CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

REPORT OF CONVERSATION Page 1 of 1

		internet ruge			N	LCD. MATIO	J 2012 -
<i>Siting, Transmission and Environmental Protection Division</i>					FILE: 11-AFC-	4	
			PF	PROJECT TITLE: Rio Mesa Solar Project			
⊠ Telephone Email	and	(916) 817-3931		Meeting	Location: Confe	erence call	
NAME:	Abdel-Karim Abulaban Christopher Dennis			DATE: N	lay 7, 2012	TIME:	9:00 am
WITH:	Mike Tietze, WorleyParsons						
SUBJECT:	Data Request Nos. 136 and 137 Submittal of Groundwater Model and Modeling Files						

DOCKET 11-AFC-4

DATE MAY 07 201

COMMENTS:

Groundwater model and modeling files were submitted in responses to Data Requests Nos. 136 and 137.

Mike Tietze was asked why the model was converted from a head model to a superposition model, as stated in the groundwater impact assessment report (GIAR). Mike said that the model is a head model, and that the drawdown was determined by taking the difference between the heads before and after the project is referred to as "superposition." Karim pointed out that the GIAR stated that a superposition model approach was adopted. Mike Tietze said that it is a misinterpretation on the Energy Commission staff's part and reiterated that the model is a head model. Mike Tietze also said he would email the model developer, Mark Trudell, so that Mark could clarify the modeling approach with Energy Commission staff.

Attached is an email string clarifying the issue.

cc:	Pierre Martinez	Signed:
		Name: Abdel-Karim Abulaban
		Christopher Dennis

From:	Abulaban, Abdel-Karim@Energy
То:	Martinez, Pierre@Energy;
Subject:	FW: Rio Mesa Modeling Questions
Date:	Thursday, May 10, 2012 8:52:06 AM

From: Tietze, Mike (Sacramento) [mailto:Mike.Tietze@WorleyParsons.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2012 12:06 PM
To: Abulaban, Abdel-Karim@Energy; Abulaban, Abdel-Karim@Energy
Subject: RE: Rio Mesa Modeling Questions

Karim - This didn't go through the first time for some reason.

Mike Tietze, PG, CHG, CEG Location Manager | WorleyParsons Group Tel: 916-817-3931 | Mob: 916-233-9731

From: Tietze, Mike (Sacramento)
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2012 10:48 AM
To: 'Abdel-Karim.Abulaban@energy.ca.gov'; 'Christopher.Dennis@energy.ca.gov'
Cc: Trudell, Mark (Orange County); 'mrojansky@brightsourceenergy.com'; 'Paul. Marshall@energy.ca.gov'
Subject: Re: Rio Mesa Modeling Questions

Agreed. We were following the definition that the post project condition is superimposed on the pre-project condition and we focus on the difference. I realize there are different interpretations and sorry this created confusion.

Mike

From: Abulaban, Abdel-Karim@Energy [mailto:Abdel-Karim.Abulaban@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2012 11:19 AM
To: Tietze, Mike (Sacramento); Dennis, Christopher@Energy <Christopher.</p>
Dennis@energy.ca.gov>
Cc: Trudell, Mark (Orange County); Michael Rojansky
<mrojansky@brightsourceenergy.com>; Marshall, Paul@Energy <Paul.</p>
Marshall@energy.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Rio Mesa Modeling Questions

Good morning Mike,

Thanks for the information. I just have to make one remark about your characterization of the way your modeling effort was done as superposition. While you can choose to call it whatever you like, the term "superposition" to a modeler has a specific meaning, which is to model incremental change to a system as a result of an incremental change in the stresses acting on the system without having to know the prior stresses. I thought it is important to make this clarification so that we have a consistent use of the terminology to avoid any chances for misinterpretation.

Regards. Karim

From: Tietze, Mike (Sacramento) [mailto:Mike.Tietze@WorleyParsons.com]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2012 4:12 PM
To: Dennis, Christopher@Energy; Abulaban, Abdel-Karim@Energy
Cc: Trudell, Mark (Orange County); Michael Rojansky
Subject: FW: Rio Mesa Modeling Questions

Chris and Karim –

I exchanged emails with Mark Trudell (he is currently in Australia). He confirmed the following:

• Consistent with what I told you, the GMS model we got for Blythe Solar included MODFLOW 2000 files which we imported into GW Vistas with no problem. We saved a similar updated set of Modflow 2000 files onto the model data CD submitted to CEC. You should be able to import these into GMS.

• Our modeling started with a calibrated steady state model that simulated pre-project heads. We calibrated the model to available head data, used the same pumping data as the Blythe model, and estimated boundary fluxes by the same method as Blythe. We contoured static heads and then used the predicted pumping heads and subtracted them from the static heads to predict drawdown impact. In our impact analysis we focused on this difference rather than on the predicted pumping heads since the difference is more instructive to evaluation of impacts. Hence the model is correctly termed a superposition model, but unlikely some superposition models, it is based on actual heads.

Hope this makes sense. Let us know if you have any additional questions.

Best Regards,

Mike Tietze, PG, CHG, CEG Location Manager | WorleyParsons Group Tel: 916-817-3931 | Mob: 916-233-9731

*** WORLEYPARSONS GROUP NOTICE *** "This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose or use the information contained in it. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email and delete the email and any attachments. Any personal views or opinions expressed by the writer may not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of any company in the WorleyParsons Group of Companies."

*** WORLEYPARSONS GROUP NOTICE *** "This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose or use the information contained in it. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email and delete the email and any attachments. Any personal views or opinions expressed by the writer may not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of any company in the WorleyParsons Group of Companies."