Memorandum

Date : September 25, 2002 Telephone: (916) 651-8835

To : John L. Geesman, Commissioner and Presiding Member William J. Keese, Chairman and Committee Member

From : California Energy Commission - Bob Eller 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Subject : PALOMAR ENERGY PROJECT (01-AFC-24) STATUS REPORT NO. 6

Pursuant to the Committee's Revised Scheduling Order of August 29, 2002, the following is staff's status report on the proposed Palomar Energy Project.

Since the staff's August 23, 2002 status report, staff has released its preliminary analysis of the proposed project and conducted a workshop in Escondido on September 19 to discuss our analysis. The workshop was well attended by representatives of the City of Escondido and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. Only a few members of the public were in attendence.

Staff has also forwarded comments to the City on their Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Escondido Research and Technology Center (ERTC) which was released at the end of July. The comment period for the DEIR closed on September 16. Prior to staff's September 19 workshop, I met with City staff to discuss our comments on their DEIR and to answer any questions they might have regarding our analysis.

CURRENT DATA REQUEST/DATA RESPONSES

STAFF

Responses to staff's data requests are complete.

INTERVENORS

Intervenor Bill Powers submitted three data requests to Sempra on September 9, 13, and 17. On September 20 Palomar Energy filed objections to these requests but said they would further evaluate them and attempt to provide information "which is feasible to obtain and relevant to the proceeding." Palomar stated they would submit any responses within the allowed 30-day response period.

<u>ISSUES</u>

The Preliminary Staff Assessment (PSA) identifies specific issues in the areas of air quality, biological resources, and transmission system engineering. These issues were the central focus of the discussion at staff's PSA workshop. Staff believes that both the biological resource and transmission system engineering issues can be resolved prior to the release of the Final Staff Assessment (FSA). Staff is working with the applicant to

John L. Geesman, Commissioner and Presiding Member William J. Keese, Chairman and Committee Member September 25, 2002 Page 2

achieve mitigation for the air quality impacts identified in the PSA. Based on our discussion at the PSA workshop, the applicant will be filing a revised PM_{10} mitigation plan in the next few weeks. Staff expects that the applicant will provide a date for submitting this proposal in their comments on the PSA, which are due on September 27.

Staff will hold a workshop to discuss this mitigation proposal following receipt of the applicant's revised mitigation plan. Staff expects this workshop to occur in mid-October in order to allow staff to include an analysis of the applicant's revised mitigation plan in our FSA in late November.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

Based on the Committee's revised schedule for the proceeding, staff is currently on schedule. At the PSA workshop, SDAPCD staff provided a letter stating that the FDOC for the project would not be submitted until early October, instead of the early September date anticipated in the Committee's Revised Scheduling Order. This delay was due to delays in receiving comments on the PDOC, and a delay by Palomar Energy in submitting information regarding potential air toxic constituents of the reclaimed water proposed for use in the project's cooling tower. The SDAPC indicates that they have verbal agreement for this delay with the applicant but have not received a written confirmation of this agreement.

Staff believes that the submittal of a complete FDOC in early November will not impact the scheduled release of staff's FSA in late November.