

Ella Foley Gannon  
 Direct Phone: 415.393.2572  
 Direct Fax: 415.262.9251  
 ella.gannon@bingham.com

August 26, 2011

Siting Committee  
 Kourtney Vaccaro, Hearing Officer  
 California Energy Commission  
 1516 Ninth Street, MS-15  
 Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: CALICO SOLAR PROJECT, DOCKET NO. 11-CAI-01  
 CALICO'S COMMENTS REGARDING STAFF RESPONSE TO  
 VERIFIED COMPLAINT TO REVOKE CERTIFICATION**

Dear Hearing Officer Vaccaro:

Pursuant to Section 1237(d) of the CEC's regulations, Calico Solar, LLC (Calico) submits these comments on the August 12, 2011 Staff Response to Verified Complaint to Revoke Certification. Calico agrees with Staff that BNSF's Complaint warrants dismissal as it is insufficient under Section 1237(a) and should also be denied on the merits. Calico appreciates Staff's thorough and broad review of the Complaint and the Conditions of Certification.

**I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On June 8, 2011, BNSF filed a document captioned as a "Verified Complaint to Revoke Certification" in Docket No. 08-AFC-13C. On June 9, 2011, the Chief Counsel's Office interpreted the filing as a complaint filed pursuant to Sections 1231 and 1237 and directed the docket office to open a new proceeding. The memorandum to the docket office, which was also sent to the service list, stated: "The Verified Complaint should not be docketed under 08-AFC-13C." Memorandum, p. 1. The Committee then issued a Service of Complaint and Scheduling Order on June 15, 2011. The order directed BNSF to correct deficiencies in its filing within 5 business days. BNSF ignored the Committee's June 15 order.

Rather than complying with the order, on July 7, 2011, BNSF served a "Petition To Revoke Certification And To Stay Compliance Proceedings Pending Adjudication Of This Petition," which was once again captioned in Docket No. 08-AFC-13, and which sought to stay consideration of the Petition to Amend in Docket No. 08-AFC-13. Calico understands that BNSF has withdrawn this filing. The document is not present in the log for either Docket 08-AFC-13C or Docket 11-CAI-01, but is posted on the Commission's website as a document related to Docket 08-AFC-13C (under "Intervenors' and Others' Documents").

<b>DOCKET</b>	
<b>11-CAI-01</b>	
DATE	AUG 26 2011
RECD.	AUG 26 2011

Boston  
 Hartford  
 Hong Kong  
 London  
 Los Angeles  
 New York  
 Orange County  
**San Francisco**  
 Santa Monica  
 Silicon Valley  
 Tokyo  
 Washington

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
 Three Embarcadero Center  
 San Francisco, CA  
 94111-4067

T +1.415.393.2000  
 F +1.415.393.2286  
 bingham.com

Then, on July 12, 2011, BNSF filed another document captioned as a “Verified Complaint to Revoke Certification.” On August 5, 2011, the Committee issued its order directing service of a complaint that was filed on “June 12, 2011” with the CEC’s Siting/Dockets Unit and on “June 20, 2011” with the CEC Chief Counsel. Calico believes these references to “June” are in error, and points out this discrepancy only because BNSF’s serial filings have created confusion. Hearing Officer Vaccaro served Calico with BNSF’s July 12, 2011 Complaint. Staff’s response also addresses the July 12, 2011 Complaint.

**II. STAFF IS CORRECT THAT BNSF’S COMPLAINT FAILS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 1237(A) AND SHOULD THEREFORE BE DISMISSED**

**A. BNSF’s Verification Is Invalid.**

Staff correctly found that the verification of the July 12, 2011 “Verified Complaint to Revoke Certification” is legally insufficient. *See* Code of Civ. Proc. § 2015.5. BNSF has now provided an amended verification with its comments, BNSF points to no authority that allows it to cure the defect in the verification simply by way of filing a comment letter pursuant to Section 1237(d). BNSF’s comments and quotation from Section 1237(a)(7) appear to imply that Staff’s finding that BNSF did not comply with this section is simply a matter of Staff “complaining.” BNSF’s Comments to CEC Staff Report, p. 6. This is not the case. Section 2015.5 requires that a verification be made under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California whenever a verification is required “under any law of this state or under any rule, regulation, order or requirement made pursuant to the law of this state.” This requirement supports the State’s interest in preventing and punishing perjury and ensures that out-of-state verifications are sufficiently reliable.

