

INFORMATIONAL HEARING AND SITE VISIT
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
Application for)
Certification for the) Docket No. 00-AFC-5
EL PASO MERCHANT ENERGY'S)
UNITED GOLDEN GATE POWER)
PROJECT, UGGPP, PHASE I)
-----)

HOLIDAY INN
275 S. AIRPORT BOULEVARD
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2000

1:00 P.M.

Reported by:
Debi Baker
Contract No. 170-99-001

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Robert Laurie, Presiding Member

STAFF PRESENT

Gary Fay, Hearing Officer

John Wilson, Advisor to
Commissioner Rosenfeld

Kevin Kennedy, Project Manager

Keith Golden

PUBLIC ADVISER

Roberta Mendonca

REPRESENTING THE APPLICANT

Jesse D. Frederick, Vice President
M. Scott Weaver, Manager
Christine Luther, Staff Engineer
WZI, Inc.
4700 Stockdale Highway, Suite 120
P.O. Box 9217
Bakersfield, CA 93389

INTERVENORS

Mark Wolfe, Attorney
representing California Unions for Reliable
Energy

Dan Leacox, Attorney
Livingston & Mattesich
1201 K Street, Suite 1100
Sacramento, CA 95814
representing Southern Energy

ALSO PRESENT

Joseph P. Como, Deputy City Attorney
Greggory Wheatland, Deputy City Attorney
City and County of San Francisco
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682

Gary Franzella
Dorothy Shempke
San Francisco Airport Commission

Tom Murphy
Aspen Environmental Group

Aaron Davis
San Jose Mercury News

Ena Aguirre

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Introductions	1
Overview	4
Presentations	10
CEC Staff	10
Public Adviser	23
Applicant	27
CEC Staff Issues Identification Report and Scheduling	32
Agencies	46
City and County of San Francisco	46
Public Comment	47
Ena Aguirre	47
Site Visit	56
Adjournment	56
Certificate of Reporter	57

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 1:00 p.m.

3 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: Good

4 afternoon. My name is Robert Laurie, and I'm the
5 Presiding Member of the Siting Committee hearing
6 this case. My colleague on the Committee is
7 Commissioner Art Rosenfeld, who is not present
8 today, but will be participating in further
9 proceedings.

10 The way the Energy Commission decisions
11 are made is that a Committee of two Commissioners,
12 that is myself and Commissioner Rosenfeld, will be
13 hearing the case and making recommendations to the
14 full Commission.

15 To my immediate right is Mr. Gary Fay.
16 Mr. Fay is the Hearing Officer assigned to this
17 case. The Hearing Officer will take the role of
18 administering the hearing process, to be
19 interfered with by the Commissioners only under
20 the most stressful circumstances, but they always
21 maintain the freedom to do so. So Mr. Fay will be
22 the Hearing Officer, and he will administer the
23 proceedings.

24 To Mr. Fay's right is Mr. John Wilson.
25 Mr. Wilson is the Senior Advisor to Commissioner

1 Rosenfeld.

2 Just a couple notes before we get
3 started today. This hearing, as others, will be
4 recorded. The reporter will maintain the record
5 and under such circumstances as problems may arise
6 in the recording she will let us know and under
7 those circumstances she is under full and complete
8 control of these proceedings and we will stop the
9 proceedings until the record is ready to go again.

10 Also, this is a cellular phone. If any
11 of you own one of these, please do something with
12 it. Energy Commission regulations allow the
13 Presiding Member to confiscate all ringing
14 telephones, and that will be done. We're not
15 serious about that, but it does have a tendency to
16 throw off our concentration, so I'd ask for your
17 cooperation in that regard.

18 I will now turn the matter over to Mr.
19 Fay. Mr. Fay will have the parties introduce
20 themselves, and to go over the process that we'll
21 be following during these proceedings. Mr. Fay.

22 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Thank you,
23 Commissioner Laurie. Good afternoon, everybody,
24 and welcome to the informational hearing for the
25 United Golden Gate Power Project Phase I.

1 I'd like to begin by taking
2 introductions just so we all know who is present.
3 And we'll begin on my left, Mr. Kennedy,
4 representing the staff.

5 MR. KENNEDY: My name is Kevin Kennedy
6 and I'm the Project Manager for the Energy
7 Commission Staff on this project.

8 MR. FREDERICK: Jesse Frederick, WZI,
9 consultant to El Paso. I'll be representing the
10 project.

11 MR. GOLDEN: My name is Keith Golden,
12 CEC Air Quality Staff.

13 MR. MURPHY: Tom Murphy, Aspen
14 Environmental Group, a contractor for the
15 California Energy Commission.

16 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: Folks, if
17 you're going to introduce yourselves you have to
18 get closer to the recording microphone in order to
19 do that.

20 MR. MURPHY: Tom Murphy, Aspen
21 Environmental Group. We're a contractor for the
22 California Energy Commission.

23 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Maybe just to save
24 everybody's time, if you're not with the
25 California Energy Commission I'd ask that you

1 introduce your party, also if you're not with WZI.
2 And thereafter, when someone makes a comment,
3 please introduce yourself for the sake of the
4 court reporter.

5 What other agencies or groups are here?

6 MR. COMO: Joe Como with the City of San
7 Francisco, City Attorney's Office.

8 MR. FRANZELLA: Good afternoon, Gary
9 Franzella and Dorothy Shempke, San Francisco
10 Airport Commission.

11 HEARING OFFICER FAY: All right, are
12 there any members of the general public here?
13 Okay, I see no indication at this time. We'll
14 move forward then.

15 The informational hearing is the first
16 public event conducted by the Committee, which is
17 a subcommittee of the California Energy Commission
18 assigned to conduct this case.

19 The Committee conducts this as part of
20 the Energy Commission's licensing proceedings to
21 review the United Golden Gate Power Project Phase
22 I.

23 Notice of today's hearing was sent to
24 all parties, adjoining landowners, interested
25 governmental agencies and other individuals on

1 November 2, 2000.

2 In addition, notice of today's event was
3 published in The San Francisco Chronicle on
4 Sunday, November 12th. Documents pertinent to
5 today's hearing include a staff issues
6 identification report filed on November 13th, and
7 a Committee draft agenda. And both documents are
8 available on the table.

9 The purpose of today's hearing is to
10 provide a public forum to discuss the proposed
11 power project and to learn about the Energy
12 Commission's four-month review process, as well as
13 to identify the opportunities for public
14 participation in this process.

15 I hope you will all be able to
16 participate in the site visit which will follow
17 this hearing. After the site visit and a dinner
18 break, the Commission Staff will sponsor a data
19 request workshop from 6:30 to 8:30 in this same
20 room? Yes, right here.

21 Today's event is the first in a series
22 of workshops and formal hearings which will extend
23 over the next four months. The Commissioner
24 conducting the proceeding will eventually issue a
25 Presiding Member's Proposed Decision containing

1 the recommendations on the proposed power plant.
2 It's important to note that these recommendations
3 must, by law, be based solely on evidence
4 contained in the public record.

