

## CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 NINTH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512



January 7, 2009

Mr. Ken Speer, Assistant General Manager  
Northern California Power Agency  
108 Cirby Way  
Roseville, CA 95678

**RE: Lodi Energy Center Project (08-AFC-10)  
Data Request Set 1 (#s 1-55)**

**DOCKET  
08-AFC-10**

DATE JAN 07 2009

RECD. JAN 07 2009

Dear Mr. Speer:

Pursuant to Title 20, California Code of Regulations, Section 1716, the California Energy Commission staff seeks the information specified in the enclosed data requests. The information requested is necessary to: 1) more fully understand the project, 2) assess whether the facility will be constructed and operated in compliance with applicable regulations, 3) assess whether the project will result in significant environmental impacts, 4) assess whether the facilities will be constructed and operated in a safe, efficient and reliable manner, and 5) assess potential mitigation measures.

This set of data requests (#s 1-55) is being made in the areas of Biological Resources (#s 1-9), Cultural Resources (#s 10-16), Geology and Paleontology (#17), Land Use (#s 18-25), Power Plant Reliability (# 26) Soil and Water Resources (#s 27-37), Transmission System Engineering (#s 38-47), Visual Resources (#s 48-49) and Waste Management (#s 50-55). Written responses to the enclosed data requests are due to the Energy Commission staff on or before February 5, 2009, or at such later date as may be mutually agreeable.

If you are unable to provide the information requested, need additional time, or object to providing the requested information, please send a written notice to both the Committee and me within 20 days of receipt of this notice. The notification must contain the reasons for not providing the information, and the grounds for any objections (see Title 20, California Code of Regulations, Section 1716 (f)).

If you have any questions, please call me at (916) 654-5191 or email me at [rjones@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:rjones@energy.state.ca.us).

Sincerely,

**Original signature in Dockets**

Rod Jones  
Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Docket (08-AFC-10) and POS

PROOF OF SERVICE (REVISED 12/08/08) FILED WITH  
ORIGINAL MAILED FROM SACRAMENTO ON 1/07/09

AA

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Biological Resources

**Author:** Joy Nishida

**BACKGROUND**

During an informal visit to the proposed project site, Energy Commission staff identified a wetland adjacent to the southwest edge of the project site in a depression paralleling a large vegetated irrigation canal. The irrigation canal is just outside the south edge of the project boundary. Arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*) and Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*) also occur around this depression. The wetland is located within the proposed project site and was not mentioned in the Wetland Survey in Section 5.2.1.4.4 of the AFC. The dominant plants identified in the wetland are perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*) and heliotrope (*Heliotropium curassavicum*), which are facultative wet (FACW) and obligate (OBL) species, respectively. A FACW plant is one which usually occurs in wetlands (estimated probability 67 percent to 99 percent), whereas an OBL plant occurs almost always under natural conditions in wetlands (estimated probability 99 percent). The depression also provides the necessary hydrologic conditions to collect water for a wetland.

According to the AFC Water Resources Section 5.15.1.1, page 5.15-5, the irrigation canal is connected to waters of the U.S. via the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) White Slough Wildlife Area, as White Slough ultimately drains to the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. Since the wetland on-site is adjacent to the irrigation canal, this wetland may potentially fall under the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction as waters of the U.S. Email correspondence had been initiated with Kate Dadey of the USACE who provided a wetlands and waters map, Figure DA 5.2-1a, had been provided. Also, since waters of the State are potentially on-site, impacts to potential waters of the State would require a Streambed Alteration Agreement by the CDFG before any disturbance. Assuming there is concurrence between staff and the applicant regarding the site as a potential wetland, a jurisdictional determination will be needed to complete the analysis.

**DATA REQUEST**

1. The AFC Data Adequacy Supplement B wetlands map Figure DA 5.2-1a does not identify the wetland described above. Please conduct a formal wetland delineation for the project area and provide the wetland delineation report and final determination from the USACE regarding whether or not jurisdiction will be asserted on the wetland and irrigation canals.
2. Please contact CDFG and provide a record of correspondence regarding the need to complete a Streambed Alteration Agreement. Should a Streambed Alteration Agreement be needed, please explain the project-specific circumstances that would necessitate substantial temporary or permanent impacts to jurisdictional waters of the State.
3. Please provide the anticipated schedule of USACE and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permitting for (and verification of) jurisdictional waters, and expected mitigation measures likely to be included in USACE and RWQCB permits, if appropriate.
4. Please provide a discussion of impact avoidance and minimization measures to be implemented to protect the adjacent irrigation canal during construction.

