucks: All trucks will access site from I-10 and SR-78. 1,233 + 48 daily one-way truck trips = 1,281.

Number in table is much higher and doesn't seem to reflect that 50% of workers would travel south on Lovekin Blvd. (And if you look down lower in the table, they have 0 for the number of workers going down Lovekin.)

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Superscript/ Subscript

SR-78, North of 22nd Ave.	2,268	~~810~~1,350	~~3,078~~3,618	C	
SR-78, North of 30th Ave.	1,404	~~1,350~~2,652	~~2,754~~4,056	C	
SR-78, South of 34th Ave.	1,188	137	1,325	C	
Lovekin Blvd., North of I-10	9,418	~~0~~107	~~9,418~~9.525	C	
Lovekin Blvd., South of I-10	7,301	~~0~~1,302	~~7,301~~8,603	C	
28th Ave., West of Lovekin Blvd.	778	~~0~~1,302	~~778~~2,080	C	

Comment [AK3]: This should be about 50% of worker trips since 50% travel from SR-78 to the project site. (Would actually be a little lower than 50% since some of this 50% would be from Ripley or south on SR-78 and would not go far enough north to pass this point.)

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Not Superscript/ Subscript

Comment [AK4]: Almost all of the workers would pass by this point, with the exception of those coming up from the south via SR-78. At this point, you would collect all the workers coming from Lovekin Blvd. and joining back up, and you would also collect all the traffic taking the SR-78 exit. This number should be nearly the number of all the one-way trips for trucks and construction workers.

Comment [AK5]: From revised submittal. This does not make sense. According to information in the submittal, 50% of workers would travel south on Lovekin Blvd.

Comment [AK6]: From revised submittal. This does not make sense. According to information in the submittal, 50% of workers would travel south on Lovekin Blvd., turning west onto 28th Ave.

RESPONSE TO CEC TRAFFIC COMMENTS 08-07-2012

Response to Comments (Please refer to Andrea's Table with Comments noted with comment balloons "AK")

Comment AK1 - 30% come from the east via I-10. That means they will be on I-10 east of SR-78 for both their arrival and departure trips, and I can use one-way trips to calculate. (0.30)(2,740) = 836.54 construction workers.
This is much higher than the project enhancement's indicated number of 514. The project enhancement is missing construction trips and possibly truck trips, too.

Response: *- This figure represents the arrival and departure each day on that portion of the freeway for workers assigned to the site. i.e. 668 to the site and 668 from the site.*

Comment AK2 - 50% of construction workers would travel on SR-78 and turn into the site from there. (Most of these would be from I-10, but some would be coming up from the south via SR-78 or would be coming down from Ripley, where they would not be traveling on SR-78 just south of I-10.) Those from Blythe might use Lovekin Blvd. and avoid SR-78 just south of I-10.

Even though some workers from Blythe would probably use I-10 and would therefore be on SR-78 just south of I-10, for simplicity's sake, I just assumed that half of the 90% of workers coming from I-10 (west or east) would use the SR-78 exit (not the Lovekin one).

60% of workers from the west via I-10 + 30% of workers from the east via I-10 = 90% of workers.
(0.90)(2,740) = 2,466 one-way trips
(0.50)(2,466) = 1,233 one-way trips over here.

Trucks: All trucks will access site from I-10 and SR-78. 1,233 + 48 daily one-way truck trips = 1,281.

Number in table is much higher and doesn't seem to reflect that 50% of workers would travel south on Lovekin Blvd. (And if you look down lower in the table, they have 0 for the number of workers going down Lovekin.)

Response: *– Andrea, we agree with your comment. The updated figure shows the arrival and departure each day on this portion of SR-78 south of the freeway.*

AK3 - This should be about 50% of worker trips since 50% travel from SR-78 to the project site. (Would actually be a little lower than 50% since some of this 50% would be from Ripley or south on SR-78 and would not go far enough north to pass this point.)

Response *- Andrea we agree with your comment, The model assumes that we will have about 5% of the workers living locally in Blythe and to a lesser extent in Ripley. Figures have been updated to reflect this statement.*

Comment AK4 - Almost all of the workers would pass by this point, with the exception of those coming up from the south via SR-78. At this point, you would collect all the workers coming from Lovekin Blvd. and joining back up, and you would also collect all the traffic taking the SR-78 exit. This number should be nearly the number of all the one-way trips for trucks and construction workers.

Response: *- Andrea we agree with your statement. Table has been updated to reflect this statement.*

Comment AK5 - From revised submittal. This does not make sense. According to information in the submittal, 50% of workers would travel south on Lovekin Blvd.