5 To insure that this happens and to
6 preserve the integrity of the Commission's
7 licensing process, Commission regulations and the
8 California Administrative Procedures Act expressly
9 prohibit off-the-record contacts between
10 participants in this proceeding and Commissioners,
11 their Advisors and the Hearing Officer.

12 This is known as the ex parte rule.
13 This means that all contacts between a party to
14 this proceeding and Commissioners Laurie and
15 Rosenfeld, or their staffs, concerning a
16 substantive matter must occur in the context of a
17 public discussion held on the record.

18 This hearing is an example of a
19 discussion on the record. Another example is any
20 written communication which is filed in the
21 Commission's docket unit and distributed to all
22 parties.

23 The purpose of this rule is to provide
24 full disclosure to all participants of any and all
25 information which may be used as a basis for the

1 future decision on whether or not to license the
2 project.

3 Please note that petitions to intervene
4 have been filed by the California Unions for
5 Reliable Energy, CURE, and by Southern Energy
6 Potrero, LLC. These petitions were both granted
7 on November 13, 2000.

8 During the course of the hearing we will
9 proceed in the following manner: First the
10 Commission Staff will provide an overview of the
11 Commission's four-month licensing process and its
12 role in reviewing the project.

13 Next, Roberta Mendonca, the Commission's
14 Public Adviser, if she is here, will briefly
15 explain how to obtain information about and
16 participate in the licensing process.

17 Then the applicant will describe the
18 proposed project and explain plans for developing
19 the project site.

20 After that the Commission Staff will
21 summarize its preliminary view of the project, set
22 forth in its Issues Identification Report, and
23 address potential scheduling questions.

24 Upon completion of these presentations
25 interested agencies and members of the public may

1 ask questions and make comments.

2 And then following the presentations we
3 will adjourn to the site visit.

4 So, before we begin are there any
5 questions?

6 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: Is Southern or
7 CURE present?

8 MR. WOLFE: Yes. Good afternoon, I'm
9 Mark Wolfe here for CURE.

10 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: Mr. Wolf, --

11 MR. WOLFE: Yes.

12 HEARING OFFICER FAY: -- you're free to
13 join us at the table since you are a party.

14 MR. WOLFE: Why, thanks.

15 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Yes.

16 MR. Yeah, I'm here with Livingston and
17 Mattesich; I represent Southern Energy.

18 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Please identify
19 yourself.

20 MR. LEACOX: I'm Dan Leacox, just here
21 with Livingston and Mattesich, represent Southern.

22 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Okay, the same
23 courtesy is accorded to you, if you wish.

24 Both of these gentlemen represent
25 parties which have intervened in the case.

1 Are there any other questions before we
2 begin? All right, then I'd like --

3 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: Sir, why don't
4 you come up to the microphone.

5 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Yes, we have two
6 people who have just come in, and we like to be
7 sure that if they're not with the Energy
8 Commission Staff, or WZI, that they identify
9 themselves.

10 MR. DAVIS: Aaron Davis with The San
11 Jose Mercury News. Just so I understand, the
12 adjacent landowners that were notified of this
13 hearing included the corporations surrounding the
14 airport, or residents on the other side of Highway
15 101?

16 HEARING OFFICER FAY: I believe there is
17 a regulatory distance that determines who gets
18 notified. So, it's possible that residents that
19 were of great distance from the site would not
20 have received direct mail notice.

21 However, it was published in The
22 Chronicle and we're trying to publicize it as much
23 as possible.

24 MR. MURPHY: And the next hearing would
25 be when?

1 HEARING OFFICER FAY: The next hearing
2 has not been scheduled yet. But if you look at
3 the draft schedule that staff has proposed in the
4 Issues Identification Report, I think we're
5 looking at sometime around January 12th, is that
6 right?

7 MR. KENNEDY: Approximately, yes.

8 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Yes, so
9 approximately January 12th for an evidentiary
10 hearing. In the meantime there will be a number
11 of publicly noticed workshops the first of which
12 is this evening. And those workshops are less
13 formal than an evidentiary hearing but they are
14 open to the public, anybody can come and ask
15 questions about the project and offer their
16 comments.

17 MR. MURPHY: Thank you much.

18 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Certainly. All
19 right, asking again, any comments before we begin,
20 or any questions?

21 Okay, I would like to turn it over to
22 the staff then. Mr. Kennedy, would you begin your
23 presentation?

24 MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Fay and
25 Commissioner Laurie. As I indicated before, my

1 name is Kevin Kennedy and I'm the Siting Project
2 Manager for the Energy Commission Staff for this
3 project.

4 What I'm going to be doing in this
5 initial presentation is giving a brief overview of
6 the permitting process, some of which is very
7 similar to what we would normally do in a normal
8 project. This is also an expedited project, on a
9 four-month schedule. So there is some special
10 things that we'll be talking about in terms of the
11 overall schedule, which I will touch on.

12 After I'm done, Roberta Mendonca will be
13 giving an overview of public participation in the
14 process. The applicant will be giving an overview
15 of the project. And then I'll be returning to
16 talk a bit about some of the preliminary issues
17 that we have identified at this stage with respect
18 to this project.

19 Now, with any process it's always tough
20 to tell the players without a scorecard, so -- by
21 the way, the overheads that I'm using are actually
22 available on the table over there. So, if anybody
23 wants a hard copy of those, feel free to take one.
24 It may make it a little bit easier to follow
25 along.

1 As Commissioner Laurie and Mr. Fay
2 indicated, the ultimate decision makers in this
3 permitting process are the five Commissioners who
4 are appointed by the Governor who make up the
5 actual Energy Commission.

6 Those Commissioners have delegated
7 responsibility for hearing evidence in this case
8 to a two-member Committee consisting of
9 Commissioner Laurie and Commissioner Rosenfeld.
10 Gary Fay will be acting as Hearing Officer in
11 order to direct the entire process, the
12 evidentiary process.

13 Beyond that there are, at this point, a
14 number of equal parties to these proceedings,
15 starting with El Paso Merchant Energy, represented
16 I said on the overheads, Jim Brady, who is the
17 Project Manager for WZI, Jesse Frederick also with
18 WZI is representing them today.

19 Local, state and federal agencies are
20 also party to the process. The Energy Commission
21 Staff, who I'm representing today. And then any
22 formal intervenors, CURE and Southern Energy, at
23 this point, are the formal intervenors in this
24 process.

25 All have equal standing to be

1 participating in the proceedings, to be offering
2 evidence, to cross-examine witnesses as we get
3 into the evidentiary portion of the proceedings.

4 The public also has the opportunity to
5 have input into the process overall at any of the
6 public workshops and hearings, the public has the
7 opportunity to comment. Written comments are also
8 accepted.

