



BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
1-800-822-6228 – www.energy.ca.gov

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE **MARIPOSA ENERGY PROJECT**
(MEP)

DOCKET No. 09-AFC-3

ERRATA TO THE PRESIDING MEMBER'S PROPOSED DECISION

After reviewing the comments submitted by the parties on or before May 13, 2010, we incorporate the following changes to the April 13, 2011 Presiding Member's Proposed Decision (PMPD):

ALTERNATIVES

1. ***Page 9; insert the following paragraph before the heading "7. No Project Alternative":***

Intervenor, Robert Sarvey, submitted written comments claiming that the Decision ignores alternatives that provide fast start and fast ramping capability. Specifically, Mr. Sarvey refers to the Mulqueeney Ranch Pumped Storage Project (MRPSP) as an alternative. We disagree. First of all, the MRPSP is a proposed project, not an alternative. Proposed projects are relevant to cumulative impacts analysis but are not treated as alternatives. In addition, the preliminary permit (Ex. 411, which was received into the record on February 24, 2011) indicates that the project is only in its nascent phase (a preliminary permit application was filed with FERC on October 1, 2010) and does not support Mr. Sarvey's assertion that the MRPSP would have either fast start or fast ramping capability. In fact, the MRPSP preliminary permit indicates that the MRPSP would only be able to run continuously at 280 MW for 8 hours (Ex. 411, p.12). Assuming Mr. Sarvey meant to present the water pumping station as an alternative technology, we note that it would still not fulfill several key project objectives: it is not natural gas fired, not located in the Altamont Wind Resource Area, would require extended linear infrastructure, may have extensive impacts due to reservoir construction and would not be able to meet the start date contemplated in the power purchase agreement with PG&E. As such, nothing in the record indicates that either the MRPSP or pumped storage in general is a reasonable alternative to consider. Thus, while we have considered and addressed the MRPSP in evidentiary hearings and herein, we can understand why the MRPSP was omitted from Staff's analysis since the Final Staff

Assessment was published at the same time as the MRPSP's preliminary permit was filed with FERC.

2. Page 15, after the second paragraph insert the following paragraph:

Robert Sarvey commented that the range of alternative sites was "impermissibly narrow" without citation to law. As noted above, the range of alternatives is governed by the "rule of reason" and CEQA sets no minimum number or quantified range of alternatives (see *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal. 3d553, 556 and *Marin Municipal Water District v. KG Land California Corporation* (1991, 1st Dist.) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1652, 1665-1666).

3. Page 15, the FINDINGS OF FACT are renumbered as follows:

1. The record contains an acceptable analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the project as proposed.
2. The evidentiary record contains an adequate review of alternative project sites, linears, fuels, technologies, and the "no project" alternative
3. The proposed use of a freshwater supply is consistent with state water policy SWRCB Resolution 75-58, and the Energy Commission's 2003 *IEPR* water policy because there is no other economically feasible or environmentally superior alternative at this time.
- 3.4. Alternative fuels and technologies are not capable of meeting project objectives.
- 4.5. No site alternative is capable of meeting the stated project objectives.
- 5.6. The "no project" alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant environmental impacts.
- 6.7. The "no project" alternative is not environmentally superior to the MEP Project.
- 7.8. If all Conditions of Certification contained in this Decision are implemented, construction and operation of the MEP will not create any significant direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse environmental impacts.

FACILITY DESIGN

4. Page 1, 1st paragraph, first sentence, change to read as follows:

The broad engineering assessment of the Mariposa Energy ~~Plant~~Project consists of separate analyses that examine its facility design, engineering efficiency, and reliability aspects.

POWER PLANT RELIABILITY

5. Page 5, Item 4, change to read as follows:

4. An availability factor of ~~23~~ 92 to 98 percent is achievable by the MEP.

TRANSMISSION LINE SAFETY AND NUISIANCE

6. Page 1, second paragraph, last sentence, change to read as follows:

The project's switchyard would be designed and built by ~~PG&E~~ the project owner according to PG&E's guidelines on safety and field management.

7. Page 6, Verification for Condition TLSN-1, change to read as follows:

Verification: At least 30 days before starting the ~~upgrade~~construction of the transmission line or related structures and facilities, the project owner shall submit to the Compliance Project Manager (CPM) a letter signed by a California registered electrical engineer affirming that the lines will be constructed according to the requirements stated in the condition.

8. Page 6, Condition TLSN-3 and Verification, change to read as follows:

TLSN-3 The project owner shall ensure that the rights-of-way of the proposed transmission lines ~~are~~is kept free of combustible material, as required under the provisions of section 4292 of the Public Resources Code and section 1250 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

Verification: During the first 5 years of plant operation, the project owner shall provide a summary of inspection results and any fire prevention activities carried out along the right-of-way of ~~each~~the line and provide such summaries in the Annual Compliance Report.

9. Page 7, Condition TLSN-4 and Verification, change to read as follows:

TLSN-4 The project owner shall ensure that all permanent metallic objects within the right-of-way of ~~each~~of the two project-related lines ~~are~~is grounded according to industry standards.

Verification: At least 30 days before the lines ~~is~~are energized, the project owner shall transmit to the CPM a letter confirming compliance with this condition.

GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

10. Page 17, before the heading, “FINDINGS OF FACT” insert:

PUBLIC COMMENT

Intervenor, Rajesh Dighe, filed written comments that claim that the state “is going against its own Renewable Energy Generation AB32 initiative to reduce GHG emissions” but does not specify how. Identical form letters were received from Hui Chen, Tony Zhou, Simon Wu, Wentao Li, the Samat family, Linda X. Zhao and Kishor M. Bhatt. In a later filed comment, Mr. Dighe suggests rooftop solar panels and voluntary conservation via community education as an alternative. As explained above, MEP operation will foster the achievement of the GHG goals of AB 32.

11. Page 18, “FINDINGS OF FACT”, change to read as follows:

When it operates, the Mariposa Energy Project will displace generation from less-efficient (i.e., higher-heat-rate and therefore higher-GHG-emitting) power plants in the San Joaquin Valley Greater Bay Area.

12. Page 20, Conclusions of Law, change to read as follows:

12. Any new natural-gas-fired power plant that we certify must:
- a) not increase the overall system heat rate for natural gas plants;
 - b) not interfere with generation from existing renewables or with the integration of new renewable generation; and
 - c) have the ability to reduce system-wide GHG emissions.

We find that MEP is consistent with these requirements.

AIR QUALITY

13. Page 6, first paragraph, change to read as follows:

(Note: Table 4 presents the construction phase maximum ground-level impacts.)

“Estimates for the highest short-term daily emissions and total annual impacts emissions over the 14-month construction period are shown in Air Quality Table 4.”

14. Page 19, first full paragraph, change to read as follows:

Mr. Sarvey criticized the mitigation agreement that the Applicant entered into with SJVAPCD (Sarvey Op. Brief, p. 9). Staff acknowledged that the project’s PM emissions could cause an impact because they will ~~or~~ contribute to a violation, due in part to the

fact that BAAQMD exempts projects with lower emissions, such as the MEP, from offset requirements.

