

**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application for Certification for the
Mirant Marsh Landing Generating Station Project

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

DOCKET
08-AFC-3

DATE	JUN 25 2010
RECD.	JUN 25 2010

**APPLICANT'S PRELIMINARY OPPOSITION TO
ROBERT SARVEY'S APPEAL OF THE COMMITTEE'S DENIAL
OF HIS LATE-FILED PETITION TO INTERVENE**

June 25, 2010

Lisa A. Cottle
Winston & Strawn LLP
101 California Street, Suite 3900
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 591-1579
Facsimile: (415) 591-1400
lcottle@winston.com

Attorneys for Mirant Marsh Landing, LLC

**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application for Certification for the
Mirant Marsh Landing Generating Station Project

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

**APPLICANT'S PRELIMINARY OPPOSITION TO
ROBERT SARVEY'S APPEAL OF THE COMMITTEE'S DENIAL
OF HIS LATE-FILED PETITION TO INTERVENE**

On June 21, 2010, the Committee denied the late-filed petition to intervene of Robert Sarvey based on its finding that Mr. Sarvey has not shown good cause to allow his late intervention. The Committee noted that Mr. Sarvey has participated in proceedings before other agencies where the Marsh Landing Generating Station ("MLGS") is being addressed (namely, the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("BAAQMD")). The Committee found that Mr. Sarvey "could have petitioned to intervene at any point in this proceeding, which has been active since September, 2008," and that "for unstated reasons, he attempted to wait until the last possible moment to file and missed the deadline." The Committee found that Mr. Sarvey was on notice that a Staff Assessment would be published in this proceeding, "followed by a Staff Workshop, publication of any necessary revisions to the Staff Assessment, and then Committee proceedings." The Committee ruled that Mr. Sarvey's excuse, which was that he was waiting for a document titled "Final Staff Assessment" to be published, does not constitute good cause for allowing his late intervention. (Committee Order Denying Petition to Intervene, issued June 21, 2010.)

Mr. Sarvey is now appealing the Committee's order to the full Commission. In a petition filed on June 24, 2010, Mr. Sarvey asks the Commission to rule on his appeal at the Commission's June 30, 2010 business meeting, which is less than a week after he filed his appeal. The applicant intends to prepare a more comprehensive response to Mr. Sarvey's appeal, but in light of the short amount of time before the June 30, 2010 business meeting, the applicant believes it is necessary to file this preliminary opposition specifically to object to the Commission's taking this matter up on June 30, 2010. Hearing this matter on June 30, 2010 does not afford the applicant sufficient opportunity to respond to Mr. Sarvey's allegations, particularly

because the applicant is currently preparing for the prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing that will be held on July 1, 2010. Those events have been scheduled since May 12, 2010, when the Committee held a publicly noticed status conference in this proceeding.

In addition, the agenda for the June 30, 2010 business meeting has already been publicly noticed and adding the consideration of Mr. Sarvey's appeal as an agenda item at this late date would violate the notice requirement in the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act of 2004 (California Government Code section 11255), which requires the Commission to provide ten days' notice of items it will consider at a business meeting. Neither of the exceptions to the ten-day notice requirement provided under Government Code Section 1125.3 applies here. Mr. Sarvey has not demonstrated that an emergency (as defined in Government Code section 1125.5) exists to allow a waiver of that requirement, nor is there any basis for concluding that there is a "need to take immediate action" under Section 1125.3(b). The Committee properly denied Mr. Sarvey's late-filed petition. The fact that there is so little time between the Committee's June 21, 2010 order and the start of the evidentiary hearing in this case is a direct result of the fact that Mr. Sarvey waited so long to file his petition to intervene. He has acknowledged that he has long been aware of the proposal to construct the MLGS and that he was waiting for the last possible moment to intervene. Having miscalculated when that moment would arrive, Mr. Sarvey has not demonstrated good cause for allowing his late intervention.

