DOCKET
07-AFC-6
DATE Jun 10 2011
RECD. Jun 13 2011

CITY OF
CARLSBAD
Office of the City Manager

www.carlsbadca.gov

June 10, 2011

Robert B. Weisenmiller, Ph.D., Chair
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS-33
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chair Weisenmiller:

As was expressed by the City of Carlsbad Mayor and Council Members at the hearing on the Proposed Decision, citizens of our community, the City Council, and I are very disappointed in the Proposed Decision regarding the CECP. We believe the highest and best use of this land in the coastal zone of our City is not to continue the industrial uses that have been there for the last 60 years but to turn the land into a resource so that the citizens of Carlsbad and the state can enjoy their limited and priceless coastal resource. Instead, as the existing Encina Power Station approaches the end of its useful life, the Committee is poised to gift the community with a new power plant that will last at least another 30 years.

The City understands the importance of electricity to our society and is not opposed to a new power plant within its jurisdiction. In that spirit, the City's Redevelopment Agency tried to work with the applicant prior to their filing their AFC to develop a smaller, more efficient power plant and the City identified alternative sites within city limits. As Agency staff testified, they had been led to believe by the applicant that a smaller plant would be constructed on the site within an office building type structure. However, instead of replacing the Encina Power Station with a smaller facility located in an office building type structure, the Committee recommends substituting the existing 321 megawatts of Encina Units 1-3 for a large, 135-foot high, 558 megawatt, industrial structure. As City staff testified, the alternative sites were acceptable to the City and a developer even submitted an alternative project on one of the sites to SDG&E during their energy procurement process.

During this proceeding the City was accused by the Commission staff as being biased against the project and by the Committee as having a land use process that is "complex" and a "policy and regulatory puzzle." Complexity is not a reason to re-interpret local land use regulations.

In reaching its Proposed Decision, the Committee has either ignored or incorrectly interpreted the City' land use regulation and several potential other state and local requirements. Some of the most important are:

1. The California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code Section 30101) requires that an industrial facility can be located within the coastal zone only if it is "coastal dependent." The Act defines a "'coastal-dependent development or use' means any development or use which requires a site on, or adjacent to, the sea to be able to function at all". Rather than using this clear understanding of the law, the Committee relied on back-door legal approach that is discussed in our filed comments.

2. The California Fire Code Section 503.2.2 states "The *fire code official* shall have the authority to require an increase in the minimum access widths where they are inadequate for fire or rescue operations." Rather than incorporating the Carlsbad Fire Chief's access requirements into its decision, the Committee choose to ignore section 503.2.2 and deferred to the CEC staff that has had no experience fighting fires and has no direct responsibility for the safety of the City's fire personnel or its citizens. Our Fire Chief's fire access requirements are fully supported by lessons learned from the recent Palomar plant fire and by the Escondido Fire Chief following that fire. The Commission may be able to override the Fire Chief's requirements but you cannot legally ignore them. At the hearing on the Proposed Decision, the Fire Chief asked that if the Commission approves the project without the access roads that you specify the reason for overriding his requirements.

3. The South Carlsbad Coastal Redevelopment Area Redevelopment Plan requires development within the area to have an "extraordinary public benefit". As discussed in our filed comments, the CECP clearly does not comply with this local legal requirement. The Committee urged the parties to come to an agreement on the process for the removal and remediation of the entire Encina power plant. Although the City and Redevelopment Agency did this, the Redevelopment Agency does not believe that these conditions satisfy the high standard for constructing new industrial facilities in this coastal location.

4. Given that the CECP is a controversial gas-fired project to be located in the California Coastal Zone with significant fire safety issues, the City believes that the "no project" alternative should be adopted by the Commission. This plant is not needed. On the day of the PMPD hearing, SDG&E submitted a filing[1] and sworn testimony[2] to the California Public Utilities Commission seeking approval of three power purchase agreements for a

[1] Application Of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902 E) For Authority To Enter Into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements With Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center And Quail Brush Power

[2] Prepared Direct Testimony Of San Diego Gas & Electric Company In Support Of Application For Authority To Enter Into Purchase Power Agreements With Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center And Quail Brush Power

total of 450 megawatts located in the San Diego load area[3]. As SDG&E testifies in these filings:

> "...with the resources additions that are proposed in this Application, the SDG&E load pocket will have sufficient resources to meet total local RA (resource adequacy) needs for all customers. It also shows that sufficient resources would exist to allow for the full retirement of the Encina Power Plant prior to the end of 2017, the date at which it would need to meet the State's new OTC policy." (Prepared Direct Testimony Of San Diego Gas & Electric Company In Support Of Application For Authority To Enter Into Purchase Power Agreements With Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power, Public Version, Page 12 line 21 to page 13 line 3)

The Committee did not have the advantage of SDG&E's filing and rejected the "no project" alternative. The Proposed Decision's reasons are identified in italics below and the response of SDG&E's testimony are as follows:

