DATA RESPONSE WORKSHOP

BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION

AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Carrizo Energy Solar Farm	)	Docket No.
	)	07-AFC-8
Responses to Data Requests	)	
URS Project 22239472.018000	)	
	)	

CARRISA PLAINS HERITAGE ASSOCIATION

COMMUNITY CENTER

10750 CARRISA HIGHWAY

SANTA MARGARITA, CALIFORNIA 93453

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2008

5:10 p.m.

Reported by:
Troy Ray
Contract No. 150-07-001

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS PRESENT

Mary Dyas, Project Manager

Caryn Holmes, Staff Counsel

Eric Knight, Siting Office Supervisor

Michael Doughton, Staff Counsel

Suzanne Phinney

Negar Vahidi

Beverly Bastian

Jason Ricks

Mark Lindley

Rick York

Brian McCollough

Casey Weaver

Paul Marshall

APPLICANT

Jane Luckhardt, Attorney
Downey, Brand Attorneys, LLC
Carrizo Energy, LLC
Ausra CA II, LLC

Perry Fontana
Robert Morgan
Sam McIntosh
George Dore
Pete Johnson
Carrizo Energy, LLC
Ausra CA II, LLC

Angela Lieba
Sarah Temple
Kristin Walker
Emily Sullivan
Jeremy Hollins
URS Corporation

APPLICANT

Theresa Miller
Matt Moore
Robert Scott
Mark Storm
Amy Gramlich
Brian Glenn
URS Corporation

Joe Patch
Ken Horn
Patch Services

INTERVENOR

Tanya A. Gulesserian, Attorney
Adams, Broadwell, Joseph & Cardozo
California Unions for Reliable Energy

ALSO PRESENT

Jim Patterson, Supervisor
San Luis Obispo County

Ellen Carroll
John McKenzie
San Luis Obispo County

James Kilmer
Caltrans
California Department of Transportation

Deborah Hillyard
Dave Hacker
California Department of Fish and Game

Bob Nolen

Patty Nolen

Gordon Hayes

Tim Strobridge

Mike Strobridge

ALSO PRESENT

Robin Bell

Jim Bell

Louise French

John Ruskavitch

Susan Harvey
North County Watch

Fred Young

Kelly Hayes

Ryan Cooper

Kenneth Tab

Roberta Peterson

I N D E X

P R O C E E D I N G S

5:10 p.m.

MS. DYAS: Good afternoon. I'm Mary Dyas; I'm the Siting Project Manager from the California Energy Commission over this Carrizo project. I'd like to thank everyone for being here this evening, or this afternoon.

The purpose of this workshop, data response workshop, is to discuss responses to staff's data requests, and to continue discussions on the issues that have arisen, or have been identified. And to receive input again from agencies and the public.

On the table just inside the doors over there, there are blue cards for when we have our open public comment period. If you can just put your name on it so I can call you up when we do have our open public comment period.

And then there are also a number of different handouts from our Public Adviser's Office. I think that's a handout on frequently asked questions with the Public Adviser's contact information. As well as an Energy Commission permitting process timeline.

And then Ausra also has a number of

handouts regarding the project that you can pick up there. And there are also copies, I believe there may still be some there, or not, of them, the data responses that we're going to be discussing here.

And there's also a sign-in sheet; so if you could please, when you get a chance, and we will be having a break for something to eat. I'm planning it probably about a quarter after six, depending on where we are in the agenda.

There's also copies of the agenda back on that same table.

And as far as the timing on this, we're going to try and not keep you here too late. So hopefully we'll be able to get through things.

As far as the Energy Commission's process, what we've covered so far, there are three major phases in our licensing process. There's the data adequacy phase where staff reviews the application that was filed by Ausra to determine if it meets all the minimum requirements for the siting regulations.

And once it does meet all the requirements, the project is deemed adequate, or complete. And that actually happened on December

19, 2007.

And then after the data adequacy phase, there's the data analysis and discovery phase. And during this phase is where staff and the agencies and the intervenors gather data in order to do their analysis.

Staff conducts independent engineering and environmental analyses of this project. And that includes identifying any issues and evaluate an reasonable range of alternatives in comparison with the environmental effects of the proposed project.

Also identifying measures that can mitigate or reduce any potentially significant impacts. Staff also recommends the conditions of certification that would govern the operation of this plant.

The preliminary staff assessment and final staff assessment are the two documents that staff will produce. And any comments that we have received so far have been distributed to staff. And staff will consider those comments and they will be addressed in their individual analyses.

To date, under this particular phase in the process, we issued an issues identification

report on January 23rd. On January 28th staff filed data requests. And on January 29th, as most of you were probably here, we had the informational hearing and site visit in which questions were also asked.

Following the preliminary and final staff assessments, once the final staff assessment is released, we will go into the evidentiary hearing phase. And that's where the Committee will consider all of the -- staff makes a recommendation to the Committee. And then the Committee will consider things and then make their decision as to whether or not to approve the license. And that's just a quick overview.

As I mentioned, the comments that have been received have been distributed. And Ausra has also answered a number of the questions, and is prepared to also file other answers to other questions that have yet to be filed. And they will also be making some introductory remarks.

To start off I would like to have each group, the applicant and the intervenor, and ourself, we will go through introductions. And then we'll have any agencies that are in the audience introduce themselves. And then we will

proceed into the discussions on the data responses that the applicant filed.

So, first off, on the Energy Commission team there's Eric Knight, who is the Supervisor over the project managers in the siting office.

We have Caryn Holmes and Mike Doughton who are Staff Counsel. And we have a number of staff members here with us tonight. We have Beverly Bastian who is our cultural staff. Suzanne Phinney who is covering alternatives and waste management. Brian McCollough is biology. And Rick York is supervisor over one of the environmental units.

We have Negar Vahidi who is land use. Jason Ricks who is traffic and transportation. And then Casey Weaver who is also on the water staff. And I believe we have a number of others scattered in the audience. Paul Marshall who is the supervisor over the water unit. And Mark Lindley who is also a water analyst.

And then I will have Perry take over and introduce his team.

MR. FONTANA: Actually have Jane take over.

MS. DYAS: Or Jane, okay. Jane.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Hi. My name is Jane Luckhardt and I'm Project Counsel for Carrizo. And up here at the table with me are Rob Morgan and Perry Fontana from Carrizo. And then we have a variety of other folks, and I'll try and introduce them. Hopefully I won't miss anybody. I have a list.

So, I see Sam McIntosh in the front, from Carrizo. And Sarah Temple is around somewhere. There she is. And I see Angela Lieba from URS. Let's see, Pete Johnson should be somewhere. There we go.

And then from Patch, the engineering folks helping out with the project there should be Joe Patch and Ken Horn. And then going back in with the URS folks, we have Kristin Walker and Emily Sullivan -- where's Emily? Right behind me. And Jeremy Hollins is around.

Brian Glenn, cultural resources, Pat Mock and Theresa Miller for biology. George Dore for traffic and transportation. Amy Gramlich for visual resources. She's the one back in the corner I can't see. Matt Moore and Robert Scott from water resources. And Mark Storm for noise. Mark is way in the back.

And if I've missed anybody hopefully these guys will kick me. I think I've done it. Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Okay, Tanya.

MS. GULESSERIAN: My name is Tanya Gulesserian; I'm an attorney representing the intervenors California Unions for Reliable Energy.

MS. DYAS: Perry, did you want to make any opening comments or anything?

MR. FONTANA: I think we're just ready to get into it.

MS. DYAS: Or Jane?

MS. LUCKHARDT: No, I think we're ready to start.

MS. DYAS: Okay. Okay, we do have -- one thing I do want to note here is that this workshop is actually being recorded, just like the informational hearing was. So there will be a transcript produced following this workshop.

So, as we did with the informational hearing, if you're going to ask questions and you do want to get them on the record you'll have to come up to the microphone so that you can be recorded.

So, are there any government agencies

who would like to introduce themselves here. And just kind of come up as you are. I know James Patterson is here.

MR. PATTERSON: Jim Patterson, I'm the San Luis Obispo County Supervisor for the --

MS. DYAS: Jim, sorry. Can you, so that he can get it on --

MR. PATTERSON: Jim Patterson, Fifth District Supervisor for San Luis Obispo County; this is in my district.

MS. DYAS: And I was told that you wanted to make a few comments?

MR. PATTERSON: You want me to --

MS. DYAS: Yeah, go ahead and do that now.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, okay. This is a California Energy Commission project, but I want to insure the folks that live here and elsewhere in the County that we'll have ample opportunity to participate in the process.

And one of the things that we're doing in working with the CEC and Ausra is to schedule a public meeting on a Saturday so folks that can't come in the afternoon or on a workday will be able to have the same opportunity to ask questions of

the applicant and the CEC.

We have a meeting scheduled for Saturday, April 12th out here in the morning. We don't have a location and exact time yet, but we'll get that information to you.

That same afternoon we'll be meeting either in Santa Margarita or Atascadero. So folks -- and, of course, you're all here so you have this opportunity, but other people haven't.

But the idea is to maximize the opportunity for community members to have input into this project.

MS. DYAS: Thank you, Jim. Any other agencies that would like to introduce themselves?

MS. CARROLL: I'm Ellen Carroll; I'm the Environmental Coordinator for the County. And we've been reviewing all of this information and preparing letters, and will continue doing that.

MR. McKENZIE: And I'm John McKenzie. I work under Ellen, and kind of a primary contact for solar-related projects in the County.

MR. KILMER: James Kilmer, Caltrans, development review. I'll be looking to see how the project impacts highway 58.

MS. HILLYARD: I'm Deborah Hillyard with

the California Department of Fish and Game. And we're looking at issues related to our responsibilities as a trustee agency for fish and wildlife resources for the state.

MR. HACKER: I'm Dave Hacker; I'm also with the Department of Fish and Game in the same role. So we're working together on this project.

MS. DYAS: Any other agencies that would like to introduce themselves?

MR. SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MS. DYAS: Are there any other agencies that would like to introduce themselves?

Okay. Now we'll continue on to the discussions. And as far as the way we're going to do this, for each topic area that we are discussing regarding the data responses, what we're going to do is we're going to have the interaction between the Commission Staff and the applicant and the intervenor to discuss the responses, and whether or not the responses were fully acceptable as far as what the information is that they were looking for.

And then we will from there get agency comment on that particular topic regarding the response that was filed. And then we will move to

the public as far as if they have a response specifically related to that data response.

And, again, we will have the open public comment period at the end. So, as far as comments on the topic areas, we would like to keep it specifically to the data response.

So, first on the agenda, the first topic area that we have is alternatives. And my CEC Staff is Suzanne Phinney.

MS. PHINNEY: The applicant did answer the questions that we had addressed. But I wanted to just ask a little bit elaboration on that.

There were a number of sites that were identified as alternative site locations. And I was wondering whether the applicant had actually identified specific parcels for those pieces of property.

I understand in Kern County that was not the case. It was just a general region. But it wasn't clear from the discussion whether there were actual parcels. And the map that was provided was, you know, just kind of stars on a fairly general map.

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, this is Rob Morgan with Ausra Carrizo Energy. For the Daggett-

Soppeland alternative, for the Harper Lake alternative and for the Old Mine alternative we have some section numbers we've identified.

We never actually got to discussions around individual parcels, per se. And you're correct, in the Kern County area we looked at a broader region, decided as a region it was inferior to here, and so didn't get very deep on that one.

I can read those off; I can give those. We have them written up but they didn't make it in the package. So I do have some section numbers to give you.

MS. PHINNEY: Well, I can copy down --

MR. MORGAN: Okay, I'll read them in. So for the Daggett alternative it's township 10 North, Range 3 East, Sections 4 to 9 and Sections 16 to 21.

MS. PHINNEY: Okay. Is it possible for you just to make a copy of those? Because I'm not sure I'm going to be able to --

MR. MORGAN: Yes. It's no problem. Yeah, yeah, --

MS. PHINNEY: -- copy them down as --

MR. MORGAN: -- and I can send a copy of

some BLM maps that have been designated, as well.

MS. PHINNEY: That would be very helpful.

MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Do you want it read into the record so it's in the transcript?

MS. DYAS: That might actually be a good idea, yes, please.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Okay.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. I apologize in advance, then. For the Harper Lake alternative, Township 11 North, Range 4 West, Sections 19, 29 through 32.

For the same alternative, Township 11 North, Range 5 West, Sections 13, 24 and 25 and 36.

For the Old Mine alternative, Township 10 North, Range 1 East, Sections 20 and 21 and Sections 27 and 29.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Would you repeat that last one?

MR. MORGAN: The Old Mine alternative is Township 10 North, Range 1 East, Sections 20 to 21 and 27 through 29.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS. PHINNEY: And I also wanted to find out whether the applicant had identified any environmental information and had that available for those particular locations. Because, as you know, the Energy Commission does a fairly detailed analysis of site alternatives to projects, typically what's done, and that would be useful to the extent that the Energy Commission decided to evaluate some of the alternative sites that you have proposed.

MR. MORGAN: As far as I know we do not have any environmental analysis of those sites. We did a screening analysis to get from one region to another. Pick a region and went deeper on this region.

MS. PHINNEY: Thank you, those were my questions.

MS. DYAS: Did the applicant have any other concerns regarding the alternatives?

Tanya, did you have any comments on the alternatives?

MS. GULESSERIAN: No.

MS. DYAS: Do any of the agencies have comments on the alternatives responses?

MS. SPEAKER: No.

MS. DYAS: Anyone in the public have any questions or comments on the responses for alternatives?

Please state your name so --

MR. NOLEN: My name's Bob Nolen. I live here in California Valley. Just curious, of these alternatives you said you haven't identified specific parcels? You haven't?

MR. MORGAN: That's correct. We looked at certain sections in those larger townships. We looked from a screening level analysis that looked at transmission availability, solar resources, our general feasibility assessment we do. Did not actually go to the extent of identifying parcels or contacting landowners.

MR. NOLEN: Okay.

MS. DYAS: Are there any other public questions at this time?

Okay, we'll move on to land use.

MS. VAHIDI: I'm Negar Vahidi and I'm the land use technical specialist for the California Energy Commission on this project.

The data request for land use were numbers 19 through 25 for those folks that want to look at those.

There were a number of responses that you couldn't give us because -- the applicant couldn't provide to us because they indicated it required coordination with the County Planning and Building Department.

And staff did send a letter on February 6th to the County posing the same questions to them, as well. And the County was nice enough to provide us with responses in a letter dated yesterday.

So, I think at this point the missing responses, we think, are okay, based on the responses from the County. And any further clarification we're going to just work directly with County Staff to clarify, as we're conducting the analysis.

And specifically with regard to conditions, we're going to work with them as we find things. As we're doing the analysis we will speak to them about the types of conditions they'd want to seek.

MS. DYAS: Did the applicant want to make any response to that?

MS. LUCKHARDT: No. It sounds like the information exchange has occurred, and you're

getting the information that you need from the County. And so we're here if there are any additional questions.

MS. DYAS: Tanya, do you have any questions?

MS. GULESSERIAN: No.

MS. DYAS: Do any of the agencies have any comments or questions regarding this?

Does anyone in the public have --

MR. NOLEN: Bob Nolen again. As far as under the building height it says that the modified height will not exceed the life-saving equipment capabilities of the fire protection agency.

How are you going to deal with the local station here being part-time? Has anybody discussed that? That it's manned by volunteers, what, Friday through Monday, I believe. So, has anyone looked at that as possibly changing this to a, you know, 24/7 staffed station in order to provide the fire safety services for this?

MR. FONTANA: Perry Fontana with Carrizo Energy. We have had initial discussions with the fire department specifically going to your question. I don't think a decision has been

reached or request been made from fire agencies regarding whether or not they would see the need for a full-time station.

We are continuing to coordinate with them. But I don't think we have, at this point in time, a specific answer to the question.

MS. DYAS: That question is on the record, though, and we will be addressing it.

Does anyone else in the public have a question or comment on land use? Thank you, Negar.

The next topic is cultural resources.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we play musical chairs.

MS. BASTIAN: Okay, thank you. I did feel that -- I'm Beverly Bastian, CEC cultural resources. I did feel that the responses to two of my questions were deficient at this time. And I do understand this had to do with insufficient information yet available from the applicant.

Specifically I was asking about the Morro Bay-Midway transmission line, and the Midway Substation, both of which may have to be modified to accommodate the new power that would be coming out of the proposed plant.

And my questions had to do with identifying whether these are significant resources, and whether the potential impacts to them would be significant.

And the applicant stated that they have not yet received the -- it's called a system impact study from PG&E. And I understand that that's necessary before they can decide whether their will be these impacts. And then decide if they are significant.

But, it was not clear to me whether or not it was the applicant's intent to indeed provide that information, the historical background and these calls as regards the significance of both the resources and the impacts on these two resources.

Do you expect to do that once you know what the system impact study says, or --

MR. HOLLINS: We're anticipating the system impact study to be available on, I believe, March 20th. After that point, you know, we would know a little bit more whether or not if the transmission line would be impacted as a result of the project.

And, you know, if it would be impacted,

you know, we would certainly look at it in terms of cultural resource impacts and, you know, in terms of --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Would you speak up?

MR. HOLLINS: Sorry about that. So just to kind of paraphrase what I just said, as soon as the system impact study is made available to us, which is anticipated to be on March 20th, if it does determine that the transmission line would be impacted by the project, then we would look at the, you know, potential impacts to the significance, if it does, of the transmission line.

MS. BASTIAN: And the substation, as well?

MR. HOLLINS: Substation, as well, yes.

MS. BASTIAN: Okay. If it becomes an issue at all I would like to say that I would regard those impacts as part of the project. In other words, even though it may be PG&E that does this work, it's necessitated and a foreseeable consequence of the project.

And therefore, under CEQA, it is a potential impact and would require an evaluation, and possibly mitigation.

So that's all I really needed to clarify at this time.

MS. LUCKHARDT: I think we understand that we just need to understand fully what the impacts might be to the line and the station in order to determine whether we're going to have impacts to it or not.

MS. BASTIAN: Okay.

MS. DYAS: Thank you. Tanya, do you have any comments on this?

MS. GULESSERIAN: Not at this time.

MS. DYAS: Thank you. Do any agencies have any comments on the cultural resources response? Any members of the public?

Okay, we'll move on now to biological resources.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Hello. I'm Brian McCollough with the California Energy Commission biological resources. And we received your data responses and thank you. For the most part the data responses were adequate and we appreciate that.

And I suspect that as far as lighting plan measures go what was discussed were general concepts as far as minimizing excessive lighting

and maintaining light only where necessary.

And that I'll be working with the visual resources in evaluating the impact of site lighting on biological resources.

And then the next item that I would like to discuss was a discussion with the California Department of Fish and Game that I had regarding some of the biological surveys conducted. And as last year was such a dry year the survey results from last year may not necessarily be representative of biological resources that could potentially be on the site.