15. Page 47, AQ-26 verification, change to read as follows:

Verification: The results and field data collected during source tests shall be submitted to the District and CPM within 60 days of testing and according to a pre-approved protocol (AQ-27). Testing for steady-state emissions shall be conducted upon initial operation and at least once every 12 months. f1

PUBLIC HEALTH

16. Page 10, between paragraphs 6 and 7, insert the following paragraph:

The PMPD addressed all of the public comments received prior to publication. The following comments were received after publication of the PMPD during the 30-day comment period.

Amber Ziegler, Aaron Basilius, Hui Chen, Tony Zhou, Simon Wu, Wentao Li, Sara and Mark (no last name given), Elaine Kan, Ramkuma Balanbramaiar, John Rubin, Smitha Unnikrishnan, Rahul Dighe, Rajesh Dighe, Pramit Shah, and the Samat family all submitted comments opposing the project due to their concerns regarding air pollution and the impacts to the health of Mountain House residents. Similar comments were also submitted in writing by Sylvia and Doug Little, Mrs. Donald Jess, Tina Williams, Daniel Jess, Dolores Kuhn, Jane Peterson and Joan Uznay of the rural area they refer to as the “Original Mountain House Community” in Alameda as distinct from the Mountain House “town” in San Joaquin County. These concerns are addressed and considered above.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

17. Page 2, Natural Gas, first paragraph, second sentence, change to read as follows:

The natural gas will be delivered by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) via a new 580-foot long, ~~four~~eight-inch pipeline that would run directly west from PG&E’s existing gas pipeline (Line 002).

18. Page 9, Risk Mitigation, first paragraph, last sentence, change to read as follows:

MEP would use 19 percent aqueous ammonia solution stored in one stationary 10,000-gallon above-ground storage tank, with a maximum fill quantity capacity of 8,500 gallons to minimize the potential for overflow during filling.

19. Page 16 insert after last paragraph:

Intervenors Robert Sarvey, Rajesh Dighe and Rob Simpson filed written comments essentially claiming that the record contained insufficient analysis of the natural gas pipeline because no expert from PG&E testified. As stated above, expert testimony has established that the impact of MEP's natural gas cycling is negligible. The Decision is based on substantial evidence and there was no showing that the addition of a witness from PG&E would have been anything other than needlessly cumulative.

20. Page 18, Condition HAZ-2 and Verification, change to read as follows:

HAZ-2 The project owner shall concurrently provide an ~~updated~~ Business Plan, an ~~updated~~ Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan (SPCC), and an ~~updated~~ Risk Management Plan (RMP) prepared pursuant to the California Accidental Release Program (CalARP) to the Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH) and the CPM for review. After receiving comments from the ACDEH and the CPM, the project owner shall reflect all recommendations in the final documents. Copies of the final ~~updated~~ Business Plan, ~~updated~~ SPCC Plan, and ~~updated~~ RMP shall then be provided to the ACDEH and the Alameda County Fire Department (ACFD) for information and to the CPM for approval.

Verification: At least 30 days prior to receiving any hazardous material on the site for commissioning or operations, the project owner shall provide a copy of a final ~~updated~~ Business Plan and ~~updated~~ SPCC Plan to the CPM for approval. At least thirty (30) days prior to delivery of aqueous ammonia to the site, the project owner shall provide the final ~~updated~~ RMP to the ACDEH and the ACFD for information and to the CPM for approval.

21. Pages 19 and 20, Condition HAZ-7, change to read as follows:

HAZ-7 The project owner shall also ~~revise the existing or~~ prepare a new site-specific security plan for the commissioning and operational phases that will be available to the CPM for review and approval. The project owner shall implement site security measures that address physical site security and hazardous materials storage. The level of security to be implemented shall not be less than that described below (as per NERC 2002).

The Operation Security Plan shall include the following:

4. a. A statement (refer to sample, Attachment A), signed by the project owner certifying that background investigations have been conducted on all project personnel. Background investigations ~~shall be restricted to determine the accuracy of employee identity and employment history and shall be~~

conducted in accordance with state and federal laws regarding security and privacy;

4. b. A statement(s) (refer to sample, Attachment B), signed by the contractor or authorized representative(s) for any permanent contractors or other technical contractors (as determined by the CPM after consultation with the project owner), that are present at any time on the site to repair, maintain, investigate, or conduct any other technical duties involving critical components (as determined by the CPM after consultation with the project owner) certifying that background investigations have been conducted on contractors who visit the project site. Background investigations shall be restricted to determine the accuracy of employee identity and employment history and shall be conducted in accordance with state and federal laws regarding security and privacy.

22. Page 22, Hazardous Materials Attachment A, change to read as follows:

**Attachment A
Hazardous Materials
Proposed for Use at the Mariposa Energy Project***

Chemical	Use	Quantity	Storage Location (GA Location Code)	State
Aqueous Ammonia (19% NH3 by weight)	Control oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions through selective catalytic reduction	8,500 gallons	Onsite storage tanks with secondary containment (38)	Liquid
R 134A (1-1-1-2-Tetrafluoroethane)	Refrigerant in the inlet air chiller system	110,000 26,960 pounds	Inlet air chiller system (21)	Liquid
Cleaning chemicals/detergents	Periodic cleaning of combustion turbines	Varies (less than 300 25 gallons liquids or 100 pounds solids for each chemical)	Chemical storage tote or drums at a protected temporary storage location onsite (40)	Liquid
Diesel No. 2	Fuel back-up fire pump	200 gallons	Permanent onsite storage in above ground storage tank with secondary containment (32)	Liquid
Hydraulic oil	High-pressure combustion turbine starting system, turbine control valve actuators	270 450 gallons	Onsite 55-gallon drums (9), 160 gals in CT tanks	Liquid

Laboratory reagents	Water/wastewater laboratory analysis	Varies (less than 5 gallons liquids or 10 pounds solids for each chemical)	Laboratory chemical storage cabinets (stored in original chemical storage containers/bags) (43)	Liquid and granular solid
Lubrication oil	Lubricate rotating equipment (e.g., gas turbine and steam turbine bearings)	3,200 400 gallons	Onsite 55-gallon drums, and 200-gallon waste oil storage tank (5), <u>and 2600 gallons in CT/ Gen tanks</u>	Liquid
Mineral insulating oil	Transformers/ switchyard	28,800 <u>36,000</u> gallons	Inside the transformers; no mineral actually stored on site (18)	Liquid
Sodium carbonate	Alkalinity source for nitrification reactor	200 pounds	Dry storage area	Solid Powder
Sodium hypochlorite (12.5 % solution)	Biocide/biofilm control for potable, fire, and service water systems	500 gallons	Water treatment chemical feed storage (40)	Liquid
Acetylene	Welding gas	185 pounds	Maintenance / warehouse building (40)	Gas
Oxygen	Welding gas	250 pounds	Maintenance / warehouse building (40)	Gas
Propane	Torch gas	300 pounds	Maintenance /warehouse building (40)	Gas
EPA protocol gases	Calibration gases	256 24 pounds	CEMS enclosures (2), <u>Maintenance/ Warehouse (40)</u>	Gas
Cleaning chemicals	Cleaning	Varies (less than 25 gallons liquids or 100 pounds solids for each chemical)	Admin/control building, maintenance/warehouse building (40)	Liquid or solid
Paint	Touchup of painted surfaces	Varies (less than 25 gallons liquids or 100 pounds solids for each type)	Maintenance /warehouse building (40)	Liquid

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

23. Page 3, first paragraph, last sentence, change to read as follows:

Construction and laydown areas will be located in an existing maintenance yard at the Byron Bethany Bay Irrigation District (BBID) headquarters and in annual grassland immediately adjacent to the MEP site.