Response: *- Andrea we agree with you. This was an error in the way we programmed the spreadsheet. We have since ran the model to show and verify the trip assignment. Table has been updated to reflect this statement.*

Comment AK6 - From revised submittal. This does not make sense. According to information in the submittal, 50% of workers would travel south on Lovekin Blvd., turning west onto 28th Ave.

Response: *- Andrea we agree with you. This was an error in the way we programmed the spreadsheet. We have since ran the model to show and verify the trip assignment. Table has been updated to reflect this statement*

Additional Responses

Traffic on Lovekin Blvd., North of I-10 (There was no comment on this item but URS updated the table)

Response: - Andrea we assigned a number of trips to this route to account for local workers.

Supporting Discussion and Documentation

In response to CEC comments, Applicant has determined that there were some errors on the EXCEL formulas/references used to derive the daily project construction added trips. It must be noted that the discrepancies did not influence the general outcome of the traffic study. All roadway segments maintain their forecast Level of Service (LOS) C operating conditions.

Applicant has conducted a special DAILY Traffic Model Run to provide a comprehensive tracking of the project trip assignment consistent with the Traffic Model Assumptions used in the AM and PM peak hour analysis. To prevent the recurrence of the EXCEL errors, Applicant will run DAILY Traffic Model forecast as a standard operating practice to generate daily project added trip information.

Traffic Model Trip Distribution Assumptions

The following matrix describes the distribution input in the traffic model. The zone and gate system represent the interchange of trips in the traffic model.

Zone	Gate 1 – I-10 West Coachella Valley	Gate 3 – I-10 East of Lovekin	Gate 4 – SR-78 South to Imperial County	Gate 6 – Lovekin north of I-10 representing local trips from Blythe
1 – Operations	40%	60%		
2 – Const. workers	60%	30%	5%	5%
3 – Const. materials	35%	65%		
4 – Const. equipment	20%	80%		

Traffic Model Daily Construction Trip Assignment

The results of the traffic model forecast to support the Daily Project Construction Table is attached. This provides a summary of the Project Daily Construction Trip Generation, Distribution and Resultant Link volumes.

Attachments:

1. Updated Traffic Table with redlines incorporating updated numbers. (Word document)
2. Traffic Model Forecast Summary for Daily Project Construction Scenario (PDF)

Rio Mesa Solar Electric Generating Facility (SEGF)
Daily Trip Generatioh

Trip Generation Report

Forecast for Daily Construction

Zone #	Subzone	Amount	Units	Rate In	Rate Out	Trips In	Trips Out	Total Trips	% Of Total
2	Construction	1.00	Construction	1370.00	1370.00	1370	1370	2740	98
	Zone 2 Subtotal					1370	1370	2740	98.3
3	Construction	1.00	Materials Truc	12.00	12.00	12	12	24	0.9
	Zone 3 Subtotal					12	12	24	0.9
4	Construction	1.00	Equipment Truc	12.00	12.00	12	12	24	0.9
	Zone 4 Subtotal					12	12	24	0.9
TOTAL						1394	1394	2788	100.0

Rio Mesa Solar Electric Generating Facility (SEGF)
Daily Trip Generatioh

Trip Distribution Report

Percent Of Trips Trip Distribution

	To Gates			
	1	3	4	6
Zone				
1	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
2	60.0	30.0	5.0	5.0
3	35.0	65.0	0.0	0.0
4	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0