9 The Public Adviser's Office has the role
10 within the Energy Commission of working with
11 intervenors and the general public to help them
12 understand the way our process works.

13 So those are the key players. The staff
14 is in the process of conducting independent
15 analysis of this project. We are just one of the
16 many players providing evidence for the Committee
17 and ultimately for the Commission.

18 Overall the purpose of the siting
19 process, as enacted in state law, is to insure
20 that a reliable supply of electrical energy is
21 maintained at a level consistent with the need for
22 such energy for protection of public health and
23 safety, for promotion of the general welfare, and
24 for environmental quality and protection.

25 And I would like to emphasize that there

1 are two key parts to that. The need to insure a
2 reliable supply of energy, and also the need to
3 protect public health, safety and the environment.

4 Since this project is under a special
5 expedited permit process, it was adopted in order
6 to help insure that we would have the electricity
7 needed to meet summer demand in 2001 and 2002 and
8 2003. And I'll talk a little bit more about that
9 later.

10 There's clear emphasis in this
11 proceeding on the need to insure a reliable
12 supply. At the same time I would emphasize that
13 the second half of the Energy Commission's purpose
14 in this siting process, to protect people and the
15 environment, is something that we are taking very
16 seriously. That this still applies, and we're
17 going to be taking it very, on the staff side,
18 certainly taking a very close look at this
19 project, and careful look at this project to make
20 sure that if it is certified, that it's done in a
21 way that will meet both halves of the Energy
22 Commission's purpose.

23 Now, I just want to go through a fairly
24 quick run-through of the Energy Commission's
25 overall siting process. First of all, the Energy

1 Commission is the permitting authority for any
2 thermal power plants in California 50 megawatts or
3 greater.

4 And also for various related facilities,
5 such as transmission lines, water supply lines,
6 gas pipelines, and the like.

7 Part of our role is to make sure that we
8 coordinate with federal, state and local agencies.
9 Part of what we are trying to do is make sure that
10 any certification takes place in a way that is
11 consistent with local laws, any laws, ordinances,
12 regulations and standards.

13 The Energy Commission, in this process,
14 is the lead agency for the California
15 Environmental Quality Act.

16 As such, we are responsible for
17 conducting a full review of the environmental
18 impacts of this project. Our analysis is subject
19 to the CEQA guidelines, and also includes an
20 analysis and review of the compliance of the
21 project with the applicable laws, ordinances,
22 regulations and standards, which we tend to
23 abbreviate LORS. So if you hear the term LORS
24 tossed around today, that's what we're talking
25 about.

1 Our analysis also includes a look at the
2 various engineering aspects of the project;
3 reliability; efficiency; transmission systems;
4 engineering and other engineering aspects of the
5 project.

6 As we are undergoing today, and will
7 continue through the course of this process, there
8 will be a number of public hearings and workshops
9 on the project. And at the end of the process
10 what we end up developing is CEQA equivalent
11 documentation.

12 We do not do a formal environmental
13 impact report in this process, but instead the
14 staff will be producing a staff assessment which
15 provides evidence and testimony from the staff's
16 perspective on the impacts of the project.

17 From there the Presiding Member will
18 develop a proposed decision, and ultimately the
19 Commission's decision will be the equivalent CEQA
20 documentation for this project.

21 As I noted and Mr. Fay mentioned, this
22 will be an open public process. Any of the
23 communications that go on among the parties is
24 required to occur in a public forum.

25 There will be workshops and hearings as

1 we move along. The notices will be sent out 10 to
2 14 days in advance. We have mailing lists. If
3 people want to be added to the mailing lists that
4 aren't currently on it, I believe that we have
5 sign-up sheets here today where you can just check
6 and indicate that -- do you have sign-up sheets,
7 Mr. Fay?

8 HEARING OFFICER FAY: I don't, but I
9 believe Ms. Mendonca will prepare one.

10 MR. KENNEDY: Okay, so if you want to be
11 added to the mailing list, you can be added
12 through the sign-up sheet.

13 People can also contact either myself or
14 Mary Dyas, who's the Project Secretary and is
15 helping me with the slides -- to be added to the
16 mailing list, if you know of people that might be
17 interested who aren't here today.

18 There's also an email list server for
19 this project. The handouts include the address
20 for where you would go to sign up for that.

21 The documents in the case, starting with
22 the application for certification, and continuing
23 with the staff assessment and other documents that
24 are developed for the project are also available
25 for public review at a number of places, including

1 some at the local public libraries in South San
2 Francisco, both the West Orange and Grand Avenue
3 branches have those. Apparently the Grand Avenue
4 branch had gotten rid of theirs, not quite knowing
5 what to do with it. But as of this morning they
6 have another copy of it. I dropped it off on my
7 way here. So I know that they have that.

8 We also sent them to the Millbrae and
9 San Bruno Libraries and to the San Francisco Main
10 Library. It's also available at the Energy
11 Commission's library and various other libraries
12 around the state. Information on the project is
13 also available through the Energy Commission's
14 website. And the address is given in the
15 handouts.

16 All the information that is filed in the
17 case is also available through the Dockets Unit at
18 the Energy Commission. The address is given on
19 the handouts.

20 As I noted before, part of the work that
21 we do at the Energy Commission is to coordinate
22 with other agencies, local, state and federal. We
23 have been in contact already in this case and are
24 working with people from the City and County of
25 San Francisco, the San Francisco Airport

1 Commission, the Bay Area Air Quality Management
2 District, the Bay Conservation and Development
3 Commission, and various other agencies, many of
4 which are represented today. And I believe there
5 are a few more who are going to be making it for
6 this evening's workshop, as well.

7 As I noted earlier, this is under an
8 expedited permitting process that was actually
9 enacted in a state law that was just passed and
10 adopted in September.

11 This law included a provision for the
12 four-month permitting process for projects that
13 can be online by next August. And the nature of
14 the four-month process is such that the permit
15 that would be granted under this proceeding would
16 only allow the facility to operate through the
17 summer of 2003.

18 At that point it would have to either be
19 replaced by a combined cycle power plant that
20 would be permitted separately. Or cease operation
21 and then be removed.

22 The Phase I of United Golden Gate that
23 we're discussing today was actually the first
24 project to apply under this special four-month
25 provision. At the moment we are actually, at the

1 Energy Commission we have this and one other
2 project that are being considered under this
3 provision.

4 And one thing that I would like to
5 emphasize about this project. This is phase one
6 of a much larger project. The phase one is a
7 simple cycle peaking power plant. The applicant
8 proposes to have it online by next August 1st.
9 And as I mentioned, this permit, if it was
10 granted, would only allow them to operate for
11 three years.

12 The full project is planned for the same
13 site. It would be 570 megawatts, a combined cycle
14 power plant. At this point we are expecting an
15 application from the applicant for that project to
16 be filed sometime in late December.

17 The two projects are independent of each
18 other from our perspective in terms of how we will
19 be permitting them. If the phase one of the
20 project is certified through this proceeding, if
21 the second phase is not certified, then phase one
22 will have to be removed.