And so I wanted to facilitate a discussion between the CEC, the applicant and the Department of Fish and Game regarding how to better categorize what resources are on the site.

MS. MILLER: I'm Theresa Miller from URS. I did a lot of the bio surveys out there last year. And we are currently coordinating with CDFG on looking at further surveys for 2008. It was a dry year last year, but the site is highly disturbed, continually cultivated. And we're not certain of the need for the rare plant surveys because of that disturbance. I'm not sure how many rare plants would occur on the site.

And also further discussing census species surveys with CDFG and Fish and Wildlife at this time.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Tanya, do you --

MR. McCOLLOUGH: And in additional discussions with the Department of Fish and Game, and also regarding one of the data responses for questions about proposed offsite habitat compensation lands, one thing that should be discussed further if the appropriate mitigation ratio for the species that have been present on the site.

And Fish and Game indicated that the ratio was -- that an appropriate ratio would be five-to-one for kit fox.

MS. MILLER: We're currently discussing that with CDFG and also looking at lands that are within the Carrisa Plain area looking at offsite mitigation lands in that area.

So, based on the take, CDFG also said they need to prepare a complete take and jeopardy analysis before they decide on mitigation plan and the ratios. So we're continuing discussions in that area, as well.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Very good.

MS. MILLER: And continue to give them our information on surveys that we have done.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Do we have an idea about the timeframe for when we might have these discussions finalized?

MS. MILLER: Probably a month or two.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Okay. And we also anticipate being part of these discussions, as well.

MS. MILLER: Definitely.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Definitely.

MS. DYAS: Tanya, did you say you had something?

MS. GULESSERIAN: Not at this time, thank you.

MS. DYAS: Do any agencies have any comments on the biological resource responses? Do any members of the public have any comments on the biological resources?

MS. NOLEN: I'm Patty Nolen of the California Valley. I know that the groundcover out there is not I would say endangered or special, but I think -- everything out there is kind of a concern.

And I don't know, you say this is a green project, but when you remove all the animals off the site and all the plants off the site, it leaves a sterile environment. It doesn't look too green. Even though the technology is, it still -- there's a tradeoff, I'm sure. Thanks.

MS. HILLYARD: Sorry I wasn't quick enough.

MS. DYAS: Oh, no, that's okay.

MS. HILLYARD: California Department of Fish and Game. This is Deb Hillyard. We have been having ongoing discussions with the Energy Commission and applicant about information issues. And those continue.

And I wanted to just clarify a few things. We have a number of state and federally listed species that are confirmed or have the potential to occur onsite. That we're continuing to work out the legal issues regarding permitting authority and responsibility with the Energy Commission.

We are proceeding under the assumption that the Energy Commission and Fish and Game will meet all of the requirements of the California Endangered Species Act and other aspects of Fish

and Game Code, including those codes relating to streams and other resources that come under our purview.

And providing input to the CEC in our role as an entrusted agency and a responsible agency under CEQA.

We are working with the applicant to make sure that we have biological surveys. Part of the intent of doing biological surveys is to determine not only presence, but also to have a reasonable assurance of absence, if, in fact, that's a conclusion that we draw from surveys that are going to be done.

We need to have biological surveys in order for the impact analysis to proceed. The applicant indicated that we would want to see an analysis of the impact of take, as well as a jeopardy analysis.

Typically we rely on the applicant to provide that information to us, but we can provide guidance on what that would include.

We are concerned about direct loss of habitat, as well as impacts on rare species and other important wildlife species such as prong-horn antelope and tule elk.

We are concerned about the indirect effects on wildlife resources including lighting and traffic.

And we will be providing direct guidance through the CEC to the applicant in regards to surveys that we would like to see completed out on the site.

I think that we are definitely interested in working with the timeframe that you identified in the next one to two months, seeing as how the surveys that we think might need to be completed would need to be completed within that timeframe. So if we don't work these things out then we're looking at another year before we have adequate information.

So, we remain committed to working with the Commission and making sure that we have the information that we need.

MS. DYAS: Thank you, Deborah. Any more questions?

MR. HAYES: My name is Gordon Hayes, and unlike Mr. Patterson, you'll hear what I say. We can't hear you guys in the back of the room. When you're talking and you get to the end of your sentence you drop your voices and we lost

everything.

I would like to address the part on the lighting, too. I live pretty close to this thing. And you're not going to be able to wash those things during 115 degree weather during the summertime, so you're going to have to do it at night. And the lighting part, it is going to ruin everything for us right there where we live, to clean these things.

I know you can't do it in 115 degrees because whatever you do it with, if it's liquid it's going to just evaporate just like that.

Thank you.

MR. STROBRIDGE: My name's Tim Strobridge.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Actually, Tim, before you start if we could just provide a response to his question that would be helpful.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Sure.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Or a comment.

MS. LIEBA: Hi, this is Angela Lieba from URS. I just wanted to provide -- can you hear me? I'm going to put this right in front of me, is that better?

AUDIENCE SPEAKERS: Yes.

MS. LIEBA: No problem. This is Angela Lieba with URS. And I just wanted to provide a response to the nighttime lighting because obviously we had several comments about lighting issues last time.

So we do have Amy Gramlich here for our visual resources and lighting, but I just wanted to make sure it's known that we're going to be limiting nighttime lighting overall for the project, trying to minimize temporary impacts related to nighttime lighting wherever practicable.

And Joe and Ken here from our project engineering team can probably provide some additional information about when nighttime operations would occur. But currently we're only planning to do necessary processes during the night that cannot be performed during daytime operations.

There are basically two primary activities that would be performed on offpeak hours due to temperatures. Those include pouring concrete foundations. In addition -- and in pouring concrete foundations, the typical highway lighting would be used. And also during

millwright work.

Foundation pourings would happen approximately once a month over the course of about three to four months. Although the number could feasibly average half a dozen nights in total.

Millwright work requires smaller portable halogen lights. These lights are not pole-mounted, and would therefore have more limited temporary impacts to the nighttime lighting conditions.

So, I just wanted to provide that additional input as far as what lighting is going to be provided and when that lighting is going to be occurring.

MR. STROBRIDGE: My name's Tim Strobridge. This is the third meeting I've been to. I brought up questions about several things at each meeting. The first meeting I brought up water. Couldn't answer my questions.

Brought up lights. Couldn't answer my questions.

And actually, you know, if this project is so well designed and planned, these questions, you know, they should have all the answers right

upfront for us.

Well, my family owns -- well, we own 40 acres, 2800 feet behind this project site. And we're building a house. We're not going anywhere. And if this site is approved, well, you know, I'm retired and I don't mind being a watchdog on this. There's private property rights that people have all over this country, and lighting, spills over onto other people's land, as far as I'm concerned, would -- if I own property adjacent to it, I would object to it.

Noises. If they want to make noise on their own property, that's fine. But I don't think anybody else wants to listen to an industrial site out here.

In this report you're talking about sodium lights and mercury vapor lights and halogen lights, and those are not low-level lumens. They're bright; they're construction-type lighting. They would be offensive from a distance. They would be offensive close by.

There is a residence within three-tenths of a mile of this site that's been left off of the paperwork. I guess it's a modular, it doesn't count, right? But there are people living there,

you know, they're neighbor people.

We're building a house 2800 feet from it. And mainly I hope this project is shifted off to another area. This is not the right place for it. This is a pristine area, with wildlife, and old ways of life out here. People that have lived out here for generations, and you're going to be changing a way of life for a lot of people.

Thank you.

MR. FONTANA: Mary, if I could, just to provide some information. There were a number of questions at the informational hearing and other questions we have received.

We will be docketing, on the Energy Commission website, responses to all of those questions. We took the transcript from the informational hearing and we've tried to address every question in there.

So, that will be on the Energy Commission website; and if people need us to send them a copy directly, we would be happy to do that.

MS. BELL: Hi, I'm Robin Bell. And regarding the lighting, I was disappointed to see the specifications of the plant lighting, or

actually lack of them.

And one of the reasons I thought for getting all this information was to determine its effect on wildlife. Is this as far as it's going to go for you to be able to determine the effect on wildlife, just as minimal as possible? Or are you going to really get some specific numbers to work with?

MR. McCOLLOUGH: I anticipate that we will have more concrete data to work with.

MS. BELL: Okay, so this is not enough to make a judgment on what it will affect, then, correct?

MR. McCOLLOUGH: I believe so.

MS. BELL: Okay. And then the other question is about construction lighting. And that I'm wondering, and again it's more information I suppose, that would affect wildlife and residents, is how many of those big construction lights? Especially when I believe those condensers are 25,000 square footprint. So I would assume that would take many.

Plus, also, I'm thinking that it's pretty optimistic to think that pouring concrete and was it millwrights were the only occupation

that would happen at night. Especially when, you know, by 11:00 you can't work out here. And if your hours -- in the summer, if your hours are going to be 7:00 to 7:00, that really leaves you four hours a day to work.

So, I don't really think that that estimate is realistic. And I think that that should be looked at. I would like to know if you guys are going to be able to do that in that timeframe. Because I don't think guys will be welding in 110 degree weather.

MS. HOLMES: Maybe I can provide a little bit of information. Nighttime operations are typically concerns. And as a result of that the Energy Commission typically includes in its licensing conditions specific prohibitions against operating outside of certain hours.

So, I don't know that the hours that they have proposed are the hours that would ultimately be adopted by the Commission. The Commission may adopt more stringent requirements in terms of nighttime work or lighting. But those would be enforced with conditions of certification.

It's not as though we're trusting them

simply to say that's what they're going to do and not say anything about it in the decision. It's included as a specific requirement.

And there are consequences, financial and otherwise, for violating those conditions.

MS. BELL: Great. And so I would assume, and not to jump ahead, but like the same kind of outline would apply to noise during construction? That would all be minimized?

MS. HOLMES: Yes. Yes, and noise is typically -- there's a number of ways that we do it. We obviously have to estimate noise at this point. I don't want to get ahead into -- do we have noise as a topic or not?

MS. DYAS: There was only one comment.

MS. HOLMES: Okay. Noise has to be estimated at this point. And we do that, and they do that, through models. But then we require that after the work begins, and also -- for construction purposes and also for operation purposes, we typically require that there be actual measurements taken to see whether or not they're complying with the conditions.

And if they're not then they have to go back and do more work to make sure that they

comply with them. So, yeah, there is a mechanism there to insure that those levels are met.

MS. BELL: Okay, great. Thank you.

MS. FRENCH: Hi, I'm Louise French. Can I be heard back there, I hope? I just want to speak up a little bit for some of those little bitty guys of the biological resources, the little mice and everybody calls them vermin. And the basis of the food chain that's very necessary for the raptors and then for the coyotes and for all the other predators that inhabit this beautiful plain out here. And you can see them going across the cultivated fields, as well as the uncultivated fields. They are there.

And I don't know what your plans are for handling mice with your wires and everything, but are these little guys going to be able to survive there still? And what do you do about all the insects? This basis of the whole biological chain is needed. And what kind of environment is going to be left when you have there? Is this mitigatable or is it non-mitigatable?

As we rode the bus last time there was this beautiful golden eagle that took off from the fence on the PG&E property right there. He's the

top of the food chain. But we need them all.

MS. MILLER: There will be a -- I also wanted to respond to an earlier comment first regarding the sterilizing the site. We won't be sterilizing the site. Vegetation control is only anticipated with topical herbicides. Otherwise we're not clearing all vegetation in that manner.

As far as the mice and other rodents that would use the site, there will be mitigation for any of the land that is taken. So, whether it's onsite or within the Carrisa Plain or nearby, there will be mitigation for all the land that is removed or otherwise impacted.

MR. HAYES: My name is Gordon Hayes, again. Why should we have to go and look up on the internet? I'm tired of looking up all this stuff on the internet.

You have not given us one answer. The only thing you can say is I don't have it right now, but I'll get back to you. Now, you want to put it on a piece of paper out here, come and look at the people in the eye and tell us the answers to the questions. Instead of writing it all down where everybody gets in a meeting room and then they can just dazzle us with all the other stuff.

Put it out in words and face somebody directly in the face. When we first came to the very first meeting you said 11 times, we think. It was nothing that I know, we know. It's we think.

You don't have the positive that you know. This whole project is -- all it is is an experiment.

MR. FONTANA: I think there are handouts here with responses to data requests, responses to other comments. We will be producing, as indicated, be docketing very soon other responses. And we are happy to provide directly to folks so that they have that information.

MR. BELL: Hi. My name's Jim Bell, and I live about a mile from the proposed site. I'm coming back to the lighting issue. It was answered a little bit, but if you don't mind, I mean, what kind of came along as, gee, we're going to keep it as low as possible. And then I hear you say that's good with us.

When will the plan be initiated? Will it be reviewable by the public, by the people that live here? And so that we can get a good layman's feel of how this is going to impact the lighting,

especially within a mile.

MS. DYAS: As far as responses from the Energy Commission, sometime, I believe our initial deadline is June 1st for filing our preliminary staff assessment. We are going to, like I said, the comments that have been filed so far have been passed out to staff to review for their -- during, while they're doing their analysis.

And we will have a section in each topic area, like we're covering tonight, you know, the different technical areas, each area will have a response to public comment and agency comment section so that you will be able to see that your answers -- or that your questions are -- and it'll probably spell out where in that particular section the question is being answered.

MR. BELL: Well, the question would be is there going to be a plan? And will it be reviewable by the people? And is that by the time you make --

MS. DYAS: Right, and then once --

MR. BELL: -- your recommendation?

MS. DYAS: Right, when we -- no. No. When we file our preliminary staff assessment that's what it is, it's preliminary.

MR. BELL: Um-hum.

MS. DYAS: It's staff's first cut at their analysis. And that will be put out for public review. And there will be a 30-day review comment period where you will be able to look at it and say, well, that doesn't address it.

And then that's when we will be having a workshop --

MR. BELL: Afterwards.

MS. DYAS: -- afterwards --

MR. BELL: Okay.

MS. DYAS: -- to discuss --

MR. BELL: So somewhere along the line --

MS. DYAS: -- the preliminary staff assessment.

MR. BELL: -- we can expect a plan?

MS. DYAS: Oh, yes.

MR. BELL: Okay.

MS. DYAS: Yeah.

MR. BELL: That's what I was -- that's the basic question.

MS. DYAS: Well, and --

MR. BELL: Pardon?

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Yeah, I expect to

find --

MR. BELL: Okay, we hope so.

MS. DYAS: Right, and the lighting issue will be handled more in the visual resources section as opposed to the biology. They coordinate to cover the biological part of it, but it's more of a visual issue than a biological issue.

MR. BELL: I just brought it up because it's under that heading that you were talking about.

MS. DYAS: Right. No, that's fine. Were there any other comments on the biological issues responses? Okay, thank you, Brian.

The next topic is traffic and transportation.

MR. RICKS: My name is Jason Ricks; I'm a transportation and traffic specialist with the -- working for the CEC.

I have three questions. The first, has a haul route been identified for deliveries of materials during construction to the site?

MR. FONTANA: One of the things before we get into the detailed traffic discussion, that I wanted to let people know that we just discussed

with the Energy Commission, it's in response to some of the public comments and obviously concerns over truck traffic on highway 58.

We are going to be providing a supplemental filing to the Energy Commission and to the public that outlines our plan to do some limited manufacturing on the site during construction. That will have a significant reduction in truck trips which we think will be beneficial to the project and something that we can definitely accommodate.

So there will be -- traffic will be one of the sections that we'll get a significant revision in the supplemental filing to address that component of the project.

MR. RICKS: So currently a haul route has not been identified?

(Pause.)

MR. McINTOSH: Hello. I'm Sam McIntosh; I'm Vice President of Construction for Ausra. It's my responsibility to construct this facility.

We are currently looking at a haul route, multiple alternatives for haul routes. Clearly highway 58 is where we have to get to and the project site, and we're looking at various

alternatives coming from both the east and the west.

It's clear that the north is not a mechanism to get you to the site, so -- we're also looking at container orientation so that it fits onsite on highway 58 in accordance with what Caltrans expects.

We have not identified the exact haul routes, though.

MR. RICKS: My other two questions may sound like they're probably under review currently, but I'll ask them anyway now.

As you probably know, state route 58 is restricted truck route, or has a truck route advisory by Caltrans, limited to truck-trailers to a certain size. But a KP/RA ratio of less than 30 feet, kingpin to rear axle, which means the trucks used for deliveries have to be smaller than a standard truck.

And I was wondering if that was taken into consideration when the traffic study was completed.

MR. DORE: Yes, it was.

MR. RICKS: It was, okay. And also the AFC identifies that large and heavy equipment

would need to be delivered to the site. And I was wondering if it's been verified that that equipment would fit on the smaller trailers.

MR. DORE: This is George Dore. To the extent that we have equipment identified, yes, that has been included.

MS. LUCKHARDT: That's also part of the reason why Carrizo has shifted to doing more manufacturing onsite, is to bring the pieces in in smaller sizes and fewer trucks. And so they won't have to bring as large of the pieces in at a time.

And I'll let Perry or someone else -- okay.

MR. RICKS: Okay, that's all I had.

MS. DYAS: Tanya, did you have any questions?

MS. GULESSERIAN: Not at this time, thank you.

MS. DYAS: Do any of the agencies have comments?

MR. KILMER: Caltrans, development review. I have a couple questions regarding access to 58. Has, in fact, a very specific site for the driveways for both the staging area and the final ingress/egress been established?

And, two, are you planning to come in to get a permit from us? Or is it my understanding that you don't need a permit from us?

Typically if you want to do any improvements on a facility or cut the fence for a new ingress/egress, you would have to come in for an encroachment permit. We encourage you to come in early if you have both of those sites located so we can discuss any sort of operational problems that may exist such as site distance or safety issues like that.

MR. DORE: At this time there is no new connection to the sites or improvements through state route 58. However, we will secure encroachment permits for all traffic crossings within 58.

There's a laydown area that has been identified on the south side of the road that would have to be done with a encroachment permit. And would be done at such time as it's deemed necessary.

MR. KILMER: Okay.

MS. LUCKHARDT: And we appreciate your comments. It's helpful to understand from agencies what kind of lead time and advance notice

and information they need, so it's very helpful to have your comments on it.

MR. KILMER: Thank you. We just encourage early consultation to forestall any problems. Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Any other agency comments? Any public comments on traffic and transportation?

MR. RUSKAVITCH: My name's John Ruskavitch. I live out here on the Plains. I submitted a 22-page report. I tried to make it as small as possible.

First off, when are we going to get told in your decisions on that report? Because this is the highway 58 report. URS, who had it rated as an A rating, one of their many many nontruths. Right here, highway 58 is rated an E, a C and a D.

There's a CHP report I'm going to give to the Board tonight, too. They let us local truckers out here because we live here and we know the road. You can't bring interstate trucks over highway 58. Only local trucks.

The only way you can do this is to bring them through Paso Robles. Then that drops onto the county; you're not paying any taxes to maintain the roads.