## **LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10) DATA REQUESTS**

### **BACKGROUND**

AFC Section 5.2.1.1.4 on page 5.2-2 states that the CDFG White Slough Wildlife Area is located approximately 4 miles northwest of the project site, when in fact, the wildlife area is approximately one-half mile to the west of the project site. According to a December 2, 2008, phone conversation with Dan Gifford of CDFG, giant garter snake (GGS), federally and state listed as Threatened, and a bird, the California black rail (black rail), a federal species of special concern and state listed as Threatened and a Fully Protected species, occur in the White Slough Wildlife Area. The large vegetated irrigation canal located immediately south of the proposed project site connects to the White Slough Wildlife Area and provides suitable habitat for GGS and black rail. The proposed project area is considered by the San Joaquin Council of Governments' (SJCOG) document, the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) to be known occupied habitat for GGS. Staff also identified a wetland in a depression with arroyo willow and Fremont cottonwood adjacent to the southwest edge of the project boundary paralleling the irrigation canal. Bird species observed during field surveys included red-tailed hawk, white-tailed kite, a state Fully Protected species, and Swainson's hawk, a state listed Threatened species, on Table 5.2-2 on page 5.2-17 in AFC Section 5.2.1.4.2. Due to the presence of the wetland and trees, the area has the potential to provide habitat for special-status species and nesting raptors. Page 15 of the AFC Data Adequacy Supplement B Section 5 discusses impact avoidance and minimization measures that will be developed in coordination with the MSHCP Oversight Committee which includes representatives from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and CDFG. This is further complicated by a need to fill the wetland and may require a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the USACE. If the USACE determines that the wetland is not within its jurisdiction, then the applicant will lack a federal agency nexus and would likely need to consult directly with the USFWS through the Federal Endangered Species Act Section 10 process.

### **DATA REQUEST**

5. Please provide the impact avoidance and minimization measures, other mitigation measures, the mitigation performance standards, and remedial measures that will be developed by the MSHCP Oversight Committee to be implemented to protect sensitive species and nesting raptors that could use the White Slough Wildlife area during construction.
6. Please contact the USFWS and provide a status update on the anticipated schedule for the Section 7 consultation process should a federal agency nexus occur regarding USACE jurisdiction of on-site waters.
7. Please contact the CDFG and the SJCOG regarding the special-status species that are Fully Protected (i.e., the birds, black rail and white-tailed kite) and provide the impact avoidance and minimization measures and other mitigation measures.

### **BACKGROUND**

Figure 5.2-2 of AFC Section 5.2 shows the proposed natural gas pipeline route and the project site relative to surrounding vegetation communities and habitat types. The colored overlays obscure the land features on the aerial figure. A detailed color aerial photograph at a scale of 1 inch equals 500 feet (1:6,000) with a 30 percent overlap without colored overlays would show

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

the proposed project site and natural gas pipeline route more clearly. Staff needs this information to complete its analysis.

**DATA REQUEST**

8. Please provide color aerial photographs taken at a recommended scale of 1 inch equals 500 feet (1:6,000) with a 30 percent overlap showing the proposed natural gas pipeline corridor so that the features pictured on the aerial photographs are not obscured.

**BACKGROUND**

AFC Section 3.2 page 3-1 states that “there will be approximately 520 feet of line tying the plant to the existing STIG plant 230-kV switchyard.” AFC Figure 3.2-2 shows the proposed transmission tower to be utilized for the 520 feet of transmission line. No figures exist within the AFC with the location of the proposed transmission line or transmission towers relative to the biological resources on the project site. Staff needs this information to complete its analysis.

**DATA REQUEST**

9. Please provide a revised AFC Figure 5.2-4 with the location of the proposed transmission line and transmission towers added to the figure.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Cultural Resources  
**Author:** Bright Eastman

**BACKGROUND**

The AFC for the Lodi Energy Center (LEC) includes information on the acreage of soil disturbance for laydown, site preparation, and grading. Information that appears to be missing from the AFC includes details regarding the respective depths of various excavation activities for construction of the new facility. The previous construction of the NCPA Combustion Turbine # 2 (CTP) probably resulted in the disturbance of the upper soil layers of at least part of the proposed project site.