The Commission's consideration of an appeal in the Orange Grove proceeding (Docket No. 08-AFC-04) is instructive here. A petitioner in that case attempted to intervene three days prior to the evidentiary hearing and after the deadline for intervention. The Committee denied the late-filed intervention at the evidentiary hearing and the petitioner subsequently appealed. The full Commission considered the petitioner's appeal more than a month after the appeal was filed, after allowing parties an opportunity to prepare responses to the appeal and allowing the petitioner to reply to those responses. In the Orange Grove case, the Commission confirmed that the petitioner had not shown good cause for intervention and concluded that the petitioner's interests had not been harmed, noting that the petitioner had the opportunity to comment without intervention.¹ As in the Orange Grove proceeding, Mr. Sarvey will not be harmed if his appeal is heard on a normal schedule, with sufficient time for the applicant and other parties to prepare responses, rather than an unreasonably expedited schedule that would provide parties mere hours

¹ Commission Order Denying DFI Funding, Inc.'s Appeal of Denial of Petition for Intervention, at p. 4.

to respond to the appeal, as well as providing minimal notice for purposes of the agenda for the June 30, 2010 business meeting. Mr. Sarvey continues to have the opportunity to provide public comments and his attempt at late intervention does not constitute a need for the Commission to take immediate action on his appeal. Also, as even Mr. Sarvey acknowledges, his concerns about the project have already been considered and addressed by the applicant and the BAAQMD in their assessment of his comments on the Preliminary Determination of Compliance for the project. The applicant therefore requests a similar opportunity to provide a response to Mr. Sarvey's appeal as was provided in the Orange Grove proceeding, and suggests that responses be due by July 15, 2010, and that the matter be taken up at the Commission's July 28, 2010 business meeting.

Mr. Sarvey's June 24, 2010 petition also contains numerous errors and misrepresents the procedures that have been followed in this case. There have been many opportunities for public comment and participation dating all the way back to December 2008, including several workshops, the opportunity to comment on the Staff Assessment issued on April 26, 2010, and a properly noticed Committee status conference where the schedule for this proceeding was discussed in a public forum. Notices of all workshops and other events have been published on the Commission's website, which Mr. Sarvey has acknowledged that he visits once a week. Mr. Sarvey never participated in any of those events or provided any comments in this proceeding until his late-filed petition to intervene. As noted above, the applicant has not had sufficient time to address all of Mr. Sarvey's errors and misstatements and requests the opportunity to present a full written response to his appeal by July 15, 2010. A partial list of errors in Mr. Sarvey's petition includes the following:

- Mr. Sarvey had more than 20 months to intervene in this case, not five working days as he alleges. Also, the date of the prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing was discussed at the Committee status conference on May 12, 2010, notice of which was posted to the Commission's website on April 29, 2010. Mr. Sarvey could have attended or participated in the status conference by telephone or internet but he elected not to do so. Had he participated, he would have known that the deadline for intervention would be June 1, 2010, as dictated by Section 1207 of the Commission's regulations.

- Staff issued a Staff Assessment on April 26, 2010 that clearly stated that it was intended to reflect Staff's final conclusions and recommendations for the project and that Staff would not be publishing a document titled "Final Staff Assessment." Staff invited the public to comment on the Staff Assessment by May 26, 2010 and held a public workshop (which was properly noticed) on May 4, 2010 to discuss the Staff Assessment. At the workshop, Staff and the applicant discussed several substantive issues in detail, including Staff's proposed requirement for limiting ammonia slip, which Mr. Sarvey identifies as one of his "major issues." The originally proposed ammonia slip limit was thoroughly discussed and vetted at the May 4 workshop. The applicant explained at the workshop why an ammonia slip limit of 5 ppmvd is not achievable for this project. The applicant subsequently submitted a detailed explanation of feasibility in its comments on the Staff Assessment on May 24, 2010. The applicant also provided letters from vendors confirming that an ammonia slip limit of 5 ppmvd cannot be guaranteed at this time. Staff evaluated the documents and information submitted by the applicant and modified the ammonia slip requirement in its Revised Staff Assessment accordingly. Mr. Sarvey could have participated in the workshop and submitted his own comments on the Staff Assessment but he elected not to do so. He was on constructive notice that the ammonia slip requirement could change in the Revised Staff Assessment.