Or Bitterwater. You come up Soda Lake Road about 30 miles, that's dirt, through the Monument. They don't want you, either.

So just to start out, URS, I'd like to talk to you after this meeting and explain a few of the problems you have with your report, because I've been in construction for many years and I know what I'm reading. And it's a lot of false.

But just to start out, highway 58, you can't bring interstate trucks over it. If you do smaller trucks like you're talking, you're going to triple the pollution factor. Anybody knows the bigger the truck the more energy -- you know, it burns cleaner. If you bring it all over on pickups you're causing a mess.

So, here is to start. And do you have any idea when you're going to answer my questions?

MS. DYAS: Well, as I had mentioned with the others, the questions that have been turned in, like yours and Robin's, and have been distributed to staff. And that's the whole purpose of their analysis.

And they are taking those questions that have been asked into consideration during their analysis. When we publish our preliminary staff

assessment, like I said, there will be a section in there for responses to public comment and questions. And that's where we, as the Energy Commission, will be responding to your questions.

I believe Perry is going to be filing tomorrow responses, you know, that are going to be docketed and distributed to staff, as well, and be made available to the public, the responses to your questions.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Okay, because so far everybody's just kind of batting around. But --

MS. DYAS: Well, no, that's as far as our process --

MR. RUSKAVITCH: -- this is, I mean this is so easy for me to get. And I don't know why URS did not find out this road was not suitable for truck traffic. It's so easy to bring it up in Caltrans.

The only A category is over the Tehachapis, not out here. You have 1900 vehicles per hour in each lane. Where the hell do you get that figure from? I mean, that's all part of the problem.

So, here's to start. Hats off to the Highway Patrol --

MR. RICKS: The TCR report, you have a copy of that, too.

(Pause.)

MS. HARVEY: Thank you. My name is Susan Harvey and I represent --

MS. LUCKHARDT: Can we have just a second. We need to --

MS. HARVEY: I'm sorry.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Some of the concerns that we've heard and that we're trying to address today are that the project has not responded to questions that people have asked during previous hearings and workshops.

And so we've brought a lot of folks here today who have area-specific knowledge and are here to help answer as many questions as we can.

We are filing responses to the comment letter that Mr. Ruskavitch filed earlier with the Energy Commission. We intend to file those, a full written response, either Friday or the following Monday.

And then I'll let our traffic specialist respond to the comments about the ratings on the roads.

MR. DORE: The level of service rating

is set by the Highway Capacity Manual. And it's on an hourly basis. The hourly volumes that we get from Caltrans says that the volumes are about 50 cars an hour on this section of highway 58. That, if you go into the processes, that's a level service A.

Now, the 1900 cars an hour, that's capacity for a two-lane road. We are nowhere near the capacity of a two-lane road with a traffic volume of 50 to 80 cars an hour. That's the level of service A that's referred to.

Now, condition, that's a whole separate discussion. And we'll leave that for --

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Because you need to change your report because it's wrong.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: You didn't do your homework.

MS. DYAS: Were there any other public comments on this?

MS. HARVEY: Thank you very much. Susan Harvey, North County Watch. I was concerned when you were talking about alternate routes in here. The only alternate routes, of course, would be unpaved roads; it would be Soda Lake Road or Bitterwater Road. And we'd have a huge problem

then with fugitive dust from those, plus the inadequacy of the roads. And in the winter they'd generally be impassable.

So I have a concern if you're going to have any traffic come over those, be they construction workers or equipment. I believe you'll have to study what the air quality impacts of that will be, you know, under CEQA.

And also the issue of construction workers coming in or employees. I would hope someone would consider as an alternative that the construction workers or the employees could be bused in and out, rather than everyone bringing their individual transportation.

Thank you.

MR. DORE: Addressing the construction issues. The issue of bringing them in on buses is addressed in the document, and what has been proposed.

We have not proposed using unpaved roads at all for any of the haul routes.

MS. BELL: Hi. Robin Bell. And I had asked Perry Fontana this question, and he thought that me might have an answer. And if he doesn't, maybe -- I'm not sure, I couldn't quite hear, is

anybody from CURE here?

MS. GULESSERIAN: Yes.

MS. BELL: Oh, okay. Will it be mandatory for the workers to come in on the bus? Or will they be able to drive their own cars? And, if so, that traffic should be considered in the count rather than nine buses, I think.

MS. GULESSERIAN: CURE does not have an answer to that question.

MR. McINTOSH: It's difficult to force workers -- this is Sam McIntosh with Ausra. It's difficult to force workers to use a mode of transportation that's provided for them. But it certainly is within our means to entice them and otherwise provide a suitable alternative to them using their own vehicles.

So we anticipate that buses will be an attractive alternative to driving their own vehicles.

MS. BELL: But not mandatory. So, perhaps, the full volume should be considered.

MR. NOLEN: Bob Nolen, again. First, you just mentioned that because of the size limitations you can bring more material in for onsite construction. Wouldn't that actually

increase the number of trips and not reduce them? You said you're trying to reduce them.

MR. McINTOSH: Because the manufacturing -- this is Sam McIntosh, again -- manufacturing actually uses raw material that's more densely packed. And so when those assemblies are made, they take up more volume. And therefore we reduce the traffic, the trip count, because the trucks are loaded more densely.

MR. NOLEN: Which way are you going to be bringing in the majority of this stuff? Just kind of curious. I mean it's coming from Bakersfield, or is it coming from 101?

MR. McINTOSH: I'm not sure that we have the exact answer for that. We're trying to get some local goods and services, so that's sort of our objective. We haven't actually procured anything.

MR. NOLEN: And as far as, I think you called it a class A road out here. Where was that the term? Is that people just driving around in the Valley here? Are those people actually leaving the Valley and coming back? Is that -- that seems kind of high to me.

MR. DORE: This is George Dore. The

level of service is based entirely on the traffic counts that we get from Caltrans.

MR. NOLEN: Okay.

MR. DORE: It's a road tube that's strung out and just counts cars as they go past the site.

MR. NOLEN: Okay. And the last question, since you're going to be bringing stuff in from the east, has anyone talked with San Luis Obispo County about road maintenance when that highway gets shut down with snow? Because it's the last place in the County to ever see a plow.

(Laughter.)

MS. HOLMES: Can I just -- I want to talk about, I think that what I'm hearing people talk about is three different issues. One is the amount of traffic; number two is the physical condition of the road and potential deterioration of the road; and the third is safety associated with travel over the roads.

And we will be looking at all of those. I don't know what we're going to say for this project, but I do know that we need to look at them differently and mitigation can be different for different types of issues.

For example, for road damage sometimes we require photographs of roads before construction traffic and after, and we require the applicant to repair the roads to the condition that they were in prior to the construction.

For safety concerns we have required flagging; we have required signage; we have required road improvements. There's a variety of things.

So, we are looking at all three issues and they will get addressed. But I just want to make sure that we distinguish as we go forward and talk about traffic, to be clear about which specific kind of traffic issue people are addressing.

So, now you probably have a response.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Yeah. I think there is a certain amount of different things that folks are talking about. And I think, you know, there's some confusion about when we talk about level of surface A, that level of surface A simply addresses how many cars drive across the road. It doesn't address some of the things that Caryn was talking about. You know, with the turns in the road and the turning radius and how big the truck

is you can bring in.

Level surface A simply addresses how many cars and trucks are actually traveling on that road.

And so I think that there are just some different categories there that they're maybe creating some confusion.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: John Ruskavitch, again. Isn't it true you're opening up a manufacturing plant in Las Vegas, Nevada, south of town, off of highway 15? And isn't this where the majority of the parts are going to be manufactured?

Now, if you put them in small container-type trailers you have to come over the Tehachapi truck scale. So what you're looking at is weight factor of less than 72,000 pounds overall gross to load in Las Vegas, with 30-foot long trailers, to come over highway 58?

So you're not even maximizing what a normal semi can haul. So are you manufacturing in Vegas or not?

MR. FONTANA: We do have a manufacturing facility in Las Vegas, but by moving limited manufacturing onto the site we'll be shipping raw materials directly to the site.

As Sam McIntosh indicated, we have not done procurement yet. But I can say that all of the materials are not going to come from Las Vegas. We'll have raw materials shipped here to the site.

And as Sam also indicated, the reason we expect the reduction in truck trips is when our assemblies are together, frankly the space frames, you'd be shipping a lot of air on the truck. And by shipping the raw materials you can avoid some of that.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: But isn't this going to be mainly stainless steel? What is the main number one material used?

I've been in the interstate trucking business since 1987, so that's why I kind of know the business. And I know where all the brokers and the majority of material comes from. So you can't kind of tell me something that I don't, you know, -- I know what I'm talking about when it comes to that industry.

MR. McINTOSH: You asked about whether the majority of the material is stainless steel. No, it's carbon steel, the majority of the material.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: And where's the manufacturing that you're going to bid from?

MR. McINTOSH: The manufacturing of carbon steel occurs all across the world -- all around the world. And then those components are fabricated in various fabrication shops.

And then we bring that fabricated raw material in and form sub-assemblies --

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Like out of China?

MR. McINTOSH: And those sub-assemblies are then formed into full assemblies. Like out of China for what particular?

MR. RUSKAVITCH: For the carbon steel. Most of the mills here in the United States are being shut down.

MR. McINTOSH: I think Newcore would argue that.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Where?

MR. McINTOSH: Newcore.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Where's that at exactly?

MR. McINTOSH: Newcore manufacturers and fabricates steel all over the United States.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Where's the -- I'm just asking because, you know, you would start bidding

to figure out how much your product is going to be to buy to build this, along with your transportation.

When I go into a bank I have to know exactly where things are coming from before the bank even talks to me about buying any equipment. I mean it's more of I-don't-know routine.

And, you know, it's kind of getting a little bit tiring, guys. Three meetings. I mean you should have heard the presentation that Walmart had in Atascadero last night. Those people are very sharp. And they've been on the news and the radio, and they know it's not well, we have to look and we have to research. We know where everything's coming from and how it's going to get there, and what impact it's going to do to everything. Not more studies.

MR. McINTOSH: Sounds like you're very informed on the commodity pricing of steel, which actually fluctuates on a daily market price. And procurement of that material will occur essentially just in time. And at that point we'll pick where the most cost effective and appropriate solution provider is providing material from.

MS. NOLEN: Patty Nolen, California

Valley. At night from my home I can see the traffic on highway 58. And literally, for every, you know, time that we sit on the porch we can count how many cars go down that road.

Fifty to 80? My husband drives the route every morning. He passes maybe two people. So obviously they're all going on way.

The commute you're listing is an hour and a half for the average worker at this place; it's not out here. It's Bakersfield, San Luis Obispo and Paso Robles. Gas ain't cheap. And hopefully we'll work some kind of carpooling system out. Highly unlikely.

Like the Owens Dry Lake area can prove to you is statistically -- nod your head all you want -- more people, more emissions, more accidents. This is an extremely rural area out here. And the last people we had out here that were in a situation that was of dire necessity were some old folks that -- our valley for six days.

So, as far as that CDF station out here, you can see how good it is. It's open, what, three days a week, four days a week. And it's a crap shoot. For six days elderly people, no food,

not water, no help. Think about that.

I travel highway 58 on a regular basis. I'm cut off all the time by large vehicles, flatbeds, people coming home, you know, quickly from where they've been working in San Luis Obispo heading to Kern County.

It is a dangerous, dangerous road. And only people who have been driving it for many many years really know what they're talking about. It has no railings. People go straight off those edges and you don't ever see them again.

And you're bringing people out here who don't know those roads. And quite frankly I don't think you're going to have any workshops to tell them how to drive out here.

And just like the Owens Dry Lake, more people means more problems out in our area, more vandalism, more offroaders because they know that this area has very little oversight.

So, when you're bringing all these workers into our area on these roads and everything else, think of all the damage they're going to basically impact our area, besides what you're talking about.

I really think you need to think about

those things.

MS. DYAS: Thank you, Patty. Are there any other public comments?

MR. YOUNG: Fred Young, local resident. I'm having trouble hearing so I'm going to try and yell. Because I figure if I'm having trouble hearing them, they're going to have trouble hearing me.

I was waiting for somebody to bring up an issue that came up last time, or at least that occurred to me and some others here. I was waiting for somebody else because I'm real uncomfortable getting up here. Especially with my back to the audience. You know, if I say something wrong they may start throwing things at me.

(Laughter.)

MR. YOUNG: No, just kidding. The last meeting they talked about the project site on one side of route 58, and the laydown area on the other side of route 58.

Now, I know these construction people are used to going across roads. But this is the only road, the only main road in and out of here. And we have all this land.

So the question is simple, why does the laydown area have to be across 58 from the project site area?

MR. FONTANA: The main reason for the laydown area across highway 58 is that as we build out the site, the solar field will occupy the entire site. And the piece of property that we were able to secure was the property to the south of highway 58.

MS. DYAS: Are there any more traffic comments?

MR. BELL: Hi. My name's Jim Bell. And it's basically a comment; it's not a question. I was a little flabbergasted by what I heard here today with regard to you're so far into this project, and what I'm getting out of this you haven't even determined a legal way to get your stuff to the site.

And I'm a little amazed at the staff that you wouldn't have recognized this as a problem and brought it up.

That's it.

MS. DYAS: Thank you for your comment, Jim.

We'll move on to the soils and water

resources now.

(Pause.)

MS. DYAS: Before we get started with the soil and water, let's take a 15-minute break. I believe there is chili and -- so we'll start back up at 6:45.

(Brief recess.)

MS. DYAS: We have one comment regarding the traffic and transportation, just to get it on the record.

MR. RICKS: I just wanted to respond quickly to the comment about Caltrans designating state highway 58 as a level service E roadway.

The TCR report that they published in 2000 is actually -- the level service E is the projected level of service in the year 2023. The year the study was done the level service was recorded as level C. And the data in the AFC is Caltrans data from 2006, I believe, and that's where the level service A came from.

So I just wanted to clear that up. Thank you.

MS. HOLMES: I just wanted to address two topics really quickly before we get started again. First of all, as Mary said when we

started, our objective here tonight is to get the data responses that we received from the applicant clarified to the extent that we need clarification.

Secondly, we want to hear from you in terms of your specific concerns that may not have been addressed in the data responses or in the staff's data requests.

And I'm asking that you please stick to the specific issues that you're concerned about. We want to be able to respond to your specific questions. You're telling us that you don't like the applicant or you don't think they're a good business, or things like that don't help us get the information that we need in order to respond to your concerns and prepare a PSA.

So, please, let's focus on the specific technical issues tonight and I think it'll go a lot better. I think that we'll be able to get our responses to you about your concerns faster if we can do that.

Second, I want to say that I sense that there's a lot of frustration that there is not specific information. And I want you to trust me on this, it's because of the stage that we are in

in this process. We don't have a staff analysis yet. We are collecting information.

And the questions that you have raised will be addressed in the staff's preliminary staff assessment.

So I understand that you want the information now. We'd love to have the analysis complete now, but we don't. We have to take the information that we collect from other agencies, from members of the public about their concerns, from the applicant and from other sources that we can find and try to put it all together and address all pieces of it together.

When we do that we will have an assessment. I'm not saying that you'll necessarily agree with how we've addressed all of the issues, but the issues will be addressed. And you'll have an opportunity at workshops to ask us questions about how we considered the various pieces of information that went into our analysis.

So, let's move forward and stay focused on the technical topics so that we can get the questions answered.

Thank you, Mary.

MS. DYAS: Okay, we're going to be

starting with the soil and water topic.

MR. LINDLEY: Hi. I'm Mark Lindley; I'm working with the Energy Commission on the soil and water issue.

I provided a series of data requests covering water supply, stormwater management, wastewater discharge, water quality and soil resources to the applicant.

On the whole I was relatively happy with the responses I received from the applicant. They were very helpful in providing a better understanding of --

(Audience speaking simultaneously.)

MR. LINDLEY: They were very helpful in providing a better understanding of water use at the site, and how water will be managed at the site.

I do have some followup questions for the applicant that I'd like to pose to them, and hopefully -- I know they may not be able to answer them completely right now, but at least this will help them to provide answers, better answers in the future.

One thing that came out from some of the back-and-forth between the public and the

applicant and at the meeting we had in January was the concern over water use and quantity of water that's going to be drawn from the groundwater aquifer.

And then another thing that came up was that the site was going to be landscaped around the fringe or the perimeter of the site. And I was wondering if the water use estimate of 22 acrefeet per year that's included in the AFC, if that includes any irrigation for the landscaping onsite. And whether that number needed to be revised to account for that irrigation.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Okay, before we get into that specific question, which I appreciate and I'll have these guys introduce themselves again and respond to, we need to clarify one thing.

In determining the peak water usage for the project we found an error in the numbers that were provided in the AFC and in the initial data responses. The numbers that were in that showed a maximum daily use of 700,000 gallons per day. That number is incorrect. the correct number is 74,000 gallons per day. That is the approximately once-a-year occurrence. That is the maximum water use for one day.

In addition, the average daily water use --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah, that's for the entire year, but --

MS. LUCKHARDT: -- for the entire year --

MR. SCOTT: -- 13 gallons per minute.

MS. LUCKHARDT: But that's not changed.

MR. SCOTT: No.

MS. LUCKHARDT: That hasn't changed. Yeah, just the acrefeet per year was listed at 21.8 acrefeet per year. The corrected value is 20.8, or rounded up to 21.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay --

MS. LUCKHARDT: And then I'll let --

MR. LINDLEY: -- 20.8 acrefeet per year.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Right.

MR. LINDLEY: And that's your average annual water use, or your projected maximum?

MS. LUCKHARDT: That is the average. The projected maximum daily was the earlier one.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Okay, and then I'll let these guys respond to your question.

MS. HOLMES: Excuse me, Jane, sorry --

will you be --

MS. LUCKHARDT: Yes.

MS. HOLMES: Thank you. I just want to make sure that there's something that's a formal filing that gets docketed and served and all of that, --

MS. LUCKHARDT: Yeah, it will --

MS. HOLMES: -- so that we have that.

MS. LUCKHARDT: -- initially be filed in the responses to some of the comments that we'll be filing on either Friday or Monday. And we can follow that up with something further, if you'd like.

MS. HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay. The first question that I wanted to bring up was whether or not irrigation water for the landscaping that's proposed for the perimeter of the site is included in, I guess now I'm talking the 20.8 acrefeet per year figure.

MR. MOORE: Matt Moore, URS. The irrigation was not included in the water use estimates. Rather than perimeter screening around the entire site, the applicant has opted to work with the potentially affected individuals,

offering a tree-planting allowance for individual screening.

The tree planting will be handled in coordination with individual property owners. The applicant recommends the use of the California Juniper, a native tree to the area, which will be able to sufficiently thrive without additional irrigation.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay, so the 20.8 acrefeet per year is a number that you feel is an adequate number for your average annual use.

