

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	09-AFC-07C
<b>Project Title:</b>	Palen Solar Power Project - Compliance
<b>TN #:</b>	207196
<b>Document Title:</b>	Colorado River Indian Tribes Response to Second Petition for Extension of Deadline
<b>Description:</b>	For Commencement of Construction
<b>Filer:</b>	Sara Clark
<b>Organization:</b>	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Intervenor Representative
<b>Submission Date:</b>	1/6/2016 11:54:21 AM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	1/6/2016

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**Energy Resources  
Conservation and Development Commission**

In the matter of:

Amendment for the **PALEN SOLAR  
ELECTRIC GENERATING SYSTEM**

DOCKET NO. 09-ACF-7C

**INTERVENOR COLORADO RIVER INDIAN TRIBES**

**RESPONSE TO SECOND PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR  
COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION**

REBECCA LOUDBEAR (Wisc. State Bar No. 1036107)  
NANCY JASCULCA (State Bar No. 236350)  
COLORADO RIVER INDIAN TRIBES  
Office of the Attorney General  
26600 Mohave Road  
Parker, AZ 85344  
Telephone: (928) 699-1271  
Facsimile: (928) 669-1269  
Rloudbear@critdoj.com  
NJasculca@critdoj.com

WINTER KING (State Bar No. 237958)  
SARA A. CLARK (State Bar No. 273600)  
SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP  
396 Hayes Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 552-7272  
Facsimile: (415) 552-5816  
King@smwlaw.com  
Clark@smwlaw.com

On September 16, 2015, the California Energy Commission granted a request by Palen SEGS I, LLC to extend the construction deadline for their project by one year, on one condition: the company was required to file a petition to amend the project description by December 22, 2015. TN#206118. Rather than submit the required amendment, on December 22, 2015, Palen SEGS I, LLC filed a second petition to extend the deadline once again. TN#207099. Intervenor the Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT or the Tribes) responds to the petition pursuant to Section 1716.5 of the California Energy Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Palen SEGS I, LLC did not meet the five-year commencement of construction deadline provided in section 1720.3 of the Commission's Rules. Nor did Palen SEGS I, LLC comply with the condition imposed in the Commission's September 16, 2015 extension by submitting a petition to amend the project by December 22, 2015. The Commission cannot now "modify" the existing extension after the fact. *See* § 1720.3 (extension can be granted only "prior to the deadline"). Consequently, the Commission's 2010 decision has expired and cannot now be revived.

Even if its extension request was not too late, Palen SEGS I, LLC fails to show "good cause," as required under section 1720.3. Consequently, the Commission should put a stop to the endless saga over this troubled project and require the new owner, Maverick Solar, LLC, to begin proceedings afresh.

Allowing Maverick to rely on the existing docket—which currently contains myriad documents related to different project iterations—for its new project would thwart the public participation goals of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. The Tribes are particularly concerned that the ongoing use of the existing docket would allow the California Energy Commission to continue its reliance on incomplete and misleading analysis regarding the new project's likely impacts on cultural resources. For these reasons, the Tribes urge the Commission to deny the petition.

Under Section 1720.3, the Commission can grant an extension of the deadline to commence construction of a project upon a showing of "good cause." The Commission has not adopted a definition of good cause. The California Supreme Court, however, has stated that the nature and extent of the showing necessary to satisfy the good cause requirement for an extension must, of necessity, vary with the circumstances of each case. *Chalco-California Corp. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County* (1963) 59 Cal.2d 883; *see also R. J. Cardinal Co. v. Ritchie*, 218 Cal.App.2d 124, 144 (1963) ("good cause" is "largely relative in [its] connotation, depending upon the particular circumstances of each case"). Consequently, it is largely within the discretion of the Commission to broadly consider the impacts of extending the deadline for construction and allowing Maverick to continue to rely on the existing certification and docket for its entirely new project.

Palen SEGS I, LLC bases its claim of "good cause"—presumably on behalf of the new owner, Maverick Solar, LLC—on four factors: the perceived diligence of the various project owners; the bankruptcy of Abengoa, Palen SEGS I, LLC's parent company; the potential "efficient use" of the existing record, and the alleged "public benefit" of bringing the Project online. Regardless of Palen SEGS I, LLC's perceived diligence (which has aimed at seeking

## **CRIT Response to Second Petition to Extend Construction Deadlines**

*Docket No. 09-ACF-07C*

Page 2 of 4

certification for another new project, *not* on construction of the certified project) or the hypothetical benefits of a future project (which could be realized regardless of the Commission's decision on this petition), the fact remains that the public is now faced with reviewing yet another iteration of the Palen project, one that the Commission has not previously considered. The existing docket now contains hundreds of declarations and exhibits and days of testimony from experts and the public, all relating to the potential impacts and benefits of a solar parabolic trough project and two-tower project. It now appears that Maverick will ask the Commission to consider a solar photovoltaic project. While some prior analyses for other technology may remain relevant and up-to-date for this new project, many aspects of Commission review will need to be updated and refined.

Allowing Maverick to continue to rely on this massive and confused docket for its new project will thwart the public participation in violation of CEQA. The fundamental purpose of CEQA is to "inform the public and responsible officials of the environmental consequences of their decision before they are made." *Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th at 182, 195. A "paramount consideration" for the Commission must be "right of the public to be informed in such a way that it can intelligently weigh the environmental consequences of any contemplated action and have an appropriate voice in the formulation of any decision." *Karlson v. City of Camarillo* (1980) 100 Cal.App.3d 789, 804. Consequently, the Tribes request that the Commission deny Palen SEGS I, LLC's petition and allow Maverick's new project to be considered from a fresh slate. To be sure, Maverick and the Parties should be permitted to re-submit testimony and exhibits to the extent they continue to be relevant to this new project. But the public should not be forced to wade through thousands of documents relating to multiple different projects to understand the potential impacts and benefits associated with the new project. *See Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova*, 40 Cal. 4th 412, 442 (2007) (Data "must be presented in a manner calculated to adequately inform the public and decision makers, who may not be previously familiar with the details of the project. Information scattered here and there in EIR appendices or a report buried in an appendix, is not a substitute for a good faith reasoned analysis.") (internal citations and quotations omitted).

The Tribes are also concerned that allowing Maverick to seek an amendment to the existing certification, rather than submitting a new application, will perpetuate the inadequacies the Tribes identified in the prior proceeding related to cultural resources. In particular, the Tribes continue to have concerns about the proposed compensatory mitigation, the Commission's efforts to consult with impacted Tribes, and the landscape-level cultural resource impacts associated with the proposed Project. CRIT also has concerns that Maverick's reliance on existing cultural resource analysis will obfuscate the ever-increasing impacts of past, present, and future renewable energy projects on this important cultural resource landscape. For example, in just the past two years, projects such as the Modified Blythe Solar Power Project and the Blythe Mesa Solar Power Project have been approved, and projects like the Desert Quartzite Solar Project have begun environmental review. For these reasons as well, the Tribes urge the Commission to deny Palen SEGS I LLC's petition and instead encourage Maverick to submit a new Application for Certification.

## **CRIT Response to Second Petition to Extend Construction Deadlines**

*Docket No. 09-ACF-07C*

DATED: January 6, 2015

COLORADO RIVER INDIAN TRIBES

By:           /s/ Rebecca Loudbear          

REBECCA LOUDBEAR

NANCY JASCULCA

Attorneys for Intervenor Colorado River Indian  
Tribes

DATED: January 6, 2015

SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP

By:           /s/ Sara A. Clark          

WINTER KING

SARA A. CLARK

Attorneys for Intervenor Colorado River Indian  
Tribes

736154.1