**B. BNSF Failed to Provide Factual Support for its Allegations of Non-Compliance.**

In its Report, Staff found that BNSF completely failed to provide any specific facts to support its sweeping allegations that Calico has significantly failed to comply with the terms and conditions of the its license and that Calico has affirmatively stated that it will not comply with these conditions in the future. Staff is correct on both accounts. Staff is also correct that these failures require dismissal of the Complaint.<sup>1</sup> As found by Staff,

---

<sup>1</sup> It is hardly surprising that BNSF’s complaint did not track the requirements of Section 1237(a) as BNSF did not specify whether it was filing the complaint under Section 1231 or 1237 or some other unnamed provision. We agree with Chairman Weisenmiller’s determination that the verified complaint includes allegations which could, if correctly presented, fall under Sections 1231 or 1237. We commend the Committee and the Staff’s continued efforts to ensure a full consideration of issues raised in this proceeding despite BNSF’s continued inability to comply with the Committee’s orders and the Commission’s regulations.

BNSF's Complaint does not reference *any* particular condition that Calico has failed to satisfy, but rather includes a blanket statement that Calico is out of compliance and intends to remain so. This statement does not meet the requirements of Section 1237(a).

In its comments on the Staff Report, BNSF claimed that Staff's attempt to discern meaning from its generalized and sweeping Complaint resulted in a "complete misread[ing] of BNSF's Verified Complaint." BNSF's Comments, p. 1. BNSF then explained that its allegations of non-compliance are wholly based on claims that SunCatchers may not be commercially available and that the project may not be economically viable. As Staff correctly found, these allegations have nothing to do with whether Calico is currently in compliance with the Commission's decision or whether it will be in compliance with applicable conditions some time in the future.

BNSF is correct that events which have transpired since issuance of the Commission's Decision have led Calico to propose modifications "to the project design, operation, [and] performance requirements. *See* 20 CCR § 1769(a)(1). Therefore, consistent with the procedures provided in Section 1769, Calico filed a Petition to Amend the Calico Solar Project on March 22, 2011. BNSF did not and cannot cite any support for the absurd proposition that a request to amend a license, filed under the provision of the Commission's Regulations, is evidence that a project owner will not comply with a commission decision and that the license should be revoked.<sup>2</sup> If the Commission accepted BNSF's interpretation, which is not made pursuant to any legal authority or practical rationale, it would mean that an applicant could never request changes to a Commission's decision post certification.

### **III. STAFF IS CORRECT IN CONCLUDING THAT BNSF'S COMPLAINT IS WITHOUT MERIT**

Because BNSF failed to cite any specific condition with which Calico has failed to comply, CEC Staff from each technical area conducted a full investigation of Calico's compliance with all the conditions of certification and determined that BNSF's claim of non-compliance is wholly without merit. Staff found that "of the 180 separate Conditions of Certification, staff has identified only one Condition that Calico has been unable to comply with." Staff Response, p. 6. With respect to that Condition, REL-1, Calico notes that the only reason why it has not yet provided data related to the Maricopa facility to the Compliance Project Manager is that it does not have the relevant data. As was described in its Petition to Amend, the Calico Solar Project is no longer owned by Tessera Solar, the owner and operator of Maricopa Solar, and therefore, Calico Solar is not able to access the logs and detailed reliability and maintenance data. Accordingly, in the Petition to Amend filed prior to the date when the first report was due under the

---

<sup>2</sup> BNSF's bizarre reference to "anticipatory repudiation" of a Commission decision can be deemed BNSF's recognition that it has absolutely no authority for its assertion. *See* BNSF's Comments to CEC Staff Report, p. 1.

Kourtney Vaccaro, Hearing Officer  
August 26, 2011  
Page 4

Conditions of Certification, Calico asked to be relieved of this condition. Recognizing that this request has not yet been considered by the Commission, Calico has communicated with the operator of the Maricopa facility regarding the type of data that is required. Calico will continue working with the operator of the Maricopa Facility in Calico's attempt to obtain and provide the relevant data, if possible.

