

Terramar
Kerry Siekmann
Catherine Miller
5239 El Arbol
Carlsbad, Ca. 92008

June 28, 2011

Robert B. Weisenmiller, Ph. D., Chair

James D. Boyd, Vice Chair

Karen Douglas, J. D.

Carla Peterman

Dear Chair, Vice Chair, and Commissioners,

With this letter Terramar respectfully submits comments regarding the Errata to the Presiding Member's Preliminary Comments for the Carlsbad Energy Center Project. Terramar wishes to reserve the right to add written and oral comments as necessary up to and including the June 30, 2011 business meeting (and beyond if the meeting is rescheduled.)

Terramar also wishes to include a copy of a letter received in the mail today from NRG regarding the start of construction of the CECP on June 30, 2011. (This letter can be opened using Adobe Reader 8.) As no certification has been issued, Terramar requests that the Commission nullify this letter as NRG's notification of construction to the residents within a one mile radius.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kerry Siekmann

Intervener for Terramar

Original Signed and Submitted to Docketing

State of California

Energy Resources Conservation and
Development Commission

In the Matter of:)	Docket No.
The Application for Certification of the)	07-AFC-6
Carlsbad Energy Center Project)	

Comments of Intervener Terramar on the Errata to the Presiding Member's
Proposed Decision

Kerry Siekmann
Catherine Miller
5239 El Arbol Dr.
Carlsbad, Ca. 92008
760-438-5611
June 28, 2011

State of California

Energy Resources Conservation and
Development Commission

In the Matter of:) Docket No.
The Application for Certification of the) 07-AFC-6
Carlsbad Energy Center Project)

Errata Comments Introduction

Intervener Terramar represents the neighborhood south of the Encina Power Station site. We have lived next to the Encina power plant for nearly sixty years. If another power plant is to be built next to our neighborhood we must rely on the California Energy Commission (CEC) to follow required Laws, Ordinances, Regulations and Standards (LORS) in all matters concerning the certification of the Carlsbad Energy Center Project (CECP);

The Energy Commission must determine whether the CECP will be designed, sited, and operated to ensure safe and reliable operation. (Pub. Res. Code, § 25520(b); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 20, § 1752(c)(2) PMPD Reliability, p. 1

Up to this point the CEC’s Errata and PMPD have disregarded LORS; including the California Coastal Act and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and local LORS without making the proper overrides. The Commission cannot license a project that conflicts with one or more LORS unless it finds:

"that such facility is required for public convenience and necessity and that there are not more prudent and feasible means of achieving such public convenience and necessity." (Pub. Res. Code, § 25525)

This determination must be made based on the totality of the evidence of record and consider environmental impacts, consumer benefits, and electric system reliability. Intervener Terramar can only conclude that overrides have been avoided as the CEC is not able to prove need or public convenience for the Carlsbad Energy Center Project. Therefore, the project should be turned down for certification.

Errata Comments

The California Energy Commission errs by calling themselves the “fire code official” in the Errata document. The CEC named the Carlsbad Fire Department as the California Fire Code enforcement authority in the Presiding Member’s Proposed Decision (Appendix A-40,41). The Errata document allowed this declaration to stand.

In the Errata to the Presiding Members Proposed Decision (PMPD) (16- p. 28) the California Energy Commission (CEC) erred when defining themselves as the “fire code official”:

“Fire code official” is defined as “[t]he fire chief or other designated authority charged with the administration and enforcement of the code, or a duly authorized representative.” (24 Cal. Code Regs. § 202.) Given the Energy Commission’s exclusive jurisdiction over the permitting and regulation of thermal power plants such as the CECP, we believe the role of “fire code official” falls to us as we must both set the development standards for the project and then enforce them.

The commission must concede that the PMPD table in Appendix A-40, 41(as noted below) defines and declares the Carlsbad Fire Department the enforcer of the California Fire Code and the National Fire Protection Association Standards. The Errata makes no issue with this table. Therefore, the Carlsbad Fire Chief stands as the “fire code official” per Energy Commission’s own documentation that has been a part of the CEC’s documentation from the start of this process.