One of the data requests that I asked for was to compare the water use of the plant with water uses in the surrounding area. And the site right now appears to support existing pasture grasses. And I would like you guys to be able to provide what the typical annual evapotranspiration for those pasture grasses are right now so that we could better compare water use on the site in its current condition versus how you're going to be using water for the power plant.

And as I understand it, your power plant, you're going to be terracing the plant. The terraces are going to have low points. You're going to capture incident rainfall and allow that

water to percolate.

Those terraces are going to be covered with gravel, they're not going to be vegetated? Is that a correct understanding?

MR. PATCH: My name is Joe Patch. The plan right now is to terrace the slope to create low spots so that the incident rainwater or stormwater is collected and allowed to infiltrate back into the ground.

There is no intent right now, no particular reason that we would look to put gravel on the site, but rather just scarify it as it's being sloped and as it's being benched which is part of the overall site development.

MR. LINDLEY: And so with the mirrors on the terraces is that going to allow some vegetation to grow between the mirrors, or are the mirrors going to mostly cover the terraces?

MR. JOHNSON: Pete Johnson; I'm an engineer with Ausra. The mirrors actually cover 83 percent of the land, so, you know, there might be minimal growth underneath the mirrors, but we don't expect it to be --

MR. LINDLEY: Okay, so what I'm getting at is I think it would be very interesting for us,

and especially given the concerns of the community regarding water use and groundwater drawdown, is to be able to get a good comparison of how much water the site currently evapotranspirates versus the amount of water that would be lost to evaporation once you construct the site and the amount of water that's going to be infiltrated into the site.

As a followup question I think one of the important things that the Energy Commission Staff usually looks at is impacts to surrounding wells. And this is one concern that I should have brought up in my original data request. Would be it would be good for the applicant to provide a map showing neighboring groundwater wells that neighbors are using. And then to provide a drawdown analysis to demonstrate or analyze whether there would be potential impacts to those neighboring wells.

MR. SCOTT: Right. My name is Bob Scott; I'm the hydrogeologist for the project. We have prepared a map that shows the location of neighboring maps (sic). As you are probably certainly aware, well information is proprietary in the State of California. So, the map that

we'll show you right now, there are probably other maps within -- other wells within the mapped area that we have not identified.

There was -- the information that we obtained is information on the topographic quadrangle maps for the area. As well as some other information that appeared in a report by Bechtel for the former ARCO solar facility on the adjacent property to the east. There were seven wells that appeared in that study.

I've reviewed the location of those wells and they appear to be identical to some of the wells that are on the USGS map.

Here's the topo map with the location of wells. I'm sure it's probably hard for some people to see in the back. But they're identified with yellow crosshairs, and you can see that there are a number of them within a couple, two or three miles from the site.

(Audience speaking simultaneously.)

MS. LUCKHARDT: Can you show --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah, yeah. I will.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. SCOTT: Um-hum. Here's the well on the site. Here's another well here, there, here,

here. There are a couple down here. Down in this area here. And it looks like there's one up here.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: There's a lot more.

(Audience speaking simultaneously.)

MR. SCOTT: -- don't quite understand is this information is not available from the state because it's not public information. So if you have information on well locations and depths somewhere, certainly we would be interested in that information.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: What do you consider neighboring? Like how far --

MS. DYAS: Can you come forward and ask your question, please.

MS. HAYES: Hi. My name's Kelly Hayes. What do you consider neighboring, how many miles distance is that?

MR. SCOTT: Oh, excuse me. Within a couple of miles.

MS. HAYES: Okay, so like my house is not on there and I'm within a couple miles. I know I have several neighbors' houses who are on there and we're not --

MR. SCOTT: Oh, I'm sure you do, yeah.

MS. HAYES: Okay. Okay. Well, if

you're talking about neighboring --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah, so, you know, we'd like to certainly have that information.

MS. HAYES: Okay, great.

MR. SCOTT: And you also asked about a drawdown evaluation.

MR. LINDLEY: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: Before you go to the next slide, -- yes, we've done a preliminary evaluation. And we basically used standard practice -- transient flow, a 4-Tran program, to evaluate drawdown that would be associated with pumping the well on the property.

As Jan had mentioned previously, the average daily pumping rate will be 13 gallons a minute. So that was the queue or the pumping rate that we used in the program.

We also included the 70,000 gallons that will occur as a one-time pumpage once a year in order to clean the air-cooled condensers.

So, running through the model, we ran it for a period of 20 years. And the results here show the drawdown associated with pumping that well for that period of time.

So, the cone of depression at the well

and in the immediate vicinity is going to show on the order of, on the property, four to five feet of potential water level change.

Our model was preliminary and it did not account for any net recharge to the aquifer from surface water infiltration or recharge to the aquifer away from the site.

So, within -- you can see within about two and a half, two miles the potential effect might be on the order of two feet. But we believe that that is over-estimated.

MR. LINDLEY: Would it be possible to update that analysis to also take into account the expected recharge that you're going to get from capturing the incident rainfall?

MR. SCOTT: Certainly. That's something that we -- yeah, that's exactly where we're headed.

MR. LINDLEY: Yeah, because given the concern I've heard from the community, the ideal thing that I would like to see is a report that would look at rainfall and evapotranspiration under the existing conditions of the site.

And then also look at groundwater withdrawal and impacts to surrounding wells during

construction. Because that was one thing that wasn't completely clear from the AFC is exactly how much water is going to be used during the construction period for dust suppression and --

MR. SCOTT: Right, right, and we can talk about that, also.

MR. LINDLEY: -- and moisture conditioning. And then ultimately, given that you're going to capture so much rainfall on site, and infiltrate that rainfall, it would be ideal to be able to take into account the groundwater recharge that you would expect from that --

MR. SCOTT: Right.

MR. LINDLEY: -- and help be able to provide the community a better understanding of what the ultimate impacts might be to their groundwater resource.

MR. SCOTT: Certainly. I understand where you're coming from.

Water volume is something that I think that a lot of people have a hard time getting their arms around. Just to give the group here a feeling for how much water we're talking about, 13 gallons a minute is roughly the amount, the maximum rate that you can pump out of a garden

hose, which is generally about 10 to 15 gallons a minute.

And the volume of water that will be used by the plant on a daily basis, 18,500 roughly, is about the amount of water in a small in-ground swimming pool that might be in somebody's backyard. So, just to give an idea of what that volume is.

Here's a plot that shows the results of our preliminary modeling evaluation. The pumping well there is at a distance zero, and you can see how the cone of depression develops away from the pumping well.

And you can see that the change in water level away from the site quickly decreases, that shows to a distance of two miles.

Now, the data, in order to run this we used some aquifer characteristic data from a pump test that was done at the former ARCO facility next to the proposed site.

MR. LINDLEY: So hydrolic conductivities would probably be relatively similar between the ARCO site and the proposed site?

MR. SCOTT: Yes, that's true. And so the values that were used are shown on the lower

portion there. And these are the results for year 20 of pumping. And it's basically in a steady state condition.

MR. LINDLEY: Yeah, but that doesn't give the applicant any credit for if there's additional recharge?

MR. SCOTT: Exactly. Exactly.

MR. LINDLEY: That's something that I think would be helpful to be able --

MR. SCOTT: Yes, yes --

MR. LINDLEY: -- to include.

MR. SCOTT: -- yeah, and we'll be refining the model.

MR. LINDLEY: One other thing on the water use and water supply. Generally, just to follow up on my data request 35, which was looking at potential alternative sources of water. We understand that groundwater quality in the aquifer varies greatly. And I'm not sure if you guys have looked at whether or not it varies with depth. And if there's a potential to target lower quality water for the groundwater withdrawal to use in the power plant, to hopefully leave some of the -- if there's better quality -- I'm not sure if the groundwater quality varies with depth. Ideally

we'd want to target the lowest quality water for the power plant.

MR. SCOTT: I anticipate that it would. It looks like it's basically a two-aquifer system. There's a deeper confined zone and a shallower zone. And the shallower zone, I think, has a known history of lesser water quality than the deeper zone. And then it also --

AUDIENCE SPEAKERS: Opposite, opposite.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: You've got it backwards.

(Audience speaking simultaneously.)

MR. RUSKAVITCH: The top water is what we drink out here; you can't drink the deep, it's alkaline.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Do your homework.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay, so that's where I think, as part of that report, it might be helpful to help target or take a look at the water quality from the shallower zone, the zone that most of these folks are grabbing their water from; and then the deeper zone.

And if the power plant can use the water from the deeper zone that's of a lower quality, that would help to preserve --

MR. SCOTT: That's actually the intention. The water is going to be pumped from a zone from 400 to 600 feet, from the deeper zone.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay. So I was just thinking that it might be helpful if we had like a nice single document that we lay this all out that would help the community understand what they could expect as far as water use, because water's a very key issue in this area.

MR. SCOTT: Okay.

MR. LINDLEY: Then I've got another line of requests, or just clarifications on stormwater management. I understand that the U.S. Army Corps has taken a look at the swale that runs through the laydown area to determine whether or not there's jurisdictional concerns.

And I'm not sure how that analysis is going to come out. When I look at the swale I don't see significant wetland habitat.

But one concern I would have, given the perimeter swales, is that we don't decrease runoff from the site to the point that that impacts down gradient, you know, users and receivers in the down gradient channel and any wetland or creek habitat down gradient of the site.

So I think it would be helpful to be able to compare runoff that's being delivered to that channel under the current conditions versus runoff delivered post-project.

And it wasn't completely clear to me through the data responses how that's going to work out. My guess is that when you work out that drainage erosion and sediment control plan that you'll be able to cover that.

MR. MOORE: Matt Moore, URS. We have taken a look at that. Per the biology analysis there are no vernal pools or vernal pool habitat or wetlands associated with the jurisdictional delineation.

As such, any of the water that we'd be holding back onsite would not be diminishing any habitat from the biological standpoint.

To touch on the amount of water reaching the site, we do have the perimeter swales around the site, which would be directing the offsite upstream water from the upstream watershed. The amount of water that we would be holding onsite during an average annual basis would be 203 acrefeet. That would be the reduction in the potential water that could be delivered to that

swale system.

The watershed upstream of the site that's tributary to that swale is approximately 50 square miles. The reduction for the site would remove on an average annual basis the 640 acres, the one square mile parcel.

The numbers that I've worked up calculating a volume tributary to that point with the 50 square miles is 10,130 acrefeet. The reduction being 203 acrefeet that's captured on the site would leave 9930 acrefeet still tributary to that point.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay. And I was wondering when the drainage erosion sediment control plan was going to be available.

MR. MOORE: We are currently working on it. We should have that completed by the end of this month.

MR. LINDLEY: And then the one final followup that I'd like to just check on is from the data requests and responses that I got it wasn't very clear to me how wastewater was going to be dealt with, and where it was going to be discharged to, and that kind of -- I'd like to get some more detail on where the wastewater is going

to go and what your plans are with your wastewater.

MR. MOORE: There's very --

(Pause.)

MR. PATCH: This is Joe Patch of Patch Services. There is a water balance that is in the AFC that describes all of the streams that are incoming that are being recovered.

And one of the responses to the questions that we're asked is we've identified that 97 percent of the processed water that is used in the cycle itself, in the steam cycle, is recovered.

So all of the streams that otherwise might be discharged are taken back and through the process, are recovered in that process.

The demineralization is a closed system. The regeneration of the demineralizing beds will be done offsite. So there is no waste stream onsite.

The only stream that we have that we would call, I guess, a discharge stream is that we have a filter that will filter the water coming out of the well before it comes into the tank, before it gets to a softener. And so that filter

discharge, I think, is eight gallons per eight-hour shift, or ten gallons per eight-hour shift.

What it amounts to is that any sand, dirt, miscellaneous material that comes out will be backwashed through the filter. That water will be just taken off of the site, and/or just used locally for dust control, for miscellaneous purposes.

Other than that there are no waste streams onsite.

MR. LINDLEY: So it's a zero liquid discharge system?

MR. PATCH: It's zero minus the fact that we are going to backwash what would be the filter that is picking up the sand out of the well water.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay. That was my thing.

MS. DYAS: Tanya, did you have any comments or questions?

MS. GULESSERIAN: No, not right now, thanks.

MS. DYAS: Any agencies have comments on the soil and water responses?

MR. PATTERSON: Jim Patterson, San Luis Obispo County. As you're all aware there's a

national monument, the Carrisa Plain National Monument downgrading it from the site. And it was raised at a monument advisory committee meeting about a month ago that there could be a potential impact on the surface water drainage from the site into Soda Lake.

And I know it's a long ways away and upstream of the plant. You just mentioned there was only about a 10,000 acrefoot collection, I believe, of gradient, if I got your numbers right, from the surface drainage.

And my question is, or concern is would you analyze any potential impact on surface deflection or surface or subsurface drainage into the monument in the Soda Lake area.

MR. LINDLEY: That is exactly the reason why I was asking about changes in the hydrology between the existing conditions and post-project conditions. And that is something that I would expect that the applicant would be addressing in the drainage erosion sediment control plan.

As I understand it, that 10,000 acrefeet versus 200 acrefeet, that is probably about at the location of the project site. And then there would be a considerably larger watershed area that

actually is contributory towards Soda Lake.

Ultimately, certainly given the concern from San Luis County, I would hope that you guys could expand your water balance to include the Soda Lake tributary area. Just to be able to quantify the changes in runoff going to Soda Lake.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Yeah, we'll add that to the report; they're adding it to their notes right now. So it'll be included in that. Impacts on the monument, itself.

MR. LINDLEY: Okay, thank you.

MS. DYAS: Are there any other agency comments on the, the water responses?

Okay, public comments on the soil and water. Please come forward.

MR. TAB: My name is Kenneth Tab and I'm California Valley resident. As far as the water, I have done more study than anybody else here I'll be happy to provide.

I had the local geologist, John Cooper, do study all the subdivision area. And the quantity of water is not a problem. Quality is the problem.

We have one well is 500 feet deep. I just had the total chemical analysis. It's less

than 500 parts per million for dissolved solids, which is better than anyplace in the United States.

All the -- level between 182 to 250, depends where you are. Solids are from 700 to 3000, maybe even more.

I drill five wells recently. Were from -- elevation of 120 feet deep, and they were about 700 to 2000 parts per million, depends where it was located.

So, I will be happy to provide the local people, you, a copy of my lab reports. I did a chemical analysis and bacterial analysis for all of them.

MR. SCOTT: Well, that would be very useful.

MR. TAB: Yes, I will do that. By the way, I'm in favor of project, and there are a lot of people in favor. They are not here. There are about 200 families live here. There are quite a few of them in favor of the project.

Thank you.

MR. LINDLEY: Sounds like he's got some good information for identifying the lowest quality water for power plant use.

MR. STROBRIDGE: My name's Tim Strobridge. Could you put the slide on again, please?

Sir, I didn't get your name, I'm sorry.

MR. SCOTT: My name is Bob Scott.

MR. STROBRIDGE: And you're with?

MR. SCOTT: And I'm with URS; I'm a hydrogeologist.

MR. STROBRIDGE: You're the hydrogeologist.

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Okay, now you were telling us that you weren't sure of the wells. I can show you two wells right now, one is a third of a mile in proximity.

MR. SCOTT: Okay.

MR. STROBRIDGE: And the other one is mine, 2800 feet. That's three squares up from the red line, three squares up.

I would like to know how you can do an analysis of the water table with inaccurate information. If you can't compile accurate information your data is useless.

MR. SCOTT: We're working with the data that's available. And the aquifer characteristics

that we --

MR. STROBRIDGE: Now, you're asking --

MR. SCOTT: -- used are --

MR. STROBRIDGE: -- people here to come forward and tell you where their wells are?

MR. SCOTT: No. Only because we were asked to identify the wells within the -- the neighboring wells in the vicinity --

MR. STROBRIDGE: Well, you've --

MR. SCOTT: -- of the site.

MR. STROBRIDGE: -- done a very poor job because that's two I know of right there.

MR. SCOTT: No, but what you don't quite understand is that the information is not publicly available.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Well, you know, doors could be knocked on, too, then.

MS. HOLMES: I have a question perhaps that may shed some light on this. And that is can you tell us, since this is your area of expertise, can you tell us how the results of your analysis might vary depending upon whether or not there were a few or a lot of additional wells in the area? Can you tell us how that would affect -- if you know how that would affect the results?

MR. SCOTT: This is Bob Scott. Certainly the number of wells and the amount of water that you pump all have an effect on the overall water level in the aquifer.

What our model was to show was the effect that what just our pumping would have on the aquifer. Not the combined effect of everybody's well that's pumping in the area.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Can you assure everybody in this room that their pumps aren't going to be going dry?

MR. SCOTT: Well, the other thing is that we're going to be pumping from the deeper zone. And so when I say that there's a change of two feet, it will be -- that will be the change that would be affected in the deeper aquifer.

And they're separated by clay. And so they are two different systems.

MR. STROBRIDGE: So what you're saying is you can assure everybody here that they're not going to have any water problems after this plant is online pumping 74,000 gallons a day?

MR. SCOTT: 74,000 gallons a day is going to be a once-a-year. And it may actually be less --

MR. STROBRIDGE: But then you're going to revert to the 18,500?

MR. SCOTT: -- than that. Right.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Every day.

MR. SCOTT: Which is -- the 18,500 is, like I said before, is 13 gallons a minute. And it amounts to your garden hose at home on its maximum flow rate.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Yeah, I realize what 18 gallons a minute is. Well, the equivalent of 18,000 gallons is like four or five thousand gallon water tanks would be a good analogy, instead of a backyard swimming pool. That would be --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah, yeah.

MR. LINDLEY: Just to follow up on that. We're very early in the process, but ultimately what I would expect from the CEC's side is that once we get the analysis from the applicant, we would be reviewing that analysis.

And then depending on our review and the perceived potential for impacts, oftentimes in power plant projects where they're drawing groundwater we include a condition of approval that requires the applicant to replace the water

source or drill new wells if they have an impact to a neighboring well.

Certainly we're not at that point yet. We haven't even, you know, gotten to the staff assessment. But ultimately that may be something that we would include here. And I would imagine that the applicant -- I can't speak for the applicant, but it's certainly something that we would consider.

MR. NOLEN: Bob Nolen, California Valley. The first is, as far as change is 74,000, are you storing this onsite in tanks? If you're going to use that much a day, since you own well's not producing that.

MR. PATCH: Joe Patch. The answer is yes. Again, if you look at in the AFC there are several tanks that are there that are being used, some for raw water storage, some for fire protection, some for the softened water that they use every day in the washing sequence. Yes.

MR. NOLEN: And second, I'd just like to say the whole issue of the good water and bad water should really get taken a look at, I think, a little more. If you can use the garbage water it would relieve a lot of concerns from people

around here for sure.

MR. SCOTT: This is Bob Scott, again. I think certainly the applicant, that would be the applicant's intention.

MR. NOLEN: Okay.

MR. SCOTT: Using water from the deeper zone.

