

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	23-OPT-01
Project Title:	Fountain Wind Project
TN #:	251678
Document Title:	fwp_responses_PO-18_TRAF-001
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Caitlin Barns
Organization:	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
Submitter Role:	Applicant Consultant
Submission Date:	8/18/2023 10:22:18 AM
Docketed Date:	8/18/2023

Data Request Identifier	Request Source	Topic	Reviewer	Siting Regulations	Information	Opt-In Page Number And Section Number	Original Determination of Adequacy	Information Required To Make OPT Conform With Regulations	Response Date	Applicant Response No. 1	CEC Disposition 1	Applicant Response No. 2	CEC Disposition No. 2	Applicant Response No. 3	CEC Disposition No. 3	Applicant Response No. 4	CEC Disposition No. 4	Applicant Response No. 5	
PO-018	Deficiency Letter Matrix	Project Overview	Salyphone Ng Kerr	Appendix B (b) (2) (A)	Maps at a scale of 1:24,000 (or appropriate map scale agreed to by staff) of each proposed transmission line route, showing the settled areas, parks, recreational areas, scenic areas, and existing transmission lines within one mile of the proposed route(s);	TN 248297-2: CEQA Initial Study Figure 2	No	Not to the scale of 1:24,000 and no settled areas, parks, recreational areas, scenic areas are shown.	5/11/2023 8/18/2023	The Project does not propose to construct any new high voltage transmission lines. By definition, Transmission lines are electric lines capable of carrying high voltage electricity, greater than 69kV. The project proposes new 34.5 kV collection lines that would be both overhead and underground. Collection lines would run from turbine to turbine and would tie all of the turbines into the Project substation. A map is provided in (TN# 250101) of the settled areas, parks, recreational areas, and existing transmission lines within one mile of the proposed overhead collector line.	The response is inconsistent with the Project Description (dated July 10, 2023) and inconsistent with the California ISO LGIA and the Appendix A - Q1106 Queue Cluster 8 Phase II Study. Please resubmit response.	The Fountain Wind Substation is sited directly adjacent to the proposed Switching Station and Point of Interconnection, which is accurately referenced in the Project Description and previously provided KMZs. Fountain Wind will finance, design, engineer, procure and construct the required Switching Station, consistent with the LGIA. A 2-mile generation tie-line is NOT required by the Project. It appears the Cluster 8 Phase II Study references a proxy substation location for the Figure 1-2 Drawing. The inconsistency is irrelevant to the results of the study, and the Project Description should be referenced for the accurate location information.	Please provide a description and diagrams of the poles required to support the gen-tie. Diagrams should include pole dimensions.		The Project does not propose to construct a gen-tie line. In the substation schematic (TN# 250504) on PDF p. 4 on the left side of the page is a profile of the 77-ft-tall structure that will connect the Fountain Wind substation to the PG&E switchyard.		For the interconnection to the 230 kV line, an existing transmission tower would be removed from the Pit-Vaca Dixon No. 2 transmission line and replaced with four tubular steel poles up to 125 feet in height.		

