California Energy Commission Energy Facilities Siting & Environmental Protection Division REPORT OF CONVERSATION

DOCKET09-AFC-9

DATE JAN 22 2010

RECD. MAR 16 2010

File: 09-AFC-9

Project Title: Ridgecrest Solar Power Project

() TELEPHONE (X) MEETING LOCATION:

NAME: Eric Solorio TIME: 10:00-11:00 DATE: January 22, 2010

WITH: Renewable Energy Policy Group PHONE (916) 651-0966

SUBJECT: The Renewable Energy Policy Group – comprised of senior representatives from the U.S. Department of the Interior, the California Governor's Office, and the California Natural Resources Agency – will discuss issues affecting the timely permitting of large-scale solar thermal power plants and their qualifying for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding.

Solar Millennium applicants presented the status of each proposed facility and then identify critical environmental, land-use, or other issues affecting their progress.

COMMENTS: Solar Millennium presented on three projects: Blythe, Palen, and Ridgecrest. Generally, their comments were the same for all three projects.

Rachel McMahon, Scott Galati, and Peter Weiner provided an overview of the Solar Millennium company, the Ridgecrest Solar Power Project and key issues affecting the project. Following their overview, Solar Millennium began to discuss the current status of their project, issues affecting their progress and recommendations to resolve their issues.

Current Status of the Ridgecrest Solar Power Project:

- The California Energy Commission Informational Hearing and Site Visit was held January 5, 2010.
- Solar Millennium planned to file their Data Responses on Monday, January 25, 2010.

Issues are currently affecting the progress:

- CEC Staff are requesting a high level of information from the applicant.
- CEC Staff are not being transparent with the applicant nor consistent with the wildlife agencies as to what mitigation measures are acceptable.
- Applicant is not receiving adequate advice and guidance (prior to filing an application) regarding NEPA requirements.
- The timing of Compliance Staff review can delay constructing the project.
- The expanded definition of jurisdictional waters.
- The alternative analysis is overly prescriptive.
- CAISO process and the interconnection process.

Applicant's Recommendations to resolve these issues:

- Allow ARRA projects to move forward for transmission systems.
- Performance Standards
 - Limit the amount of information required to implement mitigation measures.
 - Start with conditions from other projects and determine what needs to be done to mitigate.
 - o Develop a Decommissioning Plan
- For channel designs, determine how much of a design is necessary.
- Assign a CBO to review compliance plans in the summer.
- Develop an in-lieu fee program to mitigate impacts to biological resources.
- For Alternatives Determine what level of Protocol Level Survey's is necessary.

NAME: Eric Solorio SIGNATURE:	