For a more detailed explanation of why Mr. Sarvey has not shown good cause for his late intervention, please see the attached opposition that the applicant filed on June 11, 2010. As demonstrated therein, the Committee properly denied Mr. Sarvey's late-filed petition.

As stated above, the applicant requests the opportunity to provide a full response to Mr. Sarvey's petition by July 15, 2010 and requests that this matter be addressed at the Commission's July 28, 2010 business meeting.

June 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lisa A. Cottle", written over a horizontal line. A long, thin diagonal line extends from the top right of the signature across the page.

Lisa A. Cottle

Winston & Strawn LLP

Attorneys for Mirant Marsh Landing, LLC

ATTACHMENT

Copy of Applicant's Opposition to the
Late-Filed Petition to Intervene of Robert Sarvey

(Filed June 11, 2010)

**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application for Certification for the
Mirant Marsh Landing Generating Station Project

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

**APPLICANT'S OPPOSITION TO THE LATE-FILED
PETITION TO INTERVENE OF ROBERT SARVEY**

June 11, 2010

Lisa A. Cottle
Takako Morita
Winston & Strawn LLP
101 California Street, Suite 3900
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 591-1579
Facsimile: (415) 591-1400
lcottle@winston.com
tmorita@winston.com

Attorneys for Mirant Marsh Landing, LLC

**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application for Certification for the
Mirant Marsh Landing Generating Station Project

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

**APPLICANT'S OPPOSITION TO THE LATE-FILED
PETITION TO INTERVENE OF ROBERT SARVEY**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Committee's direction issued on June 4, 2010, Mirant Marsh Landing, LLC, the applicant in this proceeding ("Mirant Marsh Landing"), submits this response in opposition to the late-filed petition to intervene of Robert Sarvey. Section 1207(b) of the Commission's regulations and the Committee's Notice of Prehearing Conference and Evidentiary Hearing dated May 26, 2010 ("Hearing Notice") established 5:00 p.m. on June 1, 2010 as the deadline for submitting a petition to intervene in this proceeding. Mr. Sarvey did not meet that deadline. Mr. Sarvey instead filed his petition on the afternoon of June 4, 2010, three days after the deadline. His petition therefore must be treated as a late-filed petition to intervene.

Section 1207(c) of the Commission's regulations specifies that the Presiding Member may grant a late-filed petition to intervene only upon a showing of "good cause" by the petitioner. The Hearing Notice placed members of the public on notice that late-filed petitions to intervene in this proceeding will not be granted absent a showing of "extraordinary good cause." Mr. Sarvey has failed to meet his burden to demonstrate that extraordinary good cause, or any good cause, exists to allow his late intervention. In fact, Mr. Sarvey has not provided any valid excuse for missing the deadline, as explained below. Mr. Sarvey's late-filed petition to intervene therefore must be denied.

Allowing Mr. Sarvey's late intervention at this advanced stage in the proceeding would prejudice the applicant, undermine the integrity of the Commission's procedural rules, and condone the practice of waiting until the last possible moment to intervene, as also explained below. For all of these reasons, Mr. Sarvey's late-filed petition to intervene should be denied.