24. Page 12, Paragraph 2, change to read as follows:

Further, Conditions of Certification **BIO-17** (Waters and Wetlands Impact Avoidance and Minimization Measures) and **BIO-18** (Revegetation and Restoration Plan) establish measures to avoid and minimize impacts to the remaining wetlands and waters. These conditions include measures to protect waterways from pollutants including sediment, establish buffer zones, and install erosion control, as well as measures directing revegetation, topsoil storage and use. ~~Indirect impacts, such as impacts from noise,~~

~~lighting, and traffic could occur but are mitigated with the implementation of Conditions of Certification **BIO-7**.~~ Implementation of Conditions of Certification **BIO-7, BIO-9, BIO-16, BIO-17, and BIO-18** reduce impacts to these resources below a level of significance. The USACE must issue a permit for impacts to waters of the United States from this project before the MEP can be constructed. (Ex. 301, p. 4.2-33.)

25. Page 20, paragraph 1, change to read as follows:

Swainson’s Hawk (State Threatened)

MEP grasslands provide Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, and construction of the project will result in the permanent loss of approximately 10.1 acres, and long-term loss of 12.1 ~~9.2~~ acres of this habitat. In addition, certain construction activities within 1/2 mile of an active nest during the breeding season (March 1 - September 15) could cause nest abandonment or forced fledging. Mitigation ratios suggested by CDFG to address foraging habitat loss are outlined in the *Staff Report regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (Buteo swainsoni) in the Central Valley of California* (CDFG 1994):

26. Page 29, Table 2, change to read as follows:

**Biological Resources Table 2
Compliance with Federal, State, and Local LORS**

Applicable LORS	In Compliance	Discussion
Federal		
Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 (33 USC 1344)	<u>Yes</u> Undetermined	Discharge of dredged or fill material into the waters of the United States requires a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The applicant has completed a wetland delineation report and amendment, and has received a preliminary jurisdictional determination from the USACE Sacramento District. The USACE is currently drafting the CWA 404 authorization to construct the project under Nationwide Permit #12, but the permit cannot be issued to Mariposa Energy until Section 7 ESA

Applicable LORS	In Compliance	Discussion
Section 401 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 (33 USC 1341)	<u>Yes</u> Undetermined	consultation is finished (i.e., Biological Opinion sent to the USACE). Any applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the United States must obtain a certification from the State in which the discharge originates or would originate, that the discharge would comply with the applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards. A certification obtained for the construction of any facility must also pertain to the subsequent operation of the facility. The applicant has submitted a Section 401 Water Quality Certification Application to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) Central Valley Region, and will also submit a memo outlining changes to the original application. Certification from the CRWQCB is pending.
Endangered Species Act (Title 16, United States Code, sections 1531 et seq.; Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, part 17.1 et seq.)	<u>Yes</u> Undetermined	Potential take of California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, San Joaquin kit fox, and branchiopods (federally-listed species), requires compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). "Take" of a federally-listed species is prohibited without an Incidental Take Statement, which would be obtained through a Section 7 consultation between the USACE and USFWS. The applicant has submitted a Biological Assessment and updates for the project to the USFWS, and the USFWS is currently reviewing this information.
Eagle Act (Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 22.26 and 22.27) and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (Title	Yes	Condition of Certification BIO-16 requires protection of compensation habitat for California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, San Joaquin kit fox, western burrowing owl, and other special-status species. Habitat preserved for these species

Applicable LORS	In Compliance	Discussion
16, United States Code section 668)		would also serve as golden eagle foraging habitat.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act (Title 16, United States Code, sections 703–711)	Yes	Condition of Certification BIO-8 provides for pre-construction nest surveys, protective buffers, and monitoring if nests are found, and Condition of Certification BIO-7 limits off-site disturbance.
Executive Order 11312	Yes	Conditions of certification BIO-7 and BIO-18 limit species used in revegetation, and also call for a revegetation plan for disturbed areas.

27. Page 31, change to read as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT

~~No public comment was received on the subject of Biological Resources. Intervenor, **Rob Simpson**, comments that The CEC has illegally attempted to usurp the exclusive authority of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in making conclusions regarding the application of the Endangered Species Act. We disagree. The record reflects that Energy Commission staff and Applicant have worked cooperatively with other agencies such as USFWS and CDFG. We have found that implementation of the conditions of certification below, along with the acquisition of and compliance with a Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement will reduce impacts below a level of significance. (Ex. 301, p. 4.2-50.)~~

28. Page 33, #24, change to read as follows:

Condition of Certification **BIO-16** will reduce potential impacts to the Golden Eagle from construction and operation of the MEP below the level of significance.

29. Page 40, BIO-06 (a) change to read as follows:

BIO-6 The project owner shall develop a BRMIMP and submit two copies of the proposed BRMIMP to the CDFG and USFWS for review and comment and the CPM for approval and shall implement the measures identified in the approved BRMIMP.

The BRMIMP shall be prepared in consultation with the Designated Biologist and shall identify:

a. All biological resource mitigation, monitoring, and compliance measures proposed and agreed to by the project owner;

b. ~~All applicant proposed mitigation measures presented in the Application For Certification, data responses, and workshop responses;~~

30. Page 47, BIO-10 #1 (d) iii, change to read as follows:

Before the start of linear work each morning, the designated biologist or biological monitor shall check for CRLF and CTS under any equipment such as vehicles and stored pipes. The biological monitor shall check all excavated steep-walled holes or trenches greater than 6 inches each morning before sunrise for any CRLF and CTS. CRLF and CTS shall be removed by the Designated Biologist or Biological Monitor and

relocated to the USFWS and CPM CDFG-approved relocation site. All excavated holes or trenches located outside the MEP site shall be ramped at the end of the work day, or escape boards will be placed in the trench to allow the animals to escape.

31. Page 47, BIO-10 #1 (i), change to read as follows:

i. Bruns Road and Access Road Monitoring:

- i. During wet-season construction (October through April ~~mid-November through October~~, though earlier or later if conditions are wet and CTS are observed) if there will be large volumes of construction traffic (25 vehicles or more) scheduled to arrive or depart after dusk or before dawn. CTS moving between breeding sites and burrows shall be protected by one of these methods:

ii.

