

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	)	Docket No. 01-AFC-24
	)	
Application For Certification of the	)	COMMISSION STAFF'S
Palomar Energy Project	)	RESPONSE TO PETITION
	)	FOR COMMITTEE WORKSHOP
	)	ON ALTERNATIVE COOLING
	)	OPTIONS
_____	)	

The Energy Commission Staff ("Staff") offers the following response to the request of intervenor Bill Powers for a Committee Workshop on the subject of alternative cooling options. We do not believe it is appropriate for the Committee to hold a workshop on a topic that it is likely to have to resolve during the evidentiary hearings. While staff remains unconvinced that it is appropriate to an alternative cooling method to the use of reclaimed wastewater proposed by the applicant, it is willing to further explore the issue with Mr. Powers at a staff workshop.

Throughout his participation in this proceeding, Mr. Powers has argued in favor of dry cooling. In its Preliminary Staff Analysis, Staff found the applicant's proposed use of reclaimed wastewater for cooling to be appropriate. No environmental impacts were found to result from that cooling method that could not be mitigated to insignificant levels.

On September 19, 2002, staff held a public workshop on the PSA. Mr. Powers attended that workshop and asked questions of both staff and the applicant. Water issues were discussed during the workshop.

Staff plans to hold an additional staff workshop on remaining air quality issues. That workshop will be scheduled after the applicant submits further information about its offset strategy, which the applicant has estimated it will file during the week of

October 7. Staff will add a discussion of cooling alternatives to the workshop agenda. Although staff workshops normally focus on answering questions and taking comments about staff documents, staff will invite Mr. Powers to present information that he believes is relevant to the cooling issue. Staff will then review that information, along with information previously submitted and decide whether to revise its recommendations, which will be published in the Final Staff Assessment.

To the extent Mr. Powers is requesting that the Committee receive evidence and make decisions about this or any other substantive issue in the case, his request is premature. Evidence is taken at the evidentiary hearings, which occur after the staff

has completed its analysis and published the FSA. Following the close of the hearings, the Committee prepares its proposed decision for public review and comment, followed by action by the full Energy Commission. If Mr. Powers remains unsatisfied with the Staff's recommendations in the Final Staff Assessment, he is free to present evidence in support of his position during the evidentiary hearings.

DATED: October 3, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

---

PAUL A. KRAMER JR  
Staff Counsel