

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-AFC-01
Project Title:	Puente Power Project
TN #:	205955
Document Title:	City of Oxnard Letter to CEC July 15, 2015
Description:	Oxnard City Council Position re NRG Power Plant Proposal (CPUC Application No. A.14-11-016, Southern California Edison (SCE) Request for Proposal (RFO) for Moorpark Sub-Area (U-338-E)
Filer:	PATRICIA LARKIN
Organization:	SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP
Submitter Role:	Intervenor Representative
Submission Date:	8/31/2015 3:52:33 PM
Docketed Date:	8/31/2015

Tim Flynn
Mayor



Office of the Mayor

300 West Third Street
Oxnard, California 93030
(805) 385-7430
Fax (805) 385-7595
www.ci.oxnard.ca.us

July 15, 2015

Robert Weisenmiller, PhD, Chair
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS-29
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

**RE: Oxnard City Council Position Regarding the NRG Power Plant Proposal
(CPUC Application No. A.14-11-016, Southern California Edison (SCE)
Request for Proposal (RFO) for the Moorpark Sub-Area (U-338-E))**

Dear Chair Weisenmiller:

The City provides these comments to document its concerns regarding Southern California Edison's proposal to purchase power from the NRG "Puente" plant, a proposed 262 MW generating facility to be located immediately adjacent to the existing NRG Mandalay Generating Station (MGS). Both the existing and proposed facilities are located about 600 feet from the State Trust Land mean high tide line boundary. In their California Energy Commission (CEC) Application for Certification (AFC) application, NRG's new plant will have a 188-foot exhaust stack which would be nearly as tall as the nearby MGS 203-foot stack. NRG does not propose to remove the MGS Once-Through-Cooling (OTC) facility or its stack after it is decommissioned in late 2020. Over the past year, the City Council (Council) of the City of Oxnard (City) has taken several actions to implement the Coastal Act, Coastal Commission Sea-Level Rise (SLR) Guidance, and to protect the Oxnard and Ventura County community from the impacts of building additional energy-generating facilities on Oxnard's coastline, including the following:

1. On July 1, 2014, Council adopted a 45-day urgency interim ordinance prohibiting the expansion of existing, or development of new, energy facilities within the coastal zone pending the City's completion of studies and updates to the local coastal program, zoning ordinances, and other land use regulations. On July 29, 2014, the moratorium was extended to June 30, 2015.
2. On December 23, 2014, Council authorized the Mayor to execute a Protest to CPUC Application No. A.14-11-016 on behalf of the City. The City then submitted expert testimony that questioned the reliability of the proposed NRG facility because of its exposure to current and future coastal storm, erosion, and tsunami hazards.
3. On June 22, 2015, the City filed a Petition to Intervene in the CEC AFC process and will request and present information related to the

environmental impacts of the NRG facility on wetlands, endangered species habitats, air quality, aesthetics, and tourism.

4. At its May 19, 2015 meeting, City Council members voted unanimously to extend the previously approved moratorium for a second year and directed the City Manager to discuss with NRG and State agencies how to remove both the Ormond Beach and the Mandalay OTC Generating Stations.

As you will soon receive briefs from NRG and the other Intervening Parties that you will rely on to determine the Commission's decision, please give deference to the City and its 206,000 residents and the over 400,000 people who live and work in West Ventura County who have lived with the beachfront MGS for over 50 years. The CPUC should first ensure that the RFO process resulted in an adequate choice of preferred resources that would minimize all of the impacts of providing additional generating capacity. However, if additional conventional gas fired energy resources are required, the Council prefers an inland site that would reduce impacts to the coastal zone. If the CPUC does not, or believes it cannot recommend an alternative location, the most prudent course for the CPUC would be to wait until the CEC completes its site-specific environmental review of this project. Such comprehensive review is necessary to assess the many reliability risks associated with the Puente project and to determine the extent to which those risks can be safely mitigated without creating significant adverse impacts to the environment. Such comprehensive review is also necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts of a second tall exhaust stack in the middle of a public beach surrounded by McGrath State Beach.

Finally, if the CPUC does act now, the City urges it to consider the whole of the project before approving the RFO and the Resource Adequacy and Purchase Agreement ("RAPA") for the Puente project. At each step in the process to date, no entity has fully considered the effects of its actions. Instead, the ISO, SCE, and NRG have all acted independently, with each of them making decisions that may make sense within their own independent areas of interest, but which do not consider the broader implications of the project. We ask that the CPUC not perpetuate this process by approving the Puente project before it has undergone a complete assessment of its reliability and vulnerability to environmental hazards as well as its other environmental impacts. If the CPUC does not believe it is the appropriate entity to conduct this analysis, it should defer approval of the RFO and RAPA for the Puente project until after the CEC has acted.

Sincerely,



Tim Flynn, Mayor

- C. President Michael Picker, CPUC
Chair Robert Weisenmiller, PhD, CEC
Chair Steve Kinsey, Coastal Commission
President Pedro Pizarro, SCE
President and CEO Stephen Berberich, CalISO
President and CEO David Crane, NRG Energy

