DOCKET
09-AFC-7
DATE JUN 14 2010
RECD. JUN 15 2010

June 14, 2010

California Energy Commission
Docket Unit
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Subject: **APPLICANT RESPONSES TO SELECT CURE DATA REQUESTS SET ONE DOCKET NO. (09-AFC-7)**

Enclosed for filing with the California Energy Commission are the Applicant's responses to select CURE Data Requests Set One for the Palen Solar Power Project (09-AFC-7).

Sincerely,

Arrie Bachrach

PALEN SOLAR POWER PROJECT (09-AFC-7)
CURE DATA REQUESTS, SET ONE Nos.1 – 195 (SELECTED RESPONSES)

Response Date: June 14, 2010

Introduction

The following are responses to select CURE Data Requests (DRs) from their Set One (Nos. 1-195) submittal dated May 14, 2010. Solar Millennium is responding in good faith to 96 of the 195 DRs as previously stated in the Palen Solar I, LLC's Objections And Notice of Inability To Respond to CURE's DATA REQUESTS, dated May 25, 2010. Responses will be provided to the following requests:

2, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 48, 49, 50, 55, 56, 58, 67, 68, 70, 73, 74, 75, 77, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 99, 103, 104, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 125, 126, 133, 139, 140, 141, 144, 145, 147, 151, 158, 159, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, and 195.

CURE DR-2

Information Required:

Please provide the resume of each person that performed "general wildlife surveys."

Response:

A summary of all personnel qualifications was provided in Attachment A of the 2009 BRTR.

CURE DR-8

Information Required:

Please confirm whether the Spring 2010 surveys along the selected Transmission Line Route and PSPP disturbance areas have been completed.

Response:

Yes, Spring 2010 surveys have been completed along the selected Transmission Line Route and PSPP disturbance areas.

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-9

Information Required:

If Spring 2010 surveys have been completed, please describe the outcome of these surveys and provide the information requested in Data Requests 2, 3 and 4 above for these surveys.

(**CURE DR-2**: Please identify and provide the qualifications for those persons who conducted general wildlife surveys in 2009 and those who have or will conduct such surveys in 2010.

CURE DR-3: Please provide an update for the requested information (i.e. identify and provide qualifications for those persons) concerning the 2010 surveys when such surveys have been completed and are considered final.

CURE DR-4: Please indicate on the vegetation map which portions of the map were drawn from vantage points and which were drawn from actual site visits.)

Response:

See answer to CURE DR-2.

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-10

Information Required:

If not complete, please describe what steps remain to complete the surveys and provide the requested information concerning ongoing and future surveys when such surveys are completed.

Response:

The 2010 surveys have been completed.

CURE DR-14

Information Required:

Please document agency approval to forego each of the following survey efforts:

a. Surveys in areas that were previously surveyed in 2009, and

b. Standard DT survey protocol, including Zone of Influence survey requirements and the requirement to conduct surveys when DT are most active (April through May).

Response:

Methods and approvals were summarized in the 2009 BRTR and were provided in the Spring Survey Protocols, docketed on April 22, 2010.

CURE DR-15

Information Required:

Please indicate whether all habitats and impact areas, including all transmission line corridors currently under consideration and adjacent areas, were surveyed for special-status plant species.

Response:

All areas surveyed are presented in the 2009 BRTR and the preliminary 2010 results, docketed on June 14, 2010.

All areas for which special status plant species surveys are required have been completed.

CURE DR-17

Information Required:

Please discuss how driving and meandering transects (at inconsistent spacing) constitute systematic field techniques.

Response:

Methodology for botanical surveys was provided in the 2009 BRTR. . In DR-BIO-81 of the AECOM Response to the CEC Data Request (December 2009), AECOM proposed that biologists would walk 10- to 20-meter parallel transects within all habitats of the disturbance areas, regardless of habitat suitability. After further consideration of the terrain within the survey area, this approach was revised; habitat complexity dictated how far each botanist was able to see and therefore dictated the necessary spacing. AECOM botanists have consulted with regional experts including Andrew Sanders and David Silverman to conclude that intuitive controlled surveys per Whiteaker et al. 1998 are sufficient for documenting a complete floral inventory on site (including the target special status plant species). The Whiteaker (1998) method is the BLM-approved method for conducting botanical surveys.

CURE DR- 19

Information Required:

Please provide information on the specific locations at which protocol rare plant surveys were conducted, by month and year. In your response, please identify the "key vantage points" referenced in the BRTR (pg. 24), and specify the areas within the assessment area that were surveyed more than once.

Response:

Relevant and appropriate information was provided in the 2009 BRTR, and the preliminary 2010 results, docketed on June 14, 2010. . In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-24

Information Required:

Please explain whether any Coachella Valley Milk vetch were observed on the PSPP disturbance area or buffer area during the Spring 2010 surveys.

Response:

Coachella Valley milkvetch was not observed in the 2009 or 2010 surveys for PSPP.

