

November 16, 2012

California Energy Commission
DOCKETED
11-AFC-3

TN # 68543 NOV 16 2012

Eric Solorio, Project Manager California Energy Commission Docket No. 11-AFC-3 1516 9th St. Sacramento, CA 95814

Cogentrix Quail Brush Generation Project - Docket Number 11-AFC-3, Quail Brush Power Project Cluster Phase II Interconnection Study Second Addendum

Docket Clerk:

Pursuant to the provisions of Title 20, California Code of Regulations, and on behalf of Quail Brush Genco, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Cogentrix Energy, LLC, Tetra Tech hereby submits the Quail Brush Power Project Cluster Phase II Interconnection Study Second Addendum (11-AFC-3). The Quail Brush Generation Project is a 100 megawatt natural gas fired electric generation peaking facility to be located in the City of San Diego, California.

If you have any questions regarding this submittal, please contact Rick Neff at (704) 525-3800 or me at (303) 980-3653.

Sincerely,

Constance E. Farmer Project Manager/Tetra Tech

Constance C. Farmer

cc: Lori Ziebart, Cogentrix John Collins, Cogentrix Rick Neff, Cogentrix Proof of Service List



BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 1-800-822-6228 – WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE QUAIL BRUSH GENERATION PROJECT

DOCKET NO. 11-AFC-03 PROOF OF SERVICE (Revised 10/29/2012)

APPLICANT

Cogentrix Energy, LLC
C. Richard "Rick" Neff, Vice President
Environmental, Health & Safety
9405 Arrowpoint Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28273
rickneff@cogentrix.com

Cogentrix Energy, LLC
John Collins, VP Development
Lori Ziebart, Project Manager
Quail Brush Generation Project
9405 Arrowpoint Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28273
johncollins@cogentrix.com
loriziebart@cogentrix.com

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
Connie Farmer
Sr. Environmental Project Manager
143 Union Boulevard, Suite 1010
Lakewood, CO 80228
connie.farmer@tetratech.com

Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
Barry McDonald
VP Solar Energy Development
17885 Von Karmen Avenue, Ste. 500
Irvine, CA 92614-6213
barry.mcdonald@tetratech.com

Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
Sarah McCall
Sr. Environmental Planner
143 Union Boulevard, Suite 1010
Lakewood, CO 80228
sarah.mccall@tetratech.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Ella Foley Gannon
Camarin Madigan
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
ella.gannon@bingham.com
camarin.madigan@bingham.com

INTERVENORS

Roslind Varghese 9360 Leticia Drive Santee, CA 92071 roslindv@gmail.com

Rudy Reyes 8655 Graves Avenue, #117 Santee, CA 92071 rreyes2777@hotmail.com

Dorian S. Houser 7951 Shantung Drive Santee, CA 92071 dhouser@cox.net

Kevin Brewster 8502 Mesa Heights Road Santee, CA 92071 Izpup@yahoo.com

Phillip M. Connor Sunset Greens Home Owners Association 8752 Wahl Street Santee, CA 92071 connorphil48@yahoo.com

*Mr. Rob Simpson, CEO Helping Hand Tools 1901 First Avenue, Suite 219 San Diego, CA 92101 rob@redwoodrob.com HomeFed Fanita Rancho, LLC Jeffrey A. Chine
Heather S. Riley
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP
501 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
jchine@allenmatkins.com
hriley@allenmatkins.com
jkaup@allenmatkins.com
vhoy@allenmatkins.com

Preserve Wild Santee Van Collinsworth 9222 Lake Canyon Road Santee, CA 92071 savefanita@cox.net

Center for Biological Diversity John Buse Aruna Prabhala 351 California Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104 jbuse@biologicaldiversity.org aprabhala@biologicaldiversity.org

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO e-recipient@caiso.com

City of Santee
Department of Development Services
Melanie Kush
Director of Planning
10601 Magnolia Avenue, Bldg. 4
Santee, CA 92071
mkush@ci.santee.ca.us

Morris E. Dye Development Services Dept. City of San Diego 1222 First Avenue, MS 501 San Diego, CA 92101 mdye@sandiego.gov

INTERESTED AGENCIES (cont.)