The LEC project description (pp. 2-9–2-17) lists several equipment installations that appear to require foundations capable of considerable weight-bearing. Staff assumes that such foundations would have to extend to some depth in the ground and additionally that overexcavation of the holes for these foundations and filling with engineered fill could be required to ensure the stability of the foundations. Thus it is possible that excavations associated with the new installation could reach previously undisturbed soil layers where intact archaeological deposits could exist.

To assess potential project impacts to possible buried archaeological resources, staff needs information on the locations and on the greatest depths to which previous ground disturbance of any nature extended and on the greatest depths to which the proposed new equipment foundations would extend.

**DATA REQUEST**

10. Please provide the depths of the excavations, from the existing finish grade, required for the following trenches and foundations for proposed LEC equipment, systems, and features:
  - a. new combustion turbine generation
  - b. new steam turbine generator
  - c. new automatic generator control
  - d. new selective catalytic reduction emission control system
  - e. new auxiliary boiler and stack
  - f. pipelines for water, natural gas, wastewater, and stormwater
  - g. new generation setup unit
11. Please adapt Figure 2.1-2 (Proposed LEC Project Elevations) to show the expected depths of foundations for the illustrated equipment, pipelines, and underground tank installations.
12. Please provide a separate project site plan showing the locations of all previous ground-disturbing activities. A site plan such as AFC Figure 2.1-3 with the disturbed areas indicated by shading or other such convention would be acceptable.

**BACKGROUND**

The “Construction Impacts” subsection of the AFC’s discussion of cultural resources notes the “extensive disturbance” of the project site due to the construction of the existing STIG plant, and the unlikelihood of encountering buried cultural resources except for “limited potential” below the “plow zone.” Paleontological and soils investigations in the AFC describe soils in the project area consisting of the Mokelumne River alluvial fan deposits, and alluvial silty clay, sand, and

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

gravel, all of which could have covered prehistoric archaeological sites. Prior to historic leveling of the area for agriculture, many of the prehistoric archaeological sites in the Delta were on low mounds possibly associated with the alluvial fan deposits and late Pleistocene-age dunes. Archaeologists have observed that some of the mounds extend below the current ground level and some are buried entirely with no surface evidence, making the consideration of the potential presence of buried archaeological deposits relevant. Staff needs additional information to evaluate the potential for encountering buried archaeological deposits during the construction and operation of the project.

**DATA REQUEST**

13. Please provide a discussion of the historical geomorphology of the project site that evidences consideration of the potential there for buried archaeological deposits. The discussion should include information on the development of Delta sand deposits during and subsequent to the Late Pleistocene era, particularly sands of the Piper series. The primary bases for the discussion should be data on the geomorphology, sedimentology, pedology, and stratigraphy of the project area or the near vicinity during the Late Quaternary period. The sources of these data may be a combination, as necessary, of extant literature or primary field research.

**BACKGROUND**

The AFC does not mention whether the project will need to import fill to the site and/or export unsuitable soils off-site. Staff needs to know if the soil borrow or soil disposal sites the project would use have been surveyed for cultural resources.

**DATA REQUEST**

14. Please indicate whether the proposed project may use any non-licensed, non-commercial soil borrow or disposal sites. If so:
  - Please have a qualified archaeologist survey these sites and record on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms any cultural resources that are identified;
  - a. Please submit to staff a report on the methods and results of these surveys, with recommendations for the treatment of any cultural resources identified in the surveys; and
  - b. Per Soils on page 37 of AFC Supplement B, please create a list of potential vendors for fill in the project vicinity.

**BACKGROUND**

Trenching dimensions for the natural gas pipeline for the project are included in the AFC, but with no discussion of associated additional ground disturbance, such as new access roads. Staff needs to identify any cultural resources that could be impacted by additional ground disturbance, and to identify any additional potential impacts to cultural resources.

**DATA REQUEST**

15. If any additional ground disturbance, such as new access roads, will be needed to construct the natural gas pipeline, please have an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Standards survey for cultural resources the impact areas of all

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

additional ground-disturbing activities and provide staff with a report of the survey methods, personnel resumes, and results.