32. Page 49, BIO-10 Verification, change to read as follows:

Verification: No less than 30 days prior to the start of any project-related ground disturbance, the project owner shall provide a final Management Plan to the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS. The final, approved Management Plan shall be incorporated into the BRMIMP within 10 days of completion of the plan, and implemented. ~~No less than 40 days p~~ Prior to the start of any ground disturbing activities or construction equipment staging, the project owner shall provide the CPM a letter-report describing the findings of the pre-construction surveys, including the time, date, and duration of the survey; identity and qualifications of the surveyor(s); and a list of species observed, number of CTS and CRLF observed and moved, and location to which they were moved. The project owner shall report monthly to the CPM, CDFG and USFWS for the duration of construction on the implementation of CTS and CRLF avoidance and minimization measures. Within 30 days after completion of construction the project owner shall provide to the CDFG and CPM a written construction termination report identifying how mitigation measures described in the plan have been completed.

Within 60 days of completion of the permanent power plant site fence, the project owner shall submit a figure and photographs to the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS of the CTS and CRLF barrier fence.

33. Page 66, BIO-16 Verification, change to read as follows:

*If the project owner chooses to mitigate under **Section A** of this Condition:*

Agreements to delegate land acquisition to an approved third party shall be implemented within 6 months of the start of project ground-disturbing activities. If the project owner elects to delegate land acquisition prior to project construction, the project owner shall provide to the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS a delegation proposal that identifies the third party and includes their qualifications to complete land acquisition

and initial protection and improvement, and shall obtain approval from the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS, prior to delegation or transfer of funds. The project owner shall remain responsible for demonstrating compliance with the timelines and requirements described below.

No less than 90 days prior to acquisition of the property, the project owner shall submit a formal acquisition proposal to the CPM, CDFG, USFWS, describing the parcels intended for purchase and shall obtain approval from the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS prior to the acquisition.

The project owner, or an approved third party, shall complete and provide written verification to the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS of the compensation lands acquisition and transfer within 18 months of the start of project ground-disturbing activities, or prior to commercial operation, whichever occurs first.

The project owner, or an approved third party, shall provide the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS with a Compensation Lands Management Plan, for approval, within 180 days of the land or easement purchase, as determined by the date on the title. If additional long-term management fees are required, these fees shall be paid by the project owner no more than 90 days from approval of the Management Plan.

~~Within 90 days after completion of all project related ground disturbance, the project owner shall provide to the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS an analysis, based on aerial photography, with the final accounting of the amount of habitat disturbed during project construction. This shall be the basis for the final number of acres required to be acquired.~~

*If the project owner chooses to mitigate under **Section B** of this Condition:*

No less than 90 days prior to purchase of credits, the project owner shall submit to the CPM and CDFG for review and approval, and the USFWS for review and comment, the proposed conservation bank(s), species to be mitigated at the bank, and evidence that credits are available for purchase.

The project owner shall complete and provide written verification to the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS of the credit purchase within 18 months of the start of project ground-disturbing activities, or prior to commercial operation, whichever occurs first. The verification shall be a letter from the conservation bank, or other method approved by

the CPM and CDFG, in consultation with the USFWS, and shall include the name of the conservation bank, number of credits purchased, and the species covered under the purchase.

Under either Section A or B of this Condition:

Within 90 days after completion of all project related ground disturbance, the project owner shall provide to the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS an analysis, based on aerial photography, with the final accounting of the amount of habitat disturbed during project construction. This shall be the basis for the final number of acres required to be acquired.

34. Page 68, BIO-17, paragraph 2, Verification, change to read as follows:

If bentonite will be used, an Emergency Spill Response Plan, “Frac out” Monitoring Plan, and a Biological Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the CDFG for review and comment and to the CPM for approval no less than 30 days prior to the start of project ground-disturbing activities involving bentonite. Plan approval shall be required before construction using bentonite may commence.

35. Page 68, BIO-18 Verification, change to read as follows:

~~If an occupied nest is detected within 2 miles of the project boundary during the inventory, no less than 30 days prior to the start of any pre-construction site mobilization the project owner shall provide the CPM, CDFG, and USFWS with the final version of the Golden Eagle Monitoring and Management Plan. This final Plan shall have been reviewed and approved by the CPM in consultation with USFWS MBO. Plans measures shall be incorporated into the BRMIMP within 10 days of completion of the Plan, and implemented.~~

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES

36. Page 15, insert as the last paragraph in the PUBLIC COMMENT section before “FINDINGS OF FACT”:

Robert Sarvey submitted written comments arguing that the water conservation measures are too “speculative” to mitigate MEP’s fresh water use. We disagree. Condition of Certification **SOIL&WATER-4** (below) includes a performance standard and specifies exactly how the conservation fund is to be created, implemented, prioritized and verified. The verification specifies the time-line and steps required for the fulfillment of this condition. Moreover, the record establishes that local and regional water agencies are successfully implementing water conservation programs which underscore the feasibility of achieving additional water savings under this condition. We are satisfied that the project will have a zero net consumption of water.

LAND USE

37. Page 6, third paragraph, change to read as follows:

Two BBID properties are the only lands the project would directly use that are classified as Farmland of Local Significance.

38. Page 8, third paragraph, change to read as follows:

The project's pump station would be located near an existing, similar pumping structure on ~~BBIP~~ BBID land. The pump station would be a permanent structure that would convert the underlying farmland to non-agricultural use. However, the station's footprint would be approximately 250 square feet. The ~~BBIP~~ BBID lands are designated "Farmland of Local Importance". Staff analysis concluded that the conversion of 250 square feet of "Farmland of Local Importance" to the non-agricultural use of a pump station on a 23-acre property would not be ~~a substantial~~ and would be a less than significant impact. (Ex. 301, p. 4.12-11.) The turnout structure for the pumping station would be located along the inside bank of canal 45. Apart from the insubstantial conversion of Farmland of Local Importance resulting from the pump station and turnout structure, there are no other project components which cause the conversion of additional farmland to non-agricultural use. (*Id.*)

39. Page 8, third paragraph, first sentence, change to read as follows:

The project's pump station would be located near an existing, similar pumping structure on ~~BBIPD~~ BBID land.

40. Page 8, third paragraph, third sentence, change to read as follows:

The ~~BBIPD~~ BBID lands are designated "Farmland of Local Importance".

41. Page 14, first paragraph, change to read as follows:

Condition of Certification LAND-2 is designed to ensure that the existing livestock water supply is maintained on a year-round basis. Condition of Certification LAND-3 would require reseeding the construction laydown area with an improved seed mix over current site conditions. (*Id.* p. 4.12-18.)

42. Page 15, footnote 18, change to read as follows:

¹⁸ Conditions of Certification **TLSN-1** through **TLSN-4**, **HAZ-1** through **HAZ-7**, and **WORKER SAFETY-1** through **WORKER SAFETY-5** and VIS-5.

43. Page 16, second paragraph, change to read as follows:

The Contra Costa County General Plan expresses the broad goals, policies, and specific implementation measures which guide the decisions on development, future growth, and the conservation of resources through 2020. Approximately 0.7 miles of the MEP's water supply pipeline will be located in Contra Costa County. In addition, a temporary pipeline construction laydown and parking area would support pipeline construction. BBID would construct the water supply infrastructure. Staff concluded that the pipeline construction laydown area because BBID is a public entity, the project would be consistent with the PS (Public/Semi-Public) land use designation Contra Costa General Plan because the area would be used by a construction team affiliated with a public entity (BBID). Staff concluded the water supply pipeline would be consistent with the AL (Agricultural Lands) land use designation because the loss of agricultural land would not be substantial (250 square feet) and the loss would be at the northern margin of the property. Also, Condition of

Certification LAND-1 ensures no additional loss of agricultural land will occur. (Ex. 301, p. 4.12-28.) Staff also presented analysis showing MEP's consistency with four specific policies in the Contra Costa County General Plan.