Mindy Fogg Land Use Environmental Planner Advance Planning County of San Diego Department of Planning & Land Use 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310 San Diego, CA 92123 mindy.fogg@sdcounty.ca.gov

<u>ENERGY COMMISSION –</u> DECISIONMAKERS

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and
Presiding Member
karen.douglas@energy.ca.gov

ANDREW McALLISTER Commissioner and Associate Member andrew.mcallister@energy.ca.gov

Raoul Renaud Hearing Adviser raoul.renaud@energy.ca.gov

Eileen Allen Commissioners' Technical Adviser for Facility Siting eileen.allen@energy.ca.gov

Galen Lemei Advisor to Commissioner Douglas galen.lemei@energy.ca.gov

Jennifer Nelson Advisor to Commissioner Douglas jennifer.nelson@energy.ca.gov

David Hungerford Advisor to Commissioner McAllister david.hungerford@energy.ca.gov

Pat Saxton Advisor to Commissioner McAllister <u>patrick.saxton@energy.ca.gov</u>

ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF

Eric Solorio
Project Manager
eric.solorio@energy.ca.gov

Stephen Adams
Staff Counsel
stephen.adams@energy.ca.gov

<u>ENERGY COMMISSION – PUBLIC ADVISER</u>

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

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Constance Farmer, declare that on November 16, 2012, I served and filed copies of the attached Quail Brush Power Project Cluster Phase II Interconnection Study Second Addendum, dated February 14, 2012. This document is accompanied by the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/quailbrush/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)
or ser	vice to all other parties:
Х	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 marked *"hard copy required" or where no e-mail address is provided.
4ND	
or filin	g with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:
Х	by sending an electronic copy to the e-mail 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-AFC-03 1516 Ninth Street, MS-4 Sacramento, CA 95814-5512 docket@energy.ca.gov
OR if fi	lling a Petition for Reconsideration of Decision or Order pursuant to Title 20 § 1720

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 michael.levy@energy.ca.gov

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 occurre proceeding. Constance C. Faire

McCall, Sarah

From: Kravchuk, Lyubov <LKravchuk@caiso.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2012 10:44 AM

To: Collins, John; Wright, Linda
Cc: Mishler, Marlene; Bhagat, Dipak

Subject: RE: Confirmation of the Re-Study referenced in the Addendum to the Re-Study

Hi John,

The "Re-Study of C1C2 Phase II" report was sent to you on June 4, 2012.

Page 6 of "Re-Study of C1C2 Phase II Appendix A – C565 Individual Project Report" has the following language:

4.1 On-Peak Deliverability Assessment

CAISO updated the results of the On-Peak Deliverability Assessment performed in the original C1C2 Phase II Study.

The Project is not responsible for any Delivery Network Upgrades as identified in the Re-Study. However, the Project will be subject to the dispatch constraints identified in the C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment and described in detail in the Re-Study Group Report.

Thanks, Luba

Lyubov Kravchuk

Regional Transmission South California ISO (916) 608-5877

From: Collins, John [mailto:JohnCollins@Cogentrix.com]

Sent: Monday, November 12, 2012 4:47 AM

To: Kravchuk, Lyubov; Wright, Linda

Cc: Mishler, Marlene; Bhagat, Dipak; Collins, John

Subject: RE: Confirmation of the Re-Study referenced in the Addendum to the Re-Study

Luba,

The CEC has also asked us to have the CAISO confirm that the project is not responsible for any Delivery upgrades. In the Re-Study of C1C2 Phase II Appendix A – C565 Individual Project Report there is a statement on page 13, under section 11. Upgrades, Cost Estimates, and Time to Construct Estimates, that states "There are no Delivery Network Upgrades assigned to the Project." However, the CEC has asked us to request a statement from the CAISO.

After sending my original email I thought I should have included Linda also. Sorry if I should have done that originally.

Thank you for any assistance you may provide.