23 This project, phase one, could be
24 certified; the second phase could be not
25 certified. Or vice versa. There's no particular

1 connection between the two. At the Energy
2 Commission we will be considering them in separate
3 proceedings, and considering them independently of
4 each other.

5 I just want to put up a sort of summary
6 four-month schedule. I'll put up a slightly more
7 detailed schedule when I'm talking about the
8 particular, the second half of my presentation in
9 the issues identification report portion.

10 You can see that it's actually a fairly
11 tight timeline for this. The portion of the
12 schedule that we're in at the moment is the
13 discovery and analysis phase. We are holding the
14 information hearing and site visit today. We have
15 issued data requests that we'll be talking about
16 at the workshop this evening.

17 One of the things that we need to be
18 doing under the terms of AB-970, the law that
19 adopted the expedited four-month process, by day
20 25 the Energy Commission has to determine whether
21 or not the project qualifies under the four-month
22 provision.

23 Staff has made a recommendation in the
24 issue identification report that we believe that
25 under the criteria that we believe apply for that

1 determination, that this project does qualify.
2 I'll talk a little bit more about that in the
3 issue identification report portion of my
4 presentation. More detail is available in the
5 written issue identification report that's
6 available on the table.

7 We are looking at completing the staff
8 assessment by around day 65 from when the project
9 was considered data adequate. We're expecting
10 Committee hearings a week or so after that.

11 We anticipate a proposed decision from
12 the Presiding Member around day 89. And a final
13 decision by day 120.

14 So it's a very tight schedule, but we
15 are going to be working on it very hard. And
16 staff has already been hard at work on this
17 project.

18 In terms of contacts for the project, in
19 terms of the Energy Commission's review, I am in
20 charge of the overall technical analysis, as
21 Project Manager. My information is available on
22 the handout, my phone number and email address.

23 Gary Fay will be running the Committee's
24 proceeding in this. His information is also
25 there. And Roberta Mendonca, who will be speaking

1 shortly on the public participation aspects of
2 this, her information is also there.

3 For the applicant, United Golden Gate
4 Power Project, again I listed Jim Brady as the
5 Project Manager, as the contact person. Again,
6 Jesse Frederick is speaking on behalf of them
7 today.

8 At this point that's all that I have on
9 the overall procedure and process.

10 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Okay, thank you,
11 Mr. Kennedy. Now, I'd like to introduce Roberta
12 Mendonca, who is the Public Adviser for the Energy
13 Commission. She's a Governor appointee and while
14 she does not represent members of the public as an
15 attorney would, she is an attorney and she will
16 inform and assist any member of the public that
17 asks for help to participate in our process.

18 MS. MENDONCA: Thank you, Gary.
19 Commissioner Laurie and Mr. Fay, if you don't
20 mind, these gentlemen all know the process, so I'm
21 going to turn around and face the people that --
22 excuse me.

23 Hi, my name is Roberta Mendonca and I
24 am, as billed, the Public Adviser at the
25 California Energy Commission.

1 It's kind of unique, the commitment that
2 the Energy Commission has made to public
3 participation, because I am neither a decision
4 maker as the Commissioner will be, nor a part of
5 the independent staff at the Energy Commission.
6 I'm in my own office in my own area; and my
7 specific responsibility is to make sure that the
8 public understands how our process works and allow
9 you the opportunity to participate in the manner
10 that you select.

11 So how many people are here today for
12 their first Energy Commission meeting? Great.

13 The benefits of public participation are
14 quite varied, and you can kind of pick the level
15 of participation that you are most comfortable
16 with. The public is always invited to all of our
17 meetings, which are open.

18 To find out about the meetings I believe
19 Kevin already mentioned you can get on our mail
20 lists and get mail notice, or you can go to the
21 Energy Commission's website and get on our list
22 server so you get an automatic notice whenever we
23 have a public workshop or conference or meeting.

24 Let me just make a difference there.

25 One of the hard parts about understanding the

1 Energy Commission is understanding which hat the
2 meeting is about.

3 So, today's informational hearing, the
4 Commissioners are here. They are the decision
5 makers. Workshops are run by the staff and the
6 Commissioners are not present.

7 The staff does an independent analysis.
8 Nevertheless, the decision makers, because they
9 are decision makers, are protected by a rule
10 called the ex parte rule, meaning that they cannot
11 receive just communications from anybody. They
12 have to be noticed meetings, they have to be in
13 the context of the noticed meeting, and they can
14 be approached that way, or they can be approached
15 in writing. And the writings then get shared with
16 everybody.

17 So, it's very important when you come to
18 a workshop to recognize it's a bit more informal.
19 You can participate, offering your opinions, your
20 comments, your observations, and the staff will
21 kind of operate in a rolled-up sleeves
22 environment. You just sit down and when the time
23 comes you can add your comment.

24 When we go to a hearing the
25 participation is a little bit more organized, and

1 we usually request that members of the public who
2 want to comment fill out a blue card, and then
3 you're called upon based upon what the nature of
4 your comment might be.

5 Our hearings are transcribed. Our
6 workshops are not. So, you're welcome at all.

7 Now, if you decide that this project is
8 something that you want to be a little bit more
9 involved in, you want to be able to formally offer
10 evidence, witnesses or cross-examine.

11 We have a process at the Energy
12 Commission called intervention. Fill out a
13 petition to intervene and that petition is
14 submitted to the Committee. They decide if the
15 petition meets the criteria, and you can be
16 offered the status of intervenor.

17 We do have one intervenor already in the
18 project, which would be CURE.

19 So the Public Adviser can help you with
20 that form, make that type of information available
21 to you, and answer your questions.

22 That pretty much covers the points I
23 wanted to make. Thank you, and welcome.

24 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Thank you, Ms.
25 Mendonca.

1 Now, I'd like to turn to Mr. Frederick
2 for the applicant's presentation about the
3 project.

4 MR. FREDERICK: Thank you. As you can
5 see, that's just the first slide. Jim, you can go
6 ahead and skip to the second one, please.

7 Okay, basically this facility is located
8 within the property boundary of the San Francisco
9 International Airport. It's situated on the north
10 side of the airport, south of North Access Road,
11 and the North Field Road.

12 It is adjacent to the existing United
13 Cogen Facility, which is an LM 2500 based facility
14 that serves United Airline maintenance operation
15 and sells electricity under a standard offer
16 contract, as well.

17 The property in question upon which this
18 project is proposed is currently used as a parking
19 lot by United.

20 As Kevin Kennedy pointed out, this is a
21 smaller facility which is actually a component
22 part of the larger which is proposed for a long
23 term -- it's the original project that we
24 developed.

