CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

California Energy Commission
DOCKETED
11-AFC-2
TN # 65900
JUN 21 2012

REPORT OF CONVERSATION

Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division

FILE: 11-AFC-2

PROJECT TITLE: Hidden Hills SEGS

Email X	**Phone**	☐ **Meeting Location:**	
NAME:	Marylou Taylor, Staff	**DATE:** 6/21/12	**TIME:** 12:02
WITH:	Mike Monasmith, Staff		
SUBJECT:	HHSEGS Retention Ponds		

Monasmith, Mike@Energy

From: Marshall, Paul@Energy
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2012 12:02 PM
To: Taylor, Marylou@Energy; Watson, Carol@Energy; Knight, Eric@Energy; Monasmith, Mike@Energy
Subject: RE: HHSEGS Retention Pond

I support the technical basis and performance requirements. This may be best be docketed and/or go out in the form of a data request also.

From: Taylor, Marylou@Energy
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2012 11:15 AM
To: Watson, Carol@Energy; Knight, Eric@Energy; Monasmith, Mike@Energy; Marshall, Paul@Energy
Subject: RE: HHSEGS Retention Pond

Eric, Mike, and Paul:

Carol and I would like to send the text below as an email to the applicant prior to the Bishop workshop. Please review and comment. The workshop is quickly approaching, so we're hoping to get this out in the next couple days.

> Water staff reviewed the Data Response for WR-3 regarding the storm water retention area shown at the workshop on April 27, 2012. In staff's opinion, the applicant's estimated infiltration rate of the soil (1.14 in/hr) is too high. Therefore, the applicant's estimated ponding times would be longer than expected and areas of inundation larger than expected. Considering Bio staff's proposed condition regarding no standing water present longer than 24 hours after a storm event, the applicant's current design does not appear to meet this requirement. Water staff will propose at the workshop that the applicant perform site specific infiltration tests to recalculate ponding times and inundation areas.
>
> Once the applicant obtains more accurate data, the following information is needed in order for Bio staff to complete the FSA analysis:
>
> - The likely surface coverage in acres of a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm.
> - Proposed measures (mechanical or other means available) to ensure standing water would not exceed 24 hours
> - The minimum and maximum time that water would pond for a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm, in the absence of human intervention.
> - What is the minimum and maximum time that water would pond for a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm, with human intervention.
>
> Staff look forward to discussing this with the applicant during the Bishop workshop next week.

From: Watson, Carol@Energy
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 12:47 PM
To: Knight, Eric@Energy; Monasmith, Mike@Energy; Taylor, Marylou@Energy; Marshall, Paul@Energy
Subject: FW: HHSEGS Retention Pond

That's a great idea, Marylou.

Question for management: what format should the questions for BrightSource be in?
These are the preliminary questions:

1

- What is the likely surface coverage in acres of a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm.
- What is the minimum and maximum time that water would pond for a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm, in the absence of human intervention.
- Are mechanical or other means available to remove water/encourage ground absorption of ponding water.
- What is the minimum and maximum time that water would pond for a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm, with human intervention.
- Are other features such as additional culverts or a revised drainage plan available to reduce standing water

From: Taylor, Marylou@Energy
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 3:55 PM
To: Watson, Carol@Energy
Cc: Knight, Eric@Energy; Marshall, Paul@Energy; Monasmith, Mike@Energy; Conway, Mike@Energy
Subject: RE: HHSEGS Retention Pond

Hi Carol,

The document that the applicant submitted in Supplemental Data Response, Set 4 (dated May 11, 2012) does not contain enough information to answer the questions in your email below. There are options available to remove or reduce standing water, but none were addressed in their document.

My biggest concern about this new information is their estimated infiltration rate of the soil. They calculated a value of 1.14 in/hr, which I believe to be too high. As you know, infiltration is the seepage of water into the soil. If the estimated infiltration rate is too high, then this could lead to miscalculations: ponding times longer than expected and areas of inundation larger than expected.

I suggest that we compile a list of questions and send them to the applicant prior to the Bishop workshop. Hopefully, it will help prepare for a productive workshop and we can have this ironed out before the FSA (and resolved before the evidentiary hearings).

- Marylou

From: Watson, Carol@Energy
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 10:07 AM
To: Taylor, Marylou@Energy; Watson, Carol@Energy
Cc: Knight, Eric@Energy; Marshall, Paul@Energy; Monasmith, Mike@Energy; Monasmith, Mike@Energy
Subject: HHSEGS Retention Pond

Hi Marylou,

As we discussed last week, I am still lacking information about the proposed retention pond at HHSEGS. The most recent BrightSource filling (supplemental set 4) still leaves lingering questions, and makes final analysis difficult.
My impression is that you also had some reservations about the data presented. I believe that there were perceived inaccuracies in some of the tables, and also that the assumptions did not account for compaction of soils, as would certainly occur at the site, even with the "low impact design". Grading, grubbing, and heliostat pole installation will compact, as will subsequent years of mowing, replacing broken mirrors, etc. The PSA bio section has a condition indicating that water shall not be allowed to stand for more than 24 hours on site, with mechanical means (tilling or grading, pumping) to remove water. Standing water onsite is a wildlife attractant, which in turn will expose terrestrial

animals to construction equipment and other onsite hazards, as well as attract ravens and potentially raptors into the lethal heliostat field.

What I would like to hear from you when/if the data Brightsource presented on the retention area is accurate, or if you will have revisions. For my FSA analysis I need to know:

- What is the likely surface coverage in acres of a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm.
- What is the minimum and maximum time that water would pond for a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm, in the absence of human intervention.
- Are mechanical or other means available to remove water/encourage ground absorption of ponding water.
- What is the minimum and maximum time that water would pond for a 2, 5, 10, 25, and 100 year storm, with human intervention.
- Are other features such as additional culverts or a revised drainage plan available to reduce standing water

I'm still mulling this over to see what other info might be useful. Eric & Mike, Marylou and I had discussed presenting unresolved questions at the workshop, if necessary, to facilitate this issue.

CC: Dick Ratliff, Staff Council Project File	**Prepared by**: Mike Monasmith, Project Manager

Filename: ROC - Conway 5-3-12.doc
Directory: S:\PROJECTS\HIDDEN HILLS SOLAR\ROC's
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\mmonasmi\Application Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dotm
Title: Siting's ROC Template
Subject:
Author: Joseph Diamond
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 5/3/2012 4:31:00 PM
Change Number: 2
Last Saved On: 5/3/2012 4:31:00 PM
Last Saved By: mmonasmi
Total Editing Time: 5 Minutes
Last Printed On: 6/21/2012 3:48:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 3
Number of Words: 60 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 346 (approx.)