II. DISCUSSION

A. **Mr. Sarvey has not met his burden to demonstrate that extraordinary good cause, or any good cause, exists to allow his late intervention.**

Mr. Sarvey has not provided any valid excuse for missing the deadline for intervention. Mirant Marsh Landing filed its Application for Certification (“AFC”) more than two years ago and the Commission issued its data adequacy determination on September 24, 2008. Mr. Sarvey has had more than 20 months to intervene, but he has elected not to do so. In his response to the Committee’s questions on June 8, 2010, Mr. Sarvey stated that he “visit[s] the CEC website about once a week.” Yet he has ignored numerous opportunities for public comment and participation in this proceeding. In addition to the December 2008 initial informational hearing and site visit, Staff conducted workshops in December 2008, October 2009, and most recently on May 4, 2010. Each of these workshops was preceded by a formal notice inviting public participation that was posted on the Commission’s website. Members of the public had the opportunity to attend these events in person or to participate via telephone. Mr. Sarvey never participated in any of those events. Staff also solicited comments on its Staff Assessment issued April 26, 2010 in a notice that was posted on the Commission’s website. Mr. Sarvey elected not to submit comments on the Staff Assessment, which were due on May 26, 2010. The Committee also held a status conference in this proceeding on May 12, 2010 and alerted the public in a notice posted on the Commission’s website. Members of the public had the opportunity to attend the status conference in person or to participate via WebEx or telephone. Mr. Sarvey elected not to participate in the status conference. Having allowed all of these opportunities to pass, Mr. Sarvey cannot credibly claim that extraordinary good cause, or any good cause, exists for granting his late-filed petition to intervene.

Mr. Sarvey has long been aware of this proceeding and the progress being made here. He admits that he has been participating in the California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) proceeding in which the CPUC is reviewing the power purchase agreement for the Marsh Landing Generating Station (“MLGS”). Mr. Sarvey has submitted testimony and briefs in the CPUC proceeding on behalf of CARE, an organization in which he serves as an officer. In the CPUC proceeding, Mr. Sarvey provided opening testimony on February 22, 2010, reply testimony on March 10, 2010, and briefs on April 14, 2010 and April 22, 2010. He discussed the MLGS in all of these documents, and in several places he cited the September 2009 AFC

amendment filed by Mirant Marsh Landing in this proceeding.¹ In his briefs filed at the CPUC, Mr. Sarvey also quoted conditions contained in the Preliminary Determination of Compliance (“PDOC”) for the project that was released on March 24, 2010 by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (“BAAQMD”).²

Mr. Sarvey also admits that he has submitted comments on this project’s PDOC to the BAAQMD. In those comments, Mr. Sarvey references this proceeding in several places, indicating that he has examined the “real facts in the permitting record, CEC documents and other publicly available documents.”³ Mr. Sarvey’s participation and testimony in the CPUC proceeding and his comments on the PDOC demonstrate that he has been well aware of what was happening in this proceeding and was actively reviewing the documents filed by Mirant Marsh Landing and staff. As noted above, Mr. Sarvey has stated that he “visit[s] the CEC website about once a week.”

Mr. Sarvey also admits that he has familiarity and experience with the Commission’s licensing process and the associated requirements and procedures. In his response to the Committee’s questions on June 8, 2010, Mr. Sarvey states that he has “participated in about 20 siting cases.” As a partial list of examples, Mr. Sarvey has participated in licensing proceedings for Contra Costa Unit 8 Power Project (Docket 00-AFC-1), East Altamont Energy Center (Docket 01-AFC-4), Tracy Peaker Project (Docket 01-AFC-16), Tesla Power Project (Docket 01-AFC-21), Los Esteros Critical Energy Facility II Phase 2 (Docket 03-AFC-2), Modesto Irrigation District Electric Generation Station Ripon (Docket 03-SPPE-1), San Francisco Electric Reliability Project (Docket 04-AFC-01), Eastshore Energy Center (Docket 06-AFC-06), GWF Tracy Combined Cycle Power Plant Project (Docket 08-AFC-07). Mr. Sarvey is

¹ Opening Testimony of Robert Sarvey for Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE) in CPUC Docket No. 09-09-021, filed February 22, 2010 and available at https://www.pge.com/.../LongTermRFO-Solicitation2008-II_Plea_CARE_20100310-01.doc; Reply Testimony of Robert Sarvey for Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE) in CPUC Docket No. 09-09-021, filed March 10, 2010 and available at https://www.pge.com/regulation/LongTermRFO-Solicitation2008-II/Hearing-Exhibits/CARE/2010/LongTermRFO-Solicitation2008-II_Exh_CARE_20100407-Exh402.pdf; Opening Brief of Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE) in CPUC Docket No. 09-09-021, filed April 14, 2010 and available at <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/EFILE/BRIEF/117186.pdf> (“CARE Opening Brief”).