25 This facility was designed specifically

1 to address the system emergency that was defined
2 in AB-970. And what we did is we took the GE LM
3 6000 that is part of the original design of the
4 larger facility, removed the heat recovery steam
5 generator, and ended up with a simple cycle LM
6 6000 based, 48 megawatt nominal 115 kV unit, which
7 is going to be equipped with a high temperature
8 SCR specific for that unit.

9 We tried to use as much of the equipment
10 that would remain with the larger facility with an
11 eye to minimizing the total expense. One of the
12 extraordinary expenses that will not be reused in
13 the larger facility is the SCR, because that will
14 be a high temperature SCR. We will remove that
15 and put in a heat recovery steam generator. But
16 we needed to meet the strict air requirements and
17 BACT dictated that we do so.

18 We will be using the existing United
19 Cogen substation. That matter is being studied
20 with the assistance of PG&E, which is the
21 transmission owner for that particular substation.

22 And we will be using United Airlines
23 wastewater treatment facility for this facility.
24 Our wastewater discharge is minimal because of the
25 simple cycle nature.

1 I don't want to steal any of the CEC
2 staff's thunder. We figured that the potential
3 approval would occur in February 2001. I don't
4 want to deem to be the person who set schedule. I
5 don't know if that's correct or not, Kevin.
6 That's what we think it is.

7 We recognize that the expected useful
8 life of the simple cycle facility will be three
9 years. And we understand that to be the case.
10 However, I wanted to make a point to make sure
11 that everybody understood that that LM6000 will
12 remain with the larger facility, if the larger
13 facility is approved, and it will serve as a
14 dedicated unit to provide backup electricity to
15 the airport in certain conditions. And those are
16 worked out with the airport.

17 Okay, that basically you have a good
18 aerial overview of the location of the parking
19 area that we're talking about. And as you can see
20 there's two separate crosshatches up there. The
21 larger crosshatch is the entire parking lot. the
22 smaller crosshatch is the general location of the
23 LM6000 component of the facility. When you see
24 the plot plan you'll get a better feel for how
25 that all lays out.

1 Jim, could you point to the airport,
2 itself? Okay. And then point to 380 up there
3 towards the north, so you can see it, if you can.
4 North Access Road. There you go.

5 And, Jim, could you also point to the
6 substation, because the lettering is rather small.
7 There's the substation. The facility is directly
8 adjacent to the substation, so there will be no
9 linear interconnect, as well as for the gas.

10 Could you orient it according to the
11 north arrow, Jim, so that north is up? That's
12 good.

13 Again, Jim, would you point to the
14 substation for a point of reference? Right over
15 there. So again, you can see that the facility is
16 directly adjacent to the substation.

17 As you can see, that particular
18 location, the stack for that LM6000 will line up
19 and will not be moved in the larger project, so we
20 won't be having to relocate any of that equipment,
21 other than just dismantling the small substation
22 interconnect there to accommodate the larger
23 project and the larger design.

24 And, of course, there will be an air
25 cooled condenser in the larger design that isn't

1 necessary for this particular facility because
2 this is, again, a simple cycle unit.

3 This is an elevation of the facility.
4 That stack, -- Jim, would you put up the plot plan
5 again so that they can get a reference point for
6 that stack location? And get it back to its
7 correct orientation. And point to the stack.

8 Okay, just for your reference on the
9 next drawing, you'll want to look at that and the
10 elevation. That's the stack location.

11 Go ahead back to that elevation then.
12 Great. And that stack will be 140 feet tall
13 presently. We've already submitted that profile
14 to the FAA for their review and approval. They've
15 reviewed it; they've okayed it. And we'll be
16 working with them on any other modifications that
17 affect the elevation of the facility.

18 There's an isometric drawing showing the
19 facility a little bit more clearly, if you wanted
20 to know how it laid out. And again, Jim, would
21 you just follow your finger along the electrical
22 buss bar, the buss bar coming off there, and then
23 turn and head towards the sub -- there you go.

24 And that shows the electrical routing
25 for the interconnect. It's very short. It's

1 directly adjacent. And will only go over a
2 fenceline that's shared.

3 The facility, itself, just an
4 interesting point for those of you who aren't
5 aware of the airport security, is the facility,
6 itself, is adjacent to the security boundaries of
7 the airport. We will be outside of the secured
8 area is my current understanding. So that if any
9 problems occur between the two facilities, they'll
10 actually have to go through a security gate to
11 have access. I wanted to make that point.

12 Jim, could I have the electrical line up
13 before you leave? For those of you who are more
14 electrically inclined, this is basically the
15 electrical one line, and I will just say thank
16 you, Jim, that's enough.

17 And that concludes my facility
18 description.

19 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Thank you, Mr.
20 Frederick.

21 Now we'll return to the staff. They
22 have conducted a preliminary analysis and Mr.
23 Kennedy will review that.

24 MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Earlier this
25 week the staff filed what's called the issue

1 identification report. And the basic purpose of
2 this report is at an early stage in the
3 proceedings to give some information to the
4 participants about potential issues that staff
5 sees with the project. The idea is to get some
6 early focus on what are likely to be some of the
7 areas that require a bit more attention.

8 It's not intended in any way to limit
9 the analysis that's going on. We will be doing a
10 full analysis across all the technical areas.
11 These are just some of the areas where at this
12 stage we have some sense that there may be some
13 extra attention needed.

14 One thing that we added to the issue
15 identification report for the four-month expedited
16 process was the staff recommendation on whether
17 the project qualified for the four-month process.
18 And I'll touch on that as we go through. As I
19 indicated earlier, it's staff's recommendation
20 that this project does qualify.

21 The basic criteria that we look at in
22 terms of what types of issues we would include in
23 the issue identification report impacts that have
24 been initially identified that appear that they
25 might be difficult to mitigate; issues that might

1 result in noncompliance with any of the LORS, the
2 laws, ordinances, regulations and standards that I
3 mentioned before; issues that might be potentially
4 contentious and take a long time to resolve; or
5 things that might simply require a certain amount
6 of time to resolve that could cause schedule
7 delays.

8 We identified issues in three different
9 areas, in air quality, in land use, and in
10 socioeconomics in terms of environmental justice.

11 I think I'd want to note at the moment
12 that in terms of the environmental justice
13 concerns, this is something that we are going to
14 be looking at. It's not that we have identified
15 specific concerns that we believe are
16 environmental justice concerns at this point, but
17 it is something that we definitely want to take a
18 very close look at as we move forward with the
19 analysis.

20 There were three separate areas in air
21 quality that we had some issues. The first has to
22 do with emission reduction credits. Typically
23 with a project like this, if it is large enough it
24 would require what are called offsets or emission
25 reduction credits, for certain of the pollutants

1 that are emitted by the project.

2 The size of this phase one project is
3 small enough that under the local air district
4 rules, the Bay Area Air Quality Management
5 District, or BAAQMD, their rules do not actually
6 require offsets for this project.