44. Page 17, last paragraph, change to read as follows:

However, the evidence is clear that MEP complies with height requirements within Alameda County and that FAA jurisdiction over the Byron airport preempts most local airport policies. (2/24/11 RT 52-53.) Commission staff also made clear that they gave consideration to the Contra Costa County ALUC's letter but did not detect anything in the letter pertaining to land use compatibility and the policies in the ALUCP. Alameda County assessed the project's compatibility with each applicable ALUCP policy in their September 2010 letter. Staff reported and considered this information in the Land Use SSA. (Ex. 301 pp.4.12-30.) Nevertheless, Staff placed more reliance on the land use determinations of Alameda County, since the MEP site is located in Alameda County jurisdiction. The Contra Costa County ALUC letter identified potential project impacts from plumes on aircraft operations and pilot safety which were analyzed in the Traffic and Transportation section of the SSA. (2/24/11 RT 202-206.)

45. Page 19, LAND USE Table 2, change to read as follows:

Applicable LORS	Consistency Determination	Basis for Determination
State		
<u>California Land Conservation Act of 1965</u> (Williamson Act) (Gov. Code §51238.1(a))	Yes, as conditioned	Staff agrees with Alameda County and the DOC that the MEP would be consistent with the three principles of compatibility identified in GC § 51238.1(a) of the California land Conservation Act (CLCA). Staff has concluded the MEP is compatible with the CLCA with the inclusion of the proposed Conditions of Certification LAND-2 and LAND-3 .
Local		
<u>East County Area Plan</u> (ECAP) (general plan)		
Land Use Designation:		
Large Parcel Agriculture	Yes, as conditioned	The ECAP does not preclude the construction of power plants on land of such designation and the project would be consistent with the specifications of the Large Parcel Agriculture land use designation. The proposed Conditions of Certification LAND-2 and LAND-3 would meet the county's mitigation requirement for loss of land in agricultural production.
Public Services and Facilities- -General Services and Facilities; Infrastructure and Services		
<i>Policy 218</i>	Yes, as conditioned	The project would be consistent with the ECAP land use designation for the project site with the inclusion of Conditions of Certification LAND-2 and LAND-3 would be consistent with applicable policies, the project is appropriately located in proximity to other electrical infrastructure, and the project is more than 0.25 mile from sensitive receptors and residences.

46. Page 22, insert after Land Use Table 2 and before “5. Cumulative Impacts” the following three paragraphs:

Mr. Sarvey commented that the PMPD for “ignored MEP’s noncompliance” with Alameda County’s Standards for Subdivision and Site Development Review for Agricultural Parcels,” as Mr. Sarvey alleges that the length of MEP’s access road would violate Alameda County Fire Code Chapter 5 Section 503.1.2.1. (Sarvey, PMPD Comments, pp. 4-5). However, since the MEP does not involve a subdivision, Alameda County’s subdivision standards are not applicable. Similarly, Mr. Sarvey refers to Alameda County Fire Code Section 503.1.2.1 which clearly states that the section applies to residential developments, not infrastructure such as MEP. Therefore, neither the subdivision standards nor the length of the access road proscribed in Fire Code section 503.1.2.1 are applicable to MEP.

Mr. Sarvey also comments that the PMPD incorrectly concludes that MEP is a public facility. (Sarvey, PMPD Comments, pp. 6-7). As support, Mr. Sarvey cites to the Coastal Zone Management Act (“CZMA”) and the “Disaster Relief” Chapter of Title 42 of the U.S. Code (U.S.C.) relating to Public Health and Welfare definitions of “public facility.”(Id). However, the definitions of “public facility” under the CZMA and U.S.C. are irrelevant to how the term “public facility” is defined in the ECAP. The ECAP defines “public facility” as including “limited infrastructure, hospitals, research facilities, landfill

sites, jails, etc.”(ECAP Policy 54) This definition does not have limitation on whether there must be government ownership of those facilities to constitute a public facility for the purposes of ECAP. Thus, whether or not MEP meets the definition of a public facility under the CZMA or U.S.C. is not relevant to this proceeding; the key issue is whether it meets the ECAP’s definition of a public facility, which we find it does. Furthermore, the CZMA is wholly inapplicable to MEP since the MEP is not in the Coastal Zone, as defined by the CZMA. Similarly, provisions of law related to federal disaster relief are equally inapplicable to the determination that MEP constitutes a public facility as defined by the ECAP.

Finally, Mr. Sarvey comments that MEP violates ECAP Policy 246, claiming that “The MEP as a heavy industrial use should have a response time of 15 minutes from Alameda County to comply with Policy 246.” (Sarvey, PMPD Comments, p. 5). However, the MEP is not a heavy industrial use. The Alameda County Code defines “industrial” as “development for the purpose of manufacture or fabrication of products, the processing of materials, the warehousing of merchandise for sale or distribution, research and development of industrial products and processes, and the wholesaling of merchandise.”¹ [

¹ Alameda County Ordinance, Title 15, Chapter 15.48, Section 15.48.020. While this definition of “industrial” is not contained within the ECAP, this language provides guidance as to how to interpret the ECAP, as the Zoning Ordinance implements the General Plan. Alameda County Zoning Code § 17.02.020.

(Footnote)

¹ The generation of electricity necessary to provide a utility service for the public does not constitute the type of development contemplated by the ordinance, nor are public facilities or infrastructure such as MEP included within this definition. Additionally, Policy 246 does not require a particular response time for any type of development. Rather, Policy 246 provides that Alameda County will “limit development to very low densities in areas where... response times will average more than 15 minutes.”(ECAP 246). MEP is located in an area of very low density and will not increase population densities in that area so there is no inconsistency with this policy.

47. Page 25, second paragraph, change to read as follows:

MEP will not significantly contribute to cumulative land use impacts because: (1) It would not physically divide an existing community; (2) MEP would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction with the inclusion of the proposed Conditions of Certification; (3) The project would not conflict with the Bethany Reservoir State Recreation Management Plan and General Development Plan and (4) MEP would not be subject to the East Contra Costa County HCP/NCCP because those portions of the MEP which are located within the plan area are on land where the habitat is not sensitive.

48. Page 27, insert the following three paragraphs between third and fourth paragraph:

Intervenors Robert Sarvey, Rajesh Dighe and Rob Simpson filed written comments claiming that the MEP violated the Williamson Act, the ECAP and Measure D.