CURE DR- 25

Information Required:

Please provide the mean rainfall and temperature data obtained by the weather station(s) nearest the Project site for 2007, 2008, and 2009, and Spring 2010.

Response:

Weather information applicable to the survey seasons was provided in the 2009 BRTR. The agencies make determinations as to whether the weather conditions are reasonable to allow for acceptance of survey data.

CURE DR- 27

Information Required:

Please provide information on the occurrence of bat roosts in the vicinity of the Project area and indicate whether the BLM was solicited for information on the occurrence of known roost sites.

Response:

Bat surveys are not required.

CURE DR- 28

Information Required:

Please provide the methods that were used to survey for bats at the Project site.

Response:

Bridges were checked and no bats were found. No special surveys were required.

CURE DR- 29

Information Required:

Please provide the methods that were used to survey for woodrats at the Project site, and indicate the number of middens that were detected, if any.

Response:

Woodrats do not require specific survey protocols.

CURE DR- 31

Information Required:

Please provide complete biological resource surveys and analysis reports of the transmission line corridor addressing all sensitive species.

Response:

After submittal of the AFC documents to the CEC in 2009, an alternative site configuration was proposed for the PSPP. Additionally, various design refinements were made related to potential transmission line routes and the substation area. As a result of design changes and development of an alternative, additional biological resource technical surveys were necessary in 2010 to fill in the survey gaps in support of the PSPP review, approval, and permitting. The following biological resource surveys were conducted

at the Proposed Project and Reconfigured Alternative BRSAs during the 2010 survey season: desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*; DT) survey, Western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*; WBO), golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos* [GOEA]) nest surveys, botanical survey (vegetation community mapping and rare plant surveys), and jurisdictional waters delineation. Spring 2010 botanical surveys at the PSPP occurred within areas that were not previously surveyed in 2009 associated with the Project Disturbance Area and the Reconfigured Alternative Disturbance Area and associated 1-mile buffers.

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010..

CURE DR- 32

Information Required:

Please describe the design of the road that will be built along the transmission line corridor. Please identify the associated potential impacts to drainage and habitat connectivity.

Response:

Proposed project components and impacts are discussed in the 2009 BRTR. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR- 33

Information Required:
Please explain why desert tortoise field surveys will not be followed beyond the 500-foot buffer surrounding the transmission line corridor.

Response:

Survey methods and approvals were described in the 2009 BRTR, and were provided in the Spring Survey Protocols, docketed on April 22, 2010.

CURE DR- 34

Information Required:

Please explain why the 2010 jurisdictional waters delineation included a 250-foot buffer, rather than a more extensive buffer especially for areas downstream from the disturbance area.

Response:

The associated 250-foot buffers are based upon the California Energy Commission's *Rules of Practice and Procedure: Power Plant Site Certification and Designation of Transmission Corridor Zones* (Appendix B [Information Requirements for an Application] [13][B][iii]) (CEC 2008).

CURE DR- 37

Information Required:

Please describe how the pumping of groundwater from beneath the project site will impact the regional aquifer.

Response:

Additional numerical groundwater modeling using the same model as provided in the AFC was conducted to evaluate the impacts of the change in the construction water volume and the effects on the regional aquifer. An update to the numerical groundwater modeling and Basin water balance was provided to the CEC on March 11, 2010 in response to the January 14, 2010 CEC workshop queries. Subsequently, an evaluation of the cumulative impacts and impacts to Basin storage and affects from project pumping using the numerical groundwater modeling were updated to reflect the change in the proposed construction water volume. This evaluation was provided in Attachment 2, Environmental Evaluation of Project Updates contained in the comments to the Draft Staff Assessment and Draft Environmental Impacts Statement dated May 4, 2010.

CURE DR- 38

Information Required:

Please demonstrate that drawdown will not adversely impact area springs or the mesquite trees observed to the north of the PSPP site. Please provide site-specific data in support of your response.

Response:

Please see the Response to Data Request (January 2010) and subsequent response to work shop queries dated March 11, 2010.

CURE DR- 39

Information Required:
Please provide such substantiation from a peer reviewed journal for the assertions concerning the impacts to mesquite trees from lowering the groundwater table, as these conclusions were solely derived through personal communications.

Response:

See response to CURE DR- 38 above.

CURE DR- 40

Information Required:

Please identify the distance of the mesquite trees from the PSPP site.

Response:

See response to CURE DR- 38 above.
.

CURE DR-41

Information Required:

Please quantify the projected amount of aquifer drawdown in the vicinity of the mesquite trees observed to the north of the PSPP site, taking into consideration the increased water demand for construction.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-37.

CURE DR-42

Information Required:

Please address whether aquifer drawdown in the northern portion of Palen Dry Lake would impact the viability of mesquite seedlings and saplings.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-37 and CURE DR-38.

CURE DR- 48

Information Required:

Please provide the rationale for not including the golden eagle as a special-status species with the potential for occurring within the project disturbance area.

Response:

Golden eagle surveys were conducted in 2010 to determine whether the projects have any impact on eagle foraging habitat.