7 Staff has noted, though, that the
8 project emissions are likely to be occurring
9 almost entirely during the summer season, which is
10 also the peak ozone season. So we have asked the
11 applicant to evaluate the project's ozone
12 precursor emissions versus the local air
13 district's efforts to achieve attainment for ozone
14 in the Bay Area.

15 And as we move forward we may find that
16 the staff decides to recommend that the applicant
17 come up with emission reduction credits for ozone
18 precursors, even if they are not necessarily
19 required by the local air district.

20 The second issue with air quality has to
21 do with the cumulative impacts analysis, where one
22 of the things that we need to be doing is taking a
23 look at not just the emissions that will be added
24 to the air in the area by this project, but by
25 other projects that are likely to be coming on

1 line in the near future.

2 At the moment the applicant is in the
3 process of conducting their cumulative impacts
4 analysis. Staff intends to do an independent
5 analysis of those findings, and is likely to
6 recommend appropriate mitigation measures when we
7 file the staff assessment. So that is something
8 that the analysis is in progress at this point,
9 and is something we will be looking closely at as
10 the analysis proceeds.

11 The third area for air quality has to do
12 with the construction impact analysis. In the
13 initial application that was filed by the
14 applicant, they had included a construction impact
15 analysis that showed the potential for significant
16 air quality impacts from the construction of the
17 project.

18 Staff has requested the applicant to
19 take a closer look at that analysis, and staff
20 will also be doing their own independent analysis
21 of the construction impacts. We feel that it's
22 important that the construction analysis be both
23 accurate and thorough, and we will be looking at
24 that and may have appropriate mitigation measures
25 to recommend when we file the staff assessment for

1 that area.

2 For land use there were two issues that
3 the staff is concerned about at this point, both
4 having to do with consistency with the LORS, the
5 laws, ordinances, regulations and standards.

6 The first has to do with whether or not
7 the Subdivision Map Act would apply to this
8 project. This is a state law and often there are
9 similar local ordinances that would apply relating
10 to the need to develop a parcel map, if you are
11 leasing just a portion of a legally defined area
12 of land.

13 One of the provisions in the state law
14 indicates that if the land is being conveyed to or
15 from a government agency, then the need for a
16 parcel map would not apply. One of the things
17 that staff is in the process of looking at is the
18 question of this land is owned by a government
19 agency, The San Francisco International Airport.

20 But the lease, as we understand it at
21 this point, would be a sublease directly between
22 the project and United Airlines. Whether or not,
23 under those circumstances, the Subdivision Map Act
24 applies is not yet clear to us, and is something
25 we're hoping to be working through --

1 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: When are you
2 going to have an answer on that, Mr. Kennedy?

3 MR. KENNEDY: I would say we certainly
4 are looking to have one by the time the staff
5 assessment is filed. I am hoping that we will
6 have one much sooner.

7 My hope is that at the data request
8 workshop tonight, we had data requests relating to
9 this. I think there may be many of the key
10 players from the City and County of San Francisco,
11 from the airport, and from the applicant, and from
12 our staff. We may be able to move much further to
13 an understanding about that this evening.

14 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: How quickly
15 could the City and County process a parcel map?

16 MR. KENNEDY: My understanding is it
17 potentially could be a timely -- something that
18 would be a long enough period of time to process
19 it, that it could be a problem for the timing of
20 this project. So that's why we are concerned
21 about it.

22 That is actually the heart of the issue.
23 It's not that it would be difficult to get the
24 parcel map, but it may be difficult to get the
25 parcel map in time, if it is required. So that's

1 the concern on this issue.

2 The second land use issue has to do with
3 the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development
4 Commission, or BCDC. They have concerns about
5 this project.

6 One of the things that that agency has
7 been required to do is to identify areas within
8 their jurisdiction around the Bay where power
9 plants would not be appropriate.

10 There's sort of a general understanding
11 that certain types of power plants may be
12 appropriate to put next to the Bay, so BCDC was
13 directed to identify specific areas where power
14 plants would not be appropriate.

15 This project is not actually within the
16 strict jurisdictional boundaries of BCDC, as we
17 understand it at the moment. We're in the process
18 of confirming. It's a relatively narrow strip and
19 making sure that we have the exact measurements
20 gets very important on that.

21 But as we understand it, the project
22 site is not within BCDC's jurisdictional
23 boundaries. But in their, what's called BCDC's
24 nonsiting study, they identified airport
25 priorities as areas where they would not be in

1 favor of major power plants. And San Francisco
2 International Airport is a priority use area.

3 So it is an issue that we are talking to
4 BCDC about, to what extent they are concerned
5 about this type of project at the airport.

6 One of the issues that they're
7 interested in relates to the extent to which this
8 project would be considered an airport related
9 use. So that is something that we will be working
10 with the Airport Commission, with the City and
11 County of San Francisco, and with BCDC to make
12 sure that we understand the extent to which the
13 project is consistent with the applicable land use
14 plans, policies and regulations around BCDC's
15 nonsiting study.

16 The final issue that we identified had
17 to do with environmental justice. In the initial
18 analysis that we've done at this point we were
19 using 1990 census data, which is getting to be a
20 bit old, and we're going to be updating that
21 information, the analysis, with more recent
22 information.

23 But as of the 1990 data, looking in the
24 area that we typically do, within six miles, which
25 is based on typical air quality impacts of a

1 project, there are certain areas within that where
2 the census tracts are over 50 percent minority.

3 At this point, and overall within the
4 six-mile radius it's about 25 percent minority,
5 which for the Bay Area is actually not a
6 particularly high percentage of minority.

7 Staff is going to be taking a close look
8 as we move forward in our analysis in determining
9 whether or not there are significant impacts. And
10 in particular, to the extent that we do identify
11 any significant impacts of this project, whether
12 or not they present a significant and
13 disproportionate impact on nearby minority
14 communities.

15 So we will be taking environmental
16 justice analysis on this project very seriously,
17 and be looking to determining whether or not there
18 is a problem with that.

19 PRESIDING MEMBER LAURIE: Mr. Kennedy,
20 is it correct that environmental justice
21 principles, as you have just discussed, is
22 mandated by both federal and state law?

23 MR. KENNEDY: Certainly by federal law.
24 I believe also by state law. I would need to
25 double check the state law. Yes.

1 As I noted, one special aspect of the
2 issue identification report for the expedited
3 process is staff's recommendation concerning
4 whether or not the project would qualify for the
5 AB-970 four-month expedited process.

6 As I noted, in the issue identification
7 report, which is available here today, we laid out
8 the criteria that we feel apply for making that
9 determination, and have determined by analysis of
10 those criteria against this project that staff is
11 recommending to the Committee and to the
12 Commission that this project does qualify for the
13 expedited process.

14 I won't go into the details. It's a lot
15 of fairly detailed information in that analysis.
16 So it's available if you're interested in taking a
17 look at it.

18 And with all of that I just want to go
19 back to the proposed schedule. And I'm not going
20 to go over this in any detail. It's available for
21 people to take a look at it.

