

DOCKET**08-AFC-5**DATE MAY 18 2010RECD. MAY 18 2010

From: Raoul Renaud
To: Tom Budlong
CC: allanori@comcast.net; almamaghani@aol.com; Angela_Leiba@urscorp.com
Date: 5/18/2010 11:14 AM
Subject: Re: May 24 Evidentiary Hearing

Dear Mr. Budlong:

We appreciate your comments. We have discussed this issue at length here at the Commission and have determined that, although some topics will not be complete as of May 24, most topics are complete and we can get those done and the evidentiary record closed on those topics. There will be testimony on all topics at the May 24 - 25 sessions, as each party will put on all of the opening and rebuttal testimony and evidence filed to date, and will have the opportunity to cross-examine all of it. This will enable us to focus solely on the incomplete areas at a future session.

We will clearly need to have a future session to cover the incomplete areas of some topics. But there is plenty for us to do May 24 and 25, in addition to which the public will have an opportunity to speak to the Committee starting at 5:30 on May 24.

Raoul A. Renaud
Hearing Adviser II
California Energy Commission
1516 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916)651-2020

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any attachments are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee.

>>> Tom Budlong <TomBudlong@RoadRunner.com> 5/18/2010 11:01 AM >>>
Raoul Renaud

Hearing Officer

Imperial Valley Solar

Dear Mr. Renaud,

On reviewing recent 'events', I seriously question having the Evidentiary Hearing on May 24. I understand the pressure to proceed. But there is so much that will not be covered at the hearing that I wonder if proceeding with it will end up costing more. Consider:

* Yesterday's (Mon, 5/17) email from Caryn Holmes and Christine Hammond says staff will not have testimony on four topics - cultural,

biological, water, and alternatives. These are big topics.

* In my request for more response time last Friday (5/14) I expressed concern that the hydrogen system proposed in the May 2010 AFC supplement is not well defined - either in the supplement or elsewhere. Hydrogen can be very dangerous - extremely dangerous. The applicant's recent revision is the third. The revision was so poorly described in the supplement that it is impossible to start to analyze, except that to conclude that an expansion of the hydrogen system is underway. Something is going on -- it's not obvious what. Independent of what could be said at the hearing, the technical situation must be fully understood. More bluntly, it's an undefined complex system involving a dangerous substance that is difficult to control and that could result in explosion and fire. The applicant has not provided data to give confidence in the system design.

I disagree with the last sentence of the first paragraph in the Holmes/Hammond email that responding to other changes (e.g., hydrogen system) will not require as extensive an effort. If anything, hydrogen with its potential for instant disaster might demand a substantial effort.

It's too early to discuss this in the hearing.

* We don't have the advantage of staff analysis on the revisions in the supplement to the AFC.

It appears the hearing would cover just the 'easy' topics and could not complete its business. Another hearing will be needed to cover the balance. The extra time and expense for all involved in the May 24 hearing could be avoided.

Regards,

Tom Budlong, Intervenor