Memorandum

Date: April 30, 2004 Telephone: (916) 651-8835

To: John L. Geesman, Presiding Member

Arthur H. Rosenfeld, Ph.D., Associate Member

From: California Energy Commission -- Bob Eller, Project Manager

1516 Ninth Street

Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Subject: ROSEVILLE ENERGY PARK (03-AFC-1) STATUS REPORT #3

Pursuant to the Committee's February 2, 2004 Scheduling Order, the following is staff's third status report on the proposed Roseville Energy Park.

CURRENT DATA REQUESTS/DATA RESPONSES

Staff submitted 71 data requests on January 7, 2004, requesting additional information in the technical areas of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, efficiency, hazardous materials management, land use, noise, socioeconomics, soil and water resources, transmission system engineering, visual resources, and waste management.

Based on the review of the first round data responses, staff filed its second round data requests on March 9, 2004. These data requests, numbered 72 through 85, sought additional information in the technical areas of Biological, Cultural and Soil & Water resources. Responses to these requests were received on April 2, 2004. Staff held a data response and issue resolution workshop on April 15, 2004, in an effort to resolve any outstanding issues prior to release of the Preliminary Staff Assessment. A second issue resolution workshop, focused on Biological Resources, was held April 29, 2004, and included staff from the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Staff has received responses to all previous data requests and does not anticipate the need for further requests at this time.

No data requests have been filed by intervenors to this proceeding.

ISSUES

In our January 16, 2004 Issue Identification Report (IIR), staff identified potential major issues in the areas of air quality and land use.

AIR QUALITY

The Committee's schedule for the Roseville Energy Park anticipated that the applicant would file the Placer County Air District's Preliminary Determination of Compliance

John L. Geesman, Presiding Member April 30, 2004 Page 2

(PDOC on or before April 15, 2004. The PDOC has not yet been received and, thus, will impact staff's proposed schedule (please see below.)

Staff will continue to work with the applicant to resolve the concerns expressed in our IIR and will provide a complete analysis of the project's air quality impacts in our Preliminary Staff Assessment.

LAND USE

Staff's IIR identified land use concerns regarding the potential impacts of the project to schools proposed as part of the West Roseville Specific Plan/Land Use Plan dated March 14, 2003. The IIR cites the December 19, 2003 school site field review issued by the California Department of Education (CDE) which indicated potential safety issues related to traffic, power line locations, and hazardous pipeline (gas pipeline) locations.

In response to data request #41, the applicant indicated that they have met with CDE and discussed the school sites proposed in the West Roseville Specific Plan. The response concludes, "The REP site, with natural gas Alternative A (preferred alternative) would be consistent with the state's school siting guidelines." The applicant confirmed in their first status report that they will remove the other gas pipelines from the project description and submitted a revised map of the pipeline routes as an attachment to its Status Report #2.

Staff will continue to work with the applicant and CDE to resolve this issue and will provide its analysis of the land use impacts of the proposed project in the Preliminary Staff Assessment.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

Staff requests a day-for-day slip in the Committee's Schedule for these proceedings in order to incorporate the information from the District's PDOC in its analysis. Pursuant to the Committee's adopted schedule, staff anticipates filing its Preliminary Assessment approximately 30 days following receipt of the PDOC.