

Memorandum

Date: September 28, 2000

Telephone: ATSS (916) 654-4074

Moss Landing Power Plant Siting Committee:

To : William J. Keese, Presiding Member
Michal C. Moore, Associate Member

File: s:\projects/mossland/misc/pmpdhearing.doc

From : California Energy Commission - Paul Richins, Jr.
1516 Ninth Street Energy Commission Project Manager
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Subject : **FOLLOW-UP TO THE MOSS LANDING PMPD HEARING OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2000**

Staff was instructed by the Committee to respond to several items discussed at the Moss Landing PMPD hearing of September 21, 2000. The status of each is discussed below.

1. Issue: Clarification from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and District whether requiring soot filters for diesel construction equipment is a good idea.
Response: Staff contacted the CARB and they indicated that they would provide a letter in support of soot filters. By way of a personal communication between staff and the local air district, the district indicates support for the soot filters.
2. Issue: Trailer park closure.
Response: We contacted the County and informed them of this matter. They indicated that the trailer park was being closed as part of the approval of a new development and that the trailer park was operating illegally.
3. Issue: Would the trailer park closure change our previous analysis?
Response: No. Housing characteristics provided in Table 6.10-5 of the AFC (State of California Department of Finance, City/County Population and Housing Estimates) provide the number of housing units, vacancy rates, and number of vacant units for all cities and unincorporated communities in the four-county study area. Vacancy rates range from a low of 3.5 percent in Salinas to a high of 27.6 percent in Marina. Monterey County has an overall vacancy rate of 10.37 percent; Santa Cruz County has an overall vacancy rate of 8.99 percent. In addition to housing units, as of October 1997, there were about 12,100 motel/hotel rooms in Monterey County. Therefore, staff does not consider the potential closure of a trailer park to significantly impact the supply of temporary housing for construction workers for the Moss Landing project.
4. Issue: More specificity regarding Bio-7 mitigation measures/projects was requested.
Response: The first "Advisory Group" Meeting is being organized for November 8, 2000, at the Elkhorn Slough Headquarters. Mark Silberstein, director of the Elkhorn Slough Foundation, has already started working with Kaitilin Gaffney of the Center for Marine Conservation and Michael Bowen of the California Coastal Commission to add more specificity to the "enhancement Plan". Staff intends to hold one or more professionally facilitated meetings focusing on the specifics of an acceptable plan as soon as possible (first meeting---Nov. 8, 2000). Staff has confidence that the detailed

and stakeholder endorsed "Enhancement Plan" will be completed early in 2001. Staff feels this effort is extremely important and is personally committed to moving the planning process along steadily. The impacts this plan will address will not occur until the power plant begins operation. Construction will take at least 18 months from the date of certification. The "Enhancement Plan" will be completed and mitigation projects started well in advance of the date of power plant operation.

Note: Regarding the request for Elkhorn Slough monitoring funds for five years (\$750K/year). This type of trend study takes a minimum of ten years to determine if a significant change is resulting. With all the surrounding land uses in the Elkhorn Slough watershed, the cause of any detected trend could not be determined. Staff and the experts involved on the Technical Working Group, felt that mitigating a loss to the slough system is best accomplished by enhancing the slough system and that the best use of that money would be for additional mitigation.

5. Issue: Moss Landing Harbor District letter.
Response: In discussions with Duke Energy they state that they have no intentions of discontinuing the boat washing program that has been in place for a number of years. Regarding the other issues in their letter, Duke Energy will discuss these matters with the Harbor District and respond.
6. Issue: Provide an explanation why the monitoring of impacts was included in the FSA but dropped from the FSA errata.
Response: This monitoring was essentially the same as the monitoring that had just been completed. The RWQCB was not willing to support or include additional operational monitoring in the NPDES permit based on its input from the Technical Working Group. During an agency meeting, every person in attendance (all members of the Technical Working Group) (RWQCB, CDFG, Marine Biologist experts (3 of them), and Energy Commission staff) except Michael Bowen of the California Coastal Commission, agreed that continued monitoring was a waste of time and funds. The previous year of monitoring just completed provided adequate information on the operational impacts of the new power plant. No new information was anticipated with additional monitoring. Entrainment was the issue and we knew how much water was going to be pumped through the power plant and the density of biomass in the source water. An additional \$750K was added to the mitigation amount and the resulting mitigation amount increased from \$6.25 million to \$7 million.

cc: Moss Landing Power Plant Project Proof of Service List
John Torrey, Duke Energy
Wayne Hoffman, Duke Energy
Bud Carney, Monterey County
Alison Dettmer, California Coastal Commission