16. If there will be any additional ground disturbance, please provide staff with a description of the ground-disturbing activity and maps showing the extent of all such areas.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Geology

**Author:** Patrick Pilling, Ph.D., P.E., G.E.

**BACKGROUND**

Site-specific subsurface information is essential to completely evaluate a site with respect to potential geologic hazards and how the existing materials may impact design, construction, and operation of the facility. The information is also useful in establishing the geologic profile with respect to potential paleontological resources. The AFC for the Lodi Energy Center references an existing geotechnical report for an adjacent project (Kleinfelder, 1993).

**DATA REQUEST**

17. Please provide a copy of the 1993 Kleinfelder geotechnical report.



**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Land Use  
**Author:** Amanda Stennick

**BACKGROUND**

As stated in section 5.6.2.2.4 of the Application for Certification (AFC) the proposed natural gas pipeline would cross seven parcels that are either under Williamson Act contracts or Farmland Security Zones. The affected parcels are Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 055-180-06, 055-190-02, 055-190-03, 055-220-05, 055-220-35, 055-220-39, and 055-220-40. The AFC does not state whether an easement exists that would allow the proposed PG&E gas line to cross these parcels.

**DATA REQUEST**

18. Please provide the owner of record and the contract number for each APN listed above.
19. Please provide evidence of an easement(s) from each owner of record that would allow the proposed PG&E gas pipeline to cross the affected parcels.
20. If no easement exists, please explain how the applicant (or PG&E) intends to procure permission from each owner of record to allow the gas line to cross the affected parcels.

**BACKGROUND**

Section 5.11.2.2 of the AFC states that the pipeline installation would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use because the pipeline would be installed deep enough to allow future cultivation, and the topsoil removed during excavation would be used to restore the land to its original condition before construction.

**DATA REQUEST**

21. Please provide the number of acres that would be temporarily disturbed by the pipeline installation.
22. Please state the type of crop planted where the pipe installation would occur.

**BACKGROUND**

The Kingdon Airport is a small, general aviation facility located approximately 2.5 miles from the LEC site. Section 5.6.4 of the AFC states that the applicant will file a request for consistency determination with the San Joaquin County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) to determine what requirements would be necessary to support a finding of consistency for the pipeline that will be buried in the transition and runway approach zones of the Kingdon Airport.

**DATA REQUEST**

23. Please provide a copy of the request for the ALUC's findings for the consistency determination, the date the request is filed, and the expected date for the ALUC determination.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**BACKGROUND**

Section 5.6.1.2 of the AFC states that the proposed project would include “a 900-foot-wide disturbance area around each facility.” Figure 2.1-1 in the AFC does not show a 900-foot-wide disturbance area around the proposed facility.

**DATA REQUEST**

24. Please describe the nature and purpose of the “disturbance areas” that would be constructed around the proposed and the existing facility.
25. Please state whether the 900-foot wide disturbance areas (a total of 1,800 feet) would be restored after construction to its pre-construction condition, and provide an estimated schedule for the restoration process.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Power Plant Reliability

**Author:** Steve Baker

**BACKGROUND**

One important aspect of power plant reliability is a secure supply of water. The AFC, Appendix 2D, states that a will-serve letter from the City of Lodi (see Soil and Water Resources background, page 12) for project water supply is being sent separately. Staff needs this letter in order to complete its evaluation of Reliability.

**DATA REQUEST**

26. Please submit an updated copy of the City of Lodi's water supply will-serve letter.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Soil and Water Resources  
**Author:** Richard Latteri

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Lodi (City) has provided the Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) a “Will Serve Letter” (dated November 29, 2005) stating that the City can provide Title 22 tertiary treated recycled water to the LEC at a peak delivery rate of approximately 2.5 million gallons per day (mgd) with an average delivery rate of 1.7 mgd. The City has conditioned the delivery of recycled water to the LEC on NCPA’s construction of new or modified distribution facilities originating at the City’s White Slough Water Pollution Control Facility (WSWPCF), which is located adjacent to the project site.

**DATA REQUEST**

27. Please describe the new or modified distribution facilities that will be required for the delivery of recycled water from the City’s White Slough Water Pollution Control Facility (WSWPCF).
28. Please provide a list of the current recycled water customers that receive tertiary treated recycled water from the WSWPCF, their contractual delivery amounts, and a discussion of the long-term (30 to 35 years) recycled water supply reliability based on current and future supply and demand projections for tertiary treated recycled water from WSWPCF.
29. Please provide a discussion of the permitting and oversight requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB), Department of Public Health (DPH), and the City of Lodi for the supply and use of recycled water at the LEC and whether water recycling requirements would be prescribed by CVRWQCB prior to the delivery of recycled water to the LEC.
30. Please provide the names and telephone numbers of the CVRWQCB and DPH personnel who are responsible for recycled water permitting and use.