- *"Meets the expanding need for new, highly efficient, reliable electrical generating resources that are dispatchable by the CAISO, and are located in the "load pocket" of the San Diego region"* – SDG&E stated in their recent filings with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) that they have entered into power purchase agreements with three new natural gas power plants located within the SDG&E load pocket[4]. In addition to meeting SDG&E's expected power demands through 2018 (SDG&E Testimony, page 10), these three units will provide:

  > "...environmental friendly, quick start generation units utilizing the most advanced and efficient gas-fired technologies. They also provide the starting and/or ramping capabilities required by the Commission to accommodate sudden changes in resources or loads." (SDG&E Application, page 5)

This filing demonstrates that it is not necessary to locate a new power plant in the coastal zone and that the CECP is not necessary to meet this objective.

---

[3] SDG&E did not propose a power purchase agreement for any portion of the CECP.

[4] The two filings are: SDG&E, Application Of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902 E) For Authority To Enter Into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements With Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center And Quail Brush Power, May 19, 2011 and SDG&E, Prepared Direct Testimony Of San Diego Gas & Electric Company In Support Of Application For Authority To Enter Into Purchase Power Agreements With Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center And Quail Brush Power, May 19, 2011

- *Improves San Diego regional electrical system reliability through fast starting generating technology, creating a rapid responding resource for peak demand situations, and providing a dependable resource to backup intermittent renewable resources like wind generation and solar* – As noted above, the projects selected by SDG&E will provide fast start capability, all of the units would be capable of being dispatched from "...a cold, "idle" state to full load within 10 minutes." (Testimony, page 28, 32, 37) In addition, SDG&E states that "...these generation facilities will help to mitigate the effects of intermittency associated with increased development of renewable generation." (Application, page 6)

The text of the PMPD gives four additional reasons for the rejection of the "No Project "alternative: (a) *All five Encina units would operate "as is" into the foreseeable future.* The projects for which SDG&E chose to sign power purchase agreements will shut down the Encina units, (b) *There would be efforts to find new sites for dispatchable gas-fired generation.* Again, the SDG&E contracted projects provide this generation. (c) *Environmental impacts such as increased air pollution because older units on the SDG&E system would have to operate.* There is no CECP contract (and of course, no CPUC filing seeking approval of such an agreement), so the SDG&E projects will displace the Encina units, and (d) *The CECP can utilize existing infrastructure.* Two of the three SDG&E projects are to be located on existing power plants and the third is next to the Sycamore landfill.

We are convinced that this is the wrong location for the proposed power plant for the reasons stated above and considering the vision that the City of Carlsbad has for its coastline. We also believe that this plant does not comply with our local laws and that the Proposed Decision disregards our local coastal program, jeopardizes our proposed coastal rail trail program, disregards our redevelopment plan, and jeopardizes our public safety. As the Energy Commission we recognize that you have the ability to override our laws, but you simply can't disregard them.

I'm asking you today to not approve this facility and help us locate it somewhere else.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hildabrand
City Manager

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Flora Waite, declare that on June 13, 2011, I served and filed copies of the attached ***Letter from Lisa Hildabrand, City Manager for the City of Carlsbad, to the Chairperson Robert Weisenmiller***, dated June 10, 2011. 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 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 THE APPLICANT AND ALL OTHER PARTIES:

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

_____ by personal delivery;

_____ by delivering on this date, for mailing with the United States Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to the name and address of the person served, for mailing the same day in the ordinary course of business; that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date to those address **NOT** marked "email preferred."

AND

FOR FILING WITH THE ENERGY COMMISSION:

__X__ 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, 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.

_____ Name

6/13/11 _____ Date

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 5/18/2011)

APPLICANT
Jennifer Hein
George Piantka, PE.
NRG Energy, Inc., West Region
5790 Fleet Street, Ste. 200
Carlsbad, CA 92008
jennifer.hein@nrgenergy.com
george.piantka@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
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1600
Sacramento, CA 95814
jamckinsey@stoel.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES
California ISO
E-mail Preferred
e-recipient@caiso.com

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

City of Carlsbad
South Carlsbad Coastal
Redevelopment Agency
Allan J. Thompson
21 "C" Orinda Way #314
Orinda, CA 94563
allanori@comcast.net

City of Carlsbad
South Carlsbad Coastal
Redevelopment Agency
Joseph Garuba,
Municipals Project Manager
Ronald R. Ball, Esq., City Attorney
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008
E-mail Preferred
Joe.Garuba@carlsbadca.gov
ron.ball@carlsbadca.gov

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

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

Power of Vision
Julie Baker & Arnold Roe, Ph.D.
4213 Sunnyhill Drive
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

***Tim Olson**
Adviser to Vice Chair Boyd
tolson@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

Jennifer Jennings
Public Adviser's Office
E-mail Preferred
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us

*indicates change