CURE DR-49

Information Required:

Please provide the name(s) and qualifications of the individual(s) conducting the golden eagle surveys identified in the 2010 Survey Protocol.

Response:

Eagle surveys were completed by WRI. Information regarding the Golden Eagle surveys will be presented in the Golden Eagle survey report to be completed in June 2010.

CURE DR-50

Information Required:

Please explain the basis for the Applicant's argument that the PSPP site is not suitable foraging habitat for the golden eagle, despite the presence of golden eagle prey and the availability of suitable nesting sites within 10 miles of the PSPP site.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-48 and 49.

CURE DR-55

Information Required:

Please provide information and analysis concerning the impacts to biological resources that the four newly proposed evaporation ponds may cause.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-56

Information Required:

Please provide information regarding possible damage to the newly proposed evaporation ponds caused by floods.

Response:

The evaporation ponds will be designed so that no surface water from the surrounding area will flow to the ponds. Any water that falls directly into the ponds during a rainfall event has been included in the calculations associated with the sizing of the ponds. A discussion on the pond design and design basis was provided in the Report of Waste Discharge Application docketed May 25, 2010.

CURE DR-58

Information Required:

Please describe in detail the design features and mitigation measures that may reduce potential significant impacts to wildlife from the evaporation ponds and provide an explanation concerning the anticipated effectiveness of these measures.

Response:

This will be included in the updated Biological Assessment which will be completed by July 2010. The ponds will be netted and will have slopes sufficient to deter access by wildlife. A condition of certification was proposed for Blythe in the Revised Staff Assessment and the same condition is expected for Palen. This condition is consistent with ongoing agency coordination regarding this issue on other solar projects. Please see response to CURE DR-56. A discussion on the pond design and design basis, mitigation and corrective action plans were provided in the Report of Waste Discharge Application docketed May 25, 2010.

CURE DR-67

Information Required:
Please provide a map that depicts the areas where desert tortoise protocol surveys were conducted during each of the following years;

a. 2009

b. 2010.

Response:

Survey areas were described in the 2009 BRTR. See Response to CURE DR-31.

CURE DR-68

Information Required:

Please confirm that DT surveys were conducted for all possible transmission lines and other areas impacted by infrastructure required for the PSPP project.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-70

Information Required:

Please explain why Zone of Influence surveys for desert tortoise were not conducted for the Project. Please include a summary of the rationale for waiving this requirement and provide documentation if possible.

Response:

Survey methods and approvals were described in the 2009 BRTR and were provided in the Spring Survey Protocols, docketed on April 22, 2010.

CURE DR-73

Information Required:

Please clarify whether closer transect spacing for desert tortoise surveys was implemented at any location(s) within the survey area. If closer transects were implemented, please mark these locations on a map.

Response:

Survey methods and approvals were described in the 2009 BRTR and were provided in the Spring Survey Protocols, docketed on April 22, 2010.

CURE DR-74

Information Required:

Please confirm that the 2009 and 2010 surveys for DT were conducted during the time periods when DT are considered most active. Please indicate whether the timing of the surveys may affect the number of adult DT observed within the survey area.

Response:

Yes, surveys were conducted during active periods agreed to by agencies.

CURE DR-75

Information Required:
Please explain how the number of acres of impacted DT critical habitat was calculated and why the Applicant's calculations differ from Commission staff calculations.

Response:

Critical habitat impacts are a straight calculation from GIS based on footprint. The only differences are based on project refinements.

CURE DR-77

Information Required:
Please provide an updated analysis of the quality of DT habitat, and the DT occupancy, taking into consideration the results of the Spring 2010 surveys.

Response:

A discussion of DT occupancy and habitat quality was presented in the Applicant's comments on the Staff Assessment, docketed on May 12, 2010. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the

sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010. .

CURE DR-80

Information Required:
Please confirm whether the 8-10-mile transmission line vaguely identified in the SA/DEIS and recently confirmed in Applicant submittals to the Commission was considered as a potential new source of raven perching sites that may impact DT.

Response:

The Raven plan is based on all potential subsidies, irrespective of location, and would include monitoring of the final transmission line.

CURE DR-81

Information Required:

Please analyze and describe how DT may be indirectly impacted by perching sites on the 8-10-mile newly proposed transmission line.

Response:

There are no new impacts that were not previously identified. The Raven plan is based on all potential subsidies, irrespective of location, and would include monitoring of the final transmission line.

CURE DR-82

Information Required:
Please analyze and describe how DT may be indirectly impacted by vehicle traffic along the road that will be located along the 8-10-mile long transmission line.

Response:

There are no new impacts that were not previously identified. Avoidance/minimization measures have already been identified to minimize this (i.e., speed limits). Also, the transmission line road will not be continuously used.

CURE DR-83

Information Required:
Please provide specific performance standards for the Raven Management Plan and a Weed Management Plan.

Response:

Draft Plans have already been submitted to Docket (January 2010).