Calico agrees with Staff's conclusion that the failure to provided the data required under REL-1 should not be considered a "significant failure to comply with the terms and conditions" of Commission's Decision on the Calico Solar Project. Staff Response, p. 7. We further note that BNSF's Complaint made no mention of REL-1, and BNSF's comment letter disclaims any particular interest in Calico's compliance with this condition. Thus, BNSF's allegations that Calico has significantly failed to comply with the Commission's Decision should be dismissed.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Calico agrees with Staff that BNSF's Complaint should be dismissed as insufficient and lacking in merit. Calico notes that much of Staff's reasoning applies to BNSF's assertions which the Committee has deemed claims pursuant to Section 1231. The July 12, 2011 Complaint fails to state any cognizable legal claim pursuant to *either* Section 1231 *or* Section 1237. Calico will address the entirety of the Complaint in its answer.

Sincerely yours,



Ella Foley Gannon



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

**FOR THE CALICO SOLAR PROJECT  
COMPLAINT AND INVESTIGATION**

**Docket No. 11-CAI-01**

**APPLICANT/RESPONDENT**

Calico Solar, LLC  
Daniel J. O'Shea  
Managing Director  
2600 10th Street, Suite 635  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
[dano@kroadpower.com](mailto:dano@kroadpower.com)

**APPLICANT'S CONSULTANT**

URS Corporation  
Angela Leiba  
AFC Project Manager  
4225 Executive Square, #1600  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
[angela\\_leiba@URSCorp.com](mailto:angela_leiba@URSCorp.com)

**APPLICANT'S COUNSEL**

Allan J. Thompson  
Attorney at Law  
21 C Orinda Way , #314  
Orinda, CA 94563  
[allanori@comcast.net](mailto:allanori@comcast.net)

Bingham McCutchen, LLP  
Ella Foley Gannon  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
[ella.gannon@bingham.com](mailto:ella.gannon@bingham.com)

**COMPLAINANT**

BNSF Railway Company  
Cynthia Lea Burch  
Katten Muchin Rosenman, LLP  
2029 Century Park East,  
Suite 2700  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3012  
[cynthia.burch@kattenlaw.com](mailto:cynthia.burch@kattenlaw.com)

**INTERESTED**

**AGENCIES/ENTITIES/PERSONS**

Society for the Conservation of  
Bighorn Sheep  
Bob Burke  
Gary Thomas  
1980 East Main Street, #50  
Barstow, CA 92311  
[e-mail service preferred  
cameracoordinator@sheepsociety.com](mailto:cameracoordinator@sheepsociety.com)

Basin and Range Watch  
Laura Cunningham  
Kevin Emmerich  
P.O. Box 70  
Beatty, NV 89003  
[e-mail service preferred  
atomicoadranch@netzero.net](mailto:atomicoadranch@netzero.net)

California Unions for Reliable  
Energy (CURE)  
c/o Tanya A. Gulesserian  
Marc D. Joseph  
Adams Broadwell Joseph  
& Cardozo  
601 Gateway Boulevard,  
Suite 1000  
South San Francisco, CA 94080  
[e-mail service preferred  
tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com](mailto:tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com)

Patrick C. Jackson  
600 Darwood Avenue  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
[e-mail service preferred  
ochsjack@earthlink.net](mailto:ochsjack@earthlink.net)

Sierra Club  
Gloria D. Smith  
Travis Ritchie  
85 Second Street, Second floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
[e-mail service preferred  
gloria.smith@sierraclub.org  
travis.ritchie@sierraclub.org](mailto:gloria.smith@sierraclub.org)

Newberry Community  
Service District  
c/o Wayne W. Weierbach  
P.O. Box 206  
Newberry Springs, CA 92365  
[e-mail service preferred  
newberryCSD@gmail.com](mailto:newberryCSD@gmail.com)

Defenders of Wildlife  
Kim Delfino  
1303 J Street, Suite 270  
Sacramento, California 95814  
[e-mail service preferred  
kdelfino@defenders.org](mailto:kdelfino@defenders.org)

Defenders of Wildlife  
Jeff Aardahl  
46600 Old State Highway,  
Unit 13  
Gualala, California 95445  
[e-mail service preferred  
jaardahl@defenders.org](mailto:jaardahl@defenders.org)

**INTERESTED  
AGENCIES/ENTITIES/PERSONS  
(cont.)**

County of San Bernardino  
Jean-Rene Basle, County Counsel  
Bart W. Brizzee, Principal Assistant  
County Counsel  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 4th Fl.  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0140  
[bbrizzee@cc.sbcounty.gov](mailto:bbrizzee@cc.sbcounty.gov)

