


To: All Commissioners
Garret Shean

From: William M. Chamberlain
Chief Counsel

cc: Service list for 00-AFC-14 (El Segundo Power Redevelopment
Project AFC)



Re: Purported Petition for Reconsideration

This memo recommends that the Commission take no action at all (i.e., not even placing the matter on a business meeting agenda) on a document purporting to be a petition for reconsideration in the El Segundo AFC proceeding, filed by Santa Monica Baykeeper, Inc. and Heal the Bay, Inc. (“Intervenors”).

The Warren-Alquist Act allows the Commission to reconsider AFC decisions on its own motion or upon the petition of a party. Petitions for reconsideration “shall be filed within 30 days after adoption by the commission of a decision” (Pub. Resources Code, § 25530.) The Commission adopted the final El Segundo decision on February 2, 2005, so petitions for reconsideration of that decision were due on March 4, 2005.

On March 4, 2005, at 4:51 p.m., the Commission received, by e-mail, a document that states in its entirety:

Environmental Intervenors, Santa Monica Baykeeper, Inc. and Heal the Bay, Inc., respectfully petition the Energy Commission for reconsideration of the February 2, 2005 Commission Decision on Application for Certification (00-AFC-14), concerning the El Segundo Redevelopment Project for the following issues: (1) BIOLOGY Findings and Conditions, (2) COMPLIANCE with LORS, (3) OVERRIDE of LORS, and (4) ADOPTION ORDER UPON RECONSIDERATION.

Our specific concerns have been well-documented in the record and they have not been remedied by the latest decision. We hereby incorporate all of our previous comments by reference into this petition for reconsideration.

The document was apparently sent to the service list for the El Segundo proceeding, as well as the Commission's docket office.

Section 1720, subdivision (c) of the Commission's regulations specifies the requirements for a petition for reconsideration:

The petition for reconsideration shall set forth with specificity the grounds for reconsideration, addressing any error of fact or law.

(Cal. Code Regs., tit. 20, § 1720, subd. (c).) The March 4, 2005 document does not comply with these legal requirements. It does not specify any alleged error of fact or law, nor does it set forth any specific ground for reconsideration. Instead, it merely invites the Commission to wade through "all" of the Intervenors' previous filings, and, necessarily, to speculate about which of the dozens or hundreds of individual points the Intervenors previously raised they might now be relying on. Such a "petition" does not properly invoke the Commission's reconsideration jurisdiction under Public Resources Code section 25530. Therefore, because no valid petition for reconsideration has been filed, I advise the Commission to take no action at all with respect to the March 4, 2005 document.

Taking no action is consistent with the California Supreme Court's views on reconsideration by administrative agencies. In the leading case of *Sierra Club v. San Joaquin Local Agency Formation Commission* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 489, the Court explained that the purpose of a petition for reconsideration is "to call to the agency's attention errors or omissions of fact or law in the administrative decision itself *that were not previously addressed in the briefing*, in order to give the agency the opportunity to correct its own mistakes before those errors or omissions are presented to a court." (21 Cal. 4th at p. 510, emphasis added.) In contrast, the Court indicated, where all arguments have already been made to the administrative agency and a final decision has been reached on those points, reconsideration serves little purpose:

In cases such as this . . . the administrative record has been created, the claims have been sifted, the evidence has been unearthed, and the agency has already applied its expertise and made its decision as to whether relief is appropriate. The

likelihood that an administrative body will reverse itself when presented only with the same facts and repetitive legal arguments is small. . . . [¶] Over 50 years ago, the United States Supreme Court suggested that: "motions for rehearing before the same tribunal that enters an order are under normal circumstances mere formalities which waste the time of litigants and tribunals, tend unnecessarily to prolong the administrative process, and delay or embarrass enforcement of orders which have all the characteristics of finality essential to appealable orders." [Citations.] We agree.

