



**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**DOCKET**

**11-CAI-02**

DATE OCT 19 2011

RECD. OCT 19 2011

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT AGAINST  
ORMAT NEVADA, INC. BROUGHT BY  
CALIFORNIA UNIONS FOR RELIABLE ENERGY**

**DOCKET NO.: 11-CAI-02**

**DATED: OCTOBER 19, 2011**

**Energy Commission Staff's Reply Brief**

Pursuant to the Energy Commission's Order, Staff conducted its review and analysis of the East Brawley and North Brawley geothermal facilities to determine if either facility produced 50 megawatts or more using the Commission's regulations (title 20, California Code of Regulations section 2003). Also, Staff examined both facilities to determine if they should be aggregated for jurisdictional purposes.

As set forth in Staff's exhibit 200, Staff determined that both of the geothermal facilities should be rated at 49.5 megawatts and that aggregation of the two facilities was not appropriate.

Notably, neither CURE nor Ormat questioned Staff about its analysis about the net generating capacity or about aggregation at the evidentiary hearing. Staff believes our analysis is correct and should be adopted by the Committee.

Whether or not these facilities are within the jurisdiction of the Commission is fact specific. Staff asked for, and received, specific information about the equipment being used or proposed to be used at Ormat's facilities. Based on the responses to Staff's engineering questionnaire (Exhibits 201, 202) and supporting confidential technical information (Exhibits 203, 204), Staff analyzed the generating capacity of the East Brawley and North Brawley facilities pursuant to title 20, California Code of Regulations section 2003. That regulation sets forth the methodology that is used to calculate the generating capacity of an electric generating facility. Using the information provided by Ormat, and by independent verification and analysis, Staff determined that the generating capacity of each facility was 49.5 megawatts, which is below the 50 megawatt threshold for Commission jurisdiction.

CURE's witnesses provided an alternative analysis of the generating capacity of the two facilities. However, Staff does not believe that the analysis was carried out consistent with the methodology set forth in the regulation because the analysis makes assumptions about the operations that are not based on the information submitted by Ormat. Staff verifies that the specifications of the equipment are accurate or reasonable based upon industry standards but does not assume operation of the equipment that is different from design standards.

With respect to possible aggregation of the two facilities for the purpose of determining Commission jurisdiction, Staff's analysis resulted in the conclusion that the two facilities should not be aggregated and thus the Commission should not assert jurisdiction over the East and North Brawley facilities. Mr. Terrence O'Brien, Deputy Director of the Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division, testified that based upon his experience at the Commission, and considering the legal precedents, he did not believe the two facilities should be aggregated.

It appears that CURE's analysis with respect to aggregation is premised on documents that are no longer accurate. When appropriate, Staff agrees that such documents may be relevant to the issue of aggregation. Also, Staff does not agree with CURE's description of the shared facilities or physical proximity of the two sites. Staff's position is that using the factors set forth in the prior matters considered by the Commission with respect to aggregation, the two facilities are independent and should not be aggregated.

Having said all of the above, Staff reserves the right to change its conclusion should it appear that the facts presented by Ormat are not accurate, particularly in the case of the East Brawley facility which has not yet been approved by Imperial County or constructed as of this date.

Dated: October 19, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeffery M. Ogata

Jeffery M. Ogata  
Assistant Chief Counsel  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-14  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[jogata@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jogata@energy.state.ca.us)



**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
1-800-822-6228 – WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV**

***IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT AGAINST  
ORMAT NEVADA, INC. BROUGHT BY  
CALIFORNIA UNIONS FOR RELIABLE ENERGY***

**Docket No. 11-CAI-02  
(Revised 9/12/11)**

**RESPONDENT**

Ormat Nevada, Inc.  
6225 Neil Road  
Reno, NV 89511

**COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT**

Christopher T. Ellison  
Samantha Pottenger  
Ellison, Schneider and Harris, LLP  
2600 Capitol Avenue, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
[cte@eslawfirm.com](mailto:cte@eslawfirm.com)  
[sgp@eslawfirm.com](mailto:sgp@eslawfirm.com)

**COMPLAINANT**

California Unions for Reliable Energy  
c/o Adams Broadwell Joseph  
& Cardozo  
Marc D. Joseph  
Tanya A. Gulesserian  
Elizabeth Klebaner  
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000  
South San Francisco, CA 94080  
[mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com](mailto:mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com)  
[tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com](mailto:tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com)  
[eklebaner@adamsbroadwell.com](mailto:eklebaner@adamsbroadwell.com)

**INTERVENORS**

\*Imperial County Planning and  
Development Services  
Armando Villa,  
Planning Director  
801 Main Street  
El Centro, CA 92243-2811  
[armandovilla@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:armandovilla@co.imperial.ca.us)

\*Remy, Thomas, Moose &  
Manley, LLP  
Howard F. Wilkins  
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 210  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[hwilkins@rtmmlaw.com](mailto:hwilkins@rtmmlaw.com)

**INTERESTED  
AGENCIES/ENTITIES/PERSONS**

Imperial County Planning and  
Development Services  
801 Main Street  
El Centro, CA 92243

Imperial County Air Pollution  
Control District  
150 South 9th Street  
El Centro, CA 92243-2801

Imperial Irrigation District  
333 E. Barioni Boulevard  
Imperial, CA 92251

**ENERGY COMMISSION  
DECISIONMAKERS**

KAREN DOUGLAS  
Commissioner and Presiding Member  
[kldougla@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kldougla@energy.state.ca.us)

ROBERT B. WEISENMILLER  
Chair and Associate Member  
[rweisenm@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:rweisenm@energy.state.ca.us)

Kenneth Celli  
Hearing Officer  
[kcelli@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kcelli@energy.state.ca.us)

**ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF**

Bob Worl  
Project Manager  
[rworl@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:rworl@energy.state.ca.us)

Jeff Ogata  
Assistant Chief Counsel  
[jogata@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jogata@energy.state.ca.us)

**ENERGY COMMISSION  
PUBLIC ADVISER**

Jennifer Jennings  
Public Adviser  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[\\*publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us)

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, **Rhea Moyer**, declare that on, October 19, 2011, I served and filed copies of the attached **Energy Commission Staff's Reply Brief**, dated **October 19, 2011**. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit or the Chief Counsel, as required by the applicable regulation, is accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at:

[<http://www.energy.ca.gov/proceedings/11-cai-02/index.html>]

The document has been sent to the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit or Chief Counsel, as appropriate, in the following manner:

*(Check all that Apply)*

For service to all other parties:

- Served electronically to all e-mail addresses on the Proof of Service list;
- Served by delivering on this date, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to the name and address of the person served, for mailing that same day in the ordinary course of business; that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date to those addresses **NOT** marked "email service preferred."

**AND**

For filing with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:

- by sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid and e-mailed respectively, to the address below (preferred method);

**OR**

- by depositing an original and 12 paper copies in the mail with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid, as follows:

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION – DOCKET UNIT**  
Attn: Docket No. 11-CAI-02  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512  
[docket@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:docket@energy.state.ca.us)

**OR, if filing a Petition for Reconsideration of Decision or Order pursuant to Title 20, § 1720:**

- Served by delivering on this date one electronic copy by e-mail, and an original paper copy to the Chief Counsel at the following address, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid:

California Energy Commission  
Michael J. Levy, Chief Counsel  
1516 Ninth Street MS-14  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[mlevy@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:mlevy@energy.state.ca.us)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, that I am employed in the county where this mailing occurred, and that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the proceeding.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Rhea Moyer  
Rhea Moyer