Sincerely,



From: Collins, John

Sent: Friday, November 09, 2012 2:29 PM

To: Kravchuk, Lyubov

Cc: Marlene Ito Mishler (mmishler@semprautilities.com); Bhagat, Dipak; Collins, John **Subject:** Confirmation of the Re-Study referenced in the Addendum to the Re-Study

Luba,

The CEC has asked us to get confirmation from the CAISO that the "Re-Study of C1C2 Phase II Interconnection Study Report" referenced in the last sentence on page 4 of the "Addendum to Re-Study of C1C2 Phase II Appendix A-C565 Individual Project Report" is the one provided on <u>June 4, 2012</u>. I have attached the documents referenced.

Can you provide the confirmation?

Thanks,



The foregoing electronic message, together with any attachments thereto, is confidential and may be legally privileged against disclosure other than to the intended recipient. It is intended solely for the addressee(s) and access to the message by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient of this electronic message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete and immediately notify the sender of this error.



February 14, 2012

Mr. Gary Palo Cogentrix Energy, LLC 6 Belcourt Drive Newport Beach, CA 92660

Subject: Quail Brush Power Project

Cluster Phase II Interconnection Study Second Addendum

Dear Mr. Palo:

Attached is the Revised Second Addendum to the Cluster 1 and 2 Phase II Interconnection Study Report for the interconnection of the proposed Quail Brush Power Project (Project) to the CAISO Controlled Grid. The purpose of the Revised Second Addendum is to modify the identification of certain network upgrades resulting from a reassessment performed by the CAISO pursuant to the Technical Bulletin issued January 31, 2012 entitled "Generation Interconnection Procedures: Deliverability Requirements for Clusters 1-4." ¹

Please replace the Second Addendum dated February 10, 2012 with this Revised Second Addendum dated February 14, 2012. The revisions consist of the following: a description was added to this Revised Second Addendum about the First Addendum dated January 17, 2012 and the costs for PTO's Interconnection Facilities and Network Upgrades on the SDG&E transmission system in Section C.1 of the Executive Summary were updated to match the costs in the First Addendum.

If you have any questions, please contact Luba Kravchuk (lkravchuk@caiso.com or 916.608.5877).

Sincerely,

Robert Sparks

Manager of Regional Transmission - South

Attachment

¹ The Technical Bulletin can be accessed on the ISO website at http://www.caiso.com/Documents/TechnicalBulletin-GeneratorInterconnectionProcedures-DeliverabilityRequirements-Clusters1-4Jan31_2012.pdf

via e-mail:

Larry D. Ellefson (lellefson@enpex.com)
Gary Palo (GaryPalo@COGENTRIX.COM)
Dipak Bhagat (DipakBhagat@Cogentrix.com)
Khoang Ngo (KNgo@semprautilities.com)
Rodney Winter (RWinter@semprautilities.com)
Mariam Mirzadeh (MMirzadeh@semprautilities.com)
GI Engineers (GIEngineers@semprautilities.com)

CAISO via email:

Robert Sparks (<u>Rsparks@caiso.com</u>) Judy Brown (<u>JBrown@caiso.com</u>) Robert Emmert (REmmert@caiso.com)

Revised Second Addendum to Appendix A – C565

Cogentrix Energy, LLC

Quail Brush Power Project

Revised Second Addendum To The Cluster 1 & 2 Phase II Final Report



February 14, 2012

This study has been completed in coordination with San Diego Gas & Electric Company per CAISO Tariff Appendix Y Generator Interconnection Procedures (GIP) for Interconnection Requests in a Queue Cluster Window

1. Executive Summary

Cogentrix Energy LLC, an Interconnection Customer (IC), received a Cluster 1 and 2 Phase II (C1C2 Phase II) Study report dated August 24, 2011 for its Interconnection Request (IR) to the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) for their proposed Quail Brush Power Project (Project) interconnecting queue position C565. Subsequent to the distribution of the report, on January 17, 2012, the IC received an Addendum (First Addendum) to revise the Point of Interconnection (POI) for the Project from San Diego Gas and Electric's (SDG&E) Miguel-Mission 230 kV transmission line to the 138 kV bus of SDG&E's Carlton Hills Substation. On February 10, 2012, the IC received the Second Addendum to Appendix A to reflect the C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment. This Revised Second Addendum to Appendix A corrects the references to the original POI.

