

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION**  
**REPORT OF CONVERSATION Page 1 of 2**

|                             |
|-----------------------------|
| <b>DOCKET</b><br>06-AEC-9   |
| <b>DATE</b> JAN 28 2008     |
| <b>REC'D</b> JAN 28 2008    |
| <b>FILE</b> COLUSA_06-AEC-9 |



**Systems Assessment and  
 Facilities Siting Division**

**PROJECT TITLE: Colusa Generating Station**

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Telephone</b> | CEC  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Meeting Location:</b> |
| <b>NAME:</b>   | Jack Caswell                                       | <b>DATE:</b> 1/28/08                              |
| <b>WITH:</b>   | Raoul Renaud, Energy Commission Hearing Officer    |   |
| <b>SUBJECT:</b>                                      | Need for Air Quality Staff Testimony Clarification |   |

**COMMENTS:**

In a conversation with the Energy Commission's Hearing Officer, the attached email requests were made for clarification on the Air Quality staff's testimony in the Final Staff Assessment document for the Colusa Generating Station. This request and response for information has been docketed as part of the evidentiary record.

**Hearing Office Request:**

Jack--I have come across an issue in the AQ section that I need to clarify with staff (through you). The below language is contained in both the PSA and the FSA, and indicates that staff needs to perform further cumulative impacts analysis. My question/concern is whether or not this analysis has been performed. I suspect that the analysis was performed between the PSA and the FSA but the language didn't get changed. At any rate, we need to address it.

*To confirm staff's conclusions of insignificant impacts, staff will need to perform an additional cumulative impacts analysis, due to the applicant's modeling analysis showing a very minor exceedance of the state's one-hour NOx Ambient Air Quality Standard. However, staff is certain that additional assessment modeled maximum impact plus actual hourly NO2 background will prove that the worst-case cumulative impacts will not exceed any ambient air quality standard. Staff requires the following information from the applicant to complete this additional cumulative modeling impact analysis:*

- Staff requires the applicant to provide hourly NO2 concentration files for the Yuba City-Almond Street monitoring station covering 2001 through 2005 to complete the NOx OLM analysis for cumulative impacts.

(from pg 4.1-38, FSA)

**Response to Hearing Office:**

Mr. Renaud assumption is correct. That first paragraph and following bullet on top of page 5.1-54 should have been deleted, or alternatively could have been deleted and replaced with something like the following:

"Staff has determined that the project's direct and cumulative air quality impacts have been reduced to less than significant with the proposed mitigation measures. Staff has also considered minority populations in its analysis of air quality impacts. The minority populations (as identified in **Socioeconomics Figure 1**) are well below 50 percent, which indicates that the site area would not have the potential for local environmental justice issues."

Sorry, I'm not sure how I missed it, but I was probably too focused on dealing with the substantial intervenor comment response. The associated text in the summary of conclusions (p. 5.1-1) and the cumulative analysis text itself (p. 5.1-46,47 and Table 5.1-32) were appropriately revised based on the updated cumulative modeling analysis.

Do you want me to prepare an errata?  
 Will

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| cc: Dick Ratliff<br>Raoul Renaud<br>Dockets | Signed:               |
|   | Name: Jack W. Caswell |

**From:** Raoul Renaud  
**To:** Jack Caswell  
**Date:** 1/28/2008 8:58 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Colusa AQ

Thank you sir!

Raoul A. Renaud  
Hearing Adviser II  
California Energy Commission  
1516 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916)651-2020

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any attachments are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee.

>>> Jack Caswell 1/28/2008 8:42 AM >>>  
I'm pursuing this issue as I write. I'll get back to you today with a response to your request.

Jack W. Caswell, Project Manager  
California Energy Commission Energy Facilities Siting Division  
1516 9th. Street (MS-15) Sacramento, California, 95814  
[jcaswell@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jcaswell@energy.state.ca.us) or (916) 653-0062

>>> Raoul Renaud 1/28/2008 8:18 AM >>>  
Jack--I have come across an issue in the AQ section that I need to clarify with staff (through you). The below language is contained in both the PSA and the FSA, and indicates that staff needs to perform further cumulative impacts analysis. My question/concern is whether or not this analysis has been performed. I suspect that the analysis was performed between the PSA and the FSA but the language didn't get changed. At any rate, we need to address it.

*To confirm staffs conclusions of insignificant impacts, staff will need to perform an additional cumulative impacts analysis, due to the applicants modeling analysis showing a very minor exceedance of the states one-hour NOx Ambient Air Quality Standard. However, staff is certain that additional assessment modeled maximum impact plus actual hourly NO2 background will prove that the worst-case cumulative impacts will not exceed any ambient air quality standard. Staff requires the following information from the applicant to complete this additional cumulative modeling impact analysis:  
Staff requires the applicant to provide hourly NO2 concentration files for the Yuba City-Almond Street monitoring station covering 2001 through 2005 to complete the NOx OLM analysis for cumulative impacts.*

(from pg 4.1-38, FSA)

Raoul A. Renaud  
Hearing Adviser II  
California Energy Commission  
1516 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916)651-2020

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any attachments are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee.

