


Memorandum

Date: February 13, 2007
 Telephone: (916) 653-1245

To: John Geesman, Presiding Member
 Art Rosenfeld, Associate Member

From: California Energy Commission – Bill Pfanner
 1516 Ninth Street Project Manager
 Sacramento, CA 95814-5512



Subject: **SOUTH BAY REPLACEMENT PROJECT (06-AFC-3) STATUS REPORT #1**

The following is staff's first status report on the proposed South Bay Replacement Project (SBRP).

The Application for Certification (AFC) was filed by LSP South Bay, LLC (LS Power) on June 30, 2006 and was determined to be Data Adequate on August 30, 2006. Staff filed its Issue Identification Report on September 13, and the Public Information Hearing and Site Visit was conducted on September 15, 2006. Staff filed Data Requests (1 through 98) on October 31, 2006, and received some responses on November 29 (Data Response Set 1-A). Data Response Set 1-B is expected on February 14, 2007.

Staff conducted a Data Response Workshop on December 11, 2006 in Chula Vista to review with the applicant the Data Responses in Set 1- A (Alternatives, Biological Resources, Environmental Justice, Hazardous Materials, Land Use, Traffic and Transportation, Transmission System Engineering, Waste Management, Water and Soil Resources, Worker Safety, and Visual Resources). Staff has scheduled a second Data Response Workshop on February 26, 2007 to complete review of Data Response Set 1-A (Cultural Resources) and review the applicant's Data Response Set 1-B (Air Quality and Public Health).

On January 18, 2007, the City of Chula Vista and the San Diego Unified Port District (Port) conducted a joint session to discuss the proposed SBRP and the Port's pending long term lease to LS Power. The Port, which controls the land the proposed SBRP would be built on, backed by the Chula Vista City Council, voted in 2001 to sign a new 45-year lease with LS Power's predecessor, Duke Energy. Under the terms of the current lease, which ends in 2010, LS Power must pay to tear down the existing South Bay Power Plant. The new lease would allow SBRP to be built on 20 acres to the south of the existing South Bay Power Plant site and LS Power would demolish the old facility. This would free about 115 acres for Chula Vista's future bay front renovation, which would connect to its new marina.

At the joint meeting, Jim Avery of San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), stated that SDG&E would not purchase the power from the SBRP and that any power generated by this plant would not be used in San Diego County. This statement caused concern by the City of Chula Vista officials. Mayor Cheryl Cox, backed by a City Council majority, stated at a January 22, 2007 news conference that the City no longer supports the concept of a new power plant on the bay front property. A second joint meeting with the Port to discuss the plant's future is planned but has not been scheduled. The Chula Vista Council is expected to form a

PROOF OF SERVICE (REVISED 10/20/06) FILED WITH
 ORIGINAL MAILED FROM SACRAMENTO ON 2/13/07

John Geesman, Presiding Member
Art Rosenfeld Associate Member
February 13, 2007
Page 2

subcommittee to further discuss the plant's future and the location and size of future power plants in the region. The Port has publicly stated they will not sign a lease unless the City of Chula Vista has stipulated their preference for the proposed SBRP, which raises the potential for a project site control issue.

Schedule

Regardless of the above statements by the various parties, the applicant is entitled under the Warren-Alquist Act to a Commission decision in 12 months. Unless the applicant requests a change, staff will continue to process this AFC as expeditiously as possible.

The applicant was to provide all Data Responses on November 29, 2006. However, due to delays in air quality modeling, the complete Data Response package has not been submitted. Assuming receipt of Data Response Set 1-B on or about February 14, staff has scheduled a Data Response Workshop for February 26 to discuss Air Quality, Public Health and Cultural Resources topics with the applicant and the community.

Staff has also determined that the AFC does not contain sufficient information regarding the demolition and final interconnection phase of the project. Although the California Energy Commission does not have permitting jurisdiction over these activities, they are under its authority for environmental review. Therefore, staff is preparing a second set of Data Requests focusing on the environmental impacts associated with demolishing the existing South Bay Power Plant, the placement of fill associated with the demolition, construction of the final 69-138 kV electric transmission interconnection, demolition of the old 69-138 kV substation and construction of the new 69-138 kV substation. Assuming timely receipt of Data Response Set 1-B, this set of Data Requests – Round 2 will be filed in mid-to late February, with a request for response by mid to late March.

Progress on the PSA has slipped by approximately three to four months due to lack of timely receipt of information and the need for additional information relating to demolition and final interconnections. Therefore, the schedule for filing of the PSA is estimated to be April-May 2007. This is predicated on the applicant filing complete data responses by mid to late March, and receipt of preliminary determinations from all local, state, and federal agencies, including the Preliminary Determination of Compliance from the San Diego Air Pollution Control District which is currently expected in March or early April.

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

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE SOUTH BAY
REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Docket No. 06-AFC-3
PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 10/20/06)

INSTRUCTIONS: All parties shall 1) send an original signed document plus 12 copies OR 2) mail one original signed copy AND e-mail the document to the web address below, AND 3) all parties shall also send a printed OR electronic copy of the documents that shall include a proof of service declaration to each of the individuals on the proof of service:

DOCKET UNIT

Send the original signed document plus the required 12 copies to the address below:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
DOCKET UNIT, MS-4
Attn: Docket No. 99-AFC-8C
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

* * * *

In addition to the documents sent to the Commission Docket Unit, also send individual copies of any documents to:

APPLICANT

Kevin Johnson
LS Power Generation, LLC
1735 Technology Drive, Suite 820
San Jose, CA 95110
KJohnson@LSPower.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Chris Ellison
Ellison, Schneider & Harris
2015 H Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
cte@eslawfirm.com

APPLICANT CONSULTANTS

Robert Mason
CH2M HILL
3 Hutton Centre Dr., Ste. 200
Santa Ana, CA 92707
robert.mason@ch2m.com

Sarah Madams
CH2M HILL
2485 Natomas Park Dr., Ste. 600
Sacramento, CA 95833

INTERESTED AGENCIES

Electricity Oversight Board
770 L Street, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814
esaltmarsh@eob.ca.gov

INTERVENORS

*CALIFORNIA UNIONS FOR
RELIABLE ENERGY (CURE)
Marc D. Joseph
Suma Peesapati
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000
South San Francisco, California
94080
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
speesapati@adamsbroadwell.com

***Environmental Health Coalition**
Osa L. Wolff
Kevin P. Bundy
Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, LLP
396 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
wolff@smwlaw.com
bundy@smwlaw.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

JOHN L. GEESMAN
Presiding Committee Member
igeesman@energy.state.ca.us

ARTHUR ROSENFELD
Associate Committee Member
pflint@energy.state.ca.us

Garret Shean
Hearing Officer
gshean@energy.state.ca.us

Bill Pfanner
Project Manager
bpfanner@energy.state.ca.us

Kerry Willis
Staff Counsel
kwillis@energy.state.ca.us

Margret J. Kim
Public Adviser
pao@energy.state.ca.us

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Dora Gomez, declare that on February 13, 2007, I deposited copies of the attached to South Bay Replacement Project (06-AFC-3) Status Report #1, in the United States mail at Sacramento, CA with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to those identified on the Proof of Service list above.

OR

Transmission via electronic mail was consistent with the requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 20, sections 1209, 1209.5, and 1210. All electronic copies were sent to all those identified on the Proof of Service list above.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Dora Gomez