² CARE Opening Brief; Reply Brief of Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE) in CPUC Docket No. 09-09-021, filed April 22, 2010 and available at https://www.pge.com/regulation/LongTermRFO-Solicitation2008-II/Pleadings/CARE/2010/LongTermRFO-Solicitation2008-II_Plea_CARE_20100422-02.pdf.

³ Applicant Responses to Public Comments Received Regarding Preliminary Determination of Compliance for the Marsh Landing Generating Station, “Response to Comments Received from Robert Sarvey”, p. 30.

also an intervenor in the pending Mariposa Energy Project (Docket 09-AFC-03) and Oakley Generating Station (Docket 09-AFC-04) proceedings, both of which were filed well after this AFC. As a recurring participant in Commission licensing proceedings, Mr. Sarvey must be required to comply with procedural deadlines.

Mr. Sarvey knew that this proceeding was advancing and he knew how to intervene, but he was deliberately waiting until the last possible moment to do so. He acknowledges this in his petition when he says “petitioner has been awaiting the Final Staff Assessment and the FDOC and intended to evaluate both prior to applying for intervention.” Mr. Sarvey may have miscalculated when the last possible time for intervention would occur, but this oversight does not constitute extraordinary good cause (or any good cause) for granting his deliberate late intervention. Moreover, the practice of intentionally waiting until the last possible time to intervene is prejudicial to the applicant and disruptive to the Commission’s licensing process, as explained in Section B below.

Mr. Sarvey’s claim that he was waiting for a Final Staff Assessment (“FSA”) is also not credible. Staff has long proposed to issue a Staff Assessment rather than a Preliminary Staff Assessment (“PSA”) and FSA. This intent was communicated in status reports filed by staff and Mirant Marsh Landing and posted on the Commission’s website.⁴ Moreover, the Staff Assessment issued on April 26, 2010 was not labeled as preliminary, and very clearly explained that it was not preliminary and that staff intended for it to reflect staff’s final conclusions and recommendations for the project:

Staff typically prepares both a preliminary and final staff assessment. However, to adhere to agreed upon timelines for this project, staff will prepare a SA only. The SA presents for the applicant, interveners, agencies, other interested parties, and members of the public, **the staff’s final analysis, conclusions and recommendations.**⁵

In his response to the Committee’s questions on June 8, 2010, Mr. Sarvey stated that he has “participated in about 20 siting cases, [and has] only not seen a FSA in SPPE proceedings.”

⁴ See Staff’s Status Report #6 dated February 17, 2010 and Staff Status Report #7 dated April 15, 2010, and Mirant Marsh Landing’s Eighth Status Report dated March 3, 2010, and Mirant Marsh Landing’s Ninth Status Report dated April 28, 2010.

⁵ Marsh Landing Generating Station, Staff Assessment (08-AFC-3), April 2010, Introduction, pp. 2-2 through 2-3 (emphasis added).

This is no excuse for ignoring the clear direction in the Staff Assessment. This is also not the first time that staff has followed the approach of issuing a Staff Assessment instead of a PSA and FSA. Staff issued a Staff Assessment in the Lodi, Genesis, Orange Grove, Solar Millenium, Abengoa Mojave Solar, and Imperial Valley Solar proceedings. As someone who regularly participates in Commission licensing proceedings and visits the Commission's website on a weekly basis, Mr. Sarvey cannot credibly claim that issuance of a Staff Assessment instead of a PSA and FSA was an unfair surprise. Staff's issuance of a Staff Assessment rather than a PSA and FSA is permissible under the Commission's rules, was mentioned several times in public documents, and does not provide good cause justifying Mr. Sarvey's late intervention. Even if a PSA and FSA were published, the time to provide meaningful and constructive comments is during the public comment period for the PSA, not after the FSA is published.

