IBERDROLA
RENEWABLES

August 4, 2010

Mr. Iain Fisher
CEQA Project Manager
Energy Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3296

Re: Tule Wind Project - Response to Data Request No. 10

Dear Mr. Fisher:

Pacific Wind Development, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. (IBR) received your Data Request No. 10 regarding the Tule Wind Project. Enclosed is IBR's response.

If you have questions regarding this information, please contact me at 503-796-7781 or Patrick O'Neill at 858-712-8313.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Durocher
Wind Permitting Manager

cc (via e-mail): Greg Thomsen, BLM (GThomsen@blm.gov)
Thomas Zale, BLM (Thomas_Zale@blm.gov)
Jeffery Childers, BLM (jchilders@blm.gov)
Rica Nitka, Dudek (rnitka@dudek.com)
Patrick O'Neill, HDR Engineering (Patrick.oneill@hdrinc.com)

Enclosed: Visual Simulations and Applicant's Environmental Document (provided via FTP)

IBERDROLA RENEWABLES, Inc.
1125 NW Couch St., Suite 700
Portland, OR 97209
Telephone (503) 796-7000
www.iberdrolarenewables.us

Visual Simulations

Note: The changes requested as part of Data Request No. 8 have been incorporated into the attached visual simulations and all visual simulations, including those not modified will be provided via FTP.

1. The project EIR/EIS has separate discussions for the proposed project and alternatives. The Tule Wind Project Applicant's Environmental Document Figures 3.2-3 and 3.2-9 provide views that include the Alternative Route 3 transmission line. For clarity in the document we would like to request additional visual simulations. Please prepare the following figures:

    a. A new figure for the *proposed* 138 kV transmission line along Old Highway 80 showing the proposed interconnect with the rebuilt Boulevard Substation. Through a review of aerial photography and street views it appears that the existing distribution line shown in Figure 3.2-3 leads to the existing Boulevard Substation. Therefore, this figure should show the proposed transmission line crossing Old Highway 80 in order to interconnect with the rebuilt Boulevard Substation. This figure currently appears to show the 138 kV transmission line for Alternative Route 3 along the highway (if Alternative Route 3 has been simulated in this figure, the transmission line should also cross Old Highway 80 to interconnect with the Boulevard Substation).

    Response: HDR re-rendered the power lines to reflect Alternative 2 leading to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation location. This results in one new simulation. The revised figure will be provided as a high resolution .jpg via FTP.

    b. A revised Figure 3.2-3 to show Alternative Route 3 crossing Old Highway 80 at this location to interconnect with the rebuilt Boulevard Substation.

    Response: HDR re-rendered the power lines to reflect Alternative 3 leading to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation location. This resulted in one modified simulation. The revised figure will be provided as a high resolution .jpg via FTP.

    c. A revised Figure 3.2-9 to show only the wind turbines (proposed project) and not the Alternative Route 3 transmission line in the simulation.

    Response: HDR revised the visual simulation to show only the proposed project without Alternative Route 3 transmission lines. The revised figure will be provided as a high resolution .jpg via FTP.

2. Please explain why the simulations of the transmission poles in Figures 3.2-3, 3.2-4, 3.2-5 and 3.2-9 are different than the typical 138 kV steel tangent poles graphic provided (Figure 2.0-6).

Response: The originally proposed power line poles were changed during the simulation process from a steel monopole with a distribution "underbuild" to a steel tangent pole with no underbuild. The simulations referenced above simulated a steel monopole with a distribution "underbuild", which depicts more of a visual intrusion than the proposed monopole steel tangent pole (i.e., the height of the simulated power line poles is taller than the proposed steel tangent poles); therefore, built conditions would be less of a visual impact than the simulations currently show.

Access Roads on Tribal Lands

3. Please provide the status regarding acquiring access to the proposed project via roads crossing tribal lands. Please describe in detail any improvements that will be required for these roadways as well as the status of biological resources and cultural resources surveys along these corridors.

   Response: Agreements for the use of the roads are being negotiated with the Campo and Manzanita tribes. The roads are generally suitable for turbine deliveries without significant work. If required by the Tribes, the roads will be widened in some areas to 24 feet to allow two way traffic. Culverts and/or sloping of the road surface will be done in a few areas to reduce water erosion. Gravel and crushed rock will be used, if soft areas are encountered, to increase road strength. Watering and dust control agents will be used during construction to minimize dust generation from truck traffic. If widening is needed, pre-construction surveys will be completed for biological and cultural resources.

Document Publication

4. Upon public distribution of the Draft EIR/EIS all supporting documents will be published on the CPUC project website. Please provide a .pdf file of the final Tule Wind Project Applicant's Environmental Document that can be used for this purpose.

   Response: *As part of this response,* a complete copy of the Tule Wind Project Applicant's Environmental Document will be provided via FTP. The directions to access the FTP site will be sent in an email to the CPUC and Dudek. Please note that an updated Biological Technical Report (BTR) will be provided the week of August 9th. The updated BTR will incorporate the additional rare plant data that was compiled toward the end of the survey season.