California ISO  
[e-recipient@caiso.com](mailto:e-recipient@caiso.com)

BLM – Nevada State Office  
Jim Stobaugh  
P.O. Box 12000  
Reno, NV 89520  
[jim\\_stobaugh@blm.gov](mailto:jim_stobaugh@blm.gov)

Bureau of Land Management  
Joan Patrovsky, Specialist/  
Project Manager  
CDD-Barstow Field Office  
2601 Barstow Road  
Barstow, CA 92311  
[jpatrovs@blm.gov](mailto:jpatrovs@blm.gov)

California Department of  
Fish & Game  
Becky Jones  
36431 41st Street East  
Palmdale, CA 93552  
[dfgpalm@adelphia.net](mailto:dfgpalm@adelphia.net)

California Energy Commission  
Kerry Willis  
Senior Staff Counsel  
*Staff Attorney for Calico  
Amendment proceeding (08-  
AFC-13C)*  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[kwillis@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kwillis@energy.state.ca.us)

California Energy Commission  
Stephen Adams  
Senior Staff Counsel  
*Staff Attorney for Calico  
Amendment proceeding (08-  
AFC-13C)*  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[sadams@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:sadams@energy.state.ca.us)

California Energy Commission  
Craig Hoffman  
*Project Manager for Calico  
Amendment proceeding (08-  
AFC-13C)*  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[choffman@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:choffman@energy.state.ca.us)

California Energy Commission  
Caryn Holmes  
Staff Counsel IV  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[cholmes@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:cholmes@energy.state.ca.us)

**ENERGY COMMISSION  
SITING COMMITTEE,  
COMMITTEE ADVISERS,  
HEARING OFFICER**

KAREN DOUGLAS  
Commissioner and Presiding Member  
[kldougl@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kldougl@energy.state.ca.us)

ROBERT B. WEISENMILLER  
Chair and Associate Member  
[rweisenm@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:rweisenm@energy.state.ca.us)

Kourtney Vaccaro  
Hearing Officer  
[kvaccaro@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kvaccaro@energy.state.ca.us)

Galen Lemei, Adviser to  
Commissioner Douglas  
[glemei@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:glemei@energy.state.ca.us)

Eileen Allen, Adviser to  
Chairman Weisenmiller  
[eallen@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:eallen@energy.state.ca.us)

**ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF**

Christine Stora  
Project Manager  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[cstora@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:cstora@energy.state.ca.us)

Kevin W. Bell  
Senior Staff Counsel  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[kwbell@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kwbell@energy.state.ca.us)

**ENERGY COMMISSION CHIEF  
COUNSEL**

Michael J. Levy  
Chief Counsel  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[mlevy@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:mlevy@energy.state.ca.us)

**PUBLIC ADVISER**

Jennifer Jennings  
Public Adviser  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[publicadviser@energy.state.us](mailto:publicadviser@energy.state.us)

**DECLARATION OF SERVICE**

I, Marsha Curtis, declare that on August 26, 2011, I served and filed copies of the attached **Calico's Comments Regarding Staff Response to Verified Complaint to Revoke Certification**, dated August 26, 2011. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit or the Chief Counsel, as required by the applicable regulation, 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/calicosolar/investigate/index.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/calicosolar/investigate/index.html)].

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 or Chief Counsel, as appropriate, in the following manner:

**(Check all that Apply)**

**For service to all other parties:**

- Served electronically to all e-mail addresses on the Proof of Service list;
- Served by delivering on this date, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to the name and address of the person served, for mailing that same day in the ordinary course of business; that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date to those addresses **NOT** marked "e-mail preferred."

**AND**

**For filing with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:**

- by sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed with the U.S. Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and e-mailed respectively, to the address below (preferred method); **OR**
- by depositing an original and 12 paper copies in the mail with the U.S. Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, as follows:

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION – DOCKET UNIT**

Attn: Docket No. 11-CAI-01  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512  
[docket@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:docket@energy.state.ca.us)

**OR, if filing a Petition for Reconsideration of Decision or Order pursuant to Title 20, § 1720:**

- Served by delivering on this date one electronic copy by e-mail, and an original paper copy to the Chief Counsel at the following address, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid:

California Energy Commission  
Michael J. Levy, Chief Counsel  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-14  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[mlevy@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:mlevy@energy.state.ca.us)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, that I am employed in the county where this mailing occurred, and that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the proceeding.