Mr. Sarvey also has not demonstrated that denial of intervention would prevent him from commenting on his areas of primary concern. In his petition, Mr. Sarvey states that he is interested in the project based on his concerns about potential air quality impacts in Tracy, where he lives, based on his assertion that "CEC staff, ARB, and the BAAQMD determined in the East Altamont Energy Center Proceeding 01-AFC-4 that 70% of all emissions emitted in the Contra Costa area impact Tracy." Mr. Sarvey ignores the fact that the Commission rejected staff's recommendation in the East Altamont Energy Center ("EAEC") proceeding that a 70% effectiveness factor be applied to emission reduction credits from the Antioch area for purposes of mitigating EAEC emissions, concluding that "we find no logical basis for a 70% factor and again do not think the methodology is established well enough to override BAAQMD decisions."⁶

Mr. Sarvey has already addressed air quality issues in his comments on the PDOC. Mirant Marsh Landing addressed his comments in detail in its responses to PDOC comments, which were docketed in this proceeding on June 4, 2010. Mr. Sarvey's comments also will be addressed by BAAQMD when the FDOC is issued. Commission staff has also confirmed that staff considered Mr. Sarvey's PDOC comments in preparing the Revised Staff Assessment issued yesterday.

⁶ Commission Decision, East Altamont Energy Center, Docket 01-AFC-4, p. 144. Mr. Sarvey made a similar assertion in his comments on the PDOC in reference to the Tesla Power Project (Docket 01-AFC-21). Mirant Marsh Landing explained that the determination he cites is not accurate as applied to MLGS and concerned circumstances unique to Tesla.

Mr. Sarvey's comments on the PDOC also address the topic areas cited in his response to the Committee's questions on June 8, 2010. He states that he is interested in issues associated with environmental justice related to public health, air quality and hazardous material transportation issues; energy efficiency and alternatives; and project design. However, he has already addressed these topics in his comments on the PDOC and they have been addressed by Mirant Marsh Landing and staff and will be addressed in the FDOC. Mr. Sarvey thus has not demonstrated that extraordinary good cause (or any good cause) exists to allow his late intervention in this proceeding.

B. Granting Mr. Sarvey's late-filed petition would prejudice Mirant Marsh Landing, undermine the integrity of the Commission's rules, and condone deliberate last minute interventions.

This proceeding has been underway for more than 20 months since the Commission made its data adequacy decision (and more than 24 months since its original filing date) and is at a very advanced stage. Mirant Marsh Landing has invested substantial amounts of time and money to develop the project and to advance this case toward a final certification decision. Mirant Marsh Landing also has explained the time constraints affecting this project and the need for a Commission decision by the end of August. These time constraints arise from contractual commitments that are in place to support construction of the project, including the power purchase agreement, a turbine supply agreement, and an engineering, procurement, and construction contract. Recognizing these constraints, Mirant Marsh Landing and staff have worked diligently to advance this case to its current status with a prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing scheduled to take place on July 1, 2010.

Allowing Mr. Sarvey's late intervention has the potential to burden Mirant Marsh Landing and could cause a delay in this proceeding, especially if Mr. Sarvey is allowed to raise new issues based on the Revised Staff Assessment or Mirant Marsh Landing's testimony that would require additional testimony or hearing time to address. This is unfair and prejudicial to the applicant in light of how much time Mr. Sarvey has had to participate.

Interested parties have every right to participate in Commission licensing proceedings and their participation should be encouraged, but they must be required to comply with deadlines and procedural rules. Excessive leniency in the application and enforcement of those rules,

particularly when parties like Mr. Sarvey wait as long as possible to comment, threatens to undermine the integrity of the Commission's process.

