

# Memorandum

Date : October 23, 1998

Telephone ATSS (916) 653-0159

To : Robert A. Laurie, La Paloma Committee Presiding Member  
David A. Rohy, La Paloma Committee Associate Member

File : MEMO002.W52

From : California Energy Commission - Marc S. Pryor  
1516 Ninth Street Siting Project Manager  
Sacramento 95814-5512

Subject : **LA PALOMA GENERATING PROJECT (98-AFC-2) STATUS REPORT NUMBER 2**

At the La Paloma Generating Project Committee's September 16, 1998 Information Hearing, staff was directed to file monthly status reports starting on September 23, 1998. The following is staff's second status report on the La Paloma Generating Project.

## **CEQA/NEPA COORDINATION**

Energy Commission staff attended a meeting scheduled by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in Sacramento on October 20, 1998. In addition, the applicant's biological resources consultant, Toyon, and Mr. Bill Chilson of U.S. Generating Company were in attendance. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss timing and coordination of the USFWS Biological Opinion, and the Biological Resources Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan (BRMIMP).

The applicant's Biological Assessment (BA) was received by USFWS from the BLM for Section 7 consultation on or about October 1, 1998. The USFWS completeness review should be finished within 30 days of receipt. If deemed complete, the USFWS would have 135 days, from the date of receipt, to complete their consultation (mid-February 1999).

Toyon has completed an outline of the BRMIMP and expects to provide a draft by late December 1998.

## **PROJECT CHANGES**

The applicant is expected to submit two changes to the project on or about October 27, 1998. One change is to move the planned raw water storage tank from the project plant site to the top of a nearby hill. The tank would prevent water "hammering" and take advantage of gravity feed. Preliminary dimensions of the tank are a height of 24 feet and a diameter of 75 feet. The applicant is preparing visual simulations to illustrate the appearance of the tank from McKittrick.

Rerouting the process water pipeline in the vicinity of the turnout station at the California Aqueduct is the second change. The new route would carry the proposed water pipeline perpendicularly across a dry wash before returning to the originally proposed routing. This would avoid running the pipeline along the wash.

### **PROCESS WATER SUPPLY SOURCE**

Staff is examining the specifics of the water use agreement between West Kern Water District and Buena Vista Water Storage District regarding the applicant's ability to draw water directly from the California Aqueduct. As proposed the project would use aqueduct water as its sole source for process water. There appears to be contract interpretation differences between the two water districts about the drawing of water directly from the aqueduct. The applicant is working with both districts to resolve the issue. Staff has told the applicant that, while timely resolution is critical to maintaining the project's schedule, the Energy Commission will not take an active role in resolving the issue.

### **DATA RESPONSE WORKSHOP**

The applicant docketed its first data responses submitted on October 13, 1998, and a workshop has been scheduled for October 27, 1998 at the Energy Commission to discuss the responses. Areas to be addressed are air quality, biological resources, water and soil resources, and waste management. Results of the workshop will be addressed in both a workshop summary and in the third status report.

### **CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The committee's scheduling order queried staff about when they will determine whether or not to include any cumulative impacts created by other potential projects in the same general vicinity as the La Paloma project. At this time there are three potential projects. Until specifics regarding these projects are known (e.g., exact locations, equipment, raw water source, etc.) staff will not be able to perform a cumulative impact analysis. The information necessary would be expected to exist in the Applications for Certifications, if and when, they are filed with the Energy Commission.

MSP:msp

cc: LaPaloma Generating Project Proof of Service List  
Larry Saslaw, U.S. Bureau of Land Management  
Peter Cross, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Jesse Wild, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Dale Mitchell, California Department of Fish and Game