

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	07-AFC-06C
Project Title:	Carlsbad Energy Center - Compliance
TN #:	203295
Document Title:	Status Report 2
Description:	Monthly Status Report
Filer:	Kerry Siekmann
Organization:	Terramar Association & Self
Submitter Role:	Intervenor
Submission Date:	10/31/2014 12:35:48 PM
Docketed Date:	10/31/2014

TERRAMAR

Kerry Siekmann

Siekmann1@att.net

October 31, 2014

VIA E-FILING

AMENDED CARLSBAD ENERGY CENTER PROJECT 07-AFC-06C

TERRAMAR STATUS REPORT 2- October 31, 2014

Terramar submitted 5 Data Requests to the Ca. Energy Commission staff as of Sept. 30, 2014. The Project Owner has chosen to object to the first three Data Requests even though they were submitted to Staff.

The Project Owner objected to Data Request 1 because “the equipment will mostly not be visible outside of the site”. I drive along the I-5 South past the project site almost every day and I am able to see very clearly into the site. The Project Owner needs to drive past the site and take another look. The view is clear as a bell into the site due to the loss of so many trees and the Project Owner has a responsibility to Terramar and the community to reveal how the project is going to look on site. But the Project Owner did not read the Data Request because it clearly states:

“”Terramar is asking staff to request a visual representation of the Amended CECP. This visual representation should appear as close as possible to how the actual completed power plant and transmission lines (including any other significant physical structures that will be a part of this project) will be configured. It should be to scale. This visual representation should include any outer shell covering that NRG is planning to install around each unit. This is just a visual request of the plant as it appears on its own and not on site.”

It would be nice if the Project Owner would read the Data Request before objecting to it. Terramar and the community would like to see what the plant would look like on its own and not on site.

The Project Owner objected to Data Request 2 because KOPs were already chosen for the CECP and it was established that view was not an issue for CECP. Terramar asked staff to consider two locations as Key Observation Points (KOP) s. A lot has changed since CECP was approved and now many of the trees blocking views along the I-5 are gone. These are very important viewpoints for Terramar residents and the community as a whole. We still hope staff requires these KOPs.

Terramar understands that the PDOC is not available from the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. Once this document is published, there may be questions submitted regarding the subject of Air Pollution.

Terramar still contends that neither the CECP nor the Amended CECP is coastally dependent and does not belong on the coastline and is waiting to hear what the Ca. Coastal Commission determines.

Terramar is still waiting for written clarification regarding the regulations of CEC. If the Amended CECP is denied then what happens? Is the CECP still licensed? Must the Project Owner begin again?

Also how would the proceedings continue if the Coastal Commission declares that the Amended CECP is not coastally dependent?

Respectfully submitted by,

Kerry Siekmann

Terramar