

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	12-AFC-03
Project Title:	Redondo Beach Energy Project
TN #:	205715
Document Title:	Energy Commission Staff's Support of the City of Redondo Beach's Motion to Compel Production of AES' Technical Noise Data
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Pam Fredieu
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	8/13/2015 1:37:42 PM
Docketed Date:	8/13/2015



BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

***APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE
REDONDO BEACH ENERGY
PROJECT***

Docket No. 12-AFC-03

**ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF'S SUPPORT OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH'S
MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF AES' TECHNICAL NOISE DATA**

Background

On August 4, 2015, the City of Redondo Beach filed a Motion to Compel Production of AES' Technical Noise Data (Motion.) The Application for Certification for the Redondo Beach Energy Project (RBEP) was found to be data adequate on August 27, 2013. The Preliminary Staff Assessment was published on July 28, 2014, and the project was suspended by request of AES (Applicant) on September 2, 2014. Applicant requested the project be resumed on April 1, 2015, and the Committee issued a scheduling order on May 5, 2015, which was vacated at the August Status Conference.

Title 20, California Code of Regulations, section 1716 (e) states:

All requests for information shall be submitted no later than 180 days from the date the commission determines an application is complete, unless the committee allows requests for information at a later time for good cause shown.

Although the 180-day discovery period has passed, as outlined in its Motion, the City of Redondo Beach (City) has repeatedly requested Applicant provide technical noise data underlying its noise impact analysis. And, it appears from the exchange of emails provided with the Motion that AES has not objected to the request for information, but has yet to provide all of the data requested.

Staff's Response to the Motion

Although Staff does not agree with the City that the data it is requesting is "necessary for a decision" (Motion, p, 5), it is certainly relevant. Staff understands the public interest and the concern of both Redondo Beach and Hermosa Beach regarding the project's potential noise impacts. Staff has held several public workshops specifically designed to understand and address noise concerns from the surrounding communities. However, given the complexity of noise analyses, it is not surprising the cities still have some questions. In order to provide the community with more information to understand the conclusions in the Preliminary Staff Assessment and ultimately in the Final Staff Assessment, Staff has contracted a modeler to evaluate the setting and proposed project to augment the information available to parties on the potential noise impacts. This will also go to the Committee's request to Staff to provide a primer on Noise.

Therefore, Staff is supporting the City's Motion. The noise data provided thus far by the Applicant, including the information contained in AES Response to Request for Technical Noise Data, docketed on August 4, 2015 (TN 205628), have been helpful in Staff's review of the project's noise model. However, to complete the modeling, on August 11, 2015, Staff requested Applicant provide additional noise data and Applicant has agreed to provide that data the week of August 17, 2015 (TN 205701).

Conclusion

Based on the reasons stated, Staff is supporting the City of Redondo Beach's Motion to Compel.

DATED: August 13, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by
KERRY A. WILLIS
Senior Staff Counsel

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	12-AFC-03
Project Title:	Redondo Beach Energy Project
TN #:	205701
Document Title:	Email regarding Noise Data - Additional Information
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Cenne Jackson
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	8/12/2015 3:08:48 PM
Docketed Date:	8/12/2015

Jackson, Cenne@Energy

From: Jackson, Cenne@Energy
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 3:02 PM
To: Jackson, Cenne@Energy
Subject: RE: RBEP Noise Data - Additional Information

From: Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com [<mailto:Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 2:29 PM
To: Khoshmashrab, Shahab@Energy
Cc: Winstead, Keith@Energy; Mark.Bastasch@CH2M.com; Cindy.Salazar@CH2M.com
Subject: RE: RBEP Noise Data - Additional Information

Hi Shahab,

Mark Bastasch is out of the office and we will provide the requested information when he returns next week.

Thanks,

Jerry Salamy
Principal Project Manager
CH2M HILL
2485 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95833
Office Phone: 916.286.0207
Cell Phone: 916.769.8919

From: Khoshmashrab, Shahab@Energy [<mailto:Shahab.Khoshmashrab@energy.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 11:24 AM
To: Salamy, Jerry/SAC
Cc: Winstead, Keith@Energy
Subject: RBEP Noise Data - Additional Information

Jerry,

The noise data information provided thus far by the applicant, including the information contained in AES Response to Request for Technical Noise Data, docketed on August 4, 2015 (TN 205628) have been helpful in staff's review of the project's noise model. However, to verify our findings, I am requesting that you provide the following additional information.

1. Please provide plotting coordinates, i.e. x and y, for all noise sources included in the noise model, including area sources, line sources, barriers, and buildings. This should include a figure showing all wall locations included in the noise modeling with indicators of whether the walls are existing or proposed. As an example of a wall mentioned in the modeling data not readily identifiable is the wall called "EastPL_2", which is identified as a 9.1 meter high wall, but unlike point sources no coordinates are given.
2. Please provide all excess attenuation or absorption factors included in the modeling. There appears to be an increase in attenuation factor for a transformer wall that is not applied to the other transformer walls. There is

also an increased attenuation on the ACCWindWall. Please provide an explanation and justification for these factors.

3. Please provide a figure that links to the notations used in the model data spread sheet that identify the specific source or structure in the plans. This is requested for clarification as it appears the fin-fan configuration and the STG transformer are located in different locations in AFC Figure 2.1-2 plan set submitted versus the data transmitted as part of the GoogleEarth SiteLayout.kmz file that included the site layout in an electronic format.

Thank you.

Shahab Khoshmashrab
CEC