

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-AFC-02
Project Title:	Mission Rock Energy Center
TN #:	223036
Document Title:	Thomas Koff Comments Response to Committee Request for Comments on Applicant's Notice to Suspend Proceedings
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Thomas Koff
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	3/23/2018 3:58:16 PM
Docketed Date:	3/23/2018

Comment Received From: Thomas Koff

Submitted On: 3/23/2018

Docket Number: 15-AFC-02

Response to Committee Request for Comments on Applicant's Notice to Suspend Proceedings

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Response to Committee Request for Comments on Applicant's Notice to Suspend Proceedings

I'm appalled by the CEC Staff's Response to the Committee Request for Comment. How is it possible that the "Staff does not object to the Applicant's response to the Committee"?

The Applicant (Calpine) originally unilaterally suspended the Application by providing a Notice of Suspension of Application for Certification (whatever that is) on March 9, 2018. On March 15, 2018 Susan Burns Cochran, Hearing Officer, issued a memorandum requiring Calpine to specify the length of the requested suspension. Additionally, at that time, it was pointed out that the Notice of Suspension was being treated as a Motion.

The Applicant responded on March 19, 2018 that it wanted to suspend the Application for what amounts to an unspecified time frame. Calpine specifies 3 conditions that all need to be completed before the suspension will be rescinded. Each of the 3 conditions may be incomplete beyond 2021; this is in essence an open-ended suspension. How does this satisfy the CEC's requested specification of the length of the requested suspension? Quite simply, it doesn't.

And so how is it possible that Staff does not object to the Applicant's response to the Committee? Is it possible they didn't read the Applicant's response? This calls into question the integrity of the entire Staff processing of the Application.

Due to the incompatibility between the energy production requirements of the Moorpark Sub-area and the Mission Rock Energy Center(MREC), as demonstrated by the SCE RFO which excludes fossil fuel powered energy generation, it is impossible to envision any

scenario under which the Mission Rock Energy Center could possibly be built within the parameters of the current Application.

From the beginning, the Calpine project had no customer for its energy. This has been reconfirmed by the SCE RFO. Additionally, the project has no approved way to tie into the power grid, and in fact withdrew from the ISO Cluster Study 9. This siting of this project in the flood plain removed it from consideration as an alternate in the Puente Power Project. The additional fill required to increase the elevation of the site is an environmental disaster of no small proportion. The effects of the MREC facility on the plants and animals of the Santa Clara River environment are unacceptable. The effects of the air pollution on the Environmental Justice population are likewise deplorable. The project tramples and desecrates the sacred grounds of the area's native people. All this for a project that has been shown to be unnecessary.

The committee should encourage the Applicant to withdraw the Application. Failing this, it's incumbent upon the committee to follow the appropriate process to terminate the Application.