**BACKGROUND**

In Section 5.15.1.4.1 of the Application for Certification (AFC), NCPA states that no backup water supply for the LEC is required or planned at this time due to the high reliability level of the WSWPCF.

**DATA REQUEST**

31. In the event of a long-term outage at the WSWPCF and the facility is not capable of delivering recycled water to the LEC, please provide a discussion of the actions to be taken by NCPA for continued LEC operation.
32. Please provide a discussion of potential backup water suppliers that includes: a. the location of the water suppliers; b. the sources and quality of the water to be supplied, and c. the timeframe a backup water supply would be available for LEC operation.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**BACKGROUND**

Within the AFC (Section 5.15.1.3), NCPA states that the project site is in the 100-year floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In Data Response 21 of the LEC's Supplement B – Data Adequacy Responses, NCPA proposes to elevate the project site above the 100-year flood elevation.

**DATA REQUEST**

33. Please provide the elevation of the lowest and highest points on the LEC project site as determined by a licensed civil engineer or land surveyor.
  
34. Per the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program, please provide a discussion of the procedure for requesting a revision or amendment of the 100-year floodplain map for removal of the LEC site from the floodplain and provide the expected timeframe or schedule for submitting an application to FEMA for this purpose.
  
35. In the event that the FEMA designated 100-year flood elevation rises due to climate change, please provide a discussion of the methods to be employed to keep the LEC site from flooding.

**BACKGROUND**

In the Geotechnical Report located in Appendix 2C of the AFC, the authors of the report recommend the over-excavation of approximately 5 feet of the existing soil from the project site then recompacting the soil as engineering fill (Section 4.9). Recomposition of the existing soil may further lower the project site elevation resulting in the need for additional imported soil to elevate the project site above the 100-year flood level.

**DATA REQUEST**

36. Please provide the cross sections and volume calculations for the amount of soil to be cut and over-excavated from the LEC project site and the amount of soil to be used as fill to elevate the site above the 100-year flood level.

**BACKGROUND**

In Response 17 of the LEC's Supplement B – Data Adequacy Responses, NCPA has submitted both a draft construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Preliminary Drainage Study (Attachments DA 5.15-1 and DA 5.17-7). Both documents only cover the 4.4 acres of the LEC plant footprint and provide no delineation or description of the 9.8 acres of proposed construction and laydown areas or the 2.5-mile natural gas pipeline. The information provided by NCPA is incomplete and does not provide sufficient information for a CEQA analysis.

In Response 17, NCPA proposes to submit a Construction Drainage, Erosion, and Sediment Control Plan (DESCP)/SWPPP prior to site mobilization. A draft DESCP/SWPPP is required to properly delineate the entire LEC Project and to provide a discussion of potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures for protection of soil and water resources during construction of the LEC.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**DATA REQUEST**

37. Please provide a draft DESC/P/SWPPP containing elements A through I below outlining site management activities and erosion/sediment control best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented during site excavation, elevation, construction, and post-construction activities. The level of detail in the draft DESC/P/SWPPP should be commensurate with the current level of planning for site elevation, grading, and drainage. Please provide all conceptual storm water pollution and erosion control information for those phases of construction and post-construction that have been developed or provide a statement when such information will be available.