MR. NOLEN: Prior information that was handed out by the Energy Commission stated that they believed that this area is already in over-draft. Has there been any updated conclusion on that, as far as drawing the water?

MR. SCOTT: That's really unclear from the number of studies that have been done in the area here. We have reviewed a study that was done in 1967 that actually indicates that there was net recharge to the basin, predevelopment, of 80,000 acrefeet a year.

MR. NOLEN: Okay. And also prior information that was released by you all stated that as far as environmental impact report type situation concerning the swale in the laydown area, if I remember right, was that if it's not declared other waterway by the Corps of Engineers, then you have to go through a process. And then

your whole project will be unfeasible because of the time amount for an EIR.

MR. FONTANA: The process would be longer if the Corps did not review it under what was called a section 7 consultation. I mean at this point in time if we had to go through the longer route I don't know if I'd make the statement the project would be infeasible.

We would just have to work with all the agencies to see what the schedule would be. But it would be a longer process.

MR. NOLEN: Okay. And the last question, the one page here you're saying you're going to use that 74,000 gallons one time a year for cleaning the condensers, and then under -- you know, later on here in number 52 you're saying that all that water that's going to be used, that 74,000 gallons in one day is going to be evaporated, as opposed to disposed of?

MR. PATCH: This is Joe Patch. The use of the water, everybody has seen, I think, in some of the layouts that we did, the condensers, they sit way up in the air. Large amounts of air. That's the cooling mechanism for the process for the cycle.

What happens is they get dirty. The spray in the way it's configured is that there is a spray bar that will run down across these coils. They're fin coils just like, you know, you're familiar with in a water heater, but with fins on them.

And the idea is that it's a fine spray, it's a mist. The idea is to knock the dirt off, knock the dust off that's accumulated on them. By the time with that fine mist and you're 100 feet in the air, it hits the ground. There may be some that comes down to the ground. I wouldn't suggest that there wouldn't be. But the majority of it will just evaporate.

MR. NOLEN: Would you do something like try to do this cleaning at certain times of year to facilitate the evaporation of the wastewater?

MR. PATCH: I would think we'd do it in offpeak, but in the summertime, yeah. And right now we've scheduled it for once a year. But there have been a number of cases of air cooled condensers, similar types, similar manufacturers, where the condenser has not been washed in three to five years.

We have not done that. We've stated the

recommendation initially going in was 12 months; that's the cycle; that's the water balance that you have. That's the water consumption rate you have, recognizing that we really don't expect that's going to be the case. It's probably the once every three to five years.

MR. NOLEN: Okay. And the other one is it just dawned on me your prior information stated that you were going to use a 1000-gallon septic tank for 75 workers. Has that been modified?

MR. PATCH: We had talked to San Luis Obispo County. The County standard for sewage disposal, waste disposal systems is the Uniform Plumbing Code section K.

In talking to the County their basis is 20 gallons per day per worker. In an industrial setting as there is in office buildings and a number of areas, particularly what was mentioned specifically was the wineries. They have fairly large wastes and waste treatment systems. This is nowhere near rival that size.

But in the design of the system we will follow the Uniform Building Code section K. That meets the County standards. And what we would look to do is based on the infiltration rates in

the soil and the size of the leaching field that we would have, it's a system. It's not just a tank in the ground.

MR. NOLEN: Yeah, oh, yeah.

MR. PATCH: It will be a system. There will be a digester process; there will be an overflow process. And there'll be a clean water and discharge through the leaching field, all of which is standard practice in San Luis Obispo County in a number of locations.

So, that would be the basis under which we would size the system right now.

MR. NOLEN: Okay. And one more thing as far as stormwater runoff. Are you -- I haven't gone through all of this yet -- are you looking at using detention basins or infiltrator type systems to dispose of water accumulated onsite from say rain runoff?

MR. MOORE: The site will be graded such that there will be a series of infiltration areas within the site so that the water would be allowed to accumulate during heavy rainfall. The water that's not, you know, immediately soaked into the ground would be allowed to pond and infiltrate into the ground.

MR. NOLEN: So, it'll be an exposed pond, not an underground infiltration?

MR. MOORE: This would be on the surface.

MR. NOLEN: As far as, you know, water doesn't perk around here all that good. What kind of -- I'm just curious, what kind of mitigation are you looking at in dealing with standing water and mosquito abatement, or something in that direction?

MR. PATCH: This is Joe Patch, again. The infiltration rates that we have, there were a number of borings that were taken on this site, and actually the adjacent site.

And the infiltration rates are mediocre, not particularly great, but not poor. And the question to the County was, is this area subject to and can it be used to handle a leachfield. The County's answer is typically this area the answer is yes.

The issue when it comes to stormwater was that these detention basins would be created such that the slopes are very flat, so that the amount of accumulation of water at the bottom, based on the rainfall rates we have on a 25-year

storm in this area are very very small. So there is a possibility that some would accumulate.

During the construction process the plan was that that area would be, as it is shaped and graded, would be scarified. That keeps the surface about as permeable, I think, as you can make a surface. And that was the plan. So we don't see standing water, we don't see those kinds of things, potentially wetlands developing.

MR. NOLEN: You say the scarifying during the construction process. What about after the construction process?

MR. PATCH: Well, scarify it before you actually put the mirrors up. Once the mirrors are up, then that land is pretty well under the mirrors.

MR. NOLEN: You won't be getting in there to maintain or have to maintain these basins that--

MR. PATCH: There isn't any thought that we would need to do that.

MR. NOLEN: Okay.

MS. DYAS: Any other public comment questions on the soil and water?

MS. HARVEY: Thank you. Susan Harvey,

North County Water. And I would request, I don't know what level of pure water that you're going to need for the system, but as you're thinking of accessing fairly poor water, I would request that the impacts from purifying that water be considered in the CEQA process.

You know, potential 3000 parts per million. I don't know how useful that is for some of these processes, of total dissolved solids.

MS. DYAS: Thank you. Any other water comments?

MR. BELL: Hi, Jim Bell, once again. Is it possible to put the well map up? Just like to make a comment.

The gentleman here that said you could come and check his wells. They're down here. They're nowhere in (inaudible). And the water quality is quite a bit different in California Valley where his wells are than they are on the map. Okay? So, just to clarify that.

MR. LINDLEY: Sure.

MR. BELL: Just to come back to a point that the San Luis Obispo Planning and Public Works Department claims that our area is in an over-draft situation. Okay? This is what they

reported to, I think, the staff and yourself.

Given that fact, and I like your analogy of the hose and the swimming pool, utilizing the figures that you gave, you're basically utilizing 21 acrefeet per year at the site on your average deal.

In the information given to us by URS, .52 is your average residence. Most of the small parcels around there, all out into the left and up to the north, are basically, even though they're 40 acres, they're basically residences.

So in a sense, in the middle of that circle right there you are impacting that area with approximately 40 residences. Okay. That's an --

MR. SCOTT: Right.

MR. BELL: -- analogy that drives home more than just a garden hose and a swimming pool.

MR. SCOTT: Right.

MR. BELL: To put 40 residences in that area where we already know we're in an over-draft situation, okay.

Also, I wanted to make one comment, and again this goes back to answers, and maybe it explains a little bit of our impatience. At the

last January meeting we were told those are good questions, we'll get you answers. Okay.

We didn't get any answers prior to this. Some of us took to the internet and contacted Perry. And we were told, we'll have those answers for you at the workshop.

One of the -- some of the frustration is one of the questions that was asked was how much water will be utilized during the period of construction, during the two- or three-year period of construction. That was in our meeting here in January, to you.

We were told we'd get that. The gentleman just asked -- one of the gentlemen just asked that not long ago, and they don't have that information yet.

Now they know how much dirt they're moving. They know how long they're going to move it. They know what they need to do for dust abatement. They know what they need for compaction. I don't understand the reason that after so much time has passed that they don't have this information. Because this really could impact our area over and above the daily usage of the plant.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Bell, we do have that information. And we can share that with you right now, if you'd like.

MR. BELL: How much water?

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. How much water during construction --

MR. BELL: Okay, because somebody told me nobody knew.

MR. SCOTT: Yes, we have that information.

MR. BELL: You have that?

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. BELL: Okay, sure, perfect. Also I'd like to make one comment that I notice in the material from URS there's a plan B, if you will. You have an emergency situation if, in fact, you run out of water in the aquifer.

Your plan is to bring in two water trailers per day. My question to you is what about your neighbors. What kind of mitigation do you have for us? Or do you suck it dry and we're on our own?

MR. MOORE: This is Matt Moore with URS. The water use during construction will be on the order of one-third of that during operations.

This would include -- over the period of three years this would include the 5 acrefeet for concrete mixing, as well as the compaction and dust control water.

MR. BELL: So it would be one-third of the 18,000 a day, is that what you're saying?

MR. MOORE: Correct. Yes.

MR. BELL: Okay, thank you.

MS. NOLEN: Hi, Patty Nolen, California Valley. It's just one more concern -- oh, I'm sorry, I thought you were done.

(Pause.)

MR. BELL: I would like a comment on my last question.

MS. LUCKHARDT: That's what we're doing.

MR. MOORE: Yeah.

MS. NOLEN: Sorry about that.

(Pause.)

MR. PATCH: This is Joe Patch. I'd like to respond to the question about the two or three trailers of water that would be brought into the site.

The intention wasn't that we could supply the aquifer and basically take care of this whole area. The issue was that if we had, in the

treatment, in the water treatment system, if we had a failure, if we had a pump failure, if we had something go down where we just needed a day or two or three to make a repair, and the storage water that we had in the tanks ran short. And we wanted to keep the process going, as we would. Then we would bring water in for that short duration.

It is not intended to recharge the aquifer, nor in the case where we would take every drop of water out of the ground and leave everybody without water. It was simply for process control.

MR. BELL: May I comment?

MS. DYAS: Yes.

MR. BELL: Jim Bell, again. Reading from your material it says here, in the event that the groundwater basin is temporarily unable to meet the -- I don't have my glasses -- in other words meet your needs, that you would bring in two trucks. That has absolutely nothing to do with what you just said.

(Pause.)

MR. PATCH: This is Joe Patch. To go extend beyond that, in terms of the maintenance of

the system onsite, the well and the well pump, itself, is part of our system.

I mean it's not uncommon, everybody here that lives on the wells, they do fill up, they do need to be reworked, they do need to be rescreened, pump fails. And when they do you have to go back in and fix it.

The intent was that we obviously don't look at taking all of the water out of the aquifer. The ability to bring water in is an emergency situation where somewhere in the system, whether it was a screen failure in the well, or it was a pump failure in the well, whether it was an internal system problem, that's the condition under which we may have to bring the water in.

If, in fact, what we have onsite, and we do have storage capacity of raw water, to bridge some of these potential gaps, if that failed then we would bring it in on a short-term basis.

MS. NOLEN: Patty Nolen, California Valley. One of the things I brought up last time that I think is under water issues is when you're constructing on the site that enough water be provided that you deal with the dust.

I know Jim's going to probably argue

with me about this, but if you Google this area one of the things you'll come across is the USGS site where they have handling of -- well, protocol of how you're supposed to handle the dirt in this area because of Valley Fever.

I find it hard to fathom that the prison in Corcoran and the prison in Coalinga have had successful lawsuits from guards and prisoners for being exposed to Valley Fever, yet it's not a concern here. It's the same soil.

Kern County is the number one source of Valley Fever in the United States. That is a fact. You can Google it over and over again. And quite frankly, I think you're exposing some people to a very hazardous situation out here if you don't deal with that dust. It's not a joke. It's a life/death situation.

MS. BELL: Hi. Robin Bell again. And I have two questions. There was a graphic up here that showed the water use for cattle. And I'm wondering what's that based on? Like is it the amount of cattle that this property would have in a given year?

MR. SCOTT: Oh, that's the amount of water -- information available indicates that

cattle generally drink on the order of 20 gallons a day. What that number represents is that I assumed that there may be as many as 1000 head of cattle for the 640 acres.

MS. BELL: For a whole year?

MR. SCOTT: Oh, yeah, that's a -- for a whole year they would be drinking 22.9 acrefeet.

MS. BELL: And somebody would actually have 1000 head of cattle on that property for an entire year?

MR. SCOTT: Well, then --

MS. BELL: I'm not a cattle rancher, myself, but that sounds really suspect.

MS. HOLMES: I think we're going to get to the point where we understand how much water the project is going to use during construction and operation. We're not going to have a staff assessment that says that we fully understand this project unless we have this information.

Let's not argue about the comparisons at this point. Let's get to the point of whether or not there are --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Then don't show them.

MS. HOLMES: Let me finish --

MS. BELL: Do you --

MS. HOLMES: We need to know whether there's additional information that you want us to consider or to address that will help us assess this project's impacts.

MS. BELL: Yes. That I think that the cattle is up there because it's being compared to what is being used now. And it is very important, the number of cattle. So they're putting up this number and you need to know if that is a comparable number for the use of this property.

MS. HOLMES: We are not going to be comparing the water use on this property to the water use as if it were being used for grazing. So, --

MS. BELL: Okay. Because you asked for a comparison of typical water use per acre in the neighboring land uses. And I'm saying, so you asked for that, cattle wasn't on here. We don't do these things here that is on here.

And that cattle number, in my guess, is incorrect.

MS. HOLMES: Okay.

MS. BELL: Okay. Then the second question is, is what you have said that work hours conflict; that would be monitored. Will water use

be monitored, too?

MS. HOLMES: Yes.

MS. BELL: Okay, thank you.

MR. TAB: Kenneth Tab. I just want to add one more information of the well in there 45 years. And pumps 300 gallons per minute. Never been less than that. And new wells we drilled at 120 are between 30 and 40.

Subdivision leases and land is cheaper. They used to buy water from us. They use about 20,000 gallons a day on summertimes.

MS. DYAS: Are there any further water comments?

MR. PATTERSON: I think it would be helpful if the applicant could actually provide what data's available on the aquifer, the total volume of the aquifer. You know, do a profile so people know. And do your basin balance, you know, what your recharge is on an annual basis.

So people know exactly what the volume is, what the quantity is. How much you're using in a year; how much is going back. If there is indeed an over-draft, this is an opportunity to really evaluate what information's out there and provide that.

I think it would, you know, give some assurances that, you know, oftentimes basins are tens of thousands of acrefeet, and you're using a fraction of that. But we need to know what that is.

MS. DYAS: Thank you. Real quick, before we move on to the final technical areas, we need to -- we had one more comment on the land use that wanted to be revisited, I believe. Is she still here?

MR. KNIGHT: My name's Eric Knight. I'm Energy Commission Staff. Negar Vahidi, who is doing the land use assessment for staff, had a followup question on data request 24.

Which is a question related to what appeared to be a recorded restriction on the property. And the applicant explained that there's a mineral rights restriction.

And that they had done some research and found that the rights have existed for many years. And there's been no mineral extracted from the property. And they found no indication that any minerals exist to be extracted.

And that apparently there were some testings that were done and there were no

discoveries.

We were wondering what the source of that information was, if you could provide it to us.

MR. MORGAN: This is Rob Morgan with Carrizo Energy. The source of that information is the owner of the mineral rights. We have since purchased those mineral rights and have a quit claim. So, it's a nonissue.

MR. KNIGHT: Okay, thank you. That answers it, thank you.

MS. DYAS: As far as the other technical areas, the first one that we're going to hit on is noise. And our noise staff was not able to attend tonight, but the question that he had was regarding the data response to number 27 asking whether or not residents and nearby receptors would be at home during construction hours 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

And staff has requested that information or verification regarding ML-1 and ML-3.

MR. STORM: Yes, good evening. This is Mark Storm with URS. We did make efforts to contact residents at those locations. We were able to get comments I believe it was from ML-3.

We were told that there would be occupants, residents during the daytime.

MS. DYAS: Thank you. Tanya, do you have any questions on noise?

MS. GULESSERIAN: No, thank you.

MS. DYAS: Any agency comments regarding noise?

MR. HAYES: What about the school?

MR. STORM: Yes, we did. I believe our -- we did contact the school as part of responding to these data requests. We spoke to the principal of the school, Ms. Kimberly McGraff. Had a discussion with her regarding the school's construction, what levels were anticipated and shown in our report regarding what the exterior levels would be outside the school where children were playing and so forth.

MS. DYAS: Any other public comments on noise?

MS. BELL: Hi, Robin Bell. And I have a question. Basically my property -- well, there are a lot of homes that will be affected by this noise that aren't shown on this map.

For instance, during construction I'm about the same distance --

MS. HOLMES: Robin, can I interrupt you?

MS. BELL: Yes.

MS. HOLMES: Which map are you looking at so we can all be there?

MS. BELL: It is figure 5.12-1.

MS. HOLMES: Is that from the AFC?

MS. BELL: It's this one.

MS. HOLMES: From the AFC? Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

MS. BELL: And I'm just wondering what the criteria is to be a sensitive receiver. Because it seems to me that three years of construction noise would qualify many more people as a sensitive receiver.

And I don't know, will you guys be finding out how many residences there really are in the area? Or are you going to rely on this information?

MS. HOLMES: Well, I think now that you've raised the concern I think first of all we're going to ask right now, the applicant, how you identified the sensitive receptors that were included in the analysis in the AFC. And then we will also be discussing it with the noise staff and asking him or her, I don't know who the

assigned person is, to look more closely at the issue.

So, first, I would start just by asking the applicant where the information comes from, and how we can verify it or not, as the case may be.

MR. STORM: Our understanding was that sensitive receivers would include schools, obviously residents, daycare facilities, senior care facilities, you know, where noise would be considered -- I should say areas sensitive to noise.

The figure that Ms. Bell points out, I have it in front of me, we, through the course of our site survey and interaction with other resource groups, did prepare this report.

We identified these residences. We may not have captured all of them. But as you'll see in the same figure, there are -- our noise levels produced contours to show where certain decibel levels -- as the sound is propagating away from the site -- Angela, would you be able to show that?

MS. LIEBA: Sure.

MR. STORM: It might be easier for the

audience.

(Pause.)

MR. STORM: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, what you're seeing on the screen now is a figure that we prepared that shows a combination of a couple of things.

It actually identifies what we considered noise sensitive receivers, including residences, and the school is also on there, as well.

There's also, as I began to explain and now we have the figure in front of us, showing different colors which are associated with decibel level contours.

So if there was a residence or a noise sensitive receiver that we have not identified here, you could locate it on this figure and then see between which noise level contours it would fall.

And that would at, at this time, our estimate of the operational noise level.

MS. BELL: But if you are talking to residents to see if they're home or not during, you know, operation or construction hours, then you would think you would talk to these other

people, too.

And I'm just wondering if -- well, there's another issue. For instance Mike Strobridge has just started construction on a home. I have a home I'm just finishing construction on, but had planned to start another one last November, but it's on hold now with this thing.

So you have no -- and I'm heavily invested in that. And yo have no idea on our intention. And that would be the home -- his will be done by the time you're in construction, and ours should have been.