Intervenor, Robert Sarvey commented that the Committee must “override the County’s Agricultural Preserves Objectives, Uniform Rules and Procedure Section,” based on his opinion that the Uniform Rules only permit electrical facilities “accessory to other permitted uses” as a compatible use (Sarvey PMPD Comments, p. 4). However, Mr. Sarvey overlooks the fact that Government Code section 51201(e) provides that compatible uses are defined in either local rules or by the Williamson Act itself. In this case, the Williamson Act expressly recognizes electric facilities as a compatible use, and the evidentiary record establishes that Alameda County has never made a finding to the contrary. (Cal. Gov. Code § 51238; 2/24/11 RT 150:4 – 152:22). Additionally, the Uniform Rules cited by Mr. Sarvey expressly recognize that compatible uses are defined by both the Williamson Act and the Alameda County Rules itself. (Alameda County Agricultural Preserves, Objectives, Uniform Rules and Procedures, II(C)(3)(h)).

Mr. Sarvey also commented that “the PMPD fails to address the key finding for a conditional use permit is that the MEP must be a public need...Unchallenged testimony in the record demonstrates that the MEP is not needed for the public.”(Sarvey PMPD Comments, pp. 7-9). Mr. Dighe also commented that the MEP was not needed. Mr. Sarvey’s assertion that testimony “demonstrated that the MEP is not needed for the public” was “unchallenged” is incorrect. Applicant has put forth substantial evidence that

MEP is needed because Eastern Alameda County has insufficient local generation to meet load demands (Ex. 1, Appendix 5.6A, p. 1.) and that MEP is necessary to support the integration of renewable resources to the grid, and provide support for intermittent resources to ensure that load needs are met, especially during critical times when the intermittent resource is not generating or during peak load conditions. (Ex. 1, Appendix 5.6A, p. 9; Ex. 301, pp. 4.1-72, 4.1-77, 4.1-82). Moreover, the CPUC's decision approving the MEP power purchase agreement with PG&E is evidence that MEP is required for the public need. (See discussion in the **ALTERNATIVES** section of this Decision).

Finally, Mr. Sarvey argues that the MEP is "completely inconsistent with the ECAP as modified by Measure D." (Sarvey, PMPD Comments filed 5/13/11). We disagree as explained in pages 8 through 15 above.

49. Page 28, item 9, change to read as follows:

9. Local land use ordinances and policies applicable to the MEP include the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act), the East County Area Plan (ECAP), ~~and Alameda County Ordinance Code (Title 17: Zoning), Contra Costa County General Plan, and Contra Costa County Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan.~~

50. Page 29, items 12 and 13, change to read as follows:

12. With the implementation of Conditions of Certification **LAND-2** and **LAND-3**, the MEP will be consistent with the three principles of compatibility identified in Government Code section 51238.1(a) of the California Land Conservation Act (CLCA).

13. With implementation of Conditions of Certification **LAND-2** and **LAND-3**, MEP will comply with the ECAP designation for Large Parcel Agriculture and would meet the county's mitigation requirement for loss of land in agricultural production. The ECAP does not preclude the construction of power plants on land designed for Large Parcel Agriculture.

51. Page 30, Items 21, 28 and 29, change to read as follows:

21. With implementation of Conditions of Certification **LAND-2** and **LAND-3**, the MEP will comply with ECAP Policy 128 (Infrastructure and Services) since it is located in proximity to other electrical infrastructure and is located more than 0.25 mile from sensitive receptors.

28. The MEP will comply with applicable provisions of the Contra Costa County General Plan AL (Agricultural Lands) land use designation concerning agricultural lands because the minor ~~(250 square feet)~~ loss of agricultural production land associated with the project's pumping station would not be substantial (250 square feet) and the loss would be at the northern margin of the

property. Furthermore Condition of Certification **LAND-1** will ensure no additional agricultural land is lost through conversion to urban use and will ensure that the project's pipeline construction is in accordance with BBID requirements.

29. The MEP will comply with Contra Costa County General Plan PS element (Public/ Semi-Public) land use designation since the construction area will be used by ~~BBIC~~BBID, a public entity.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

52. Page 1, Paragraph 1, 3rd Sentence, change to read as follows:

However, during plant operation, traffic impacts tend to be minimal due to the limited number of vehicles involved; still, an increase in hazardous materials delivery to the area is expected. Any transport of hazardous materials must comply with federal and state laws.

53. Page 2, Summary and Discussion of Evidence, Paragraph 1, change to read as follows:

The evidence of record is undisputed regarding the potential impacts of the MEP on all transportation except the Byron Airport which is located in Contra Costa County, slightly less than 3 miles ~~northwest~~east of the site.

54. Page 3, Paragraph 2, change to read as follows:

Major access roads located near the MEP may be impacted by ~~construction and operation of the~~ traffic related to construction and operation of the project. These include: Interstate 205 (I-205), ~~which is~~ a freeway located approximately 3.5 miles south of the MEP site; Interstate 580 (I-580), which merges with I-205 about 3.5 miles south of the MEP site; Byron Highway, ~~is an~~ arterial located about 2 miles northeast of the MEP site; Bruns Road, ~~is a~~ north-south road lying along the western border of the MEP property and intersecting with Byron Highway to the north; Kelso Road, ~~is~~ just north of and adjacent to the proposed MEP site; Mountain House Road, which runs north-south and is a local two-lane road in the vicinity of the MEP; and West Grant Line Road, ~~is a~~ two-lane rural roadway in the vicinity of the MEP site.

55. Page 3, Bulleted Items, change to read as follows:

- Contra Costa County – General Plan, Growth Management Element;
For semi-rural areas within Contra Costa County, a high LOS C is the lowest acceptable level of service; and
- Alameda County Congestion Management Agency– Congestion Management Program

For roadways within the Congestion Management Program network (which includes State highways), the Level of Service standard is LOS E, except where F was the LOS originally measured. Where LOS F already exists, LOS F is the standard

- Alameda County – East County Area Plan

56. Page 4, Paragraph 2, change to read as follows:

The record contains analyses of other transportation modes conducted to determine the impacts which the MEP could have upon them. ~~These include: freight and passenger rail is located~~, approximately 7 miles from the MEP site. There are several park-and-ride lots for car pools in the vicinity of the proposed MEP. Local plans do not include planned bikeways or pedestrian pathways within the vicinity of the MEP, ~~and due to road conditions which~~ are not safe for bicycles. There are no pedestrian crosswalks within the vicinity of the project. The Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) provides commuter train service between Stockton and San Jose, with connections to Amtrak and Caltrain into the Bay Area. The ACE stop closest to the proposed MEP site is in Tracy. The Byron Airport, located approximately 2.7 miles ~~northwest~~east of the MEP site, is a small public facility owned by Contra Costa County and is used for general aircraft operations, flight training, skydiving, and ultralight, glider and jet operations. (See **Traffic & Transportation Figure 1.**)

57. Page 7, Paragraph 4, change to read as follows:

The Byron Airport has no air traffic control (ATC) tower and lies beneath Class E airspace. This airspace extends for a 5-mile radius around the Airport, from 700 feet AGL up to 18,000 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). Aircraft operating under visual flight rules (VFR) ~~Pilots~~ are not required to be in radio communication with any ATC facility, and their flight paths need not conform to published instrument approach or departure patterns when operating within the Byron Airport airspace. Under VFR visual flight rules (VFR) ~~rules~~, aircraft are generally allowed to enter the standard pattern from any direction, provided it does not interfere with other aircraft or violate local noise abatement restrictions.