- A. Vicinity Map** – A map(s) at a minimum scale 1"=100' shall be provided indicating the location of all project elements (construction site, laydown areas, pipelines, etc.) with depictions of all significant geographic features including swales, storm drains, and sensitive areas.
- B. Site Delineation** – All areas subject to soil disturbance for the LEC (project site, laydown area, all linear facilities, landscaping areas, and any other project elements) shall be delineated showing boundary lines of all construction areas and the location of all existing and proposed structures, pipelines, roads, and drainage facilities. The Site Delineation shall be at a minimum scale 1"=100'.
- C. Watercourses and Critical Areas** – On the Site Delineation, the location of all nearby watercourses including swales, storm drains, and drainage ditches shall be shown. Indicate the proximity of those features to the LEC construction, laydown, landscape areas, and all transmission and pipeline construction corridors.
- D. Drainage Map** – The DESC/P/SWPPP shall provide a topographic site map(s) at a minimum scale 1"=100' showing all existing, interim and proposed drainage systems, and drainage area boundaries. On the map, spot elevations are required where relatively flat conditions exist. The spot elevations and contours shall be extended off site for a minimum distance of 100 feet.
- E. Drainage of Project Site Narrative** – The DESC/P/SWPPP shall include a narrative of the drainage measures to be taken to protect the site, downstream facilities and watercourses. The narrative shall include the summary pages from the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses prepared by a professional engineer or erosion control specialist. The narrative shall state the watershed size(s) in acres used in the calculation of drainage control measures and text included that justifies their selection. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses should be used to support the selection of BMPs and structural controls to divert off site and on-site drainage around or through the LEC construction and laydown areas.
- F. Clearing and Grading Plans** – The DESC/P/SWPPP shall provide a delineation of all areas to be cleared of vegetation and areas to be preserved. The plan shall provide elevations, slopes, locations, and extent of all proposed grading as shown by contours, cross sections or other means. The on-site locations of any disposal areas, fills, or other special features shall also be shown. Illustrate existing and proposed topography tying in proposed contours with existing topography.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

- G. Clearing and Grading Narrative** – The DESCP/SWPPP shall include a table with the quantities of material excavated or filled for the site and all project elements of the LEC (project site, lay down area, transmission corridors, and pipeline corridors) whether such excavations or fill is temporary or permanent, and the amount of such material to be imported or exported.
- H. Best Management Practices Plan** – The DESCP/SWPPP shall identify on a water pollution control drawing (WPCD) the location of the site specific BMPs to be employed during each phase of construction (initial elevation, grading, linear excavation and construction, and final grading/stabilization). Treatment control BMPs used during construction should enable testing of storm water runoff prior to discharge to the storm water system. BMPs shall include measures designed to prevent wind and water erosion in areas with existing soil contamination.
- I. Best Management Practices Narrative** – The DESCP/SWPPP shall show the location (as identified on the WPCD), timing, and maintenance schedule of all erosion and sediment control BMPs to be used prior to initial grading, site elevation, and all project excavation and construction. Text with supporting calculation shall be included for each project specific BMP proposed for use prior to initial site elevation, grading, and project excavation and construction. Text with supporting calculation shall be included for each project specific BMP.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Transmission System Engineering  
**Authors:** Laiping Ng  
**Technical Senior:** Mark Hesters

**BACKGROUND**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the identification and description of the “Direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment.” The Application for Certification (AFC) requires discussion of the “energy resource impacts which may result from the construction or operation of the power plant.” For the identification of impacts on the transmission system resources and the indirect or downstream transmission impacts, staff relies on the System Impact and Facilities Studies for insuring the interconnecting grid meets the California Independent System Operator (California ISO) reliability standards. The studies analyze the effect of the proposed project on the ability of the transmission network to meet reliability standards. When the studies determine that the project will cause a violation of reliability standards, the potential mitigation or upgrades required to bring the system into compliance are identified. The mitigation measures often include the construction of downstream transmission facilities. CEQA requires the analysis of any downstream facilities for potential indirect impacts of the proposed project. Without a complete System Impact Study (SIS) or Facilities Study (FS), staff is not able to fulfill the CEQA requirement to identify the indirect effects of the proposed project.

**DATA REQUEST**

Section 3.3.1 of the AFC indicated that NCPA/Lodi Energy Center, California ISO, and Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) have agreed to expedite the transmission interconnection study process. The Facilities Study would include elements from the System Impact Study. Also as stated in the AFC, NCPA, and PG&E have agreed to include elements from the SIS in the interconnection Facilities Study, which was due to be completed in December 2008.

38. Provide the Facilities Study.
39. Identify major assumptions in the base cases including imports to the system, major generation and load changes between the peak and partial peak cases.
40. Analyze system for N-0, important N-1 and critical N-2 contingency conditions and provide a list of criteria violations in a table showing the loadings before and after adding the MLGS.
41. Provide a Short Circuit Duty Analysis.
42. Provide a Dynamic Stability Analysis.
43. Provide a Reactive Power Deficiency Analysis.
44. Provide system protection and substation evaluation.
45. List mitigation measures considered and those selected for all criteria violations.
46. Provide electronic copies of \*.sav and \*.drw PSLF files.
47. Provide power flow diagrams (megawatt, % loading & per unit voltage) for base cases with and without the project. Power flow diagrams must also be provided for all N-0, N-1 and N-2 studies where overloads or voltage violations appear.