So, I'm wondering, considering the lack of information that you have on wells and residences, perhaps maybe all of these landowners in like a three-mile radius that would be affected, should be mailed a form or a questionnaire so that you can get the well information, the residences, when they're home, so you're dealing with the accurate information.

I mean I just did a quick count and there's over 28 houses within a three-mile radius of this.

So you'd have the info that way. Thank

you.

MS. DYAS: Were there any further questions on noise?

MR. COOPER: Ryan Cooper, Carrisa Plains. Can you explain what each level that -- within the dark blue line, what does it mean? If you're within the grey line, what does that mean?

MR. STORM: Sure, of course. I realize the detail is quite small. For example, there's what you see, I'll call it a teal or turquoise color, that's what our models predict as a 35 db contour.

As you can see, it's actually -- oh, excuse me, sorry about that.

(Parties speaking simultaneously.)

MR. STORM: This dark blue contour is -- now I've got to -- this dark blue contour is a 30 decibel level. As I said, this turquoise or light blue is 35. There's a green one here identified as 40. And going closer towards the power block of the plant, 45, 50. These are 5 db increments. Until obviously finally you're close to the power block, we're seeing contours of 60.

And so, like I say, for example, if you had a location between the dark blue and the light

blue, that means the expected operational noise level would be between 30 and 35.

MR. COOPER: Can you give an equivalent of that? Is that a car driving by? Is that a jet plane? Is that a --

MR. STORM: Sure.

MR. COOPER: -- rock concert. You know, they always say, whatever decibels a certain --

MR. STORM: A rock concert, that's -- a jet takeoff. Thirty, 35 would be -- one of the responses that I describe as an analogy is like a window fan, or a humidifier. Could even be like a fan noise.

Because, as I think we've identified in the report, it's the condensers, they have large fans. It's part of their design.

So, like I say, a window fan or a humidifier, you know, at some distance, five or ten feet. That's the nature or the character of the sound.

Now the level of the 30, 35 that's -- the analogy would be like a thermometer. You measure heat with degrees, temperature. Likewise you measure sound with this decibel scale.

So 30 to 35 is actually, relatively

speaking, quiet. You know, my voice now in this room, you know, 40 to 50 db. If I get into a microphone it's going to be a lot louder.

It really depends on the loudness. But, again, the nature the of the sound is going to be something similar to a fan, because it's going to be a continuous sort of sound.

Does that answer your question?

MR. COOPER: Yeah. And so just for a comment I know that there's a house that's actually underneath the white part right there, underneath the title box that has family members that are there during the daytime.

There's also house right here that also has family members that are there during the daytime I know weren't contacted at all, you know, about noise issues.

So those are two that I know because one is mine and one's my neighbor's.

(Laughter.)

MR. STORM: Sure, well, what I can tell you is that when we did our site surveys, (inaudible) which are in the report in the appendices, we were measuring current ambient levels. Okay, what's the existing environment.

Those ambient levels were in the 30s and 40s already.

And so what all this is showing is the predicted noise, operation noise from the plant. It's not showing what's already the existing noise. And that existing noise can change with wind speed. You know, wind over buildings, trees, et cetera.

You know, there's the birds and cars and so forth.

MS. HOLMES: Maybe it would be helpful if you explained to them, since it isn't, to me, as a non-noise person, it's not intuitive, what happens when you have a 35 db increase added to a 35 db background. You don't get 70, do you?

MR. STORM: That is correct, thank you. Yeah, the decibel scale is logarithmic, so that she's exactly right. If you add to like decibel levels together like 30 or 50 or 60, you only increase by three.

The rule of thumb is if I have two identical sources, -- sound, it's only a 3 db increase. Likewise, if I -- every halving is a minus 3 db. So, no, you don't get 30 plus 30 is 60. No. Far from it.

In fact, if I have two sources, one's 30 and one's 40, you'll barely hear the 30. Again, it's a logarithmic scale. In other words a 10 db difference is an order of magnitude. So that louder source actually has ten times the sound intensity. Does that help?

MS. HOLMES: Yeah, I'm just trying to help them understand what this project here would sound like, not in isolation, but relative to the background noise that they already know and are familiar with out there.

MR. STORM: Of course, your existing environment includes all kinds of sources, you know, wind noise, wildlife, car traffic, human activity, you know, things you do around your home, what your neighbors are doing. That's already part of, again, all the sources combined. That's called the ambient. And that's already there.

Again, what this figure is showing you is just from the projected plant operations. Our report also shows the combination of those two. And, in fact, we had it show that the increment caused by the plant would not exceed 5 db over existing levels. We were able to show that

compliance.

Does that help?

MS. HOLMES: Yeah, thanks. Noise is a really hard issue to have people understand.

MR. COOPER: I just wanted, because I haven't read everything like everybody else has. But I did read something that, you know, they contacted people and most people aren't home during the day. You know, and it's like, well, my wife is with my kids all day. And I know our neighbors are, and most of the neighbors that I know are home during the day. So just wanted to make sure that gets out there. Thanks.

MS. HOLMES: Thank you.

MS. BELL: Robin Bell, again. And I just wanted to ask for some clarification on the average sound. Because I was confused. If the average sound is 35 to 40, and it's from cars and birds and wind, but all that stuff varies.

And are you doing like -- is that what it sounds like all the time? Or is that just what the average sound, because maybe a bird's louder and a car is louder?

Because I'm wondering about the time like sometimes tractors run and sometimes they

don't. But this would run from 7:00 to 7:00, correct?

MR. STORM: That's correct.

MS. BELL: Okay. So how would that compare to -- when you said it's a very minimal increase, how would that compare to what you hear at a second, not an average? Does that make sense?

MR. STORM: It does make sense, yes. The plant will have, as I said, it has these large dry-cooled condensers, just with fans. And they are intended to be continuously operated.

So, like I said, it will sound like, you know, a window fan or a dehumidifier. And that's on all the time. But it's average -- sound energy level, or LEQ, as we call it, that's how it's described, will be at these predicted levels. But that has to be predicted.

The measurements we conducted in the site area, we also record those levels as LEQ. And this is what you're talking about. What's the average, the average sound energy. Which includes, you know, a bird chirp. That bird chirp could be 70 db according to what we measure. Or a tractor or a car passing. But those are momentary

events.

So the LEQ is averaging all of those. To demonstrate say within an hour, it's looking at the contribution of all those impulse or intermittent sounds, which would be quite loud, along with what might be relatively quiet background noise.

But, again, the LEQ is providing the energy average. As if you're going to, okay, I need this described with one level, what is that level.

MS. BELL: Except that yours is a constant, whereas a bird chirp or a car and those kinds of things are momentary, right? But so those extremes of quiet and then chirping or a car make the average. But yours is the average.

So, when you had a -- I know we're talking averages, but when you had a quiet moment, there would be a significant more increase than -- right?

MR. STORM: Well, again, the quiet moment, and I believe in my response I was addressing one of your questions. And one was, as I recall, there are levels in the 20s. And the level, those in the 20s might be one of these

quiet moments. But that will only maybe last, you know, a minute or two because there are other noises being made all the time.

Again, as our field notes in the report show that we were measuring, again, these LEQs, these average sound levels. As well as I can recall, I can quote from the report, is the 30s, or even in the 40s, which are higher than these --

MS. BELL: Right, but they're not constant, correct?

MR. SPEAKER: Mark, what's the L --

MS. HOLMES: L-90. What's the L-90?

MR. SPEAKER: And L-10 and L-90.

MR. STORM: Okay, well, let's clarify.

(Laughter.)

(Parties speaking simultaneously.)

MS. SPEAKER: These are important.

MS. HOLMES: Yeah, this is helpful. Go ahead.

MR. STORM: Well, people are saying, what's L-10, what's L-90. Okay. People say L and then a number. Okay, that number be, it's a statistical descriptor meaning -- somebody says, what's the L-10. That means the sound is going to exceed this level 10 percent of the time.

What that does, it's going to capture intermittent events, you know, a car goes by, let's say within a five-minute period. If only one car passes, or a number of car passes, so that it's a 80 db, it's only 10 percent of the time, then the L-10 would be 80.

L-90, on the other hand, it means 90 percent of the time this level, x, is going to be exceeded. So L-90 captures continuous sound sources like air conditioning, like machinery. And, yes, condenser fans.

MS. HOLMES: And there should be L-10 and L-90 information in the AFC. It's required as part of our data adequacy. But I don't have the AFC with me.

MR. STORM: That's correct.

MS. HOLMES: And that, I mean --

MS. BELL: So L-90 is what it sounds like most of the time, then?

MS. HOLMES: Yeah, that's the way -- that's a --

MR. STORM: -- it's meant to represent continuous sounds; whereas L-10 --

MS. HOLMES: Picks up the big stuff.

MS. BELL: Right.

MS. HOLMES: Right. So look at the L-90 levels and that will help you, I think.

MR. STORM: Right.

MS. HOLMES: And they should be in the AFC.

MS. BELL: Okay, thank you.

MR. STORM: Thanks, everyone. There will be a quiz next week.

(Laughter.)

MS. PETERSON: I'm Roberta Peterson and I have just a suggestion.

MS. HOLMES: People, we can't hear her.

MS. PETERSON: I have a suggestion. I missed the first part of the meeting about biological part, the animals and land and so forth.

And my suggestion is on the excess land, such as like the buffer zone, land that's not going to be used at all, if that can be turned into like a preserve type of thing for the native animals. Habitat friendly, perhaps add extra things that would attract them, tall poles for the eagles and extra rocks and native landscaping and so forth.

And possibly make part of friendly to

the public like walking trails, something that we would enjoy out here without disturbing the animals. Their nesting places, of course, would be off limits.

But anyway, I think that also aside from having to pay people to get this done, there are plenty of volunteers in the County that would help with that, also, that know what they're doing.

Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Thank you. Were there any other comments on noise before we move on?

Okay, let's move on to visual resources. Our staff was fine with the visual resource responses, and so they didn't have any additional questions.

Tanya, do you have anything?

MS. GULESSERIAN: No.

MS. DYAS: Are there any agencies that have comments on visual resources? Any public comments on visual resources?

MS. BELL: Just one quick comment on visual resources. And I sent some comments back on the responses that Ausra sent to me asking about how the landscaping would work.

Again, there's a lot more residences

than what is indicated. And, two, at the initial meeting where Ausra talked to people and said that they were open to landscaping, we hadn't seen the plan yet.

And when we did see the plan, I called Perry, as he'd given us his card, and said to call with any questions. And we didn't want trees up against our house because we want to look out over our livestock. And we also want somewhat of a view left.

And so, you know, he said we could do eucalyptus along our eastern border, about 190 of them. And whatever would make us happy.

So from the response I got, that's been reneged about now it's just the sensitive receivers, is what I understand. And I know there's other people here that were told they would get landscaping, too. And now it's just the sensitive receptors.

I think that's a really subjective way to do it, and who determines who's a sensitive receptor. And I think the County probably has a good idea to go and do the perimeter landscaping so everybody got the same treatment.

And that's my comment.

MS. DYAS: Thank you, Robin.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: John Ruskavitch. Part of this visual is also the thermal flare from the condenser units. In URS' report, they keep shrinking my airstrip, because I'm within the 20,000 feet of the project. By being under 3200 feet, they do not have to file a report with the Federal Aviation to get their opinion on this project.

Well, I'm 4200 paved, and I'm within the 20,000 feet, so I would like a Federal Aviation report about the plumes and the glare for airplane travel. And it's not just used once in a great while.

Thank you.

MS. HOLMES: Just for the record, FAA doesn't do plumes.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: No, no, it's in their report that by --

MS. HOLMES: If you asked for an FAA report on plumes, the FAA doesn't analyze plumes. They're working on developing a method for doing it, but they don't do it yet. It's been an issue in another case. The staff does it.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: So, by shrinking the

strip they are exempt. I'm saying I'm long and you're saying you're still exempt. Is that --

MR. KNIGHT: The FAA determination is a no-hazard, only address structure heights, the brick and mortars. Not thermal --

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Well, I'm just going by their report.

MS. HOLMES: Okay, well, now you know what the -- what FAA does and doesn't do.

MS. LIEBA: This is Angela Lieba for URS. I just wanted to clarify for our land use person who isn't available tonight due to a family emergency, the FAA requires that a notice of proposed construction or alteration affecting a navigable airspace be filed for any construction or alteration of greater height than an imaginary surface extending outward and upward at 100-to-1 for horizontal distance of 20,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway of each airport with at least one runway more than 32,00 feet in actual length, excluding heliports.

The applicant's project site is over four miles, or 21,120 feet from the nearest edge of the California Valley Airfield landing strip. And the laydown area is over three and a half

miles, or 18,480 feet from the nearest edge of the landing strip.

The tallest structures at the proposed site are the 150-foot transmission line poles, and the 115-foot air-cooled condensers.

The applicant's project is not within 20,000 feet of the airfield and does not exceed the height of the imaginary surface extending at a slope of 100-to-1 from the airstrip in question.

Therefore, it is not required to file FAA 7460 notice of proposed construction or alteration. That's from our land use expert.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: I'm going by your map where it shows that it's much further than your three miles. I'm going by your resource maps, not what I'm creating. I'm going off your maps.

MS. LIEBA: Again, this is based on an imaginary plain, not a flat, you know, looking at a map -- what's the correct term -- looking down on a plain. You're talking about an imaginary plain that comes from the airport strip. That's what the FAA looks at.

I hope that clarifies your question, John.

MS. HAYES: Hi, this is Kelly Hayes.

This is my third meeting I've been to and I'm just trying to clarify in my own mind, because it seems to be said differently and then shown differently on a map, of what area from the site, how far out in regards to water, visual, sound, or noise, how far out from your site is it?

Because one thing's being said two miles, and then on your map it only shows about a half a mile around. So I guess I'm just trying to figure -- clarify that.

Because, you know, one way I'm in those areas, and another where my house is -- another area, on maps I'm not. So I just want to know if you guys have a set. Is it a two-mile radius? Is it a three-mile radius? Is it a half-a-mile radius?

MS. LIEBA: Yeah, that's a good question. This is Angela Lieba again. For every resource area they have a different threshold for what's --

MS. HAYES: Okay.

MS. LIEBA: -- considered sensitive and what radius they look at.

MS. HAYES: Right.

MS. LIEBA: That's why I brought all

these experts here today, because for every single resource area they look at different thresholds.

The Energy Commission sets standards and thresholds that we need to abide by. So, as applicants, consultant for the applicant, we make sure that we're abiding by the standards not only of the Energy Commission, but of CEQA and the local laws and ordinances that have been put in place for every single resource area.

So for different resource areas noise, visual, they all look at different expanses of radii to determine whether or not receptors are sensitive receptors for each of those different resource areas are determined.

MS. HAYES: Okay.

MS. LIEBA: So, again, they are differing for every single resource area.

MS. HAYES: Okay, and I understand that, but seems like we only get to see one map for everything from you guys, there's just one general area. But you're telling me that every single thing has a different one. But I only see one map.

So, say for noise, for instance, how far is the distance?

MS. LIEBA: Maybe I can let Mark answer that one. But, actually in the AFC there are resource maps for every single technical resource area. And most resource areas, including visual for Amy's section, there's, you know, probably half a dozen different visuals including maps for those particular resource areas.

The Energy Commission again has certain standards that they make us maintain. For instance, you know, there has to be 10-mile distance, including at a certain scale, all those map requirements for each resource area are included in the AFC.

We have this here today. We can pull them out for resource area if you'd be interested.

MS. HAYES: Yeah, I would. I'm just trying, I mean I just want to, you know, is it two miles, three miles -- for noise, water and visual. That's my three concerns, noise, water and visual. I just want to know what the distance is, you know, from the site area. Noise, water and visual. I mean it would take you like two seconds --

MS. LIEBA: Yeah, actually --

MS. HAYES: -- to tell me two, three,

four miles, whatever.

MS. LIEBA: -- Mark, do you want to talk to noise?

MS. HAYES: Just give me a number. Don't talk to me about mumbo-jumbo and do all this, you know, talking because it loses me. I'm not very educated, okay. I only went to two-year college. So I just need a two or three number, whatever.

MR. STORM: This is Mark Storm, URS. The CEC has set a certain threshold, so as I showed earlier on the contour map, sound is propagating away from the plant.

So if -- we have to comply with -- I believe, I want to say it's 50 dba during the day --

MS. HAYES: Okay, you're killing me here, Mark. I have no idea what you're talking about. Just give me --

(Parties speaking simultaneously.)

(Laughter.)

MS. HOLMES: Can I try?

MS. HAYES: Okay.

MS. HOLMES: Okay, there are --

MS. HAYES. Sure, just give me something

in English --

MS. HOLMES: There's two things that we look at. One is the County is going to set the absolute level. I think he's right, something called 50 for this particular area.

And so at an absolute minimum the project has to comply with that.

And then the Energy Commission has also set an additional threshold or a different set of requirements that says we don't want any residence, church, daycare facility, what we're calling sensitive receptors, to experience an increase greater than 10 db between 5:00 and 10:00, it's a grey area that depends on the specific circumstances.

So we look at what the County says is required for the zoning, for the land use. And then we look at the amount of increase at people's houses, schools, places like that.

If it's between 5 and 10 we do a much more detailed and thorough analysis of how many people would be affected for how long.

If it's over 10 we say, sorry, you can't build it. If it's under 5 we say it's fine. Does that help?

MS. HAYES: No.

MS. HOLMES: Sorry.

MS. HAYES: That's okay. Let me just tell you this. I live approximately one to one and a half miles from this site. Okay. Am I going to be affected by noise? Yes, I am going to be affected by noise.

Am I home every day? Yes, I'm home from the hours of 7:00 till 7:00. I'm going to hear construction trucks going beep, beep, beep, you know, back and forth. I'm going to hear a fan blowing. It's very quiet out here. So you're going to hear fans.

Visually I'm going to sit on my deck and I'm going to look at solar panels. You cannot tell me that I'm not going to, even though I'm a mile and a half from it.

Waterwise, I don't know, nobody knows what the effect of water is going to be. But I want to know if I'm in that zone of do I need to be concerned, you know.

MS. HOLMES: Okay. Well, I think that they're looking at the map right now for visual so you can see where your property is on that map.

For water we need to wait until we have

the --

(Parties speaking simultaneously.)

MS. HOLMES: Pardon?

MS. HAYES: My opinion is, you know, nobody can know about water. You know, nobody knows if we're going to run out of water or not. So, you know.

MR. STORM: Can you just point where you live --

MS. HAYES: I'm not on this map.

MR. STORM: Are you off to the side?

MS. HAYES: Yes, I'm off to this side, over here.

MR. STORM: So this is a 30 decibel sound wave. The background noise is approximately what, 30 decibels.

MS. SPEAKER: It's higher.

MR. STORM: Yeah, so the background noise you hear the average noise -- things like that, it's actually higher than the plant noise you'll hear.