CURE DR-84

Information Required:

Please address the recommended compensation mitigation ratios for DT habitat, taking into consideration the results of the Spring 2010 surveys.

Response:

Spring 2010 data do not change project findings or mitigation ratio proposals. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-87

Information Required:

Please identify specific performance criteria that can be adopted to ensure mitigation of DT impacts will be effective in reducing impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Response:

The discussion of mitigation is already presented in multiple documents including the HMP (January 2010) and in the Applicants comments to the Staff Assessment (May 12, 2010). The compensatory mitigation has been proposed consistent with required mitigation for impacts that would provide protection of species habitat in perpetuity and/or contribution to agency approved in lieu fee programs/species recovery programs that directly target DT recovery. Specific proposed lands and disclosure of those is not required or appropriate at this time. Lands must be approved by agencies.

CURE DR-88

Information Required:

Please identify all surveys during which MFTL was detected within the BRSA.

Response:

This information was provided in the 2009 BRTR. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-89

Information Required:

Please explain why focused surveys have not and apparently will not be conducted for the MFTL. In addition, please clarify why the Applicant did not conduct pitfall trapping for the MFTL.

Response:

Protocol surveys were not required for the MFTL. Information regarding surveys has already been provided in BRTRs, AFC, HMP, etc. No further information should be necessary.

CURE DR-90

Information Required:

Please explain whether surveys for MFTL will be conducted in late May through early October 2010.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-89.

CURE DR-91

Information Required:

Please explain whether any MFTL were observed within the survey area during the Spring 2010 surveys.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-92

Information Required:

Please describe potential habitat for MFTL for the facility footprint and buffer area north of I-10.

Response:

A description of suitable MFTL habitat and proposed mitigation, when relevant, was already provided in the 2009 BRTR and January 2010 HMP. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-93

Information Required:

Please indicate how many acres of suitable MFTL habitat are present in the facility footprint and buffer area north of I-10.

Response:

A description of suitable MFTL habitat and proposed mitigation, when relevant, was already provided in the 2009 BRTR and January 2010 HMP. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-94

Information Required:

Please describe the basis by which the Applicant determined that the elimination of an estimated 1.1 percent of MFTL habitat is not a significant impact.

Response:

This issue was addressed in the Applicant's comments on the Staff Assessment docketed on May 12, 2010.

CURE DR-99

Information Required:

Please indicate whether any MFTL were observed within the PSPP disturbance area or buffer areas during the Spring 2010 surveys. If MFTL were observed, please describe these observations in detail.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-103

Information Required:

Please provide evidence supporting the Applicant's proposed mitigation ratios for acknowledged direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to the MFTL and its habitat.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-104

Information Required:

Please provide evidence demonstrating that mitigation at the Applicant's proposed ratios will be effective in reducing all impacts to MFTL to less-than-significant levels.

Response:

See response to CURE DR- 103.

CURE DR-111

Information Required:

Please describe in greater detail the WBO sign observed during surveys.

Response:

See the 2009 BRTR. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-112

Information Required:

Please provide information on whether other burrows within the Disturbance Area may be active.

Response:

See the 2009 BRTR. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-113

Information Required:

Please confirm whether WBO surveys have been performed for the PSPP's transmission route currently under consideration and for the Red Bluff substation. Please also provide the results of such surveys, if any.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-31. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-114

Information Required:

Please provide justification for the Applicant's reliance on one survey year to estimate burrowing owl abundance.

Response:

One survey year is in compliance with CDFG/CBOC guidelines. Nevertheless, AECOM conducted burrowing owl surveys both in 2009 and 2010. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-115

Information Required:

Please provide the rationale for the conclusion in the AFC that a 6.5-acre conservation area would likely provide enough habitat for two (2) pairs of western burrowing owls and their fledglings, including citations to scientific literature if possible.

Response:

This is not a correct interpretation, a 6.5 acre area was proposed per pair and was proposed based on habitat to be acquired. In addition, the project applicant has agreed to mitigate as proposed in the Staff Assessment at 19.5 acres per pair or individual impacted.

CURE DR-116

Information Required:

Please indicate whether the Applicant agrees with the 78-acre compensation requirement for WBO proposed in the SA/DEIS.

Response:

Yes, will mitigate per SA/DEIS.

CURE DR-117

Information Required:

Please state how the Applicant determined the amount of compensation habitat for burrowing owls.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-115. The applicant has agreed to mitigate at 19.5 acres per individual or pair. Preconstruction surveys are also required with passive relocation. We will mitigate per SA/DEIS Comments. Also DT mitigation will be sufficient for WBO mitigation if it meets the required criteria and would protect more than the compensatory mitigation obligation for the owl.

CURE DR- 125

Information Required:

Please confirm whether Swainson's hawk nest surveys will be conducted within one or more survey periods.

