



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

DOCKET	
07-AFC-6	
DATE	FEB 09 2009
RECD.	FEB 09 2009

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE
CARLSBAD ENERGY CENTER PROJECT

Docket No. 07-AFC-6

**COMMITTEE ORDER DENYING CITY OF CARLSBAD MOTION FOR STAFF REVISED
 PRELIMINARY STAFF ASSESSMENT AND PROJECT SCHEDULE RELIEF**

On January 20, 2009, intervenor City of Carlsbad (“City”) filed a Motion for Staff Revised PSA (Preliminary Staff Assessment) and Project Schedule Relief (“Motion”). Responses in support of the Motion were filed by intervenors California Unions for Reliable Energy (CURE) and Power of Vision. Responses opposing the Motion were filed by Commission staff and the Applicant, Carlsbad Energy Center LLC.

In its Motion, City argues that unresolved issues regarding the interrelation between the Carlsbad Energy Center Project (CECP) and a Caltrans project to widen Interstate 5 (I-5) on the eastern boundary of the CECP site, require the preparation of a revised PSA and further public review of that revised PSA prior to the preparation of a Final Staff Assessment (FSA). Without such an opportunity, it asserts, the public will not have “meaningful input into the Commission staff position.”

Intervenor CURE argues in support of the Motion that the PSA is the equivalent of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and must contain a complete air quality analysis; where the analysis is incomplete, the document must be revised and recirculated. CURE further complains that a Coastal Commission report on the project, which it believes is mandated by Public Resources Code section 30413, must be provided despite the Coastal Commission’s refusal to do so.

Commission Staff urges denial of the motion. It asserts that the PSA has taken into account, to the extent of the information available, the I-5 widening project and a further refined analysis will be presented in the Final Staff Assessment (FSA). In any event, it asserts that a PSA is an “‘extra credit’ exercise to provide early and additional public access to agency analysis as that analysis is being developed. . .this agency does not always prepare a PSA as part of its project analysis. When it does so, it is quite common for certain information presented to be incomplete, and to include unresolved issues.” As a certified regulatory program, the Energy Commission is not required to prepare a DEIR.

Similarly, the Applicant asserts that the PSA has gone as far as it can in its analysis given the incomplete details available about the Caltrans project. Applicant agrees with Staff that preparation of a PSA is not mandatory. In its view, the City and public have had substantial time since the Application for Certification was found data adequate in October 2007 in which to review the proposal.

The nature of the “schedule relief” the City is requesting is not clear. It appears to suggest that the revised PSA it seeks stand in the place of the FSA, with the prehearing conference the schedule shows following the FSA instead following the PSA. It says doing so would add “negligible” time to the schedule. Given that Staff plans to hold an FSA workshop at which the public can participate, we have difficulty finding any substantive difference between the scenario the City seeks and the status quo. In either case, a revised report of the Staff’s position will be made available and subjected to public review prior to the evidentiary hearings.

After considering the arguments, we do not find it necessary or appropriate to direct the preparation of a revised PSA. As Staff notes, a PSA is not a required element of our process. It is the FSA that will be considered, along with other evidence provided by the Applicant, intervenors, and public comment at the evidentiary hearings before us. The FSA provides the Staff’s best professional judgment of the issues; the City or any other party which disagrees with Staff, may present its own expert evidence supporting its position. Staff is also free to supplement the FSA with additional or amended testimony. Its opinions regarding the project are not irrevocably fixed by the publication of the FSA.

We also agree with Staff and Applicant that the California Environmental Quality Act does not require either the preparation of a PSA or recirculation of a PSA where significant new information is added.

The Coastal Commission’s participation, or rather its lack of participation, is raised not in the Motion but in CURE’s supporting pleadings and is not addressed by the other parties. Lacking final analysis from Staff or testimony from the other parties, it is premature to address the issue at this juncture. The parties are free to raise it at a later time, such as the evidentiary hearings (after identifying it as an issue in a prehearing conference statement, of course).

THEREFORE, the Committee **ORDERS** that the Motion is **DENIED**.

Dated: February 9, 2009, at Sacramento, California.

Original signed by:

JAMES D. BOYD
Vice Chair and Presiding Member
Carlsbad AFC Committee

Original signed by:

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Associate Member
Carlsbad AFC Committee



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

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE **CARLSBAD ENERGY
CENTER PROJECT**

Docket No. 07-AFC-6

PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 2/5/2009)

APPLICANT

David Lloyd
Carlsbad Energy Center, LLC
1817 Aston Avenue, Suite 104
Carlsbad, CA 92008
David.Lloyd@nrgenergy.com

Tim Hemig, Vice President
Carlsbad Energy Center, LLC
1817 Aston Avenue, Suite 104
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Tim.Hemig@nrgenergy.com

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

Robert Mason, Project Manager
CH2M Hill, Inc.
6 Hutton Centre Drive, Ste. 700
Santa Ana, CA 92707
Robert.Mason@ch2m.com

Megan Sebra
CH2M Hill, Inc.
2485 Natomas Park Drive, Ste. 600
Sacramento, CA 95833
Megan.Sebra@ch2m.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

John A. McKinsey
Stoel Rives LLP
980 Ninth Street, Ste. 1900
Sacramento, CA 95814
jamckinsey@stoel.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
e-recipient@caiso.com

INTERVENORS

City of Carlsbad
Allan J. Thompson
Attorney for the City
21 "C" Orinda Way #314
Orinda, CA 94563
allanori@comcast.net

City of Carlsbad
Joseph Garuba, Municipals Project
Manager
Ron Ball, Esq., City Attorney
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008
jgaru@ci.carlsbad.ca.us
rball@ci.carlsbad.ca.us

Terramar Association
Kerry Siekmann & Catherine Miller
5239 El Arbol
Carlsbad, CA 92008
siekmann1@att.net

California Unions for Reliable Energy
("CURE")
Gloria D. Smith & Marc D. Joseph
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000
South San Francisco, CA 94080
gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com

Center for Biological Diversity
c/o William B. Rostov
EARTHJUSTICE
426 17th St., 5th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
wrostov@earthjustice.org

Power of Vision
Julie Baker and Arnold Roe, Ph.D.
P.O. Box 131302
Carlsbad, California 92013
powerofvision@roadrunner.com

Rob Simpson
Environmental Consultant
27126 Grandview Avenue
Hayward CA 94542
rob@redwoodrob.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

JAMES D. BOYD
Vice Chair and Presiding Member
jboyd@energy.state.ca.us

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Associate Member
kldougla@energy.state.ca.us

Paul Kramer
Hearing Officer
pkramer@energy.state.ca.us

Mike Monasmith
Siting Project Manager
mmonasmi@energy.state.ca.us

Dick Ratliff
Staff Counsel
dratliff@energy.state.ca.us

Elena Miller
Public Adviser's Office
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Maggie Read, declare that on February 9, 2009, I served and filed copies of the attached Committee Order Denying City of Carlsbad Motion for Staff Revised Preliminary Staff Assessment and Project Schedule Relief dated, February 9, 2009. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit, 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/sitingcases/carlsbad/index.html>]**. The document has been sent to both the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit, in the following manner:

(Check all that Apply)

For service to all other parties:

sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list;

by personal delivery or by depositing in the United States mail at Sacramento, California with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed as provided on the Proof of Service list above to those addresses **NOT** marked "email preferred."

AND

For filing with the Energy Commission:

sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed and emailed respectively, to the address below (preferred method);

OR


depositing in the mail an original and 12 paper copies, as follows:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

Attn: Docket No. 07-AFC-6
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

docket@energy.state.ca.us

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



Maggie Read