**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Visual

**Author:** Marie McLean

**BACKGROUND**

The Lodi Energy Center will be clearly visible from Interstate 5 (I-5), a county-designated scenic highway (See KOP 1); the White Slough wildlife and recreational area (see KOP 2); and a housing development to the south (see KOP 3). Landscaping would assist the LEC in blending into the scenic environment and providing a buffer for the residential area.

**DATA REQUEST**

48. a. Please provide a landscaping plan with vegetative screening to buffer the view from I-5; the White Slough wildlife and recreational area; and the residential area to the south. b. Along with the landscaping plan above, please provide a simulation of growth (1) after five years and (2) at maturity, and whether the new landscaping would potentially impact threatened and endangered species located within the proposed project site.

**BACKGROUND**

Second-story housing developments are located on Eight Mile Road, south of the project site. Residents of those developments would have a long, clear view of the Lodi Energy Center when looking north from second-story windows.

**DATA REQUEST**

49. To account for the view those highly sensitive viewers would have from the second story, please reshoot KOP 3 from at least 10 feet above ground and provide both a current view and simulated view of the Lodi Energy Center.

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**Technical Area:** Waste Management  
**Author:** Ellen Townsend-Hough

**BACKGROUND**

The size of the project site is reported as 4.4 acres in the project description for the Lodi Energy Center Project's Application for Certification (AFC) and 2.6 acres in the Waste Management Section of the AFC. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed for a 2.6 acre site.

**DATA REQUEST**

50. Please explain why there is a difference in the size of the proposed project in the AFC Project Description, the Waste Management section, and the Phase I ESA.

51. Assuming the project will occupy 4.4 acres, please supplement the Phase I ESA to address review of the specific project site.

**BACKGROUND**

The Phase I ESA found that in the past the proposed project site was used for agricultural purposes. The property was also used in the late 1980s and 2003 for stockpiling biosolids/sludge removed from the White Slough Water Pollution Control Facility treatment and holding ponds (page 2-1). Common agricultural practices can result in residual concentrations of fertilizers, pesticides or herbicides in near-surface soil. To ensure that the concentrations of various chemicals do not pose a potential health risk or hazard, the project owners should provide soil sampling of the parcel/project site.

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) did not identify any recognized environmental conditions, thereby eliminating the need for a Phase II ESA. Although a Phase II ESA was not completed, staff believes that given these past land uses and proposed construction the project owner should verify that no harmful concentrations of any contaminants will be encountered at the proposed project site. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has prepared the "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Fields for School Sites (Second Revision August 26, 2002)". Staff believes this guidance or equivalent may be appropriate and useful for further site analysis.

**PROTOCOL**

The project owner should determine if there is any analytical characterization data for the agriculture chemicals and biosolids that were applied to the land. Samples should be assessed for persistent agricultural chemicals, such as organochlorine pesticides and other analyses that might be indicated by a review of the characterization data associated with the sludge that was applied to the project property. These data would be used to determine a reasonable analytical suite for samples. The project owner should sample for CAM 17 metals (the 17 California regulated metals), and organochlorine pesticides in addition to the other chemicals. The AFC describes the size of the project as either 2.6 or 4.4 acres. Sampling protocol for projects that are between two to four acres in size require a sample frequency of eight locations, evenly spaced across the site. For sites greater than four acres and up to 20 acres, discrete samples should be collected on ½-acre centers. Each location should be sampled to include one surface sample (0 to 6 inches) and one subsurface sample (2 to 3 foot range).

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

**DATA REQUEST**

a. Please provide results of field sampling and analysis which adequately characterize the presence of harmful chemicals or conditions. b. Please discuss whether there will be any risk to construction or plant personnel due to the presence of these chemicals.

**BACKGROUND**

The Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) established landfill waste diversion goals of 50 percent by the year 2000 for state and local jurisdictions. To meet the solid waste diversion goals, many local jurisdictions have implemented Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion Programs.

