

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	07-AFC-06C
Project Title:	Carlsbad Energy Center - Compliance
TN #:	204877
Document Title:	Carlsbad Motion to Deny
Description:	Carlsbad Motion to Deny
Filer:	Robert Simpson
Organization:	Helping Hand Tools (2HT)
Submitter Role:	Intervenor
Submission Date:	6/3/2015 9:56:58 AM
Docketed Date:	6/3/2015

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

Petition to Amend The Carlsbad Energy Center

07-AFC-06C

**Rob Simpson Motion to deny AFC or stay PMPD and grant leave to
brief CPUC Decision Conditionally Approving Power Purchase
Tolling Agreement with SDG&E Paul Kramer Energy Commission
Hearing Office on 6/2/2015**

The PUC decision approves a different project from this project, and the original project. It indicates that the project now before the CEC is environmentally inferior. It states;

“in an effort to balance the reliability risks with the public interest in achieving our clean energy goals, we will condition approval of the Carlsbad PPTA on a reduction of the capacity from 600 MW to 500 MW...

If approved, the Carlsbad PPTA for 600 MW of conventional generation resources would categorically preclude any procurement of preferred resources beyond the mandatory minimum. It would relieve SDG&E of the duty “to procure renewable generation to the fullest extent possible”

In addition to the reduction in size the PUC required an entirely different technology which included a “synchronous condenser”

The Commission should simply deny the Application for certification based upon the PUC evidence. We should not need to waste any more time on this application that will never get built. The people of California should not continue to subsidize this project by not charging a fee for the amendment. The Applicant knows that the project that they proposed to the Commission is not the one that they got approved before the PUC. But as long as they can advance this project on the peoples tab, they have a clear motive to license projects that will never be built. If they ever propose a viable project they can get a free modification with an antiquated environmental baseline locked in at the site. One day if the Commission ever requires remuneration for the State’s financial resources instead of perpetuating this corporate welfare, dirty energy subsidy; the developer may have gotten most of its review in the prior free amendments.

The denial of the AFC should bar the applicant from applying for another amendment unless it first pays the states cost for this amendment.

We should at least have the opportunity to consider staff's opinion of the relevance of the PUC action and brief the Commission.

_____/_____
Rob Simpson
Intervener
27126 Grandview Avenue
Hayward CA 94542
Rob@redwoodrob.com