Worker Safety and Fire Protection Table 1 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards (LORS)

Applicable Law

<u>Local (or Locally Enforced)</u>	<u>Description</u>
<i>California Fire Code 2007</i>	<i>The fire code contains general provisions for fire safety, including requirements for proper storage and handling of hazardous materials and listing of the information needed by emergency response personnel. Enforced by the Carlsbad Fire Department.</i>
<i>National Fire Protection Association standards</i>	<i>These standards provide specifications and requirements for fire safety, including the design, installation, and maintenance of fire protection equipment. Enforced by the Carlsbad Fire Department.</i>

As the “fire code official”, the CDF Chief and Fire Marshall have declared that a 50 ft. fire road in the bowl and a 25 ft. upper ring

road are necessary safety requirements for the CECP. Therefore the Errata violates the California Fire Code.

The Errata states on page 15:

*24. Worker Safety, p. 4, last sentence, revise as follows:
Both ramps and the road around the power plant at the bottom of the “bowl” will be at least 28 feet wide at all places.*

Therefore the Errata document disregards Fire Code LORS. The Carlsbad Fire Marshall (the fire code official) requires the fire road be 50 ft. wide at all places at the bottom of the “bowl”.

With the future Interstate-5 expansion (a future project that must be considered under CEQA Law § 15130) a portion of the existing upper ring road will be lost. This 25 ft. upper ring road was requested by the Carlsbad Fire Marshall as a necessity for fire fighting safety along with the 50 ft. fire road in the CECP bowl. Errata page 17 states:

*29. Worker Safety, p. 11, revise Findings 6 – 9, as follows:
9. The possible future widening of the Interstate 5 freeway will not degrade fire protection in any significant way.*

The Errata again disregards Fire Code LORS. The Carlsbad Fire Chief and Fire Marshall requested a 25 ft. upper ring road for firefighting safety and this must be accommodated. The Carlsbad Fire Chief and Fire Marshall’s concerns are supported up by Escondido Fire Chief Lowry in a letter dated May 16, 2011 (Exhibit 437) page 3:

Based on our experience at Palomar, if I were the Carlsbad Fire Chief I would have concerns if a fire were to erupt at the proposed CECP, due to its physical space, access challenges and location between the Interstate 5 freeway and the coastal railroad tracks. It is also immediately

The California Energy Commission is required to make an override when disregarding Fire Code LORS as is happening in this project.

Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 eliminate the Energy Commission’s argument for coastal dependence of the CECP

Land Use 2 and 3 create a “future event” that must be considered under CEQA. That event is the shutdown of the Encina once through-cooling system (with the shut down of Units 4 and 5). Under CEQA, a proper cumulative analysis must include past, present and probable future projects. (CEQA Guidelines § 15130).

With the end of once through-cooling at Encina, the CECP argument of coastal dependence is eliminated. The CEC argues coastal dependence for the CECP based on the expanded use of the Encina’s once through-cooling unit:

The CECP is located at the existing EPS, which is a "coastal dependent use" pursuant to the Coastal Act, inasmuch as it uses once-through cooling technology. Coastal dependent uses are encouraged to expand "within existing sites and shall be permitted reasonable long-term growth where consistent with this division" (Pub. Res. Code Section 30260). Even though the existing EPS steam boiler Units 1, 2, and 3 would be retired upon successful commercial operation of the new CECP generating units, the remaining EPS Units 4 and 5 would continue operating. The EPS remains a coastal dependent facility. In addition, because the City of Carlsbad is unable to supply reclaimed water (Exs. 193; 200, p. 4.9-14) to the project for cooling and other industrial purposes, it is necessary that CECP use its proposed ocean-water purification system. Thus, the proposed project (CECP generating units 6 and 7) is an expansion of a coastal dependent use and a coastal-dependent use in its own right. (Ex. 200, pp. 4.5-10 – 4.5-13.) PMPD, Land Use, p. 7

Terramar contends that the CECP already violates the Public Resources Code §30101 (which defines “Coastal-dependent development or use” as “any development or use which requires a site on, or adjacent to, the sea to be able to function at all.”)

