

# BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 1-800-822-6228 – www.energy.ca.gov

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE CHULA VISTA ENERGY UPGRADE PROJECT

**DOCKET NO. 07-AFC-4** 

ORDER DENYING APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR A FURTHER POSTPONEMENT OF FULL COMMISSION CONSIDERATION OF THE PRESIDING MEMBER'S PROPOSED DECISION AND DENYING APPLICANT'S REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE PROCEEDING

On January 23, 2009, the Committee reviewing the Application for Certification (AFC) in this matter issued its Presiding Member's Proposed Decision (PMPD). Incorporated in the PMPD was notification to Applicant MMC Chula Vista that the Committee would entertain a request to override land use laws, ordinances, regulations and standards (LORS) to which the project did not conform. At the same time, the Committee issued notice of a Committee Conference to be held on February 23, 2009, in Chula Vista, to receive comment from the parties and the public on the PMPD.

On February 10, 2009, Applicant filed a Request for Extension of Time for the PMPD Public Comment Period and Committee Conference. In that filing, Applicant requested a minimum of two additional weeks, or until at least March 9, 2009, to continue its review of the PMPD and determine its future course of action in this matter. The Committee granted that request, and held the Committee Conference in Chula Vista on April 13, 2009. Shortly thereafter, the Committee issued its Errata, and scheduled full Commission consideration of the PMPD and Errata for the May 20, 2009 Business Meeting. That meeting was later cancelled, and full Commission consideration of the PMPD and Errata was rescheduled for the June 17, 2009 Business Meeting. Notice of that date was sent out on May 6, 2009.

DOCKET 07-AFC-4

**DATE** JUN 11 2009

RECD. JUN 11 2009

On June 8, 2009 Applicant, through its counsel, made a telephonic request that full Commission consideration of the PMPD and Errata be taken off the June 17 agenda, that this proceeding be suspended, and that Applicant be required to issue a status report in October, 2009. Applicant's counsel made those requests in writing on June 9, 2009. The stated reason for these requests was that Applicant was in the process of finalizing a sale of the project, and that delaying the proceedings would give the new owner an opportunity to further consider its course of action, including possibly asking the Committee to consider an override of the land use LORS that form the basis for the Committee's recommended denial of this AFC.

Intervenor Environmental Health Coalition (EHC) promptly filed a written objection to Applicant's request. EHC argues that the sale transaction has been pending for many months, and that the PMPD has been a matter of public record since it was issued in January. Thus, EHC argues, Applicant's waiting until now to make this request is untimely, will unreasonably inconvenience others who have made plans to attend the June 17 hearing, and will unnecessarily prolong final resolution of this matter. EHC concludes that there is no benefit to Applicant or the buyer to be gained by further delay, and that even if there were some slight benefit, the negative aspects of further delay—including the time and expense involved in extending the duration of EHC's participation in the proceeding--would outweigh it.

On June 11, 2009, MMC filed a brief in reply to EHC's opposition, providing further details about the sale transaction and emphasizing that postponing full Commission consideration of the PMPD and suspending the proceedings would give the new owner additional time to determine its future course of action with respect to this AFC proceeding. A good portion of the reply brief concerns the possibility that the new owner may decide to seek a LORS override.

The Committee finds troubling the statements in the moving papers, and the reply brief, indicating that the new owner of the project may consider seeking an

override or some other course of action. The Committee offered Applicant the opportunity to request an override when the PMPD was issued in January. The Errata was issued on May 4, 2009, making it clear that the Committee's recommendations remained essentially unchanged from those set forth in the PMPD. Applicant has never indicated that it was considering asking the Committee to consider an override. Then, 3 days ago, Applicant filed this motion and stated that the new owner "will need to decide whether it will ask the Commission to consider an override" (MMC opening brief at 2)(emphasis added). In essence, MMC asks that this proceeding be further delayed based upon the mere possibility that the new owner might decide to seek an override.

A new owner of this project will not gain any rights in this proceeding that Applicant does not now possess. Were Applicant to come forward this late in the proceedings and ask the Committee to consider an override, Applicant would need to establish to the Committee's satisfaction that it could not have made the request earlier due to circumstances about which it neither knew nor could have known. The new owner will stand in the shoes of the Applicant.

Finally, we address MMC's assertion that since the issue of override will not be before the Commission at the PMPD adoption hearing, the new owner should have an "opportunity to present it" at some future time (MMC Reply Brief at 5). The issue of whether or not the Commission should override the land use LORS pursuant to section 25525 of the Public Resources Code will not be before the Commission at the PMPD adoption hearing because there is no evidence about override in the record. There is no evidence about override in the record because MMC chose not to put on evidence about override despite the Committee's express offer to re-open the record for that purpose.

Again, the new owner will not have any rights in this proceeding beyond those possessed by Applicant. The consequences of MMC's failure to address override will inure to the new owner. Commission consideration of adopting the

PMPD and Errata on June 17 will not affect the new owner's rights any more or

less than it will affect those of MMC.