Rio Mesa Solar Electric Generating Facility (SEGF)
Daily Trip Generatioh

Link Volume Report
Daily Construction

Volume Type	NB Link In	NB Link Out	NB Link Total	SB Link In	SB Link Out	SB Link Total	EB Link In	EB Link Out	EB Link Total	WB Link In	WB Link Out	WB Link Total	Total Volume
#1 SR-78 (Neighbours Boulevard)/I-10 WB Ramps													
Base	42	47	89	55	37	92	0	42	42	29	0	29	252
Added	418	257	675	0	0	0	0	418	418	257	0	257	1350
Total	460	304	764	55	37	92	0	460	460	286	0	286	1602
#2 SR-78 (Neighbours Boulevard)/I-10 EB Ramps													
Base	61	63	124	71	31	102	21	0	21	0	59	59	306
Added	675	675	1350	257	418	675	418	0	418	0	257	257	2700
Total	736	738	1474	328	449	777	439	0	439	0	316	316	3006
#3 SR-78/22nd Ave													
Base	69	50	119	48	65	113	4	3	7	4	7	11	250
Added	675	675	1350	675	675	1350	0	0	0	0	0	0	2700
Total	744	725	1469	723	740	1463	4	3	7	4	7	11	2950
#4 Neighbours (SR-78)/28th Ave													
Base	25	14	39	29	40	69	16	27	43	20	9	29	180
Added	0	0	0	675	675	1350	1326	1326	2652	651	651	1302	5304
Total	25	14	39	704	715	1419	1342	1353	2695	671	660	1331	5484
#5 Ramells (SR-78)/28th Ave													
Base	23	32	55	12	16	28	0	1	1	23	9	32	116
Added	1326	1326	2652	0	0	0	0	0	0	1326	1326	2652	5304
Total	1349	1358	2707	12	16	28	0	1	1	1349	1335	2684	5420
#6 SR-78/30th Avenue													
Base	38	37	75	37	38	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Added	651	651	1302	1326	1326	2652	675	675	1350	0	0	0	5304
Total	689	688	1377	1363	1364	2727	675	675	1350	0	0	0	5454
#7 SR-78/34th Avenue													
Base	42	30	72	32	42	74	0	2	2	0	0	0	148
Added	69	69	138	651	651	1302	720	720	1440	0	0	0	2880
Total	111	99	210	683	693	1376	720	722	1442	0	0	0	3028
#8 Lovekin/I-10 WB ramps													
Base	220	252	472	299	273	572	0	138	138	144	0	144	1326
Added	480	240	720	68	69	137	0	445	445	206	0	206	1508
Total	700	492	1192	367	342	709	0	583	583	350	0	350	2834
#9 Lovekin/I-10 EB ramps													
Base	198	186	384	256	222	478	97	0	97	0	143	143	1102
Added	651	651	1302	240	479	719	445	0	445	0	206	206	2672
Total	849	837	1686	496	701	1197	542	0	542	0	349	349	3774

Rio Mesa Solar Electric Generating Facility (SEGF)
Daily Trip Generatioh

Volume Type	NB Link In	NB Link Out	NB Link Total	SB Link In	SB Link Out	SB Link Total	EB Link In	EB Link Out	EB Link Total	WB Link In	WB Link Out	WB Link Total	Total Volume
#10 Lovekin/14th													
Base	59	58	117	135	141	276	32	20	52	102	109	211	656
Added	651	651	1302	651	651	1302	0	0	0	0	0	0	2604
Total	710	709	1419	786	792	1578	32	20	52	102	109	211	3260
#11 Lovekin/16th-Seeley													
Base	45	47	92	51	60	111	24	12	36	24	25	49	288
Added	651	651	1302	651	651	1302	0	0	0	0	0	0	2604
Total	696	698	1394	702	711	1413	24	12	36	24	25	49	2892
#13 East I-10 Checkpoint													
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Added	257	0	257	0	257	257	411	411	822	668	668	1336	2672
Total	257	0	257	0	257	257	411	411	822	668	668	1336	2672
#14 South SR-78 @ I-10 Checkpoint													
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Added	675	675	1350	675	675	1350	0	0	0	0	0	0	2700
Total	675	675	1350	675	675	1350	0	0	0	0	0	0	2700
#19 South SR-78 Checkpoint													
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Added	69	69	138	69	69	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	276
Total	69	69	138	69	69	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	276
#23 Checkpoint West of SR-78													
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Added	0	0	0	0	0	0	829	829	1658	829	829	1658	3316
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	829	829	1658	829	829	1658	3316
#27													
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Added	0	445	445	445	0	445	668	668	1336	223	223	446	2672
Total	0	445	445	445	0	445	668	668	1336	223	223	446	2672
#28 East Checkpoint													
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Added	206	0	206	0	206	206	223	223	446	429	429	858	1716
Total	206	0	206	0	206	206	223	223	446	429	429	858	1716
#66 Mesa Dr/I-10 WB Ramps													
Base	57	54	111	55	63	118	0	25	25	30	0	30	284
Added	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	57	54	111	55	63	118	0	25	25	30	0	30	284
#77 Mesa Dr/I-10 EB Ramps													
Base	76	32	108	55	56	111	14	0	14	0	57	57	290
Added	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	76	32	108	55	56	111	14	0	14	0	57	57	290

Rio Mesa Solar Electric Generating Facility (SEGF)
Daily Trip Generatioh

Volume Type	NB Link In	NB Link Out	NB Link Total	SB Link In	SB Link Out	SB Link Total	EB Link In	EB Link Out	EB Link Total	WB Link In	WB Link Out	WB Link Total	Total Volume
#111 West I-10 Checkpoint													
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Added	0	418	418	418	0	418	829	829	1658	411	411	822	3316
Total	0	418	418	418	0	418	829	829	1658	411	411	822	3316

From: Todd Stewart [tstewart@brightsourceenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 6:18 PM
To: Koch, Andrea@Energy
Subject: RE: A few more Rio Mesa Traffic Questions

This still applies.