MS. HAYES: Okay. I'm going to invite you guys all over to dinner.

(Laughter.)

(Parties speaking simultaneously.)

MS. HAYES: You can sit on my deck and look at solar panels.

MS. GRAMLICH: This is Amy Gramlich; I'm the visual person for this project at URS. And just to kind of clarify it, what our radius is for visual, we look at three different distances, foreground, midground and distance views.

MS. HAYES: Okay.

MS. GRAMLICH: Foreground is everything at .5 miles and below.

MS. HAYES: Okay.

MS. GRAMLICH: Midground is .51 miles to almost 5 miles. And then distant views are 5 miles and beyond.

So our largest radius is about 5 miles that we look at.

MS. HAYES: Okay.

MS. GRAMLICH: And we run a viewshed model to kind of determine who can see it from the furthest distance.

MS. HAYES: And for the record, I'm neither pro nor con for you guys. But I'm just trying to bring up some point. But I would invite you guys to come and look; you know, come to our houses, come to my house, see what I'm talking

about, you know. See where my neighbors next to me, what we actually are going to have to look at, you know, sitting on a deck, or sitting, you know, enjoying our houses outside.

You know, listen to the quiet. I mean sit out in our, you know, in our community and listen to what, you know, how it is peaceful out here. And how, you know, running fans are going t make a difference no matter what your guys' statistic say or whatever. It is going to change, you know, the sounds out here.

And it going to visually change, you know, what we look at. So I invite you to come and talk to us. I mean nobody's ever written me a letter asking me if I'm home, you know, or finding out, you know, if anybody's -- none of my neighbors I know have ever to receive letters, you know, asking our opinions of, you know, whether we're home, or you know, if it's going to affect us.

So, thank you.

MR. COOPER: Ryan Cooper, Carrisa Plains. I just had two questions. One doesn't really pertain to visual, but I've had a few people tell me that a modular home is not

considered a residence. Is that true or not?

MS. HOLMES: No, for purposes of our analysis a residence is a residence.

MR. COOPER: Okay, okay.

MS. HOLMES: Doesn't matter if it's a modular --

MR. COOPER: That's good, okay.

MS. HOLMES: -- home or not.

MR. COOPER: Okay. Somebody told me that if it's a modular home it is not considered a residence.

MS. LIEBA: This is Angela Lieba. Yeah, that's absolutely not true.

MR. COOPER: Okay, thank you very much.

Second, on the visual, I know, you know, a lot of people were talking about, you know, the big towers and all this stuff. But on a more basic, is there somebody looking at, you know, color schemes on the buildings, tanks, you know, stuff like that that's going to be seen from a distance, to be able to mitigate the visual impacts, especially like you're talking about, from those more distant areas?

MS. GRAMLICH: Yes, actually for a part of the design we usually -- again, this is Amy

Gramlich -- usually we have the coloring of the buildings and all the structures proposed on the project site to match the -- or to be very similar to the natural colors in the environment.

So it's not like we're putting a big red building in the middle of a nice green or, you know, tan-colored field.

MR. COOPER: Yeah. It may be -- I'll be around after, maybe we can talk. But I got some ideas that I kind of -- so, I'll talk to you later about that.

(Laughter.)

MR. STROBRIDGE: My name is Mike Strobridge, and I've got a question about the noise on my property. I'm building a house right now and it would be best if you had your little map up there, I think.

MS. LIEBA: The noise map?

MR. STROBRIDGE: Yeah.

MR. STORM: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question, Mr. Strobridge?

MS. LIEBA: He just wants to look at --

MR. STROBRIDGE: I just have a question about the noise. I'll show you the proximity of my house.

MR. STORM: Oh.

(Pause.)

MR. STROBRIDGE: So, see that dot, that's my shop. My house dot right there.

MR. SPEAKER: That's on the -- ranch. You're up on --

MR. STROBRIDGE: No, this is me. This is my shop. This is my house, my house being built right now. Before your plant is even okayed.

Your condensers are on the far end of your building directly in line with my house. I'm the closest resident to your condensers. How loud is that going to be to my house? Does it sound like a jet going through my property constantly?

MR. STORM: No. It's a good question. You can see from the contours that the location you identified, it would be beyond the 45 db contour. In other words, it's actually between the 45 and the 40 db contour.

As a jet, as you're saying, I mean I've been to the San Diego Airport. I measured 100 db standing 300 feet from a jet engine. That's not what we're seeing here in this figure.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Well, when I go

outside, to give you an example of noise, I can go outside of my house right here on say a Saturday morning, and this guy up in here, I can hear his radio in his house, okay, like it's in my front yard. What's the decibel rating of a normal radio at normal noise listening to it.

That's how far sound travels from there to there. How far is that? All right, I can see guys that come over here shooting squirrels out of their truck, and I can hear them load their shotgun from my front porch. That's pretty minimal noise, if you ask me. And that's carrying a hell of a far distance. A whole lot less than --

MR. STORM: Yeah, we're just looking for a -- I mentioned earlier one of my comments about like a sound thermometer. You see table 5.12-1 from the AFC. I show a variety of decibel numbers going from zero db, which is -- zero db represents the lowest that a healthy human child can hear. Up to, as you were saying, Mr. Strobridge, a commercial jet at takeoff, which is 120 db. That's your range.

And there's a number of examples. For example, in this table I'm showing 40 db would

be -- I'm sorry --

MR. STROBRIDGE: I realize how loud it is. I'm telling you look, for example, I'm sure you guys don't go driving around shooting squirrels, but loading shotguns like this, -- noise, loading your shells in your shotgun. I can hear that from all the way over, probably two miles.

So, (inaudible).

MR. STORM: It will depend on the distance. If I had a sound meter it would depend on the distance from that source.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Also, I have another question.

MS. BELL: No, he's saying he can hear that at a mile, that --

MR. STROBRIDGE: That's more than a mile, two miles (inaudible) --

MR. SPEAKER: Go back over to the microphone as fast as you can, please. I just want to make sure to get all your comments on the record.

MR. STROBRIDGE: It's roughly two miles. I'm giving you an example. It's very quiet out here. Your plant, 40 db might sound reasonable to

you, but to me that's absurd. I'm right by your condensers. What's the legal setback from a residence to your condensers? Is it legal for you to put them right up on somebody's house? Is it a mile, two miles, 100 yards? What's the legal setback from a residence to your condensers?

MR. STORM: Well, in terms of noise it's --

MR. STROBRIDGE: I'm not asking about noise. I'm asking about setback distance. What's the legal distance from a house to your condensers?

MS. LUCKHARDT: That's more of a land use question.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Well, land use or not, I'm just curious.

MS. LUCKHARDT: And it, you know, the project will meet whatever setback requirements there are, so it's not a matter of it being too far. But as far as --

MR. STROBRIDGE: I'm just curious how far it is. Do you know?

MS. LUCKHARDT: Off the top of my head I don't. Do you know --

MS. LIEBA: Our land use guy is not here

unfortunately.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Let's see if we can find the setback.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Well, where'd he go?

MS. LIEBA: He had a death in his family.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Oh, okay.

MS. LIEBA: I apologize for him not being here.

MS. LUCKHARDT: We're going to see if we can't find the setbacks.

MR. STORM: Sure. There's a number of -- as I was starting to say, the sample levels going from zero on up to 120. And the first column indicates noise sources, sample noise sources.

For example, 50 db light traffic 100 feet. Forty would be distant bird calls. Thirty db a soft whisper at, I think it's five feet. And then on upwards. Those are sample noise sources.

The third column from the left I describe as a noise environment. Again, really just more examples. So you can get a 50 at -- the sample source being light traffic at 100 feet. A typical noise environment at that level would be

low limit of daytime urban ambient sound.

And then the right-most column I described as human judgment. With respect to anything like a reference level.

I think what you're trying to address is, you know, what is that shotgun shell loading. You know, where would that be in this scale.

MR. STROBRIDGE: That's also going to be a constant, so it's going to be a constant dull mmmmmm, correct? I mean you're going to have constant noise. I mean would you put something in your house that went ahhhhhh all day long? Hell, no. You'd throw that thing out the window.

MR. STORM: Yeah, as I did with my air conditioner a year ago, yeah.

MR. STROBRIDGE: You know, you're talking about making that dull constant noise that is very annoying to the average person in like a five-mile-square radius. That's kind of a lack of respect for the people that live around this area.

MR. STORM: Well, let --

MS. DYAS: Let's not get into arguments. I mean answer the question, but it sounds like it's just turning into an argument. So, state the exact question, and then see if you can answer it.

MR. STORM: I mean I don't want to argue a point. I just wanted to clarify that, yes, every sound has a source level. And as you get further away, more distant from that source, the level decreases.

And that's one thing we are trying to depict with our contours in our figure. That, yes, if you're standing right next to those condenser fans, wow, that's going to be really loud.

But if I'm a mile away, two miles away, the sound level you would expect to be much much less.

MR. STROBRIDGE: I'm 2800 feet away. I measured it yesterday, 2800 feet.

MR. STORM: Yes, and as we discussed earlier, --

MR. STROBRIDGE: That's roughly like what, half a mile?

MR. STORM: Well, I'm looking right at the location identified. At the --

MR. STROBRIDGE: So how loud would that be at a half a mile? Directly in line with the condensers.

MR. STORM: I understand the direction

and so forth. I can't give you a precise value. But I can tell you, based on the figure, that the level will be between 45 and 40 db. That's what we predicted.

That's correct, yes. My colleague reminded me that that's just from the plant. It does not include what may already be ambient levels. And our site survey showed that ambient levels are already in that neighborhood in terms of the decibel scale.

MR. STROBRIDGE: I'll tell you what, you're more than welcome to come out to my house on a Saturday morning and listen to the ambient levels. And I guarantee you it's not that. It's dead silent.

MR. STORM: I won't --

MR. STROBRIDGE: I mean has Ausra ---

MR. STORM: I won't disagree that there would be quiet moments --

MR. STROBRIDGE: -- or URS -- has any of you guys come out here on --

MR. STORM: Yes, yes, we -- yes. When we conducted measurements.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Okay, well, I spend all my time here.

MR. STORM: As a matter of fact, we conducted both short-term measurements, and I say short-term, a duration of 15 to 20 minutes.

And we also conducted long-term, what we call long-term monitoring, for example at the school. Obviously the school being a noise sensitive receiver.

We had a monitor there for a 25-hour period as required by the CEC. So that we captured, you know, not only the levels, you know, to see how the levels changes throughout the day and night.

MS. LUCKHARDT: Well, it's not in the document, but we'll pull this back information and get it out to everybody.

MR. STROBRIDGE: And you'll be able to give me an answer on legal setback?

MS. LUCKHARDT: Yeah. We will.

MR. STROBRIDGE: All right. And I have one more thing. It'll be quick. And you guys probably want to go home.

Now, the variance, or modification to the height requirements on these condensers, they're 115 feet high. The legal height is what, 35 feet in an ag area, 35, 40 feet? It's roughly

in there.

Anyways, so --

MS. LIEBA: This is Angela Lieba again. It's actually, the restriction, and John from the County can help me clarify this for my land use person who's not here, but the legal requirement is 35 feet for a habitable structure. So that's the County ordinance.

MR. STROBRIDGE: So what is it for an -- I know that we can't build a 115 foot barn out here.

MS. LIEBA: Well, if the barn is considered a habitable structure then you're required to abide by the County ordinance of the 335-foot height restriction.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Okay, so what is the height on it? So you can build something 500 feet high in an ag zone, or --

MS. LIEBA: No, --

MR. STROBRIDGE: What is the height requirement in an ag zone, in our ag zone?

MS. LIEBA: Clearly the -- well, specifically the question related from the CEC was asking about the administration building. That's a 40-foot-tall structure that we have proposed as

part of our --

MR. STROBRIDGE: I'm not asking what's the height. You know, you have to get some kind of modification to put it up 115 feet, correct?

MS. LIEBA: No. What the CEC is asking for is clarification with the County for the administration building, which is considered a habitable structure. The administration building is currently proposed at 40 feet.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Where's the County guy? Are you the County guy? What is the height requirement on a nonhabitable ag structure?

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Thirty-five feet.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Thirty-five feet. I'm just curious, you know.

MR. McKENZIE: John McKenzie. There's within the height measurements or height ordinance requirements, there's an exception provision that speaks to public facilities -- I'm sorry, not public facilities, but to utility, public utilities. Which would be an exception to that 35-foot height limit. So, --

MR. STROBRIDGE: Now there's a --

MR. McKENZIE: -- you can allow --

MR. STROBRIDGE: -- you have, there's

two things that go along with that modification, things are allowed to go that high?

MR. McKENZIE: There's no modification requirement. It's an exception which allows for structures to be taller than 35 feet if they fit under certain exceptions, which this, all the structures that are nonhabitable would fit under this exception. It's in the ordinance.

MR. STROBRIDGE: So if they decide to put up a 250-foot tall building, that's okay with the County?

MR. McKENZIE: There are certain findings that need to be made to do that. One is --

MR. STROBRIDGE: Well, I'm just curious because it's okay at 115 feet, why would 250 matter? I mean, what if they're going to like add onto it in a year, you know. Those condensers aren't big enough, hell, we're going to expand the plant to seven more sections. We're going to jump the size of those condensers up 250-foot-tall buildings. Maybe add a couple more online. What's to stop them from doing that?

MS. HOLMES: The Energy Commission.

(Laughter.)

MS. HOLMES: Can't do it without permits, without permission from us.

MR. STROBRIDGE: All right. People can do a lot of things with a lot of money.

Those are all the questions I have. But I would like the legal setback from the condensers to my house. Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Thank you, Mike. Did anybody else have any comments on the visual?

Okay, we'll quickly move on to the last two. Socioeconomics.

MS. PHINNEY: This is Suzanne Phinney and I'm representing staff who are working on the socioeconomic section. And I have a couple of questions.

In the AFC it's identified that total construction costs would be at $500 million. And that the project would provide approximately 170 million in construction payroll. And also that they anticipated wages and salaries would be roughly 55 million.

So I'm just trying to get some clarification on what's covered under those different costs, and particularly what is included in the 170 million payroll. That, you know, is

over and above the 55 million in salary and wages.

And part of that is also to get at what would be paid to the local area from that construction payroll.

MS. LIEBA: This is Angela Lieba. Can you just clarify what data request you're looking at so we can make sure --

MS. PHINNEY: Actually, this is new. So, we could wait for a second round but we thought maybe we'd just get them out now.

MS. LUCKHARDT: And you're looking at numbers that are in the application?

MS. PHINNEY: Yes. And I can give you page numbers, for example.

MS. LIEBA: Thank you, that would be helpful.

MS. PHINNEY: It's page 5.10-7, identifies the 170 million. And 5.10-14 identifies the 55 million. And I'd have to go back to figure out what page, but it's about the, I think it might be --

MR. MORGAN: Let me just look at that real quick. On the second question I don't think that we have any kind of forecast on how much of those wages will go local versus, you know, to the

east or to the west, as far as where the labor forces come from at this point. So I can't answer the second part of the question at this stage.

Can you repeat the reference to the 55 million figure? I'm not sure what that stands for.

MS. PHINNEY: Yeah, it was on page 5.10-14. It states that the anticipated construction costs to be paid out as wages and salaries, including benefits, is roughly 55 million.

And, you know, if you want to get back with a response, that's --

MR. MORGAN: I think I would like to go back and clarify, because those numbers look like they might be inconsistent.

MS. LIEBA: And, again, this is Angela Lieba. Our socioeconomic expert who's also our land use expert is, as I mentioned, not available today due to a family emergency. So he would likely have these answers off the top of his head, but we're trying to get this for you.

MS. PHINNEY: And then also on page 10-14 the AFC indicates that local products would be acquired as available. And that there would be potentially local sales tax revenue.

And to the extent that you can provide more specifics, including what that tax -- you know, possible tax revenues might be, that would be helpful. And it sounded like you might be in your new manufacturing plan, might be considering what materials are coming locally and what would be imported. So you might have more information.

And to the extent that you do have that, that would be helpful in our analysis.

MR. MORGAN: This is Rob Morgan, again. I think as was mentioned earlier there is an intent to obviously buy local to minimize freight costs, to the extent that the product is priced competitively.

A detailed supply chain is not going to be done until we are much closer to the project financing, which doesn't happen this date. We're about a year away from starting construction if this gets approved. So I'm not sure how much detail we'll be able to provide about the actual suppliers at this stage.

MS. PHINNEY: If you had any percentage of your anticipated total outlay, --

MR. MORGAN: Right.

MS. PHINNEY: -- you know, that would be

helpful just in itself.

MR. MORGAN: Okay, we'll take a look at it.

MS. PHINNEY: Or a range, or, you know, something rather than -- as much as possible, you know.

And then my third question is that, and I apologize I don't have the -- oh, it's on page 10-16, that you identify that there would be a property tax exemption for the plant.

But then you also go on to say that the property tax exemption is limited to plants installed on or before December 31, 2009. And this plant would be constructed after that date.

And so, although there has been one extension already of that, from 2005, as your document said, to 2009, you can't automatically assume that.

So, would you provide information on what property tax revenues would come from this plant if that exemption did not apply to your facility?

MR. MORGAN: We can do that.

MS. PHINNEY: Let me see if there was anything else.

And then also if you could, when you make that estimation, if you can identify how those revenues would be distributed. I think that goes -- it would be to the Board of Equalization and it goes to what they call the local tax rate area, which it would be useful for you to define for us.

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, we'll have that tracking done.

MS. PHINNEY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Tanya, do you have any comments or questions? Any agencies have comments or questions?

MR. SPEAKER: Who did you say?

MS. DYAS: The agencies, any agencies have comments or questions.

Any public comments or questions on socioeconomics?

Okay, we'll move on to the final topic which is waste management.

MS. PHINNEY: Thank you. We did have some data requests on waste management. And specifically requests 76 through 79 dealt with the question of whether the structures, any structures, the structures on the property would

be demolished. What entity would be responsible. Whether it would be part of the project, and the quantity of materials that would be disposed from that demolition.

And your responses indicated that the structures located on section 27 and 33 would be demolished. But prior to change of ownership, and therefore you did not consider that to be part of the project.

The Energy Commission would consider that demolition to be part of the project because the demolition would be required in order for your project to be built. And that demolition would not occur save for the project.

So we would be looking for quantities of materials from you that would result from that demolition.

MS. LIEBA: We will provide that.

MS. PHINNEY: Thank you. I guess we would also want clarification of who would be responsible for that demolition. And, in the past projects we have identified conditions associated with demolition of structures to insure that they are done according to the requirements of the County or the Air District.

MR. MORGAN: I think we answered that the responsibility is a contract issue between us and the landowner. But obviously anything that's done has to be done in accordance with acceptable local permits.

MS. DYAS: Tanya, do you have any comments?

MS. GULESSERIAN: No, thank you.