Data Request Identifier	Request Source	Topic	Reviewer	Siting Regulations	Information	Opt-In Page Number And Section Number	Original Determination of Adequacy	Information Required To Make OPT Conform With Regulations	Response Date	Applicant Response No. 1	CEC Disposition 1	Applicant Response No. 2	CEC Disposition No. 2	Applicant Response No. 3	CEC Disposition No. 3	Applicant Response No. 4	CEC Disposition No. 4	Applicant Response No. 5
TRAF-001	Deficiency Letter Matrix	Traffic and Transportation	Robinson Islam Kerr	Appendix B (g) (1)	...provide a discussion of the existing site conditions, the expected direct, indirect and cumulative impacts due to the construction, operation and maintenance of the project, the measures proposed to mitigate adverse environmental impacts of the project, the effectiveness of the proposed measures, and any monitoring plans proposed to verify the effectiveness of the mitigation.	TN 248288-16: DEIR Transportation; Section 3.14.3.2, Pages 3.14-10 – 3.14-16 TN 248288-14: DEIR Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Section 3.10.3.2, Pages 3.10-17 – 3.14-19 NOT DOCKETED: Fountain Wind Project Draft EIR Appendix H (Transportation), Westwood Traffic Study, Fountain Wind Power, Shasta County, California, February 11, 2020, Page 17 File was obtained from the following site on 1/30/2023: https://www.shastacounty.gov/sites/default/files/file_attachments/planning/page/361/appendix_h_transportation.pdf	No	Please expand the analysis of Impact 3.14-2 Impact 3.14-2 of Section 3.14.3 (Direct and Indirect Effects) presents the analysis of the project relative to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), which relates to the evaluation of a project's transportation impacts. Specifically, analysis using vehicle miles of travel (VMT) is identified as the most appropriate measure for the analysis of transportation impacts. The analysis of Impact 3.14-2 relies on GHG analysis in Section 3.10, GHG Emissions, since the intent of SB 743 is to encourage land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce VMT, thereby reducing GHG emissions. As explained in Section 3.14-2, absent an adopted VMT threshold, the County decided to rely on an established environmental standard that is protective of resources of legislative concern. The less-than-significant	6/16/2023 and 10-Jul and 2-Aug and 8-Aug and 18-Aug	See Section 8.1 of the revised Traffic Study (TN# 250644) for a discussion of carpooling as a means to reduce construction-related VMT.	Thank you for discussing potential measures for reducing commute VMT during construction. The acknowledgment that carpooling is a viable TDM strategy is helpful. However, quantification of the potential reduction in VMT through implementation of carpooling should be provided. A table to summarize the VMT calculation provided in Section 8.1 (Page 15) of the revised report (TN# 250644) should be provided to show how the VMT was calculated. Including information like workdays, vehicles, trips, and trip length will eliminate the need for readers to have to "back into" the calculation. Similarly, the calculation of VMT per capita in the 4th paragraph Section 8.1 (Page 15) of the revised report (TN# 250644) should identify the assumed vehicle occupancy.	Thank you for providing the inputs for the VMT calculation in Exhibit 4. Please confirm the total VMT calculation, which shows 4,766,749. It appears that the Total Aggregate for Compaction Deliveries may have been double counted. However, Exhibit 4 of the updated Traffic Impact Analysis (TN# 250985) does not quantify the potential reduction in VMT through implementation of carpooling. Also, the calculation of VMT per capita in the 4th paragraph Section 8.1 (Page 16) of the revised report (TN# 250985) should identify the assumed vehicle occupancy. It appears to be 2 employees per vehicle. Please confirm and update the analysis accordingly.	Please see updated traffic responses (TN# 251461) and Traffic Study (TN# 251464 and 251463).	The total VMT calculation was corrected in Exhibit 4 to 4,283,329. However, please correct the total VMT reference in Paragraph 3 of Section 8.1 (Page 26) of the updated traffic report (TN# 251464) to match the correct total VMT calculation of 4,283,329 in Exhibit 4. Please quantify the potential reduction (i.e., or range of potential VMT reduction) with implementation of carpooling as a TDM strategy during construction in the revised traffic report (TN# 251464) or indicated that this information will not be provided. The calculation of VMT per capita in the 5th paragraph Section 8.1 (Page 27) in the revised traffic report (TN# 251464) was updated to identify the assumed vehicle occupancy. The information provided is sufficient.	The requested revision has been made in the updated Traffic Report (TN# 251534). A qualitative analysis of carpooling is included in the Traffic Study, which concludes that carpooling could be used to reduce VMT during construction (see p. 34). Analyses in the report do not consider potential VMT reductions resulting from carpooling as a baseline assumption in order to present the most conservative scenario.	The requested modification to the revised traffic report (TN#251534), to quantify the potential reduction (i.e., or range of potential VMT reduction) with implementation of carpooling as a TDM strategy during construction, is to provide information in the record related to the "potential" VMT reduction associated with the identified TDM strategy if it were implemented. Please add the requested information.	The Applicant is not contemplating instituting a formal carpooling program and thus is unable to quantify VMT reductions as a result of carpooling.	

