

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)	Docket No. 99-AFC-8
)	
Application for Certification for)	
the Blythe Energy Project)	
)	
_____)	

STAFF COMMENTS ON PRESIDING MEMBER S PROPOSED DECISION

On February 20, 2001 the Committee issued the Presiding Member s Proposed Decision on the Blythe Energy Project and requested that Staff file written comments by March 1, 2001. The following are Staff s comments.

Traffic and Transportation

The first sentence of the second paragraph on page 258 of the PMPD may be confusing because it references the ALUC without describing the agency and stating its relevance to the project. Staff recommends that it be reworded as follows:

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), which has the authority to review and comment on any proposed development within the "airport influenced area", ...

Cultural Resources

Footnote 30 page 216 and 217 should read:

Potential impacts are considered only for those cultural resources that are deemed significant or important under criteria established by federal and state

laws and regulations. If a cultural resource is determined to be eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), then the resource is deemed significant. (National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470; 36 CFR 800 et seq.; CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Cal. Code Regs., /15064.5; Title 14, Cal. Code Regs., /4850 et seq.)

Commission Discussion page 221 and 222:

The committee inserted different verification time lines into Cul-1, Cul-2 and Cul-3 to "encourage aggressive construction schedules." Staff has already approved the Cultural Resources Specialist in accordance with Cul-1, therefore Staff concurs with that change. Cul-2 does not have to be fulfilled prior to other conditions, so the 30 day requirement will probably not result in delays, and staff again concurs. For Cul-3, the change would be satisfactory as long as the applicant provides all of the required information in a timely manner without omissions or deviations from the requirements of the conditions. If the applicant feels that it can provide a training program and respond to comments within the time requirement, then staff concurs with the 30 days. It must be reiterated though, that the applicant bears the risk that an insufficient submittal could result in unanticipated delays in order for the applicant to respond to detailed comments on the training program.

DATED: March 1, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

LISA M. DECARLO
Staff Counsel