22 One thing that I should add. We also
23 are looking at a final decision on this project in
24 February of 2001. However, this is staff's
25 proposed schedule, and I am also not the person

1 who sets the schedule.

2 The Committee makes the ultimate
3 decisions on the timing of the schedule. However,
4 given that the four-month clock started on October
5 25th, the requirements of AB-970, if this project
6 stays within the expedited permit process, would
7 be unless all parties agree to extend the
8 deadline, that the decision would need to be made
9 by the end of February.

10 And finally, in closing, I just want to
11 point out that the staff will be -- intends to
12 provide periodic status reports, as appropriate,
13 to the Committee on the progress and addressing
14 the various issues. Given the short schedule, I'm
15 not sure to what extent separate progress reports
16 beyond the staff assessment will be necessary, but
17 we certainly will be prepared to provide those as
18 needed.

19 Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Thank you, Mr.
21 Kennedy. I'll indicate that in a typical 12-month
22 case we have monthly staff reports, status
23 reports. So, we may want to discuss with you a
24 schedule that might work out to keep the Committee
25 informed of developments on a more frequent basis.

1 I'd like to make a couple points. One
2 is that in the material that Mr. Frederick put up
3 describing the project, it listed it as a 48
4 megawatt nominal project. And I'll just note that
5 the applicant filed a modification to that
6 assessment indicating that it's a 51 megawatt
7 project. And that removes any questions about
8 Energy Commission jurisdiction.

9 I'll also mention that, as Mr. Kennedy
10 stated, the Commission has to determine that this
11 proposal qualifies for the four-month expedited
12 process. And the Committee will be issuing an
13 order no later than Monday, November 20th, stating
14 whether it concurs with the staff assessment, that
15 the project does qualify for the four-month
16 process.

17 This will be reviewed by the Energy
18 Commission, by the full Commission, on December
19 6th. And if the full Commission agrees with the
20 determination of the Committee, they will ratify
21 the Committee's action.

22 But that is a matter scheduled for the
23 regularly scheduled business meeting on December
24 6th.

25 I'd also like to note that in terms of

1 the proposed schedule that staff set forth,
2 there's not a lot of room for change in that.
3 However, I'll just note that February 22nd is the
4 day after the regularly scheduled business meeting
5 of the full Energy Commission.

6 So at this point it's my guess that the
7 Committee may move the final decision up by one
8 day, and then that will ripple back up the
9 schedule. And would probably require staff to
10 issue its assessment at least one day earlier, if
11 that's possible.

12 So, we have a number of locked-in time
13 limits between some of these events listed on the
14 proposed schedule. And while the Legislature
15 reduced our 12-month process to four months, in
16 the case of an expedited project like this, they
17 did not reduce any of the review periods in
18 between events.

19 So we have the challenge of having the
20 same lead times that we've always had and having
21 less time to squeeze them all in.

22 The Presiding Member's Proposed Decision
23 will be available, in spite of this challenge, it
24 will be available for 30 days during which people
25 can comment on it before the Energy Commission

1 takes the matter up to either approve or
2 disapprove the project.

3 At this time I'd like to ask if any of
4 the agencies would like to make a comment? I see
5 that the City of San Francisco and the Airport are
6 represented here.

7 MR. WHEATLAND: Good afternoon, I'm
8 Gregg Wheatland. I'm a Deputy City Attorney for
9 the City and County of San Francisco.

10 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Welcome, Mr.
11 Wheatland.

12 MR. WHEATLAND: Thank you very much.
13 It's nice to be back, actually.

14 And also with me here is Mr. Joe Como,
15 another Deputy City Attorney. And we'll be
16 available to assist the Commission as this
17 proceeding progresses with those matters that are
18 within the LORS of the City and County of San
19 Francisco.

20 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Okay. And the
21 City will be participating tonight in the
22 workshop, is that correct?

23 MR. WHEATLAND: That's correct.

24 HEARING OFFICER FAY: All right, thank
25 you.

1 Any other agencies wish to comment on
2 their role in the case?

3 Are there any comments or questions from
4 members of the public, other agencies, anybody
5 else? Yes, ma'am, please come forward.

6 MS. AGUIRRE: My name is Ena Aguirre. I
7 live at 1414 Newcomb Avenue, San Francisco 94124.

8 I'm sorry I arrived late --

9 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Would you please
10 spell your name for the court reporter?

11 MS. AGUIRRE: Ena is E-n-a, last name
12 Aguirre is A-g-u-i-r-r-e.

13 Thank you very much for giving me this
14 time to speak. I have some concerns, however.

15 I arrived late because number one, the
16 Airport Staff, both the Commission and the Public
17 Affairs Department, kept on saying that they knew
18 nothing about this meeting; that the airport is
19 not aware of this meeting; that the airport knows
20 nothing about any power project; that they were
21 not aware; they didn't know; they were not
22 involved, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

23 I made ten different phone calls
24 yesterday afternoon trying to track down this
25 meeting because a friend of mine had told me about

1 it. I finally went to see her and picked up the
2 notice here, which, you know, allowed me to be
3 here.

4 So I'm concerned about the Airport
5 Commission and the Staff, including the Public
6 Affairs Department, not knowing about, or telling
7 me that they knew nothing about this meeting.
8 That the airport is not involved in this. That
9 they know nothing about it.

10 But I'm equally concerned about the
11 Public Adviser's Office. I did call this morning
12 and I talked to somebody there. And I tried to
13 ask questions about the agenda for today, you
14 know, if I got here late what would happen.

15 The woman who answered the phone told me
16 that they did not have a copy of any agenda. They
17 did know about the meeting, they did know about
18 the meeting. But they were unable to help me with
19 anything else at all.

20 And I just think that the Commission
21 should leave -- I mean, in terms of people like me
22 who are not connected, we don't know anybody. We
23 certainly don't have any powerful friends. We
24 don't have any governmental ties to anybody. It's
25 important that any information that is given on a

1 piece of paper like this, that, you know, some of
2 us use to try to get more information, that the
3 offices that are listed in there at least have
4 enough information to guide some of us to get
5 here. And, you know, enough of that, those two
6 areas.

7 My concerns are, you know, besides those
8 which are other agencies and other people,
9 government seems to act differently, my concern
10 has to do with the impact that a power plant like
11 this might have in Bayview Hunter's Point. I
12 happen to live in Bayview Hunter's Point. I have
13 lived there for over ten years.

14 And one of the things that we have
15 fought and fought and fought is for the closure of
16 the PG&E power plant. And we have been told that
17 at different times that the Bayview Hunter's Point
18 power plant will close. And other times we have
19 been told, well, no, they're not going to close
20 because that might be used as a backup for the
21 needs of San Francisco.

22 So, my question in this particular case,
23 and one of the reasons why I'm here, is the power
24 plant that is proposed to be built here, according
25 to what I read is a 570 megawatt natural gas fired

1 combined cycle electrical generating, you know,
2 whatever that means.