Response:

Specific Swainson's hawk nest surveys are not proposed, since there is no suitable breeding habitat exists on site, nor over most of the Colorado Desert. Nearest breeding sites are in Mojave Desert within higher desert where it nests in Joshua trees and junipers. Any Swainson's hawk observations would be evaluated as part of the Golden Eagle surveys and as part of preconstruction surveys.

CURE DR-126

Information Required:

Please confirm whether Swainson's hawk nests were observed during the surveys recently conducted for the Golden Eagle.

Response:

Information will be presented in the Golden Eagle Report. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-133

Information Required:

Please provide updated information concerning the Project's impacts to Harwood's Milk-vetch and any other special-status plants, based on the results of the Spring 2010 survey.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR- 139

Information Required:

Please indicate how the Project, and the redesigned drainage channels will impact the Couch's spadefoot toad, and whether those impacts are potentially significant.

Response:

Palen is at the edge of Couch's spadefoot toad range, is outside the NECO range, and no ponded areas were identified in 2010 that would support the species.

CURE DR-140

Information Required:

Please indicate how the Project and the redesigned drainage channels have been located and/or designed to minimize or mitigate impacts to the Couch's spadefoot toad.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-139. No mitigation for the Couch's spadefoot is required.

CURE DR-141

Information Required:

Please indicate how the Project and the redesigned drainage channels have been located and/or designed to minimize or mitigate impacts to wildlife movement.

Response:

Wildlife movement has been addressed in the AFC, 2009 BRTR, and general mitigation measures. This is also addressed Applicants comments to the Staff Assessment (May 12, 2010). In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-144

Information Required:

Please evaluate the potentially significant impacts to biological resources that may result from increased nighttime construction activities, including impacts caused by nighttime noise and lighting.

Response:

This is already addressed in the AFC, BRTR, and general mitigation measures as well as in the SA/DEIS.

CURE DR-145

Information Required:

Please state whether the Applicant relied on data available through the BLM database of right of way of applications for renewable energy projects.

Response:

Yes, the Applicant has viewed and utilized data available through the BLM database.

CURE DR-147

Information Required:

Please confirm whether transmission line corridors for the various projects identified in Biological Resources Table 9 were considered in the cumulative impact analysis.

Response:

Projects considered in the cumulative impacts analysis are summarized in the cumulative impacts discussion.

CURE DR- 151

Information Required:

Please describe feasible mitigation measures that can reduce or eliminate the Project's admitted contribution to cumulative impacts to habitat function and value for DT, MFTL, and Golden Eagle.

Response:

This discussion has been presented in the AFC, SA/DEIS comments, HMP, and BRTR. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR- 158

Information Required:

Please clarify the number of acres within the WHMA that would be impacted by the Project.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-159

Information Required:

Please indicate the Project's compliance with the NECO Plan's requirement for 1:1 compensation for impacts to BLM lands outside of DWMA's.

Response:

A discussion of the mitigation ratios and rationale for the Applicant's proposal was provided in the Applicant's comments on the Staff Assessment (May 12, 2010) and in the HMP (January 2010). In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR- 161

Information Required:

Please provide the total amount of acreage that will be disturbed by the Project footprint (i.e., solar units, power blocks, fence line, evaporation ponds, land treatment units, project laydown area, administrative buildings, maintenance buildings, access road, etc.), as currently proposed..

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-162

Information Required:

Please provide the total amount of acreage within the Transmission Line Disturbance Area, including the associated road, as currently proposed**.**

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-164

Information Required:

Please ensure that the revised drainage plan currently being developed accurately reflects the total amount of disturbed acreage provided in the Applicant's responses to Data Requests 161, 162 and 163, above.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-165

Information Required:

Please provide an accurate estimate of the total amount of cut and fill that will be required for the Project.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-167

Information Required:

Please explain what is meant by the phrase "watered on a regular basis" in the quoted excerpt from the DR response above by providing a) the amount of water that will be used and b) the frequency of such use.

Response:

The peripheral roads will not use water from the evaporation ponds but will now use a dust palliative specific to roadways for control of dust during operation. Approximately 1 AF of water will be used per year to apply the dust palliative. The application will be occur approximately every 6 months using 0.5 AF each time.

CURE DR-168

Information Required:

Please provide an estimate of the quantity of water required for regular watering of the gravel road surrounding the Project site by providing a) the total amount of water for each watering event and b) the number of watering events per year.

Response:

The peripheral roads will not use water from the evaporation ponds but will use a dust palliative specific to roadways for control of dust during operation. Approximately 1 AF of water will be used per year to apply the dust palliative. The application will be done approximately every 6 months using 0.5 AF each time.

CURE DR-169

Information Required:

In light of anticipated chemical contamination of water treated in the newly proposed evaporation ponds, please explain whether this water will be used to water the gravel road along the perimeter of the facility.

Response:

Water from the evaporation ponds will **not** be used for dust suppression or any other application within the facility. The wastewater will be contained and managed consistent with the Report of Waste Discharge Application docketed May 25, 2010.

CURE DR-170

Information Required:

If water from the evaporation ponds will not be used to water the gravel road along the perimeter of the facility, please provide the Applicant's proposed water source for this activity.