58. Page 11, Paragraph 2, change to read as follows:

Energy Commission staff uses a 4.3 meters per second (m/s) plume average vertical velocity threshold for determining whether a plume may pose a hazard to aircraft. This velocity generally defines the point at which general aviation aircraft would begin to experience more than light turbulence.

59. Page 12, Second Bullet, change to read as follows:

At an altitude of 950 feet AGL, the average plume vertical velocity is predicted to be above the threshold velocity of 9.6 mph (4.3 meters/second) for only 26 hours of the

year, and never above the vertical velocity of 13.6 mph, the upper limit of light turbulence used in the Katestone analysis.

60. Page 13, First Paragraph after the Bullet, change to read as follows:

In addition, Applicant commissioned CH2MHILL to prepare a Turbine Exhaust Velocity Characterization analysis using computational fluid dynamics (CFD). The two methodologies produced similar results for average plume methodologies at various elevations, and the Applicant-commissioned analyses and staff's analysis all determined similar results for plume average velocity during calm winds. (Id., p. 87; 2/25/11 RT 285; Ex. 301, p. 4.10-62, 63.)

61. Page 17, Paragraph 1, change to read as follows:

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ron Gawer identified himself as a pilot with an airplane at the Byron Airport. He fears that on a heavy air traffic day at Byron, he may be forced to fly over the power plant. He is concerned about plume effects and any approach zone restrictions. (Id., RT 296.)

62. Page 18, after the first paragraph insert the following paragraph:

John L. Collins commented on behalf of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association that he opposed the MEP because the plumes and associated turbulence from exhaust stacks will pose a flight hazard to aircraft operating near them. As discussed above, we have found, along with the FAA, that the MEP will pose no such hazard.

63. Page 18, insert between Paragraph 1 and Paragraph 2:

Intervenor, **Robert Sarvey** commented that if a NOTAM as required by Condition of Certification **TRANS-8** is not issued, there will be significant impacts to aviation. (Sarvey, PMPD Comments, p. 9). However, as set forth in **TRANS-8**, the NOTAM is not the sole "mitigation" provided. Even if a NOTAM is not required by the jurisdictional agency (the FAA) there will not be significant impacts to aviation safety. It is important to note that the FAA has determined that MEP will pose "no hazard" to aviation and recommended, but did not require, that the Byron Airport authority provide the MEP location and avoidance information in the listing for Byron Airport contained in the Airport/Facility Directory.(Ex. 7, Attachment DR51-1; Ex. 73) Staff's independent analysis confirmed the FAA findings of no hazard to aviation. Condition of Certification **TRANS-8** provides consistency with the FAA determination and its recommendations. Mr. Sarvey is incorrect in stating that there will be a significant impact to aviation safety if a NOTAM is not issued.

Intervenor, **Rajesh Dighe** commented that the plumes from MEP present a hazard to Byron Airport traffic. As explained above, we have taken in substantial evidence to show that the plume presents no such hazard.

64. Page 26, Verification of TRANS-8, first paragraph of the verification:

Insert the Word, 'Manager' after the words, Byron Airport.

SOCIOECONOMICS & ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

65. Page 4, change to read as follows:

Similarly, the evidence shows that existing educational, police, medical and emergency services will not be adversely impacted. (Ex. 301, pp. 4.8-7 – 4.8-9.)

As stated in Section 17620 of the Education Code; “The governing board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities”. Commercial development within the Mountain House ESD (2009) is charged a one-time assessment fee of \$0.36 per square foot of principal building area. The Mountain ESD students attend high school at Tracy USD and therefore split the revenue with Tracy USD. The split is 75 percent of the fee to Mountain House ESD and 25 percent of the fee to Tracy USD. The 7,280 square feet of occupied structure would create approximately \$2,621 in impact fees. Condition of Certification **SOCIO-1** is proposed to ensure payment of fees to these districts.

66. Page 12: insert between second and third paragraph:

Intervenor, **Robert Sarvey**, filed comments that the environmental justice policy of the State Lands Commission “represents what the State of California considers a proper environmental justice analysis for its departments.” (Sarvey PMPD Comments, p. 10). The environmental justice policy of the State Lands Commission is applicable only to staff under the purview of the State Lands Commission and is not the policy of the State of California. While these policies can be instructive, they are not binding on the California Energy Commission.

Intervenor, **Rajesh Dighe**, also filed written comments that the Committee wrongly relied on the 2000 Census data, conducted inadequate public outreach and that the MEP “causes big Environmental Justice issues because of pollution nuisance on Minority Population Mountain House Community [sic].” These issues are squarely addressed above.

67. Page 12, after the 3rd paragraph insert the following paragraph:

The PMPD addressed all of the public comments received prior to publication. The following comments were received after publication of the PMPD during the 30-day comment period.

Aaron Basilius, Prashanth Srivastava, Simon Wu, Hui Chen, John Rubin, Smitha Unnikrishnan, Pramit Shah, Jeremiah Bodnar Ramkuma Balanbramaier and Wentao Li submitted comments expressing concern that Mountain House property values will decrease due to the MEP. Similarly, residents of the rural area they refer to as the “Original Mountain House Community” in Alameda as distinct from the Mountain House “town” in San Joaquin County commented on their concerns regarding diminution of property values and other perceived impacts. Specifically, these comments were submitted in writing by Sylvia and Doug Little, Mrs. Donald Jess, Tina Williams, Daniel Jess, Dolores Kuhn, Jane Peterson and Joan Uznay. These concerns are addressed and considered above.

Vasu Devan, Paul Bhathal, Shan (no last name given), Rajesh Dighe, Vipin Goel and Allan Torres all commented on the perception that the Mountain House residents bear the burden of the MEP while Alameda County receives all the benefits. Counsel for Applicant, Gregg Wheatland, responded that the benefits to Mountain House include mitigation funds paid to San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and the Tracy Fire Department, stationed at Mountain House (see the **AIR QUALITY** and **WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION** sections of this Decision).

68. *Page 13, change to read as follows:*

~~No Conditions of Certification are required for this topic because no significant adverse socioeconomics impacts will occur as a result of construction and operation of the MEP. Condition of Certification~~ **SOCIO-1** is required to ensure conformance with LORS.

69. *Page 13, change to read as follows:*

SOCIO-1 The project owner shall pay the one-time statutory school facility development fee as required by Education Code Section 17620.

Verification: At least 20 days prior to the start of project construction, the project owner shall provide to the Compliance Project Manger (CPM) proof of payment of the statutory development fee. The payment shall be provided to the Mountain House Elementary School District (75 percent)/Tracy Unified School District (25 percent).

NOISE AND VIBRATION

70. *Page 6, after the last paragraph insert the following paragraph:*

Guy Colton lives next door to the project and expressed concerns about noise. (5/5/11 RT 105:4 -122:8.) Sylvia and Doug Little, Mrs. Donald Jess, Tina Williams, Daniel Jess, Dolores Kuhn, Jane Peterson and Joan Uznay echoed these concerns in their written comments. These concerns are addressed and considered in detail above.