**DATA REQUEST**

52. Please identify whether the city of Lodi or county of San Joaquin operates a Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion Program, and cite the jurisdiction to which the LEC Project would be accountable.

53. Please describe how project operations will meet each of the requirements of the program cited in the previous data request.

**BACKGROUND**

A Phase I (ESA) needs to be conducted for all proposed project linear facilities. The LEC applicant is proposing a 2.5-mile natural gas pipeline that has not been evaluated in a Phase I ESA.

The following types of businesses warrant investigation if they are located on, adjacent to, or in proximity to the proposed linear facility routes. Proximity is defined as within a path of migration from these businesses.

- a. Automobile dealerships, maintenance /repair, and storage and salvage lots.
- b. Golf courses (fertilizers and pesticides).
- c. Machine /equipment /appliance servicing operations.
- d. Commercial printing operations.
- e. Oil distribution facilities.
- f. Any industry engaged in the storage /transport /disposal of hazardous waste or the use of hazardous materials.
- g. Schools, daycare centers and hospitals.

**DATA REQUEST**

54. Please provide a Phase I ESA for the 2.5-mile natural gas pipeline, according to ASTM Standard E1527-05 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments.

55. Please identify the type of crops grown over as long a period as records indicate, the historical use and identity of pesticides (including organic and inorganic pesticides as well

**LODI ENERGY CENTER (08-AFC-10)  
DATA REQUESTS**

as herbicides), and a statement of the likelihood of finding levels of pesticides along the pipeline/transmission route that might present a risk to pipeline workers and/or the public.



**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
1-800-822-6228 – [WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV](http://WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV)**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION  
FOR THE *Lodi Energy Center***

**DOCKET No. 08-AFC-10**

**PROOF OF SERVICE  
(Revised 12/8/08)**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** All parties shall 1) send an original signed document plus 12 copies OR 2) mail one original signed copy AND e-mail the document to the web address below, AND 3) all parties shall also send a printed OR electronic copy of the documents that shall include a proof of service declaration to each of the individuals on the proof of service:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
Attn: Docket No. 08-AFC-03  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-15  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512  
[docket@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:docket@energy.state.ca.us)

**APPLICANT**

Ken Speer  
Assistant General Manager  
Northern California Power Agency  
651 Commerce Drive  
Roseville, CA 95678  
[ken.speer@ncpagen.com](mailto:ken.speer@ncpagen.com)

**\*Ed Warner**  
**Project Manager**  
**Northern California Power Agency**  
**P.O. Box 1478**  
**Lodi, CA 95241**  
[ed.warner@ncpagen.com](mailto:ed.warner@ncpagen.com)

**APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS**

Andrea Grenier  
Grenier & Associates, Inc.  
1420 E. Roseville Pkwy, Ste. 140-377  
Roseville, CA 95661  
[andrea@agrenier.com](mailto:andrea@agrenier.com)

Sarah Madams  
CH2MHILL  
2485 Natomas Park Drive  
Suite 600  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
[smadams@ch2m.com](mailto:smadams@ch2m.com)

**COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT**

Scott Galati  
Galati Blek  
Plaza Towers  
555 Capitol Avenue, Suite 600  
Sacramento CA 95814  
[sgalati@gb-llp.com](mailto:sgalati@gb-llp.com)

**INTERESTED AGENCIES**

California ISO  
[e-recipient@caiso.com](mailto:e-recipient@caiso.com)

Kenneth Celli  
Hearing Officer  
[kcelli@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kcelli@energy.state.ca.us)

**INTERVENORS**

Rod Jones  
Project Manager  
[rjones@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:rjones@energy.state.ca.us)

**ENERGY COMMISSION**

Karen Douglas  
Commissioner and Presiding Member  
[kldougla@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kldougla@energy.state.ca.us)

Deborah Dyer  
Staff Counsel  
[ddyer@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:ddyer@energy.state.ca.us)

Jeffrey D. Byron  
Commissioner and Associate Member  
[jbyron@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jbyron@energy.state.ca.us)

Elena Miller  
Public Adviser  
[publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us)

**DECLARATION OF SERVICE**

I, April Albright, declare that on January 7, 2009, I deposited copies of the attached Lodi Energy Center Project (08-AFC-10) Data Request Set 1 (#s 1-55) 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.

Original signature in Dockets  
**April Albright**

Attachments