

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	12-AFC-03
Project Title:	Redondo Beach Energy Project
TN #:	201843
Document Title:	Report of Conversation re: Summary of Information Presented at the 2/10/14 Data Request Workshop
Description:	Between CEC/Patricia Kelly and AES and Energy Commission Staff on 03/10/14
Filer:	Alicia Campos
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	3/10/2014 9:17:21 AM
Docketed Date:	3/10/2014

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

REPORT OF CONVERSATION



Siting,
Transmission and
Environmental
Protection Division

FILE:

PROJECT TITLE:

Redondo Beach Energy Project (RBEP)

Docket: 12-AFC-03

TECHNICAL AREA(S): RBEP Data Request Workshop on February 10, 2014

Telephone

Meeting Location: Redondo Beach

NAME: Patricia Kelly

DATE: 03/10/14

TIME:

WITH: AES and Energy Commission Staff

SUBJECT: Summary of Information presented at the 2/10/14 data request workshop

COMMENTS:

The purpose of this Record of Conversation is to provide members of the public, who were not able to attend the Data Request Workshop on February 10, 2014 in Redondo Beach and not able to call in, due to WebEx not being available, an opportunity to be informed on the technical topics presented by the Energy Commission Staff (Staff) and discussed with the AES representatives (Applicant), other parties and the public.

Discussion on Noise

- Revised noise analyses submitted by applicant February 3, 2014 in response to Data Requests 26R and 28R (TN201628): Applicant plans to perform additional ambient noise measurements at two additional locations as shown on Figure 1 Noise Monitoring Locations, designated M3 on Herondo Street equidistant between N. Francesca Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway (PCH), and at M4 at the intersection of Beryl and N. Broadway Streets. Applicant stated, ". . . monitoring data will be available in Summer 2014." *If Staff does not receive the monitoring data until this summer, it will have an impact on Staffs' publication of the Preliminary Staff Assessment (PSA) noise section.*
- Applicant confirmed that their response submitted on January 21, 2014 to Data Requests 69 and 70 (TN201584) includes the impact of temperature inversion and changes in elevation in their acoustical models.
- Discussion of noise related to material and equipment deliveries to project site, e.g. queuing of delivery trucks on Herondo Street backing up from the PCH. Applicant noted that this issue will be addressed in their traffic management plan.
- Applicant anticipates nighttime construction between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., e.g., continuous concrete pours. Applicant noted that work commencing at night would 1) stay below the allowable noise thresholds or 2) obtain permission from city of Redondo Beach in accordance with city ordinance, including complaint process. The city of Redondo Beach indicated that nighttime construction would be in violation of current noise ordinances.
- Open discussion on adequacy of noise complaint process. Intervener/public comment cited that AES is not sufficiently responding to noise complaints at existing plant, and many members of the public commented on the inadequacy of enforcement of the noise



ordinance on the current plant's operation.

Discussion on Traffic and Transportation

- Staff asked the city of Redondo Beach for an explanation of information provided during a Planning Commission hearing on January 14, 2014 related to mitigating traffic impacts and improvements to a roadway to accommodate additional vehicles. The city stated they would provide an answer to Staff.
- Applicant confirmed for Staff that a total of 18 heavy haul/ oversized truck trips would be needed during the entire phase of the construction of the proposed project.
- Staff asked if there was any potential for trucks to enter the site from Herondo Street. Applicant stated there is an existing entrance from Herondo Street, but it is too narrow to accommodate trucks. Applicant also stated they would be willing to look into an optional entrance from Herondo Street in place of trucks entering the site from Harbor Drive.
- Staff asked what Applicant's anticipated schedule is for trucks in the mornings. Staff identified experience from previous projects where trucks parked offsite and idled near the project entrance while waiting to enter prior to the beginning of morning construction activities. Applicant's representative, Stephen O'Kane, stated they do not expect trucks to park outside the RBEP entrance prior to morning construction activities. Applicant referred to a condition of certification (COC) for Applicant to prepare a traffic control plan (TCP) which could prohibit trucks parking and idling in the early morning hours prior to construction activities beginning. In addition, Applicant identified the ability to accommodate any early arrival trucks on the RBEP site if necessary. Applicant went further to explain that construction activities would create a study stream of trucks throughout the day (6 a.m. to 6 p.m. approximately).
- Staff asked Applicant if analysis of potential traffic impacts could be conducted for swing shifts. The applicant explained that there could be a small timeframe for need of 24-hour construction activities such as concrete pouring. Applicant stated they would be willing to look at the potential traffic impacts that could occur during a swing shift.
- The city of Redondo Beach pointed Staff to the city's municipal code which regulates maximum truck load weights. The city requested Staff to look at and communicate with other communities (e.g., Hermosa Beach) for LORS compliance
- The city asked if damage to roadways would be mitigated. Applicant stated any repairs would be mitigated as part of the TCP. Energy Commission staff confirmed that the TCP would include mitigation for repair of damaged roadways due to construction activities.
- The city asked what hours the trucks would operate. Applicant stated the hours of operation for trucks would be regulated by the TCP. The city requested the hours of truck operation be relegated to the allowable hours for construction activities identified in the city's noise ordinance.
- Public commented the passenger car equivalent (PCE) number used in the traffic study seems light based on existing road conditions.
- Public comment stating cumulative impacts need to consider the Shade Hotel, Harbor construction, and the community on Catalina Avenue.

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

REPORT OF CONVERSATION



Discussion on Alternatives

Staff provided a brief overview of CEQA requirements for evaluating project alternatives. In summary, those points included:

- Evaluating a reasonable range of potential alternatives to the proposed RBEP;
- Identifying and evaluating reasonable alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives; and
- Seeking alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.

Staff explained that the development of alternatives and their evaluation is conducted in coordination with all RBEP technical issue area staff. As each issue area analysis proceeds, alternatives can be screened against the level of significance for each project impact identified. Consistent with the Issue Identification Report, staff provided a preliminary list of alternatives likely to be evaluated at some level. They include, but are not limited to:


- No Project (Retrofit) Alternative.
- On-Site Technology Alternatives
- Site Configuration Alternatives

Intervenor city of Redondo Beach stated opposition against the alternatives analysis presented in the AFC, particularly the absence of a no project alternative and site alternatives. City of Redondo Beach will be filing an informational response providing: city defined project objectives and feasible alternatives (including alternative site locations). The city stated concern regarding the level of detail alternatives staff could accomplish without the project Applicant providing responses to Staff Data Requests Set 1B (TN201163), as objected to by Applicant. The city recommended Staff consider a no project alternative in addition to alternatives identified in the Issue Identification Report (TN200534).

Intervener Build a Better Redondo stated the project would be incompatible with adjacent uses and requested that Staff consider a no project alternative and requested a reconfigured site alternative evaluate siting the power blocks in the center of the site to minimize noise impacts and requested that Staff also consider a recycled water alternative.

Applicant went on the record stating confidence in their alternatives analysis provided in the AFC. Applicant stated they do not oppose Staff looking at site alternatives, but will not be providing responses per their objections to staff Data Requests Set 1B (TN201163). Applicant also objected to the need of Staff evaluating a no project alternative.

Public comments reiterated Staff consider those alternatives requested by interveners city of Redondo Beach and Build a Better Redondo, in addition to requesting that Staff consider rooftop solar and siting the project at a landfill.

cc:	Date: 3-10-14	Signed:  Name: Patricia Kelly, Siting Project Manager
-----	------------------	--