Memorandum

OCKET

October 5, 2007 Date:

Telephone: (916) 654-3915

File:

Eastshore Energy Center

Bill Pfanner To

California Energy Commission - Steve Baker From :

1516 Ninth Street

Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Subject: Response to Applicant's Comments on Facility Design PSA

Following are my responses to the Applicant's comments on the Facility Design PSA (CH2MHill letter from David Stein to Bill Pfanner dated September 19, 2007):

- 1. "Refer to the comments under Project Description above." No changes necessary.
- 2. "Page 5.1-5, COC GEN-1, please clarify...to state that the CBSC in effect for the design...." This is clear in the condition; no change necessary. "In addition to transmission engineering not being subject to CBSC, the gas line design, construction, and operation will be completed by PG&E...." Acknowledged; see below.
- 3. "Page 5.1-7, Table 1, the 'natural gas metering station structure, foundations, and connections' design will be completed by PG&E...." Item deleted from Table 1.
- 4. "Page 5.1-8, COC GEN-4, comparable to the Transmission System Engineering carveout, there needs to also be one for the gas line and its metering station." Not necessary; this item was deleted from Table 1. "Last full paragraph at bottom: Eastshore requests to adjust the RE's ability to stop work to situations where the Owner does not make a prompt and good faith effort to correct the deficiency within 5 working days of notification by the RE." This ignores the fact that the RE is the Owner's representative. No changes necessary.
- 5. Page 5.1-9, COC GEN-5, comparable to the TSE carve-out, there needs to also be one for the gas line and its metering station." Not necessary; this item was deleted from Table 1. "GEN-5: should clarify that the 'design engineer' and the 'civil engineer' could be the same person." There is no language that prohibits this; no changes necessary.
- 6. "Page 5.1-12, COC GEN-6, comparable to the TSE carve-out, there needs to also be one for the gas line and its metering station." Not necessary; this item was deleted from Table 1.
- 7. "Page 5.1-14, COC CIVIL-4, the following initial sentence seems incorrect: 'After completion of finished grading.... Approval of the plans should precede the work." Language is correct; no changes necessary.
- 8. "Page 5.1-15, Item 4, please change from 'turbine/generator pedestal' to 'engine/generator foundations." Since the engine foundations are not a two-story-high

Bill Pfanner October 5, 2007 Page 2

structure as is a turbine/generator pedestal, they need not be included in this COC. Item is deleted.

- 9. Page 5.1-17, COC STRUCT-4, is Table 3-E the relevant cite, or Table 3-D? Confirm." Table 3-E is the correct cite. "Also, plans for hazardous materials storage will need to be approved by the Fire Marshal under RMP/other procedures." See COCs under Worker Safety and Fire Protection.
- 10. Page 5.1-19, COC MECH-3, please clarify the meaning of 'increment of construction...." Interpretation is correct. No change necessary.
- 11. Page 5.1-19, COC ELEC-1, similar to previous, clarify 'start of any increment of construction.' Interpretation is correct. No change necessary.