From: Koch, Andrea@Energy [mailto:Andrea.Koch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 3:32 PM
To: Todd Stewart
Subject: FW: A few more Rio Mesa Traffic Questions

Hi Todd.

I still need these last few questions answered. Thanks!

From: Koch, Andrea@Energy
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2012 5:47 PM
To: Todd Stewart
Cc: Martinez, Pierre@Energy
Subject: FW: A few more Rio Mesa Traffic Questions

Hi Todd.

I also need the remaining questions answered (see e-mail below).

I think I may already have the answer to #6, though- sorry about that- from an e-mail you sent me after submittal of the Project Amendment. Here is what you said about employee shifts. Let me know if it still applies!

> 6 We project that the Common Area staff will be 20 per shift and each power block will have 10 per shift. So on any given week there will be 80 different people on site (minimum). Total payroll however will be around 100 to account for relief shift operators and technicians and cover for vacations, holidays, training, sick time etc.

Thanks!

Andrea

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II, Traffic and Land Use
CA Energy Commission
(916) 654-3850

From: Todd Stewart [mailto:tstewart@brightsourceenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 3:39 PM
To: Koch, Andrea@Energy
Cc: Martinez, Pierre@Energy; Flores, David@Energy
Subject: RE: A few more Rio Mesa Traffic Questions

Andrea,

Below are a couple of your questions answered. I will get the rest of them answered ASAP.

Todd

From: Koch, Andrea@Energy [mailto:Andrea.Koch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 3:02 PM
To: Todd Stewart
Cc: Martinez, Pierre@Energy; Flores, David@Energy
Subject: A few more Rio Mesa Traffic Questions

Hi Todd.

I have a few more questions for you regarding the latest Rio Mesa submittal. I think that some of the questions are the same as those I had about the original submittal. Could you provide me with the answers as soon as you can? Thanks! I've listed the questions at the end of this e-mail.

Also, I'll be out of the office for a few days starting on August 31st. I'm hoping that Bechtel can provide the revised traffic numbers by tomorrow or Wednesday at the latest so that I'll have sufficient time before I leave to complete the draft report, have it reviewed by my supervisors, and then make the necessary corrections. Let me know if this isn't possible, and I'll try to work something out with Pierre. Have you heard anything about Bechtel's timeline?

Thanks!

Andrea

Questions:

1) The Project Refinement shows no changes to Section 5.12.3.2 (Existing Traffic Conditions). This section of the original AFC, on page 5.12-17 under "Goods Movement", states that truck traffic would use 34th Avenue or Bradshaw Trail to access the site.

In the Project Refinement, pages 5.12-4, 5.12-5 and 5.12-6 include statements that truck traffic

would only use Bradshaw Trail.

Please clarify whether truck traffic would only use Bradshaw Trail, or whether it would use both Bradshaw Trail and 34th Avenue. I'm assuming that the trucks would probably just use Bradshaw Trail.

Answer: Project related truck traffic would use only Bradshaw Trail. The exception would be that TransCanada would most like use the secondary access (34th Avenue) to access their facilities once it is built since it would be a more direct access route to the tap and meter station location.

2) How did you come up with the conclusion that a large percentage of construction workers would carpool? What were your assumptions? How would they meet to carpool?

Answer: I will defer to URS/Bechtel for this answer.

3) It appears that the numbers in Table 5.12-6 of the Project Refinement are actually one-way trips, not roundtrips. Please confirm.

Answer: I will defer to URS/Bechtel for this answer.

4) I noticed that the submittals to the FAA were for structures of 820 feet AGL. Why is this taller than the ultimate tower height of 760 feet? Is it to accommodate taller construction cranes?

Answer: This was done for conservativeness early on in our permitting phase. The towers are still 750 feet with a 10 foot lightning rod.

5) I wanted to confirm the number of parking spaces for operations in the common area and at each power plant. From Figure 2-3 in the Project Refinement, it looks like there are 24 regular parking spaces and 2 accessible parking spaces at each power block. Is this correct? Also, from Figure 2-8, it looks like there are 79 spaces and possibly 2 accessible spaces. Is this correct?

Answer: I will defer to URS/Bechtel for this answer.

6) What is the largest shift of employees at a) the common area and b) each power plant.

Answer: I will get the answer directly.

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II, Traffic and Land Use

CA Energy Commission
(916) 654-3850