MS. DYAS: Any agency comments on waste management? Any public comments on waste management?

MS. HAYES: Hi, Kelly Hayes. Just, I don't know, we don't -- in Carrisa Plains we have no trash, waste management services. I was wondering if you guys, what you guys were planning on doing for just local trash pickup. If you were going to get a dumpster or -- because I'd like to be on your list of maybe the trash man could come by my house.

(Laughter.)

MS. HAYES: I really hate going to the dump.

No, really, seriously, if you guys have, you know, MidState or whoever will come out here and pick up your trash, if you guys could maybe

set us up. You know, I'm not asking you to pay for my trash service, but, you know, maybe they would pick up locally, too. I don't know if you guys have thought about that or considered that.

MR. PATCH: This is Joe Patch. Not in terms of exactly how that'll be handled other than, you know, what would be common waste and trash would be hauled to acceptable locations. I don't know that those have been specifically identified yet. Construction trash and whatnot would be taken to, you know, local landfills and disposed of as ability is provided.

But, at this point I don't think there's been anybody identified or exactly how that service would work. Or you could spin it off to say there were local residents that wanted to take advantage of it, then it could be included. I don't guess we've decided yet.

MS. HAYES: Yeah, if you would just keep us locally in mind when, you know, that time comes. Just not even in regards to your construction. I realize that's going to be a big load. But once -- you know, once the plant is here, just your local, or you know, your everyday waste that needs to be picked up,, definitely

would appreciate it.

MR. PATCH: (inaudible).

MR. RUSKAVITCH: John Ruskavitch, again. As far as the movement of hazardous material once the plant gets started, I've been confused with Tracy Road, turning directions. Right now it goes north/south. Then on some of your maps it goes east/west.

So the rumor that has been kind of going around out here is that you're planning on putting Tracy Road through to Soda Lake Road, then drop south to highway 58. In other words, that's part of the reason why you're looking at buying three sections of the Beck Ranch plus the old PG&E section. And that's in the County Courthouse at the Assessor's Office that you've made bids on that property.

So, I was just -- would like to find out. Are you planning on putting Tracy Road through? Or is that false information about buying seven and a half sections of land out here, not just one and a half sections?

MR. MORGAN: We have an option on six and a half sections roughly of land out here. Putting Tracy Road through to some other road is

not part of our plans. Obviously we plan on improving Tracy Lane for the section that borders our sites, obviously make it better for transportation, better for our trucking and better for what goes beyond us.

That's all we have as --

MR. RUSKAVITCH: Why do you have so much land then if you just keep saying 640-acre project plus the laydown site. And once you're built then you're going to put the laydown site back to how it is today. Why are you looking at so much other additional land?

MR. MORGAN: Experience in power plant development suggests that it's prudent to have more land than you need for a number of reasons. I even heard earlier today discussion around mitigation for kit fox habitat and other things. So, it's also a bit of a buffer zone for our project site for certain aspects.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: And by you owning all this additional land, is that also going to be tax exempt? Because none of this land is in the williamson Act. That's the only reason why you folks are looking at it.

So, the tax value is quite high. So if

you buy it and there's another seven and a half sections of land out of the tax roll for this County. It's more of a loss. If you're not paying your way then there's no maintenance from these vehicles. You're not paying your way, you're not paying the fire department.

I donated the land for that new fire department so it could be built out here. That's what local people do out here, they help each other.

Well, if everything's exempt, you're not contributing to us out here.

MR. MORGAN: I'm not sure what information you have that suggests the land is exempt from property taxes.

MS. LUCKHARDT: The only exemption applies to actual development on property that are completed by certain timeframe. Other sections that aren't developed within the timeframe, according to the way the current laws are written, would not be exempt.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: So then you'd pay on the new value of the land?

MS. LUCKHARDT: Yeah.

MR. RUSKAVITCH: And then what would

happen to that land that you're purchasing?

MR. MORGAN: We don't have any current plans for that land.

MR. HAYES: My name's Gordon Hayes. This lady right here, she kind of hit the nail on the head. She wonders why we don't like these people. We don't even know these people.

I'm not criticizing, but this gentleman here has always got a smile on his face and everything. Every time one of us come up here, is why is that jackass coming back up here again.

(Laughter.)

MR. HAYES: But wait a second. You people don't even live here. Nobody lives here. You are impacting our lives. If we don't say it now we're not going to get a shot at it.

So that's why we're frustrated. When we watch the television or look at the newspaper, this is a done deal. And that's just where all the frustration comes from.

And so I hope that you understand why we're so frustrated. You're impacting our lives. This project is going to devalue my property. And so why wouldn't I want to fight for it. You people don't even live here.

So, we're fighting for what's ours.

MR. MORGAN: I can understand some of the frustration. Ausra is going to be in this community going forward if this project is approved. From our perspective, it's not a done deal. There's a long process to go through that the Energy Commission manages, and it's not simple, and it's not a done deal.

But once it's a done deal, if it happens, then Ausra is part of the community for a long time. So, I can appreciate your frustration, but it's not our intent to come in here and turn around and leave and abandon the project, or leave something here that's not a part of the community.

MR. HAYES: Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Are there any further questions on waste management? Any general questions?

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mary. If I may I want to ratchet back, if I could, to visual. Because I did talk with the URS Staff about this. I think it's, from what I'm hearing, one of the most significant impacts.

You spoke this evening about the actual visual impacts of the facility, itself. And I

think there are just as serious concerns about the impact of the lighting of the facility on the night sky primarily.

And I would like specific information on how that will be measured; what the lighting of the facility will be, the types of lights and the lumens and the estimated distance from the facility that the light will actually impact the terrestrial area, as well as the night sky.

I think if you could provide that information that would be helpful.

Also, I don't know what your plans are for summing up, but there aren't as many people here as there were earlier. And unfortunately they'll miss that. But if you could just briefly run through the process so people have an understanding of what's left to be done, when that will be done, when they will have the information that wasn't provided tonight, and some dates attached to that, or approximate timelines, I think that would be helpful to know.

And I just want to say I appreciate the opportunity that you've given the community to give input. And that you continue that through the process. And I want to thank the local folks

that have come out and expressed their concerns.

This process is to allow the applicant and the CEC to know what the concerns and the issues are so they can appropriately address them, and I appreciate that opportunity.

I know it's a long way to come, but, you know, we need to do this. So, thank you.

MR. KNIGHT: I'd like to address your comment about the lighting. I used to do visual resources, I don't any longer. But, the Commission has pretty stringent requirements for lighting.

We require all lights to be pointed downward, be hooded so there is no light directed up to the sky. That's a big concern for us. We require it to be directed towards the area that's going to be illuminated.

Typically what's required is a lighting plan. That's typically required post-certification. And we have these performance criteria that they're expected to meet. But all the details about the lighting plan get submitted post-certification.

So, I'm wondering if the applicant would be willing to provide some of that information

now, earlier so the community has an opportunity to see it and comment on it.

MS. LIEBA: This is Angela Lieba. Yeah, I think obviously the community has shown that this lighting plan is something that they would want to see, you know, sooner rather than later.

So, we can certainly work with Patch engineers and the Ausra engineers to make that available as soon as we can.

MR. KNIGHT: Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Go ahead, Robin.

MS. BELL: Hi, Robin Bell, again. And I had asked the question about property values. Because all of us that live very close and have property very close are really concerned about that.

For me, this totally deflates my property value. Personally I don't want to live here. I've lived next to a freeway. I don't want to hear this.

Anyway, one of the responses I got was that, in fact, this could raise our property value because of economic stimulus. And I'd like to know a little bit more about that because I just don't see where that economic stimulus would come

from. I think the report said six to 12 people might relocate here. If people, or everybody's on a bus they're not going to go into any stores or restaurants, if we had any.

Anyway, I'd like to see more information on that because I think a lot of us are really concerned about that.

Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Thank you, Robin.

MR. YOUNG: Is this (inaudible) public comment period? Is that where we're at?

MS. DYAS: Yeah, the public comment, yes.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Fred Young, local resident. And I addressed my question to the people from Ausra here, but I think this is the proper time if I want to address the Commission. Okay. so we'll forget these guys and just let me talk to you for a minute.

You know I'm getting serious here because I got notes.

(Laughter.)

MR. YOUNG: Let's talk about what's possible here, the technology that's around today. If this was a military operation, lets suppose --

can I talk hypotheticals here?

If it was, they could build that thing so that nobody even knew it was here. They could do it. Now, I don't know if you people will require them to do it.

I've worked in a power plant. It was in a crowded area. They may have had different requirements there. It was loud as hell inside of that. But you couldn't tell those generators were running outside of the building. I know it's possible.

When you consider the requirements for this project, you have to consider what we're used to out here, and what's going to impact, you know, like this guy said, we can hear things for miles out here. It's very very quiet. A single car goes by on that road out there, I'm three miles away, I can hear it.

So, that's what's possible. Noise, if you want to, you can require them to make that thing so quiet we won't even hear it. We'd like you to do that.

Visual, you can require that building, nobody will even know it's there, who's passing by. They can landscape it; they can put up berms;

they could even sink the darn thing under the ground. You know, if this was a military operation I guarantee you nobody would know it was there.

All right, you know, and the mice, you know. With all this back to the Sierra Club lady, you know, those mice are going to be there a hell of a long time after these people are gone.

(Laughter.)

MR. YOUNG: They can't get rid of them if they tried. I have. So I'm not going to worry about that. You know, they may provide a better environment for the animals that are there.

But there's one issue that's really, you know, we can live with some inconveniences and construction disruptions and such, but the water, the water is an issue that's, you know, this is a failsafe thing.

If there are mistakes, if the water goes bad, if the wells go dry, that's a catastrophic situation. You know, we can't say, oh, well, we'll get it back up and running within a year. That doesn't work.

So, hypothetically, again, I'd like to know, and I think everybody here would like to

know, let's just suppose hypothetically that they get up and running and bad things start to happen. Because we're a very borderline community here and everybody knows we've had drought conditions and they may continue, they may get worse.

In a hypothetical scenario where the wells start to go dry, or the water quality starts to diminish, and we already have some bad water around here, what happens. Are you going to then shut this place down if that happens? Or are we all out of a place to live?

I think, you know, we're looking at it that seriously. This could kill this little town if that water, you know, which they say don't worry about, it's only a garden hose, but, you know, people I talk to don't look at it as an insignificant issue.

If the water goes bad, I figure it kills this little town. So, what happens? That's my hypothetical question. If that happens and the water starts to be an issue, and it's affecting lifestyles here to the point where people can't live here anymore, I'd like to know what happens.

(Applause.)

MS. HOLMES: Do you want an answer to

that question?

MR. YOUNG: If you can.

MS. HOLMES: If there's a situation that arises that was unanticipated, for example we looked at the analysis that they did on water and we said, looks good to us, we really don't think there's going to be a problem.

And the project is licensed and we know how much water it's using because we'll be requiring them to meter their water use. And it turns out that problems develop in other people's wells. And we have to become aware of it and you will -- anybody who lives here who wants to, assuming this project is certified, will have access to the people at the Energy Commission that handle compliance with conditions.

So, you contact them and you tell them. And at that point the Commission Staff takes a look at it. And they maybe do more detailed work on the water situation. For example, maybe they conduct very detailed groundwater modeling to try to figure out exactly what's going on down there.

And if the project -- you're asking if the project were to be determined to be causing loss of water in the well, or increased lift or

something like that, that's not happened in the past. And so I can't tell you that I know exactly what would happen in the future. But the Commission has always taken interference with water, people's personal water supply, extremely seriously. They've always been very conservative about it before there are conditions associated with other projects that say if there's an increase in drawdown of more than five feet, it has to be mitigated or the project can't operate.

So, I would expect that something along those lines would occur.

Do you want to add to that, or not?

MR. LINDLEY: Sure.

MS. HOLMES: The types of impacts that affect people's water supply are amongst the most serious that we consider. It really is a big deal for us.

MR. LINDLEY: I'm Mark Lindley. I'm water staff for the Energy Commission. Some of the things that I'm thinking about, as far as conditions of approval at this point, would involve potentially doing some groundwater monitoring to keep an eye on groundwater levels and groundwater quality along the perimeter of the

site so that the applicant can report back and identify any issues as they come up.

And then also, as she discussed, we generally include a condition of approval that deals with changes or impacts to the water supply to neighboring residents that are depending on groundwater.

So, I could see two conditions of approval that would be directly related towards monitoring the situation and requiring the applicant and the power plant, once it's up and operating, to mitigate any impacts that would come up to any of the neighboring water uses or neighboring residences.

MS. HOLMES: Thank you.

MS. DYAS: Are there any other general comments, questions?

Okay, for a closing, and one thing I do want to say initially in closing is that this is by no means a done deal.

Our staff, once we complete our analysis, the stage that we're in right now, like I said, we're in the gathering data stage. Staff is going to write their analysis and put out what we call our preliminary staff assessment. And

this is staff's first cut at what they perceive as, you know, their conclusions regarding the review of the application.

That PSA, as we call it, is due to come out sometime in early June. When it is released, there will be a 30-day public comment period. And also within this document, in each technical section, there will be a response to public and agency comments section. So we'll have your comments in there or your questions in there, and you can see where your questions are answered.

During that comment period we will generally hold a preliminary staff assessment workshop where after you, the public, have had a chance, and the agencies have had a chance to review the document, we'll hold a workshop where you can comment again on staff's analysis at this point, as opposed to just commenting on the AFC. Because you'll be able to make your comments on that staff assessment. And review it to see if your questions have been answered. You can comment and let us know whether your questions have been answered or not.

After that comment period, then we'll go into the drafting of the final staff assessment.

And once the final staff assessment is done, then we go, as I said in the beginning, into the evidentiary hearings where basically our staff will make a recommendation to the Committee.

Our staff doesn't make the decision on whether to give a license to this project. The Committee, who was here at the open house, consisting of the Commissioners and the Hearing Officer, will make that final decision on whether or not to grant the license.

So, it's by no means a done deal. And we're still really, like I said, early in the process where our staff is still working on their assessment of the project.

So there's still going to be plenty of opportunities to get your comments in there. And we do always recommend that you send your comments in writing so that they can be given to the entire staff, the Committee, so that everybody sees the questions, knows the concerns. And, you know, like I said, they will be addressed in the staff assessments.

After the staff gets done with that, then it goes into the Committee's hands to make the final decision.

So, so far after this workshop we have a workshop, actually an information workshop, scheduled for April 12th. And that's on a Saturday. We're still nailing down the details on the whens and wheres. But it will be on that Saturday.

And then after that, as I said, after the PSA has been published we will hold another preliminary staff assessment workshop, as I said, which you can make your comments on that initial document that we release.

So, there's still going to be plenty of time to get your comments in there. You can either send them directly to our dockets unit or send them to me and I will make sure that they do get docketed and distributed to everybody.

So, don't be thinking that it is a done deal, because we're still a long way out. From the date that the document was deemed adequate or accepted as adequate, which was December 19th, that started the one-year clock. So we're still early in the one-year process.

And just depending on the outcome of any of these future workshops and events that may be outside of our control, that could always take

longer. It just depends.

So, we still have a ways to go. And as Caryn mentioned, we don't take these things lightly. Our staff does look into them. And especially the water is the big issue. And we know that. And with the visual, as well.

And we do, in each section of the document, you can also go online and see what these documents look like, because a lot of the projects that we have inhouse have already gotten to that stage of having a preliminary document out.

You can see how it's set up; how each technical area contains mitigation measures, conditions of certification that the applicant is required to follow. So you can see what an example of what's going to be coming for this project.

So, keep the questions coming. Keep showing up to the workshops and making your comments. And making sure you do get answers. And, as I said -- and we do have the sign-up sheet, and if you haven't been receiving any of the notices or anything, please make a note on there and we will definitely try and make sure --

not try, we will make sure that you get added to the mailing list to receive the notices for these workshops.

So, there's still a ways to go. And we do definitely still want your comments. You know, and hopefully we will be able to answer all of them. And they will be addressed in the staff assessment.

So, I thank everybody for showing up here tonight, both Ausra and URS. And I thank Tanya for showing up for CURE.

And that's all I have for right now. And we will be back here on the 12th.

(Whereupon, at 9:30 p.m., the workshop was adjourned.)

--o0o--

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, TROY A. RAY, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Workshop; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said workshop, nor in any way interested in outcome of said workshop.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 25th day of March, 2008.

BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION *For the CARRIZO ENERGY SOLAR FARM* **PROJECT**	**Docket No. 07-AFC-8** **PROOF OF SERVICE** (Revised 2/5/2008)

INSTRUCTIONS: All parties shall either (1) send an original signed document plus 12 copies or (2) mail one original signed copy AND e-mail the document to the address for the Docket as shown below, AND (3) all parties shall also send a printed or electronic copy of the document, which includes a proof of service declaration to each of the individuals on the proof of service list shown below:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
Attn: Docket No. 07-AFC-8
1516 Ninth Street, MS-14
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us

APPLICANT

Perry H. Fontana, QEP
Vice President-Projects
Ausra, Inc.
2585 East Bayshore Road
Palo Alto, California 94303
perry@ausra.com

APPLICANT CONSULTANT

Angela Leiba, GISP
Senior Project Manager
GIS Manager/Visual Resource Specialist
URS Corporation
1615 Murray Canyon Road, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92108
angela_leiba@urscorp.com

Kristen E. Walker, J.D.
URS Corporation
1615 Murray Canyon Road, Suite 1000
San Diego, California 92108
kristen_e_walker@urscorp.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Jane Luckhardt, Esq.
Downey Brand Law Firm
555 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
jluckhardt@downeybrand.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

Larry Tobias
CA Independent System Operator
151 Blue Ravine Road
Folsom, CA 95630
ltobias@caiso.com

Electricity Oversight Board
770 L Street, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814
esaltmarsh@eob.ca.gov

INTERVENORS

* California Unions for Reliable Energy (CURE)
c/o Tanya Gulesserian
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000
South San Francisco, CA 94080
tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

Jackalyne Pfannenstiel
Chairman and Presiding Member
jpfannen@energy.state.ca.us

Jeffrey D. Byron
Commissioner and Associate Member
jbyron@energy.state.ca.us

Gary Fay
Hearing Officer
gfay@energy.state.ca.us

Mary Dyas
Project Manager
mdyas@energy.state.ca.us

Caryn Holmes
Staff Counsel
cholmes@energy.state.ca.us

Michael Doughton
Staff Counsel
mdoughto@energy.state.ca.us

Public Adviser's Office
pao@energy.state.ca.us

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Christina Flores, declare that on April 2, 2008, I deposited copies of the attached Carrizo Energy Solar Farm Project (07-AFC-8) Data Response Workshop transcript in the United States mail at Sacramento, CA with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to those identified on the Proof of Service list above.

OR

Transmission via electronic mail was consistent with the requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 20, sections 1209, 1209.5, and 1210. All electronic copies were sent to all those identified on the Proof of Service list above.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Christina Flores