

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

TO: INTERESTED PARTIES

July 31, 2000

**“Data Response Workshop Summary”
Mountainview Power Plant Project****July 26th & 27, 2000
San Bernardino County Museum
Redlands, California****MEETING PURPOSE**

On May 17, 2000, the Energy Commission determined that the Mountainview Power Plant Project (MVPP) Application for Certification (AFC) was data adequate. As part of the AFC discovery process, staff issued data requests to the applicant, Mountainview Power Company, LLC, on June 22, 2000, to obtain additional information on the project.

On July 26 & 27, 2000, staff held a public workshop with Mountainview Power Company LLC, on its responses provided to the first round of data requests. Data responses were received in the areas of air quality; biological, cultural, and geological resources; land use; noise, plant efficiency; traffic and transportation; visual resources; and water resources;

INTRODUCTION

An overview was presented stating the purpose of the meeting. The Energy Commission staff as part of the discovery and analysis phase of the Application conducted this data response workshop for Certification.

DATA RESPONSES:**AIR QUALITY** Joseph Loyer

The following responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: 1, 2b, 2d, 2e, 2f, 2g, 2h, 2l, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17,

The following responses required additional information to be provided on August 2, by the applicant: 2a, 2c, 7, 10, and 14.

August 4, 2000

Page 2

The response to DR 2j is complete with the applicant agreeing to the use of low sulfur diesel fuel as a condition of licensing for on-site construction, dependent on the availability of fuel in the SCAQMD air basin.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Rick York, Natasha Nelson

The following responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38.

Staff asked the applicant to resubmit their answer to DR19. The request was for proposed critical habitat for the California gnatcatcher, which is a legal definition, not for habitat that is suitable.

There was discussion of DR20 between the Applicant and staff regarding the total area of impact resulting from the acquisition of 38± acres. Resolution was delayed until the site visit when the plant manager showed the existing fence encloses 47 acres; both the 16.3 acres occupied by existing power plant, and 31 acres of SCE lands which the applicant proposes to acquire. The SCE lands and the power plant lands are intermingled in a patchwork pattern within the existing fence. Only 7 acres of land outside of the fence, and to the north, is proposed to be acquired. The response was deemed complete.

The waterway crossings are presented as being trenched in the applicant's response to DR21. The applicant indicated at the workshop that they are considering alternative methods to trenching including hanging the wastewater line across Twin Creek Channel using the existing footbridge, boring under Etiwanda Creek/Wash, and directional drilling the Santa Ana river at Tippecanoe. A second data request will be issued requesting the final crossing methods for these crossings since this changes the level of impact on biological resources. This change in the applicant's proposed crossing method would also require the applicant to change their answer to Data Requests 20, 21, and 31.

The BRMIMP outline submitted in response to DR22 was nearly complete based on initial staff review. Staff indicated a weed control section needs to be added under Section 8.2. A second data request will be issued to cover this topic.

The applicant's response to DR28 regarding potential nitrogen impacts was found inadequate by staff. Staff provided a copy of an article from the journal *Conservation Biology* to the applicant for their use in answering this question. The article describes how nitrogen, when released in gas form, can deposit in the soils or on plants and change the natural communities to ruderal (weedy) communities. The applicant will need to resubmit their answer after review of this material.

Staff asked for more clarification on the applicants claim that no riparian or wetland habitat would be impacted by the natural gas pipeline routes. Staff believes that much of the problem lies with the definitions. Although the applicant sees a potential for

August 4, 2000

Page 3

vegetation disturbance within the Santa Ana River, they have classified it as a disturbance to a ruderal community. Staff contends that because the vegetation is within the river and is functioning as a riparian community, that the community is riparian even if it is composed of ruderal species. The applicant will need to resubmit their answer with definitions.

Staff requested clarification on the applicant's response to DR32 regarding the amount of impact expected on Delhi sands. The applicant response stated 79.53 acres would be impacted during construction of the natural gas pipeline Alternative 1. However, it was staff's understanding that all construction would be within the street. The applicant clarified that the acres impact was estimated using a 50-foot corridor centered on the roadway. Most impacts to this soil type would be under a paved surface, but they will check their calculation to see how much may be off of a paved surface and respond August 2, 2000.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Dorothy Torres, Jeanette McKenna

The following responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: 42, 43, 44, 46.

The response to DR39 will be supplemented with all received Native American correspondence.

The applicant will redo the table attached to DR40 to address adjacent areas regarding the pipeline route.

The applicant will supply additional information for the DR41 response to identify the pipeline staging areas and the maximum trenching depths.

The response to DR45 did not provide sufficient information to determine the route to be used. The applicant stated that Alternative route 2 was no longer under consideration because it is the Historic Route 66. The applicant will provide this information for DR's 30, 40, 41 & 45 on August 2, 2000.