Response:

Dust palliatives will be used for dust control. Any water needed for dust control purposes or the dust palliatives will be groundwater from onsite water supply wells.

CURE DR-171

Information Required:

Please explain why wind fences will not also be constructed along the north and south sides of the solar fields. If the quoted excerpt from response to DR-S&W-186 is incorrect, please provide the correct information.

Response:

The rows of solar arrays extend north-south so that the mirrors can be oriented east-west to track the sun as it moves across the sky during the day. The wind fences are intended to protect the mirrors from windblown dust; because the mirrors are oriented east–west, the wind fences are only on the east and west sides of the solar fields. In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-178

Information Required:

Please explain how the desired 3:1 slope for drainage will be accomplished.

Response:

The 3:1 side slopes for the channels will be constructed of native material with conventional earthwork equipment.

CURE DR-179

Information Required:

Please explain whether the transmission line road will affect either of the surface water sites to the west of the Project site.

Response:

The transmission line road will not affect any surface water sites to the west of the Project site.

CURE DR-181

Information Required:

Please analyze the Project's impacts on existing surface flow patterns on-site and off-site.

Response:

The Project's impacts on the existing surface flow patterns on site and off site are documented in the Project Drainage Report in the Pre-development Drainage Conditions Report, and in the Post-development Drainage Conditions Report, all of which have been docketed with the CEC.

CURE DR-182

Information Required:

Please demonstrate the ecologists responsible for the 2009 and 2010 delineations have degrees, course work and training in such physical sciences as geomorphology and hydrology which would allow them to analyze the physical characteristics of dry streambeds for the delineation process.

Response:

Completion of jurisdictional delineations do not require degrees in geomorphology and hydrology. Delineations were conducted in accordance with the criteria defined by the agencies for delineations. However, our scientists are qualified to delineate waters and have USACE certifications for conducting delineations as well as comprehensive understandings of the hydrologic and geomorphic processes.

CURE DR-183

Information Required:

Please provide the name(s) and qualifications of any geomorphologist(s) who may assist the Applicant in the jurisdictional waters delineations.

Response:

See response to CURE DR-182 above.

CURE DR-184

Information Required:

Please indicate whether a revised Streambed Alteration Notification, which takes into account all recent Project modifications, has been submitted to the CDFG.

Response:

No, a revised SAA application has not been submitted to CDFG. A revised SAA application is not necessary. The intent of the governor's executive order was to make the State permitting process more efficient and the permitting authority rests with the CEC. A draft SAA application was prepared to facilitate exchange of the required information; however the project has not significantly changed from the original application, and all relevant and necessary information has been provided in subsequent submittals to the CEC and agencies to support a final decision regarding State waters..

CURE DR-185

Information Required:

Please provide revised calculations of impacted waters of the state, taking into account all recent Project modifications.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-186

Information Required:

Please provide revised mitigation calculations that reflect the Project's impacts to waters of the state taking into account all recent Project modifications.

Response:

In response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-187

Information Required:

Please explain the apparent discrepancy in the amount of sand dunes that will be directly impacted by the Project.

Response:

As indicated in the Applicant's comments on the Staff Assessment/Draft EIS that were docketed with the CEC in May 2010, the differences in the estimates of sand dune impacts between the study performed by the Applicant's geomorphologist (Dr. Miles Kenney, PG) and a study prepared by a CEC consultant (Andrew Collison), appear to center on differences in the wind vector data used in the two studies. Dr. Kenney holds that Mr. Collison overemphasizes the importance of westerly winds rather than northerly winds in determining sand transport in the area affected by the Project. Dr. Kenney's data shows a greater component of winds from the north that affect the movement of sand than does Mr. Collison; Collison sees the winds from the west as more important than does Dr. Kenney. Winds from the west would transport sand across the Project site; winds from the north would carry sand from north of the site, not across it. The greater the component of northerly winds compared to westerly winds, the less would be the effect of the Project on sand transport.

The Applicant sand dune acreages were based on GIS calculations of mapped dunes. Calculations in the final analysis will not include those from the substations because those impacts and associated mitigation will be the responsibility of SCE.

However, in response to agency direction and comment relating to the sand transport corridor, PSI has developed a reconfiguration of the PSPP to avoid to the extent feasible the most active portion of the sand transport corridor. This reconfiguration is currently being developed in more detail and will be docketed on June 30, 2010. This reconfiguration will affect the information requested by this data request and therefore a response at this time will be out of date. Therefore, we will provide a Supplemental Response to this Data Request on June 30, 2010.

CURE DR-188

Information Required:

Please describe the distinction made between sand dunes and "sand fields vegetated with sparse creosote bush scrub.

Response:

These features differ in the coarseness and stability of the sands. Sand fields are not equivalent to stabilized or partially stabilized sand dunes. .

CURE DR-189

Information Required:

Please confirm that no additional modeling has been conducted to determine potentially significant impacts from the Applicant's proposed increased construction water demand of 5,750 acre-feet.

