

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	00-AFC-14C
Project Title:	El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project Compliance
TN #:	203329
Document Title:	Memo from Hearing Adviser to Parties re Issues for Discussion at November 19, 2014 Status Conference
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Raoul Renaud
Organization:	Energy Commission Hearing Office
Submitter Role:	Committee
Submission Date:	11/14/2014 8:38:54 AM
Docketed Date:	11/14/2014

Memorandum

Date: November 14, 2014

To: All Parties

From: Raoul Renaud, Hearing Adviser

Subject: El Segundo Energy Center Amendment, 00-AFC-14C
Re the proposed El Segundo Power Facility Modification
Issues for Discussion at November 19, 2014 Status Conference

The Committee would like the parties to be prepared to address the following items at the November 19, 2014 Status Conference.

1. Update on schedule.
2. Visual Resources: In the cumulative impacts section, there is a discussion of the LADWP Scattergood Project which is currently underway. It concludes by stating that if the Scattergood power plant project modifications result in enclosed structures, there would be no cumulative visual impact. If, however, the modifications result in unscreened structures with adverse visual impact, then there could be an adverse cumulative impact when combined with the proposed El Segundo Power Facility Modification (ESPFM) entailing demolition of old Units 3 & 4 and construction of new Units 9-12. Will it be possible for Staff to obtain the information necessary to complete the cumulative impact analysis relative to Scattergood?
3. Soil and Water Resources: The discussion on the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) does not explain why Staff believes ESPFM's use of recycled water provides exemption from the need to provide a WSA, since the ESPFM also will use potable city water. For a complete record, Staff will need to include a WSA, or detail why it is not needed.
4. California Coastal Commission: Appendix VR-2 contains the Coastal Commission report of March, 2002 concerning the original AFC proceeding, 00-AFC-14. From the text of the Visual Resources section, it appears that the Coastal Commission has concluded that its March, 2002 report is still applicable and that no further Coastal Commission input or participation is needed. Is this in fact the Coastal Commission's current position? If so, it would be advisable to have written confirmation of this in the record.
5. Alternatives: To ensure we have a complete record, demand side resources such as demand response should be considered in the Alternatives discussion.
6. Air Quality/GHG: The Committee would appreciate an update on the status of both the request to amend the FDOC and the new Petition to Amend for existing Units 5 and 7 which was noted in the Project Owner's November 11, 2014 Status Report, and their impact on the schedule.

An Agenda will be provided in advance of the Status Conference. Thank you for your attention to these items.