Michael McGuirt - RE: Beacon

From:	Michael McGuirt
To:	Kenneth Stein
Date:	12/22/2008 10:08 AM
Subject:	RE: Beacon
CC:	Eric Knight; Eric Solorio; Michael K. Lerch; Rick York
Attachments:	Michael McGuirt.vcf

DOCKET
08-AFC-2
DATE DEC 22 2008
RECD. AUG 24 2009

Kenny and Eric,

I believe that Energy Commission staff and the applicant agree on the character of the path forward for the geoarchaeology field study. I would like to take the opportunity here to clarify a couple of points that Kenny makes below in his Friday morning email. Please let me know if any of my clarifications here are at variance with how either of you understands our agreements to date.

Energy Commission staff requested that the applicant complete the fieldwork for the study and provide a field report of that work prior to the publication of the FSA. Staff requested that the Energy Commission receive that field report at least 30 days prior to the publication of the FSA so that staff has time to incorporate the information in the report into the FSA. "Brief" is fine, but staff was hoping more for "concise," "concise" being that the report should provide minimal summary descriptions of the stratigraphy of the different portions of the project site that were investigated, and preliminary statements on the interpretations that the principal investigator feels are likely to be the outcome of the full analyses that will occur concurrent with or subsequent to certification, but prior to the completion of the CRMMP. The report would be "concise," because it would not be necessary to include all of the supporting data that would go into the full, final study report. The field report would be a public statement of the principal investigator's best professional judgement on what the principal investigator had seen in the field, and it would be understood that the statements in the field report could be subject to change, even significant change, depending on the outcome of the subsequent full analyses of the field data.

With regard to the timing of the submission of radiocarbon samples and the use of the resultant information from the radiocarbon assays, I would like to make the following clarification. In our teleconference of last Wednesday, I had requested that the applicant try to secure at least a few radiocarbon dates to include in the field report so that there would at least be some gross time brackets on the sedimentary deposits beneath the project site. In other words, I was asking that the applicant try and submit at least a small suite of samples that would provide a general idea of the age of the sedimentary deposits beneath the project site that the construction of the proposed project would destroy. I understand that the applicant does not want to expose the project schedule to the uncertainties of the turnaround schedule of a radiocarbon laboratory. What staff would like to ask is that the applicant simply attempt to submit this small suite of dates for expedited radiocarbon assay so that the results could be incorporated into the field report. Staff would understand if the radiocarbon laboratory was ultimately unable to follow through on an expedited turnaround.

Again, please let me know if you all feel that any of the clarifications above are not elements of our agreement. Cultural resources staff appreciates the applicant's consideration and accommodation of our information needs. Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Mike McGuirt

Michael D. McGuirt, RPA
Planner II, (Cultural Resources)
Environmental Protection Office

Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division
California Energy Commission
1516 9th Street (MS 40)
Sacramento, California 95814-5512
L 916.654.4870
F 916.651.8868

>>> "Stein, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Stein@fpl.com> 12/19/2008 10:54 AM >>>
Eric/Mike:

We are in agreement with conducting the field study with the assumption that the only things that will be required prior to completing the FSA and getting a final certification is the completion of field work (i.e., trenching) and submission of a brief field report. Data analysis and a full report would be completed as soon as possible (espicially radio carbon dating) but would not be necessary prior to certification (but would be required prior to completing a post-certification CRMMP).

That said, we can't give you a 100% green light until we receive a scope of work document back from EDAW which they are feverishly working on now (I hope to have something Monday or Tuesday). We just want to be absolutely sure we can find the right people to do the work in the timeframe required (i.e., complete field work by end of January) at a reasonable cost.

We hope to give you that bright green light early next week.

Let me know if you have any quesitons/concerns.

Kenny

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Solorio [mailto:ESolorio@energy.state.ca.us]
Sent: Friday, December 19, 2008 1:43 PM
To: Michael McGuirt
Cc: Sara.Head@aecom.com; Stein, Kenneth; Russell, Meg
Subject: Re: Beacon

Mike,
My understanding was Beacon is moving forward with the field study. By copy of this email, I'm asking applicant to confirm they are moving forward with the geo-arch field study, as discussed in the meeting.

Eric

>>> Michael McGuirt 12/19/2008 10:17 AM >>>
Good Morning Eric,

I was out of town yesterday, and I was curious if there had been any word about whether the applicant was going to in fact move forward with the geoarchaeology study on Beacon.

Mike