Response:

Additional numerical groundwater modeling using the same model as provided in the AFC has been conducted to evaluate the impacts of the change in the construction water volume. An update to the numerical groundwater modeling and Basin water balance was provided to the CEC on March 11, 2010 in response to the January 14, 2010 CEC workshop queries. Subsequently, an evaluation of the cumulative impacts and impacts to Basin storage and affects from project pumping using the numerical groundwater modeling were updated to reflect the change in the proposed construction water volume. This evaluation was provided in Attachment 2, Environmental Evaluation of Project Updates contained in the comments to the Draft Staff Assessment and Draft Environmental Impacts Statement dated May 4, 2010.

CURE DR-190

Information Required:

Please provide any evaluation that the Applicant has conducted on the impacts of the Project's construction and operation water requirements on the groundwater basin's water balance and perennial yield.

Response:

The evaluation of the groundwater basin water balance and perennial yield was provided in the AFC water resources section (5.17-22 to 5.17-26) and revised based on comments from the CEC in data response (Data Response S&W-194) dated March 11, 2010.

CURE DR-191

Information Required:

Please confirm that the recoverable storage within the Chuckwalla Groundwater Basin remains 15,000,000 acre-feet.

Response:

The reference to 15,000,000 acre-feet of storage is after the Department of Water Resources (2004), Bulletin 118, California's Groundwater - Chuckwalla Valley Groundwater Basin Summary: California Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, California. The Bulletin references LeRoy Crandall and Associates, 1979, Report of Phase I Investigation, Feasibility of Storing Colorado River Water in Desert Groundwater Basins.

CURE DR-192

Information Required:

Please provide any evaluation that the Applicant has conducted regarding the potential for outflow of groundwater from the Chuckwalla Groundwater Basin to the Palo Verde Mesa Groundwater Basin and the hydraulic connection between the two basins.

.

Response:

The Applicant has not conducted an evaluation of the change in groundwater flux from the Chuckwalla Valley Groundwater Basin to the adjacent Palo Verde Mesa Groundwater Basin. The Applicant has adequately assessed the water balance and impacts to the basin storage, demonstrating that the Project is not cumulatively considerable in terms of its impact on the Chuckwalla Valley Groundwater Basin. Recognize that as provided in Staff Assessment Condition 18 (March 2010, page C.9-106) the Applicant is required to evaluate the Project pumping affects on the flux from the Colorado River. Subsequent workshop discussions (May 11, 2010) on compliance with this condition resulted a two part approach, beginning with an assessment in the change in outflow from the Chuckwalla Valley Groundwater Basin resultant from Project pumping followed by modeling of this change and its affect on the flux from the Colorado River.

CURE DR-193

Information Required:

Please provide any evaluation that the Applicant has conducted on impacts from increased construction water requirements on the outflow from the Chuckwalla Groundwater Basin to the Palo Verde Mesa Groundwater Basin.

Response:

Please see the response to CURE DR-192.

CURE DR-195

Response Date: June 14, 2010

Information Required:

Please provide an updated table listing the construction and operation water demands for all pending projects that will rely on groundwater from the Chuckwalla Groundwater Basin.

Response:

Please see the attached TABLE CURE DR-195 for updated information on the projected groundwater use for projects in the Chuckwalla Valley Groundwater Basin.

Soil and Water Resources

Attachment DR-S&W-195

Table DR-S&W-195

TABLE DR-S&W-195
PUMPING SCHEDULE FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE CHUCKWALLA VALLEY GROUNDWATER BASIN
RESPONSE TO CURE COMMENTS
PALEN SOLAR POWER PROJECT
CHUCKWALLA VALLEY GROUNDWATER BASIN