:

- as the CECP is an air cooled plant that could function anywhere
- due to the scheduled end of Encina once through cooling by 2017 (a future event that must be considered under CEQA)

The shut down of Encina’s once through-cooling system (a future event that must be considered under CEQA) proposed in Land Use 2 and 3, eliminates the CEC’s argument for coastal dependence of the CECP.

The CECP is not coastally dependent and violates the Coastal Act. An override is necessary.

The CECP additionally violates CEQA in that with the scheduled shutdown of once through-cooling (a future event that must be considered under CEQA) they are required to go to the appropriate regulatory agencies and “assess the proper course of action to be taken (as this is a future event that must be considered under CEQA).

If the EPS Units are in fact shut down in the future and this affects the CEC’s intake water supply, the appropriate regulatory agencies will then assess the proper course of action to be taken [retain footnote 3].

Errata p. 21

Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 create the need for this action to be taken before the CECP can be certified. This has not been accomplished and therefore the project cannot be certified.

Errata Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 negate CEC arguments stating that the shutdown of Encina Units 4 and 5 is uncertain. If the shutdown is uncertain then Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 offer no value to the community.

The Errata argues that the shutdown of Encina Units 4 and 5 is an uncertain event.

Errata example, p. 22:

The City and other intervenors have contended that the Water Board's new OTC Policy will require the shutdown of EPS units 4 and 5 at the end of 2017, and that the CECP should thus be analyzed as a "stand alone" use of ocean water that will cause some (albeit comparatively minor) impingement and entrainment of marine biota. This contention is incorrect for two reasons. First, the OTC Policy does not require the shutdown of units 4 and 5 at the end of 2017. Rather, it requires the significant reduction of entrainment and impingement effects by that date. The Policy specifically provides a performance standard to meet this requirement, allowing reduction by mechanical (e.g., such as booms or screens) or performance (e.g., reduced pumping) methods. The Commission should not speculate on how the Policy requirements will be met by EPS. In addition, the OTC Policy is very clear that the 2017 date is subject to review based on the electricity reliability needs of the State, and that it may be revised to allow operation until such time as the units are no longer necessary for San Diego's electric reliability.

Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 (per CEQA) substantiate the shutdown of Encina as a foreseeable event with some certainty, otherwise Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 would have no benefit.

Therefore, the Errata errs by stating that the shutdown of Encina is uncertain; and then offering the shutdown and removal of Encina in Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 as a compromise.

Errata proposed Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 do not offer extraordinary benefit as required by the South Carlsbad Redevelopment Plan.

Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 are only a generalized plan. Unless redevelopment of the Encina site is an approved use by the South Carlsbad Redevelopment Plan, it offers no extraordinary benefit and could become a detriment to the area.

As the Carlsbad Redevelopment Attorney has testified on Feb. 1, 2010 (p.103), the CECP “adds to the blight” of the site. If the Applicant chose to redevelop the Encina site with another power plant or similar type of use, there would be no extraordinary benefit to the community and could be detrimental. Therefore, Land Use 2 and Land Use 3 offer no extraordinary benefit to the community as required by the South Carlsbad Redevelopment Plan and without express knowledge of the development great additional harm could come to the community.

Even the CEC realizes that there is no extraordinary benefit to the CECP.

Prior to approval of project like the CECP, a finding that the project will serve an “extraordinary public purpose” is required. (Ex. 407, Ordinance No. NS-779, pp. 2-4.)PMPD, Land Use, p. 14

5. With the possible exception of a finding that the CECP serves an extraordinary public purpose, required under the South Carlsbad Coastal Redevelopment Area Plan, the CECP is consistent with applicable land use LORS.PMPD, Land Use, p. 25

The CECP does not serve an extraordinary purpose and this was not corrected in the Errata Land Use 2 and Land Use 3. Therefore, the CECP violates local redevelopment LORS and an override must be made or the project must be denied.

Errata overstates the value of Encina retirement in Land Use 2 and Land Use 3.