Granting Mr. Sarvey's late intervention also would condone and potentially encourage his admitted tactic of waiting until the last moment to intervene. Mr. Sarvey has filed late petitions to intervene in at least two other siting proceedings.⁷ Parties who wish to participate in a licensing case should be encouraged to intervene and present their comments and concerns at the earliest possible time so that staff and the applicant can consider those comments and concerns in an orderly fashion. This message is clear in the Commission's *Public Participation in the Siting Process: Practice and Procedure Guide*, which warns that late intervention may not be allowed:

It is important to intervene as early as possible in the proceeding. Waiting may mean that opportunities to raise important issues may be missed. If there are no intervenors, issues may be resolved solely between the staff and the applicant. The committee may not allow a late intervenor to revisit matters resolved before the intervention.⁸

The tactic of deliberately waiting until the last possible moment to file an intervention seems intended to cause delay, rather than to provide a meaningful contribution to the analysis and decision making processes. Allowing Mr. Sarvey to intervene at this late stage may encourage parties to intervene after the deadline in future proceedings.

C. If his late intervention is allowed, Mr. Sarvey should be prohibited from raising new issues or delaying the schedule and other parties should have the opportunity to file rebuttal testimony.

Mirant Marsh Landing urges the Committee to deny Mr. Sarvey's late intervention for all of the reasons discussed above. There is no showing of extraordinary good cause (or any good cause) for allowing Mr. Sarvey's late intervention and there are ample grounds for denying it. If, however, the Committee were to grant Mr. Sarvey's late intervention, certain conditions are needed to avoid undue prejudice to the applicant. Specifically, Mr. Sarvey should be directed to comply with the following: (i) Mr. Sarvey must accept the status of the proceeding and the

⁷ See Mr. Sarvey's Petition to intervene in the Eastshore Energy Center (Docket 06-AFC-06) and Los Esteros Critical Energy Facility II Phase 2 (Docket 03-AFC-2).

⁸ Public Participation in the Siting Process: Practice and Procedure Guide, California Energy Commission, December 2006, p. 55.

record as they currently exist, including the current lack of disputed issues; (ii) given his ample prior opportunities to intervene and obvious knowledge of the proceeding, Mr. Sarvey will not be permitted to raise any new issues in this proceeding and shall be limited to presenting the comments he has made on the PDOC; and (iii) Mr. Sarvey must comply with the schedule set forth in the Hearing Notice and he will not be permitted to delay the schedule or extend the allotted time for the evidentiary hearing.

Mirant Marsh Landing also requests that parties be given the opportunity to submit rebuttal testimony to address anything that Mr. Sarvey may raise in his testimony. Mirant Marsh Landing requests that rebuttal testimony be allowed on June 28, 2010.

III. CONCLUSION

As explained above, Mr. Sarvey has not met his burden to demonstrate that extraordinary good cause, or any good cause, exists to allow his late intervention. His late-filed petition to intervene therefore must be denied.

June 11, 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa A. Cottle
Winston & Strawn LLP

Attorneys for Mirant Marsh Landing, LLC

**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application for Certification for the
Mirant Marsh Landing Generating Station Project

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Lisa A. Cottle, declare that on June 11, 2010, I served and filed copies of the attached *Applicant's Opposition to the Late-Filed Petition to Intervene of Robert Sarvey (Docket No. 08-AFC-3)*. The original document filed with the Docket Unit is accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located at the web page for this project at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/marshlanding/index.html>. The document has been sent to both the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit, in the following manner:

- For service to all other parties: Sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list; and by depositing in the United States mail at San Francisco, California with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed as provided on the Proof of Service list to those addresses **NOT** marked as "email preferred."