TECHNOLOGY	SOURCE	USE	WATER USE - RENEWABLE PROJECTS (AFY)									COMMENTS [3]
			2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018-2043	
Photovoltaic (200MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	20	20	10	--	--	--	--	--	Updated from CEC email (12-16) transmitting Table "Cumulative Projests - I-10 Corridor" and First-In-Line Solar Applications, BLM (12-21-09)
		Operational	--	--	5	7	10	10	10	10	10	
Photovoltaic (100MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	--	10	10	--	--	--	--	--	Updated from CEC email (12-16) transmitting Table "Cumulative Projests - I-10 Corridor" and First-In-Line Solar Applications, BLM (12-21-09).
		Operational	--	--	--	--	5	5	5	5	5	
Photovoltaic	Groundwater	Construction	--	--	20	20	20	--	--	--	--	Updated from CEC email (12-16) transmitting Table "Cumulative Projests - I-10 Corridor" and First-In-Line Solar Applications, BLM (12-21-09)
		Operational	--	--	--	--	--	5	5	5	5	
Parabolic Trough (500MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Updated from CEC email (12-16) transmitting Table "Cumulative Projests - I-10 Corridor" and First-In-Line Solar Applications, BLM (12-21-09). Project Withdrawn.
		Operational	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
Photovoltaic (550MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	700	700	--	--	--	--	--	--	Updated from Draft Environmental Impact Statement May 2010, Page 4.5-2 and 4.5-3.
		Operational	--	--	--	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Pump - Storage (1300MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	--	--	--	8,066	8,066	8,066	8,066	--	Updated from CEC email (12-16) transmitting Table "Cumulative Projests - I-10 Corridor" and First-In-Line Solar Applications, BLM (12-21-09)
		Operational	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1,802	
Parabolic Trough (250MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	813	813	813	--	--	--	--	--	Updated from CEC Staff Assessment water use discussion (March 2010, page C.9-5)
		Operational	--	--	--	--	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	
Photovoltaic (500MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	20	20	20	--	--	--	--		Updated from CEC email (12-16) transmitting Table "Cumulative Projests - I-10 Corridor" and First-In-Line Solar Applications, BLM (12-21-09)
		Operational	--	--	0.25	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	
Photovoltaic (200MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	--	10	10	--	--	--	--	--	Updated from CEC email (12-16) transmitting Table "Cumulative Projests - I-10 Corridor" and First-In-Line Solar Applications, BLM (12-21-09)
		Operational	--	--	--	--	5	5	5	5	5	
Parabolic Trough (484MW)	Groundwater	Construction	--	1917	1917	1917	--	--	--	--	--	Total construction time remains about the same (38 months). Total water usage during construction (1,872,602,991 gallons) or about 5,750 af. Operational use remains at 600 afy. Construction water usage averaged over a period of 3 years starting in 2011.
		Operational	--	--	--	--	303	303	303	303	303	

as to whether these projects will be permitted. They have been included for completeness though they may well not be part of the cumulative water budget for the Chuckwalla Valley Groundwater Basin.
n has been rejected.
gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/ca/pdf/pa/energy/solar.Par.45875.File.dat/Renew_Energy_2_09_solar.pdf

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of: **APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION** **for the *PALEN SOLAR POWER PROJECT***	**Docket No. 09-AFC-7** **PROOF OF SERVICE** ***(Revised 5/14/2010)***

APPLICANT

Alice Harron
Senior Director of Project Development
1625 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 270
Berkeley, CA 94709-1161
harron@solarmillenium.com

Elizabeth Ingram,
Associate Developer
Solar Millennium LLC
1625 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 270
Berkeley, CA 94709
berg@solarmillennium.com

Ram Ambatipudi
Chevron Energy Solutions
150 E. Colorado Blvd., Ste. 360
Pasadena. CA 91105

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANT

Arrie Bachrach
AECOM Project Manager
1220 Avenida Acaso
Camarillo, CA 93012
arrie.bachrach@aecom.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Scott Galati, Esq.
Galati/Blek, LLP
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95814
sgalati@gb-llp.com

Peter Weiner
Matthew Sanders
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP
55 2nd Street, Suite 2400-3441
San Francisco, CA 94105
peterweiner@paulhastings.com
matthewsanders@paulhastings.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

Holly L. Roberts, Project Manager Bureau of Land Management
Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office
1201 Bird Center Drive Palm Springs, CA 92262
CAPSSolarPalen@blm.gov

California ISO
e-recipient@caiso.com

INTERVENORS

California Unions for Reliable Energy (CURE)
Tanya A. Gulesserian,
Marc D. Joseph
Jason W. Holder
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000
South San Francisco, CA 94080
tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com
jholder@adamsbroadwell.com

Michael E. Boyd, President
Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc.
5439 Soquel Drive
Soquel, CA 95073-2659
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net

Alfredo Figueroa
Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc.
424 North Carlton
Blythe, CA 92225
lacunadeaztlan@aol.com

Basin and Range Watch
Kevin Emmerich/Laura Cunningham
P.O. Box 153
Baker, CA 92309
atomictoadranch@netzero.net

ENERGY COMMISSION

Robert Weisenmiller
Commissioner and Presiding Member
rweisenm@energy.state.ca.us

Karen Douglas
Chair and Associate Member
kldougla@energy.state.ca.us

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

Alan Solomon
Project Manager
asolomon@energy.state.ca.us

Lisa DeCarlo
Staff Counsel
ldecarlo@energy.state.ca.us

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

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Carl Lindner, declare that on, June 14, 2010, I served and filed copies of the attached Responses to CURE Data Requests, Set 1. 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:
[http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/solar_millennium_palen].
The document has been sent to 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*)

For service to all other parties:

___X_ sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list;

_____ by personal delivery or by overnight delivery service or depositing in the United States mail at Camarillo, California with postage or fees thereon fully prepaid and addressed as provided on the Proof of Service list above to those addresses **NOT** marked "email preferred."

AND

For filing with the Energy Commission:

__X_ sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed respectively, to the address below (preferred method);

OR

_____ depositing in the mail an original and 12 paper copies, along with 13 CDs, as follows:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
Attn: Docket No. 09-AFC-7
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.