**Jack Caswell - RE: Colusa AQ**

---

**From:** <WWalters@aspeneg.com>  
**To:** ""Jack Caswell"" <Jcaswell@energy.state.ca.us>, ""Keith Golden"" <Kgolden@energy.state.ca.us>  
**Date:** 1/28/2008 1:03 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Colusa AQ  
**CC:** ""Dick Ratliff"" <Dratliff@energy.state.ca.us>, ""Robert Worl"" <Rworl@energy.state.ca.us>

---

Jack,

Mr. Renaud assumption is correct. That first paragraph and following bullet on top of page 5.1-54 should have been deleted, or alternatively could have been deleted and replaced with something like the following:

"Staff has determined that the project's direct and cumulative air quality impacts have been reduced to less than significant with the proposed mitigation measures. Staff has also considered minority populations in its analysis of air quality impacts. The minority populations (as identified in **Socioeconomics Figure 1**) are well below 50 percent, which indicates that the site area would not have the potential for local environmental justice issues."

Sorry, I'm not sure how I missed it, but I was probably too focused on dealing with the substantial intervenor comment response. The associated text in the summary of conclusions (p. 5.1-1) and the cumulative analysis text itself (p. 5.1-46,47 and Table 5.1-32) were appropriately revised based on the updated cumulative modeling analysis.

Do you want me to prepare an errata?

Will

---

**From:** Jack Caswell [mailto:Jcaswell@energy.state.ca.us]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 28, 2008 8:41 AM  
**To:** Will Walters; Keith Golden  
**Cc:** Dick Ratliff; Robert Worl  
**Subject:** Fwd: Colusa AQ

Will,  
 Can you get back to me on this request from the Hearing office ASAP (see below).

Jack W. Caswell, Project Manager  
 California Energy Commission Energy Facilities Siting Division  
 1516 9th. Street (MS-15) Sacramento, California, 95814  
 jcaswell@energy.state.ca.us or (916) 653-0062

>>> Raoul Renaud 1/28/2008 8:18 AM >>>

Jack--I have come across an issue in the AQ section that I need to clarify with staff (through you). The below language is contained in both the PSA and the FSA, and indicates that staff needs to perform further cumulative impacts analysis. My question/concern is whether or not this analysis has been performed. I suspect that the analysis was performed between the PSA and the FSA but the language didn't get changed. At any rate, we need to address it.

*To confirm staffs conclusions of insignificant impacts, staff will need to perform an additional cumulative impacts analysis, due to the applicants modeling analysis showing a very minor exceedance of the states one-hour NOx Ambient Air Quality Standard.*

*However, staff is certain that additional assessment modeled maximum impact plus actual hourly NO2 background will prove that the worst-case cumulative impacts will not exceed any ambient air quality standard. Staff requires the following information from the applicant to complete this additional cumulative modeling impact analysis:  
Staff requires the applicant to provide hourly NO2 concentration files for the Yuba City-Almond Street monitoring station covering 2001 through 2005 to complete the NOx OLM analysis for cumulative impacts.*

(from pg 4.1-38, FSA)

Raoul A. Renaud  
Hearing Adviser II  
California Energy Commission  
1516 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916)651-2020

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any attachments are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee.

**From:** Raoul Renaud  
**To:** Jack Caswell  
**Date:** 1/28/2008 2:19 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: RE: Colusa AQ

We will need to reopen the record. Since it is a minor change, and does not affect any conclusions, we can do this at the PMPD hearing.

***Raoul A. Renaud***

Hearing Adviser II  
California Energy Commission  
1516 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916)651-2020

*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any attachments are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee.*

>>> Jack Caswell 1/28/2008 1:42 PM >>>

Raoul,

Your request was by email, so I'm responding in the same manner. We apologize for the confusion in this section. Staff is asking if you need an errata to his testimony?

Jack W. Caswell, Project Manager  
California Energy Commission Energy Facilities Siting Division  
1516 9th. Street (MS-15) Sacramento, California, 95814  
[jcaswell@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jcaswell@energy.state.ca.us) or (916) 653-0062

>>> <[WWalters@aspeneq.com](mailto:WWalters@aspeneq.com)> 1/28/2008 1:02 PM >>>

Jack,

Mr. Renaud assumption is correct. That first paragraph and following bullet on top of page 5.1-54 should have been deleted, or alternatively could have been deleted and replaced with something like the following:

"Staff has determined that the project's direct and cumulative air quality impacts have been reduced to less than significant with the proposed mitigation measures. Staff has also considered minority populations in its analysis of air quality impacts. The minority populations (as identified in **Socioeconomics Figure 1**) are well below 50 percent, which indicates that the site area would not have the potential for local environmental justice issues."

Sorry, I'm not sure how I missed it, but I was probably too focused on dealing with the substantial intervenor comment response. The associated text in the summary of conclusions (p. 5.1-1) and the cumulative analysis text itself (p. 5.1-46,47 and Table 5.1-32) were appropriately revised based on the updated cumulative modeling analysis.

Do you want me to prepare an errata?

Will