3 So, it's not 51 like you're all talking
4 about. According to this paper is 570 megawatts.
5 And I don't know whether, you know, that's
6 different from what I heard you people say.

7 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Maybe I could
8 address that at this time. This is phase one of a
9 larger project proposed by the applicant.

10 And each phase is being looked at
11 separately by the Energy Commission. So this
12 phase is 51 megawatts. And it's designed to just
13 take care of the electricity emergency that we
14 have.

15 And if it is approved and the bigger
16 part, phase two, is not approved, then this
17 project would have to stop operating in the year
18 2003. So it would be a temporary power plant.

19 So, this project could be approved and
20 the other one might not be approved. They're each
21 going to be looked at separately. So you'll have
22 another opportunity fairly soon after -- the next
23 month the larger project will be applied for, and
24 within about 45 days of that application, the
25 Commission will probably rule on whether the

1 application is complete.

2 And if the Energy Commission finds that
3 the applicant has filed a complete application,
4 then our 12-month process will start, and we'll
5 have another meeting like this where people can
6 come and talk about the larger project.

7 So they really are two separate reviews.

8 MS. AGUIRRE: All right, well, then
9 speaking of the 51 megawatt plant, is this being
10 proposed in terms of a backup to San Francisco
11 needs? Is it supposed to be a backup or, you
12 know, standby or whatever, because of the needs of
13 the airport? Or is it being proposed as a backup
14 or standby for the needs of the Peninsula?

15 I mean, is it, you know, being proposed
16 because of the needs of the state or the nation?
17 I don't, you know, -- this is not something that
18 from my sitting there that I was able to
19 understand. So that would be one of my questions.

20 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Why don't we stop
21 there and see if Mr. Frederick can address that.

22 MR. FREDERICK: Yes. That particular
23 facility is going to tie into the 115 kV system
24 which is the Peninsula backbone. And it does
25 provide a backup to the entire Peninsula all the

1 way from the Martin substation, which feeds the
2 City that Hunter's Point ties into.

3 So it's meant to relieve that voltage
4 problem that exists from San Mateo all the way up
5 to Martin. So it is a Peninsula support
6 generator.

7 MS. AGUIRRE: Um-hum. So were I to say
8 that the 51 megawatt is being built so that the
9 Bayview Hunter's Point power plant can be closed,
10 would I be making a right statement, or would I be
11 making a wrong statement?

12 MR. FREDERICK: That has to be left to
13 PG&E to make determinations about. The smaller
14 facility, in itself, isn't big enough to warrant
15 shutting down any power plant in the Peninsula.

16 The bigger one is big enough to carry a
17 large load in the Peninsula, but that
18 determination really has to be from PG&E. And it
19 certainly is part of the study that's ongoing for
20 the whole Peninsula. And PG&E and the City and
21 most of the Peninsula cities are involved in that.

22 HEARING OFFICER FAY: And I'll mention,
23 also, that in addition to the large phase two that
24 this applicant will be applying for shortly,
25 there's also an application for a new Potrero

1 power plant.

2 MR. AGUIRRE: Yeah.

3 HEARING OFFICER FAY: So, if both of
4 those are built, that would cover a lot of the
5 needs of the City.

6 MS. AGUIRRE: I was at that meeting last
7 week on the Potrero Hill expansion of the power
8 plant over there.

9 Okay, well, I think I got the minimal
10 information that I'm going to need. That this one
11 is not really going to help us shut down the power
12 plant. And that we really don't have to look at
13 it favorably because it looks like it's just going
14 to help the Peninsula.

15 And for those of us who live in San
16 Francisco, the Peninsula doesn't mean San
17 Francisco. But maybe among you all the Peninsula
18 means something else. To us, you know, San
19 Francisco -- the Peninsula is from, you know,
20 South San Francisco all the way down to whatever.
21 And is probably just a geographical demarcation, I
22 don't know. But in terms of power plant usage you
23 might mean something else.

24 Thank you very much.

25 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Could I ask you to

1 please leave your name and address with Ms.
2 Mendonca so that --

3 MS. AGUIRRE: Yes, I did print my name
4 and address over there.

5 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Good.

6 MS. AGUIRRE: Thank you.

7 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Thanks. Anybody
8 else from the public who would like to either ask
9 questions or make comments?

10 Okay, I see no indication.

11 The next thing on the agenda then is to
12 adjourn to a site visit where we actually go out
13 to the spot that you saw maps of here in the
14 applicant's presentation, and take a look at it so
15 we can see how it relates to the shoreline and the
16 roads nearby and the substation and all the other
17 features that were identified on the map.

18 The site visit is absolutely open to all
19 members of the public and any other agencies,
20 anybody that wants to come.

21 And so what I'd like to do is turn it
22 over to Mr. Frederick to describe how we will go
23 about out site visit.

24 MR. FREDERICK: Okay, I just received a
25 note that we weren't able to get a bus so that

1 everybody could get there by bus, so we'll have to
2 get there by carpool if we can. I appreciate your
3 patience with that. We tried to get a bus, but
4 it's such a short distance, we're really quite
5 close to the site. But if we can all just kind of
6 gather out front we can just jump in cars and go.

7 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Well, can you
8 describe --

9 MR. FREDERICK: Sure, --

10 HEARING OFFICER FAY: -- where the cars
11 are and --

12 MR. FREDERICK: -- sure. Jim, would you
13 go ahead and put the drawing up there, the aerial
14 would be best.

15 (Pause.)

16 MR. FREDERICK: For those of you who are
17 going to go to the site, Jim, would you point to
18 the upper left-hand corner. We're up there in
19 that upper left-hand corner.

20 All we have to do is just go along the
21 access road here that takes us all the way down to
22 North Access Road, and then just turn left and go
23 down North Access Road past, and it's just
24 basically down the street, take a left and you'll
25 be there.

1 Gary, do you know what road that is that
2 we would have to go down right here? Is it --

3 SPEAKER: South Airport Boulevard.

4 MR. FREDERICK: South Airport Boulevard.

5 HEARING OFFICER FAY: So, if you leave
6 the hotel parking lot you turn left on South
7 Airport Boulevard, and then turn left again on --

8 MR. FREDERICK: North Access Road.

9 HEARING OFFICER FAY: -- North Access
10 Road.

11 MR. FREDERICK: Yes.

12 HEARING OFFICER FAY: Okay. Good. Any
13 questions about those directions?

14 All right. We will adjourn to the site
15 visit, and there will be nothing further of the
16 hearing after the site visit.

17 However, if you plan to attend the staff
18 workshop, it will start at 6:30 in this same room.

19 MR. KENNEDY: That's correct.

20 (Site visit.)

21 (Whereupon, at 2:11 p.m., the
22 proceedings were adjourned.)

23 --o0o--

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, DEBI BAKER, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Informational Hearing and Site Visit; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said hearing, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 29th day of November, 2000.

DEBI BAKER

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345