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5. Alternatives, p. 2, third bulleted paragraph, revise as follows:

- *Allows the retirement of existing EPS Units 1, 2, and 3, and assists in the eventual retirement of existing EPS Units 4 and 5;*

Errata p. 2

Facts regarding the the “value” of Encina

- No RMR’s exist on any of the Encina Units 1-5.
- Only a short term tolling agreement with SDG&E exist on Units 4 & 5 (per John McKinsey June 15 Commission Hearing).
- “Once through-cooling” is scheduled to end in 2017
- The South Bay plant is already shut down.
- SDG&E has offered new contracts to other sites.

It is redundant to assume that the CECP is necessary to assist in the “eventual retirement of existing EPS Units 4 & 5”.

With the shutdown and removal of Encina per Land Use 2 and Land Use 3, the CECP would become the tallest structure in Carlsbad and not visually subordinate to Encina. Therefore, visual impacts must be reassessed per CEQA.

Overall visual dominance of the project would remain visually subordinate to the much larger and taller EPS structure.

Due to the moderate level of contrast, subordinate visual dominance, and weak view blockage, overall visual change due to structures would be low to moderate.

Impact Significance – In the context of the setting’s high visual sensitivity, the low to moderate level of project visual change would remain a less-than-significant visual impact.

PMPD, Visual Resources p, 14

Visual impacts of the CECP were based on the CECP’s lower profile in contrast to the Encina larger profile. Once Encina is removed (Land Use 2, Land Use 3), the CECP will be the largest structure in the City of Carlsbad.

With Land 2 and Land 3 the visual impacts from the CECP must be evaluated as a stand alone project per CEQA (as the removal of Encina is a probable future event.) and as the largest structure in the City of Carlsbad. This has not been performed by the CEC though it was requested. Therefore, the CEC has not properly evaluated visual resources and violates LORS. Therefore, visual impacts must be reassessed or a LORS override must be made.

The Errata disregards local LORS without making any overrides.

According to CEQA Guidelines [Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§ 15000 et seq., Appen. G, §§ II, IX, XVII], a project results in significant land use impacts if it would:

Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction, or that would normally have jurisdiction, over the project. This includes, but is not limited to, a General Plan, community or specific plan, local coastal program, airport land use compatibility plan, or zoning ordinance;

PMPD Land Use p.1

Terramar joins in and supports Power of Vision and the City of Carlsbad's position on this topic.

Errata Comments Conclusion

The Errata continues to disregard LORS; including CEQA, the Coastal Act and Local LORS.. If LORS are to be disregarded then multiple overrides must be made; need and public convenience must be proven.

If this is not possible and Terramar believes it is not, then the project must be denied certification.



June 24, 2011

Subject: Notice of Construction Activities at the Carlsbad Energy Center Project

To Whom It May Concern:

Initial construction for the Carlsbad Energy Center Project (CECP) located at 4600 Carlsbad Boulevard, Carlsbad, California 92008 is being planned to begin on June 30, 2011. Construction activities will occur between the hours of 7 am and sunset Monday through Friday, and between the hours of 8:00 am and sunset on Saturday (although non-noisy construction activities may occur after sunset if necessary).

Other activities related to the Carlsbad Energy Center Project are being planned and as the dates for these other construction activities are determined, NRG will mail another Notice to the community.

NRG is taking precautions to minimize impacts due to construction activities and has established a 24-hour per day telephone number for the public's use. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the CECP, please dial 760-710-2213.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "George L. Piantka".

George L. Piantka, PE
Director, Environmental Business
NRG Energy, West Region

cc: Joseph Douglas, CEC

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

Comments on Errata 6/28/11
Letter to Commissioners 6/28/11
Letter from NRG 6/24/11

Kerry
Siekman

I, Kerry Siekman, declare that on 6/28, 2011, I served and filed copies of the attached ↑, dated ↑, 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:

[\[http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/carlsbad/index.html\]](http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/carlsbad/index.html).

The documents have 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;
- 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 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 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, 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.

Kerry Siekman



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 Monasmi
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