AND

- For filing with the Energy Commission: Sent an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed and emailed respectively, to the address below:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

Attn: Docket No. 08-AFC-3
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Lisa A. Cottle



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

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE MARSH LANDING
GENERATING STATION**

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 4/19/2010)

APPLICANT

Chuck Hicklin, Project Manager
Mirant Corporation
P.O. Box 192
Pittsburg, CA 94565
E-mail preferred
chuck.hicklin@mirant.com

Jonathan Sacks, Project Director
Steven Nickerson
Mirant Corporation
1155 Perimeter Center West
Atlanta, GA, 30338
E-mail preferred
jon.sacks@mirant.com
steve.nickerson@mirant.com

CONSULTANTS

Anne Connell
Dale Shileikis
URS Corporation
221 Main Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94105-1917
E-mail preferred
Anne_Connell@URSCorp.com
Dale_shileikis@URSCorp.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Lisa Cottle
Takako Morita
Winston & Strawn LLP
101 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-5802
E-mail preferred
lcottle@winston.com
tmorita@winston.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
E-mail Preferred
e-recipient@caiso.com

INTERVENORS

California Unions for Reliable Energy
("CURE")
Gloria D. Smith & Marc D. Joseph
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000
South San Francisco, California 94080
gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

JAMES D. BOYD
Vice Chair & Presiding Member
jboyd@energy.state.ca.us

KAREN DOUGLAS
Chair & Associate Member
kldougl@energy.state.ca.us

Paul Kramer
Hearing Officer
pkramer@energy.state.ca.us

Mike Monasmith
Project Manager
mmonasmi@energy.state.ca.us

*Kerry Willis
Staff Counsel
kwillis@energy.state.ca.us

Jennifer Jennings
Public Adviser
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us

BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application for Certification for the
Mirant Marsh Landing Generating Station Project

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Lisa A. Cottle, declare that on June 25, 2010, I served and filed copies of the attached *Applicant's Preliminary Opposition to Robert Sarvey's Appeal of the Committee's Denial of his Late-Filed Petition to Intervene (Docket No. 08-AFC-3)*. The original document filed with the Docket Unit is accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located at the web page for this project at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/marshlanding/index.html>. The document has been sent to both the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit, in the following manner:

- For service to all other parties: Sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list; and by depositing in the United States mail at San Francisco, California with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed as provided on the Proof of Service list to those addresses **NOT** marked as "email preferred."

AND

- For filing with the Energy Commission: Sent an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed and emailed respectively, to the address below:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

Attn: Docket No. 08-AFC-3
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Lisa A. Cottle



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.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE MARSH LANDING
GENERATING STATION**

Docket No. 08-AFC-3

PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 6/21/2010)

APPLICANT

Chuck Hicklin, Project Manager
Mirant Corporation
P.O. Box 192
Pittsburg, CA 94565
E-mail preferred
chuck.hicklin@mirant.com

Jonathan Sacks, Project Director
Steven Nickerson
Mirant Corporation
1155 Perimeter Center West
Atlanta, GA, 30338
E-mail preferred
jon.sacks@mirant.com
steve.nickerson@mirant.com

CONSULTANTS

*Anne Connell
Dale Shileikis
URS Corporation
Post Montgomery Center
One Montgomery Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94104-4538
E-mail preferred
Anne.Connell@URSCorp.com
Dale_shileikis@URSCorp.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Lisa Cottle
Takako Morita
Winston & Strawn LLP
101 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-5802
E-mail preferred
lcottle@winston.com
tmorita@winston.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
E-mail Preferred
e-recipient@caiso.com

INTERVENORS

California Unions for Reliable Energy
("CURE")
Gloria D. Smith & Marc D. Joseph
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000
South San Francisco, California 94080
gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

JAMES D. BOYD
Vice Chair & Presiding Member
jboyd@energy.state.ca.us

KAREN DOUGLAS
Chair & Associate Member
kldougla@energy.state.ca.us

Paul Kramer
Hearing Officer
pkramer@energy.state.ca.us

Mike Monasmith
Project Manager
mmonasmi@energy.state.ca.us

Kerry Willis
Staff Counsel
kwillis@energy.state.ca.us

Jennifer Jennings
Public Adviser
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us