Applicant has failed to establish that postponing full Commission consideration of

the PMPD and Errata, or suspending the proceeding, would confer any benefit on

anyone. EHC, however, has shown that further delay would inconvenience

persons interested in this proceeding and would require intervenors to continue to

incur the expense of participation.

Furthermore, the Commission's Application for Certification process is intended to

take 12 months. Nearly 21 months have elapsed since this AFC was found data

adequate and the process commenced. Full Commission consideration of the

PMPD is the last step in our process, and we gave notice of our intent to conduct

that hearing weeks ago. Applicant has not shown that good cause exists for further

delay, and the requests set forth in its motion are therefore **DENIED**. Full

Commission consideration of the PMPD and Errata will take place at the June 17,

2009, Business Meeting. The parties at that time will have the opportunity to argue

their positions with respect to the PMPD to the full Commission.

Dated: June 11, 2009, at Sacramento, California.

JAMES D. BOYD

Vice Chair and Presiding Member

Chula Vista Energy Upgrade Project AFC Committee

4



# BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 1-800-822-6228 – www.energy.ca.gov

Application for Certification For the CHULA VISTA ENERGY UPGRADE PROJECT Docket No. 07-AFC-4

PROOF OF SERVICE (Revised: 2/10/09)

#### **APPLICANT**

Harry Scarborough
Sr. Vice President
MMC Energy Inc.
437 J Street, Suite 305
San Diego, CA 92101
scarborough@mmcenergy.com

## APPLICANT'S CONSULTANT

Douglas M. Davy, Ph.D. Senior Project Manager CH2M Hill 2485 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 600 Sacramento, CA 95833 ddavy@ch2m.com

## **APPLICANT'S ENGINEER**

Steven Blue
Project Manager
Worley Parsons
2330 E. Bidwell, Suite 150
Folsom, CA 95630
Steven.blue@worleyparsons.com

#### **COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT**

Jane Luckhardt, Esq.
Downey Brand Law Firm
621 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
iluckhardt@downeybrand.com

### INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO e-recipient@caiso.com

## **INTERVENORS**

California Unions for Reliable
Energy (CURE)
c/o Marc D. Joseph
Gloria Smith
Suma Peesapati
Adams Broadwell Joseph
& Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard,
Suite 1000
South San Francisco, CA 94080
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com
speesapati@adamsbroadwell.com

City of Chula Vista, California c/o Michael Meacham Director of Conservation & Environmental Services 276 Fourth Avenue Chula Vista, CA 91910 mmeacham@ci.chula-vista.ca.us

City of Chula Vista, California c/o Michael J. Shirey Deputy City Attorney Chula Vista City Attorney's Office 276 Fourth Avenue Chula Vista, CA 91910 mshirey@ci.chula-vista.ca.us \*Environmental Health Coalition
Diane Takvorian & Nicole Capretz
401 Mile of Cars Way, Suite 310
National City, CA 91950
E-mail Preferred
DianeT@environmentalhealth.org
nicole@environmentalhealth.org

\*Kevin Bundy
Shute Mihaly & Weinberger LLP
396 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
E-mail Preferred
bundy@smwlaw.com

## **ENERGY COMMISSION**

James D. Boyd Vice Chairman and Associate Member jboyd@energy.state.ca.us

Raoul Renaud Hearing Officer rrenaud@energy.state.ca.us

Christopher Meyer
Project Manager
<a href="mailto:cmeyer@energy.state.ca.us">cmeyer@energy.state.ca.us</a>

Kevin Bell Staff Counsel kwbell@energy.state.ca.us

Public Adviser's Office publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us

## **DECLARATION OF SERVICE**

I, <u>RoseMary Avalos</u>, declare that on <u>June 11, 2009</u>, I served and filed copies of the attached <u>Order Denying Applicant's Request for a Further Postponement of Full Commission Consideration of the Presiding <u>Member's Proposed Decision and Denying Applicant's Request to Suspend the Proceeding dated <u>June 11, 2009</u>. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit, is accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at: [www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/chulavista].</u></u>

The document has been sent to both the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit, in the following manner:

(Check all that Apply)

(Oneok un that rippry)
FOR SERVICE TO ALL OTHER PARTIES:
X sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list;
X by personal delivery or by depositing in the United States mail at <u>Sacramento, California</u> with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed as provided on the Proof of Service list above to those addresses <b>NOT</b> marked "email preferred."
AND
FOR FILING WITH THE ENERGY COMMISSION:
X sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed and emailed respectively, to the address below ( <i>preferred method</i> );
ORdepositing in the mail an original and 12 paper copies, as follows:
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION Attn: Docket No. 07-AFC-4 1516 Ninth Street, MS-4 Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us
I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Original Signed By:

RoseMary Avalos