

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

**DOCKET**  
**07-AFC-4**  
**DATE** MAY 23 2008  
**FILED** MAY 28 2008



**Energy Facilities Siting and  
 Environmental Protection  
 Division**

**FILE: 07-AFC-4**

**PROJECT TITLE: MMC Chula Vista Energy Upgrade  
 Project**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Telephone</b>	(619) 691-5028	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Meeting Location:</b>	
<b>NAME:</b>	Christopher Meyer	<b>DATE:</b>	05/23/08
<b>TIME:</b>	7:45 A.M.		
<b>WITH:</b>	Scott Tulloch, City Manager, City of Chula Vista Michael Meacham, Director of Conservation and Environ. Services, Chula Vista		
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Initial concerns/comments on the Chula Vista Energy Upgrade Project PSA.		

Call from City of Chula Vista with preliminary concerns/comments on the Chula Vista Energy Upgrade Project PSA. Scott Tulloch and Michael Meacham requested an opportunity to review the City's initial comments on the PSA and outline the steps the city is taking to address some of these concerns directly with the applicant (MMC Energy).

Impacts of CVEUP to Reliability Must Run (RMR) status of South Bay. City has met with SDG&E and ISO and neither have stated that CVEUP would help with RMR status.

- This is a very big concern with the City Council.
- City has asked MMC about issue and has not received an answer.
- Need clarification on how letter to mayor from ISO relates to CVEUP.

City is concerned that the use of Special Protection Schemes (SPS) instead of reconductoring could result in SDG&E upgrading the line under an Advice Letter after Energy Commission process done.

Concerns over lack of Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) between SDG&E and MMC and how that impacts benefits to Chula Vista residents. City Council feels that the lack of a PPA means that the energy would be sent out of the area.

The City has been pursuing a commitment from MMC that any reconductoring would be undergrounded.

The City's planning dept. disagrees that project is consistent with the General Plan given the recent changes to the plan (2005).

The City has been pursuing a commitment from MMC that the project will not be expanded in the future. The City is concerned that an additional 100 MW peaker could be constructed on the south side of the 3.8 acre parcel.

The Southwest Chula Vista Civic Assoc. (SWCVCA) has told the City that they believe that the old facility's local permit became invalid after it did not operate for several years. One of the conditions of an SUP states that if a non-conforming use goes dormant it must reapply for the permit. The City is unsure if this is the case for the Chula Vista Power Plant.

The City is concerned over Noise impacts from construction until 8pm at night.



The City supports air quality mitigation of electrically powering the refrigeration systems in the meat processing trucks instead of the trucks idling. City wants LOCAL mitigation [emphasis added] rather than a program, such as Carl Moyer, that could have benefits outside area. City wants mitigation within 1,000 feet of project. The following are some examples of mitigation proposed by the City:

- Upgrades to 48 homes closest to project site to reduce electrical demand.
- Increase in-home air quality (e.g., improved air filtration systems or air conditioning) for the 48 homes.
- Double pane windows on the 48 homes.

The City is also interested in any similar mitigation ideas from AQ staff.

The City is concerned about potable water use of MMC. A reclaimed water line is approx. 1-mile from project. Other users along route could benefit from reclaimed water pipeline.

The project is just north of the greenbelt. The City feels that the proposed project hasn't mitigated any potential impacts from increased operation.

City would like more review of alternative sites and the ability to connect to other substations besides the Otay Substation (i.e., Sweetwater).

Benefits that the City expects to receive if plant construction goes forward:

- Funds spent on construction would be in Chula Vista.
- Require underground utilities user's tax – the City is working with MMC but MMC has so far avoided committing to pay the tax.

**City Identified the Big Five Issues:**

- **Commitment from MMC not to expand facility past 100 MW**
- **Commitment from MMC that any reconductoring would be underground**
- **Commitment from MMC to pay Underground Utility User's Tax**
- **Money for Air Quality mitigation to be spent locally**
- **More information on reclaimed water feasibility**

cc: Bob Worl	Signed:  Name: Christopher Meyer
--------------	---