71. **Page 10, Condition NOISE-6, change to read as follows:**

NOISE-6 Heavy equipment operation and noisy construction work relating to any project features shall be restricted to the times delineated below, ~~unless a special permit has been issued by the CPM in consultation with Alameda County~~ authorizes longer hours:

Mondays through Fridays:	7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
Weekends:	8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

VISUAL RESOURCES

72. **Page 35, Condition VIS-6, change to read as follows:**

VIS-6 The Applicant shall provide a comprehensive landscaping and irrigation plan along the northern boundary of the 10 acre facility site and the vehicle access exclusively serving the facility site in accordance with the requirements of Policy 114 of the East County Area Plan. Landscaping shall be installed or bonded prior to the start of commercial operation. In no event shall landscaping be installed any later than 6 months after the start of commercial operation.

The landscaping and irrigation plan shall include a list of proposed plant or tree species prepared by a qualified professional landscape architect familiar with local growing conditions and the suitability of the species for project-site conditions.

The Applicant shall submit to the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department for comment a comprehensive landscaping and irrigation plan. The Applicant shall provide a copy of the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department's written comments on the landscaping and irrigation plan.

The Applicant shall not implement the landscaping and irrigation plan until the Applicant receives approval from the CPM. Planting must be completed or bonded by the start of commercial operation, and the planting must occur during the optimal planting season, but not later than 6 months after the start of commercial operation.

Verification: Prior to commercial operation and at least 60 days prior to installing the landscaping, the applicant shall provide a copy of the landscaping and irrigation plan to the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department for review and to the CPM for approval.

The applicant shall provide to the CPM a copy of the transmittal letter submitted to the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department requesting their review of the submitted landscaping and irrigation plan.

The applicant shall notify the CPM within seven days after completing installation of the landscaping and irrigation that the landscaping and irrigation is ready for inspection.

The applicant shall replace dead or dying plantings (plants and trees) listed or shown in the approved landscaping and irrigation plan for the project, annually at the least (e.g., start of Spring), for the life of the project. The landscaping plan must be reviewed and approved by the biology staff to identify any issues related to sensitive species.

73. Page 35, Condition VIS-6, change to read as follows:

Landscaping

VIS-6 The applicant shall provide a comprehensive landscaping and irrigation plan along the northern boundary of the 10 acre facility site and the vehicle access exclusively serving the facility site in accordance with the requirements of Policy 114 of the East County Area Plan. Landscaping shall be installed or bonded prior to the start of commercial operation. In no event shall landscaping be installed any later than 6 months after the start of commercial operation.

The landscaping and irrigation plan shall include a list of proposed plant or tree species prepared by a qualified professional landscape architect familiar with local growing conditions and the suitability of the species for project-site conditions.

The applicant shall submit to the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department for comment a comprehensive landscaping and irrigation plan. The applicant shall provide a copy of the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department's written comments on the landscaping and irrigation plan.

The applicant shall not implement the landscaping and irrigation plan until the applicant receives approval from the CPM. Planting must be completed or bonded by the start of commercial operation, and the planting must occur during the optimal planting season, but not later than 6 months after the start of commercial operation.

The applicant shall replace dead or dying plantings (plants and trees) listed or shown in the approved landscaping and irrigation plan for the project, annually at the least (e.g., start of Spring), for the life of the project.

Verification: Prior to commercial operation and at least 60 days prior to installing the landscaping, the applicant shall provide a copy of the landscaping and irrigation plan to the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department for review and to the CPM for approval.

The applicant shall provide to the CPM a copy of the transmittal letter submitted to the Director of the Alameda County Community Development Agency Planning Department requesting their review of the submitted landscaping and irrigation plan. The landscaping plan must be reviewed and approved by the biology staff to identify any issues related to sensitive species.

The applicant shall notify the CPM within seven days after completing installation of the landscaping and irrigation that the landscaping and irrigation is ready for inspection.

Dated: May 17, 2011 at Sacramento, California.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Douglas', written over a horizontal line.

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Presiding Member
Mariposa AFC Committee



BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
1-800-822-6228 – WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE *MARIPOSA ENERGY PROJECT*
(MEP)**

Docket No. 09-AFC-3

PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 5/16/2011)

APPLICANT

Bo Buchynsky
Diamond Generating Corporation
333 South Grand Avenue, #1570
Los Angeles, California 90071
b.buchynsky@dgc-us.com

Edward A. Mainland
Sierra Club California
1017 Bel Marin Keys Blvd.
Novato, CA 94949
emainland@comcast.net

Mr. Jass Singh
291 N. Altadena Street
Mountain House, California 95391
jass.singh2000@gmail.com

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

Doug Urry
2485 Natomas Park Dr #600
Sacramento, CA 95833-2975
Doug.Urry@CH2M.com

Counsel for Rob Simpson

*April Rose Sommer
P.O. Box 6937
Moranga, CA 94570
AprilSommerLaw@yahoo.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Presiding Member
KLdougla@energy.state.ca.us

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Gregg Wheatland
Ellison, Schneider & Harris L.L.P.
2600 Capitol Avenue, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95816-5905
glw@eslawfirm.com

Rob Simpson
27126 Grandview Avenue
Hayward CA. 94542
Rob@redwoodrob.com

Kenneth Celli
Hearing Officer
kcelli@energy.state.ca.us

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
E-mail Service Preferred
e-recipient@caiso.com

California Pilots Association
c/o Andy Wilson
31438 Greenbrier Lane
Hayward, CA 94544
andy_psi@sbcglobal.net

Galen Lemei
Advisor to Commissioner Douglas
E-Mail Service preferred
glemei@energy.state.ca.us

INTERVENORS

Mr. Robert Sarvey
501 W. Grantline Road
Tracy, California 95376
Sarveybob@aol.com

Rajesh Dighe
395 W. Conejo Avenue
Mountain House, California 95391
dighe.rajesh@gmail.com

Craig Hoffman
Siting Project Manager
choffman@energy.state.ca.us

Kerry Willis
Staff Counsel
kwillis@energy.state.ca.us

Morgan K. Groover
Development Director
Mountain House Community
Services District
230 S. Sterling Drive, Suite 100
Mountain House, CA 95391
mgroover@sjgov.org

Jennifer Jennings
Public Adviser
E-mail Service Preferred
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Maggie Read, declare that on May 17, 2011, I served and filed copies of the Errata to the Presiding Member's Proposed Decision, dated May 17, 2011. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit are accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at: [\[http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/mariposa/index.html\]](http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/mariposa/index.html). The document has been sent to both the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit, in the following manner:

(Check all that Apply)

FOR SERVICE TO ALL OTHER PARTIES:

- sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list;
- by personal delivery;
- by delivering on this date, for mailing with the United States Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to the name and address of the person served, for mailing that same day in the ordinary course of business; that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date to those addresses NOT marked "email preferred."

AND

FOR FILING WITH THE ENERGY COMMISSION:

- sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed and emailed respectively, to the address below (*preferred method*);

OR

- depositing in the mail an original and 12 paper copies, as follows:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

Attn: Docket No. 09-AFC-3
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, that I am employed in the county where this mailing occurred, and that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the proceeding.

Original signed by:
Maggie Read
Hearing Adviser's List