(21 Cal. 4th at pp. 501, 503.) It is clear that nothing in the Warren-Alquist Act, the Commission's regulations, or the case law requires the Commission to extend its proceedings, and to delay the finality of its decisions, upon the filing of a document that provides no new evidence and no new arguments, and does not even set forth grounds for the Commission to modify its decision except by a limitless reference to four years' worth of oral and written submissions to a voluminous record. I strongly advise that the Commission take no action with respect to the document filed by Santa Monica Baykeeper, Inc. and Heal the Bay, Inc.

Proof of Service List (Revised on 11/9/04)
filed with Original Document. Mailed from
Sacramento on 3/10/05).

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Energy Resources Conservation
and Development Commission**

In the Matter of:)
)
Application for Certification)
of the El Segundo Power Plant)
Redevelopment Project)
_____)

Docket No. 00-AFC-14
PROOF OF SERVICE LIST
[*Revised 11/9/04]

I, Gina Fontanilla, declare that on March 10, 2005, 2005, I deposited copies of the attached **PURPORTED PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION** in the United States mail at Sacramento, CA with first class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to the following:

DOCKET UNIT

Send the original signed document plus the required 12 copies to the address below:

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
DOCKET UNIT, MS-4
Attn: Docket No. 00-AFC-14
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512**

APPLICANT

Ron Cabe
El Segundo Power II LLC
301 Vista del Mar
El Segundo, CA 90245
ron.cabe@nrgenergy.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

***John McKinsey
Stoel Rives, LLP
770 L Street, Suite 800
Sacramento, CA 95814
Jamckinsey@stoel.com**

California State Lands Commission
Attn: Dwight Sanders
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California Independent System Operator
Attn: Johan Galleberg
151 Blue Ravine Road
Folsom, CA 95630
jgalleberg@caiso.com

Marc D. Joseph
CURE
Adams, Broadwell, Joseph & Cardoza
651 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 900
South San Francisco, CA 94080
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com

John Theodore Yee, P.E.
South Coast Air Quality Mgmt. District
21865 E. Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182
Jyee@agmd.gov

City of El Segundo
Paul Garry (Planning)
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Pgarry@elsegundo.org

California State Lands Commission
Attn: Jane Smith
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825
smithj@slc.ca.gov

California Coastal Commission
Attn: Tom Luster
Energy/Ocean Resources
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tluster@coastal.ca.gov

California Dept. of Fish & Game
Attn: Bill Paznokas
4949 Viewridge Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123
wpaznokas@dfg.ca.gov

National Marine Fisheries Service
Attn: Bryant Chesney
501 West Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200
Long Beach, CA 90802
Bryant.chesney@noaa.gov

INTERVENORS

William C. Reid
Utility Workers Union of America
Local 246
10355 Los Alamitos Blvd.
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
Wmreid@earthlink.net

Mark D. Hensley
City Attorney, City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Mhensley@bwsllaw.com

Michelle A. Murphy
Robert E. Perkins
4420 The Strand
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Murphyperkins@cs.com

City of Manhattan Beach
Community Development Dept.
Laurie Jester
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Ljester@ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us

Robert Wadden
City Attorney
City of Manhattan Beach
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Rwadden@ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us


Lyle & Elsie Cripe
4421 Ocean Drive
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Cripe668@earthlink.net

Richard G. Nickelson
4421 Crest Drive
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
nickmf@adelphia.net

Santa Monica Baykeeper
Attn: Tracy J. Egoscue
P.O. Box 10096
Marina del Ray, CA 90295
baykeeper@smbaykeeper.org

Heal the Bay
Attn: Dr. Mark Gold
3220 Nebraska Avenue
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Mgold@healthebay.org

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


[signature]

* * * *

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

FOR YOUR INFORMATION ONLY! Parties **DO NOT** mail to the following individuals. The Energy Commission Docket Unit will internally distribute documents filed in this case to the following:

WILLIAM J. KEESE
Chairman & Presiding Member
MS-32

JAMES D. BOYD
Commissioner & Associate Member
MS-34

Garret Shean
Hearing Officer
MS-9

James Reede
Project Manager
MS-15

David Abelson
Staff Counsel
MS-14

PUBLIC ADVISER

Margret J. Kim
Public Adviser's Office
1516 Ninth Street, MS-12
Sacramento, CA 95814
pao@energy.state.ca.us