Subsequent to the distribution of the report and First Addendum, the CAISO performed additional studies (C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment) to re-assess certain upgrades by applying the criteria in the Technical Bulletin issued January 31, 2012 entitled "Generation Interconnection Procedures: Deliverability Requirements for Clusters 1-4." This addendum to the C1C2 Phase II report (Revised Second Addendum) contains a revised identification of Network Upgrades resulting from the re-assessment. The underlying assumptions and results of the re-assessment are set forth in the C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment, which is available on the CAISO website at the following location: http://www.caiso.com/Documents/TechnicalReport cluster1 2DeliverabilityRe-

The following identified sections and corresponding changes replace and supersede those same sections in the IC's C1C2 Phase II Study report dated August 24, 2011, the First Addendum dated January 17, 2012, and the Second Addendum dated February 10, 2012.

Summary of changes:

Assessment.pdf

- A. Replace Section B.1.b. of the Executive Summary on page 3 with the following to reflect the removal of the Network Upgrades on the SCE system
 - B. Adverse impacts identified by the study are mitigated by:
 - 1. The following Delivery Network Upgrades, which must be constructed for the Project to be fully deliverable:
 - b. SCE System

i. Loop Lugo-Mohave 500 kV transmission line into Pisgah Substation – **Per the C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment, this upgrade is no longer being assigned to the Project**

ii. Add Series Capacitor Banks on Nipton-Pisgah & Mohave-Pisgah 500 kV transmission lines – **Per the C1C2 Phase II Re-**

¹ The Technical Bulletin can be accessed on the ISO website at http://www.caiso.com/Documents/TechnicalBulletin-GeneratorInterconnectionProcedures-DeliverabilityRequirements-Clusters1-4Jan31_2012.pdf

assessment, this upgrade is no longer being assigned to the Project

iii. Add new Red Bluff-Valley 500 kV transmission line – **Per the C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment, this upgrade is no longer being assigned to the Project**

iv. Add Colorado River-Red Bluff No.3 500 kV transmission line – **Per the C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment, this upgrade is no longer being assigned to the Project**

- B. Replace Section C.1. of the Executive Summary on pages 3 and 4 with the following to reflect the removal of the Network Upgrades on the SCE system
 - C. Specification of required facilities, a non-binding, good faith estimate of the Project's cost responsibility and approximate time to construct the required facilities:
 - 1. The non-binding, good faith cost estimate of the PTO's Interconnection Facilities² to interconnect the Project is approximately \$1,382,000, exclusive of ITCC³. The non-binding, good faith cost estimate for the Network Upgrades⁴ to interconnect the Project and be fully deliverable is approximately \$1,469,000 on the SDG&E transmission system and \$28,268,000 on the SCE transmission system Per the C1C2 Phase II Re-assessment, the cost of \$28,268,000 of upgrades on SCE's transmission system is no longer being assigned to the Project.
- C. Replace Section 4.3 on page 9 with the following:

4.3 Operational Deliverability Assessment

The assumptions used to perform the operational Deliverability Assessment are presented in the Group Report. Based on the study results, the Project will have FC Deliverability Status after the SDG&E area upgrades in Table 11.1 are completed (which are expected to be completed before the Project's In-Service Date), subject to the constraints and potential limitations identified in the C1C2 Phase II Reassessment.

D. Revise Section 11.2 on page 20 to remove Table 11.2: SCE Upgrades, Estimated Costs, and Estimated Time to Construct Summary – Per the C1C2 Phase II Reassessment, the SCE Upgrades no longer apply to the Project

The remainder of the Phase II Study is unaffected by the re-assessment.

The transmission facilities owned, controlled, or operated by the PTO from the Point of Change of Ownership to the Point of Interconnection necessary to physically and electrically interconnect the Project to the CAISO Controlled Grid.

³ Income Tax Component of Contribution

⁴ The transmission facilities, other than Interconnection Facilities, beyond the Point of Interconnection necessary to accommodate the interconnection of the Project to the CAISO Controlled Grid.