EFFICIENCY Steve Baker

The response was to DR47 deemed complete by Commission.

GEOLOGICAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES Robert Anderson

All of the responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: DR48 – DR52.

August 4, 2000

Page 4

LAND USE David Flores, Michael Berman

The following responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: DR54, 55, 56.

The response to DR53 was incomplete. A second Data Request will be issued to define how the site plan relates to the property lines.

NOISE Thomas Murphy

All of the responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: DR57 – DR60.

SOCIOECONOMICS & ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE James Adams

All of the responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: DR61 – DR63.

SOIL & WATER RESOURCES Lorraine White, Linda Bond

The following responses were deemed complete by Commission staff: DR65 – DR70, DR73, 77, 78, 79, 80, 86, 89. The responses to DR81 – DR88 were deferred until the applicant submits their new water plan and the balance of water issues on August 10, 2000.

DR 64:

Staff requested a draft erosion control and stormwater management plan. The applicant submitted a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. When finalized, the erosion control and stormwater management plan(s) become the SWPPP as part of the NPDES permits. Staff requested that the applicant submit the erosion control plan for both the construction and operation of the plant to the level of specificity requested. Comments in the SWPPP such as “comply with all applicable federal and local regulations” were inadequate because they provide no details as to what regulations and how would they be complied with. Staff also requested that the plan discuss spill containment standards and sizing to meet requirements; drainage facilities, both temporary and permanent with information on sizing and locations. The applicant agreed to provide the information.

DR 71:

Staff requested a complete direct connection permit application and the applicant submitted a blank application. Staff’s intent was for the applicant to submit a draft application filled out completely for MVPP to be submitted to SAWPA. The applicant indicated that the information would be provided.

DR 72:

The applicant's response stated that the capacity sale would be complete in August. Staff requested that the applicant provide verification that the MVPP has secured capacity in the SARI line after the sale is complete. The applicant agreed.

DR 74:

Staff requested that the applicant clarify just how much water they are expecting to receive from the City of Redlands wastewater treatment plant. The applicant stated that the City is committed to providing at least 50 percent of the plant's needed supply, but may be able to supply more. If the City can supply more, the applicant would like to be able to use this additional amount.

DR 75:

Question wasn't answered clearly. Staff still questions whether the City of Redlands effluent will meet Title 22 requirements for disinfected tertiary treated water. The applicant clarified that their biocide treatments are not for disinfection. It is their understanding that the pumped effluent will meet all recycled water requirements. Doug Headrick from the City of Redlands stated that the recycled water project is modeled after a similar project in San Bernardino called RIX. The City is currently pursuing the necessary approvals for the project development and the water will be available prior to the MVPP coming on line. Mr. Headrick offered to work with staff to ensure that all concerns are addressed and that staff is kept informed about the City's project.

DR 76:

Can you please identify the location of this monitoring well and the depth of the sample(s)? Unfortunately, some of the compounds were hole-punched out and I'll have to double check with the staff to find out what the various compounds are.

DR 77:

Div. 2, Title 27 does apply to liquid industrial wastewater, but in fact, staff realized it was the wrong question to ask. What is needed is a draft industrial waste dischargers permit application to Fountain Valley, if required. Based on comments made by from the District, the applicant may only be required to get the direct connections permit from SAWPA, no more for the wastewater discharge. Staff will investigate this further.

Most of the rest of the data requests made by staff dealt with the groundwater and related issues. Staff stated their concern that the project, through pumping of the lower aquifer, would result in contamination of the lower aquifer by drawing down the TCE and perchlorate that occurs in the shallow and middle aquifers in the vicinity of the proposed project wells. Rather than continue to discuss the rest of the responses individually, staff addressed this concern and the applicant's responses in general. Of particular note, is that the applicant is considering the use of the middle aquifer with the lower aquifer only providing back-up water when needed to dilute the middle-aquifer supply.

August 4, 2000

Page 6

The applicant is concerned that full use of the contaminated aquifer will result in emission violations. There is a district limit of 16-lbs. year for TCE.

After some discussion, the applicant agreed to provide staff with their proposal for a new water supply that would employ recycled water, middle-aquifer water and some lower aquifer supplies for back-up purposes. The applicant also agreed to limit their lower aquifer use to no more that is currently being extracted for the existing power facility. In light of this discussion, staff dispensed with further discussions of the individual responses until the new water supply plan is submitted.

The applicant has committed to supplying supplemental responses to all items, with the exception of water issues by August 2, 2000. Water issues will be addressed on August 10, 2000.

If you have any questions, please call me at (916) 653-1245, or E-mail me at jreede@energy.state.ca.us.

Sincerely,

James W. Reede, Jr.
Siting Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Dockets
Mountainview Mailing Lists
POS

JWR:JWR