

Ella Foley Gannon  
Direct Phone: +1.415.393.2572  
Direct Fax: +1.415.262.9251  
ella.gannon@bingham.com

December 31, 2012

Siting Committee  
Raoul Renaud, Hearing Officer  
Eric Solorio, Project Manager  
California Energy Commission  
Docket No. 11-AFC-03  
1516 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Cogentrix Quail Brush Generation Project - Docket Number 11-AFC-03,  
Response to CEC Staff Data Requests 96 through 101**

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 Carlyle Infrastructure Partners, L.P., Bingham McCutchen LLP hereby submits *Responses to CEC Staff Data Requests 96 through 101*. 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.

The topics addressed in this letter include the following:

- Technical Area: Alternatives

If you have any questions regarding this submittal, please contact Rick Neff at (704) 525-3800 or me at (415) 393-2572.

Sincerely yours,



Ella Foley Gannon

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

Beijing  
Boston  
Frankfurt  
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

A/75340696.1



## Quail Brush Genco, LLC

---

A Project Company of Cogentrix Power Holdings, LLC

9405 Arrowpoint Boulevard  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28273-8110  
(704) 525-3800  
(704) 525-9934 – Fax

December 31, 2012

Siting Committee  
Raoul Renaud, Hearing Officer  
Eric Solorio, Project Manager  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-15  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: **Quail Brush Generation Project (11-AFC-03)  
Response to CEC Staff Data Requests 96-101**

Dear Members of the Siting Committee, Hearing Officer Renaud, and Mr. Solorio:

Responses to CEC Staff Data Requests 96 through 101 are provided below.

### **Technical Area: Alternatives**

**Data Request No. 96:** (a) Please explain why the applicant revised the project objectives from those originally provided in Section 3 of the AFC.

(b) Does the applicant expect to meet an outline date of May 1, 2014, October 1, 2014, or some other date under the current permitting schedule.

(c) Given the City of San Diego Council decision not to consider redesignation of the proposed Quail Brush site to a compatible land use designation, please explain the revised project objective that states that the project should be located on a site that “could reasonably be anticipated to have” appropriate zoning.

### **Response:**

As described in the *Alternatives Analysis for the Quail Brush Generation Project, San Diego, California* (October, 2012) (“Alternatives Analysis”), both the identification of potential alternatives as well as the assessment of feasibility of those alternatives turns, in part on the basic project objectives. Given the need to identify and evaluate a wider range of alternatives than was provided in the AFC, the Applicant also thought it was appropriate to further refine and

clarify the basic project objectives. The overall project objective as described in Section 3.1 of the AFC and Section 1.1 of the Alternatives Analysis is to license and build a plant that responds to SDG&E's needs as described in SDG&E's 2009 RFO. Section 1.1 of the Alternatives Analysis simply provides more detail on the factors which make a plant responsive to the specific demand that was to be addressed through the 2009 RFO process. This additional information is meant to clarify the process by which the Applicant identified and evaluated alternatives, not to change the project objectives.

The Applicant's goal remains to bring the Project on line by May 1, 2014. However, this date has probably slipped some given changes in the permitting schedule. The desire/need is still to bring the Project on line as soon as possible, following receipt of the license.

One of the factors that the Applicant used to evaluate potential sites for the Project was the existing land use designation and the likely ability to change the designation if necessary. When the proposed Project site was originally evaluated, it was assumed that a change in the land use designation would be possible given that the City was in the process of approving a request for the same type of zone change for land adjacent to the proposed Project site (Sycamore Landfill). The refinement of this project objective was made to more accurately describe the process by which the Applicant initially identified and evaluated potential sites for the proposed Project.

**Data Request No. 97:** Please explain why close proximity to both an SDG&E substation and a high voltage transmission line would be required for interconnection? Why is it not adequate to be in close proximity to a high voltage transmission line alone?

**Response:**

As discussed in the Alternatives Analysis, one factor that was used to screen alternative sites for feasibility was proximity to existing infrastructure with sufficient capacity to serve the proposed Project. The major infrastructure necessary to serve the proposed Project includes a natural gas line, a substation and a high voltage transmission line, all with existing capacity to serve the proposed Project. To ensure that a wide range of alternatives were considered, an alternative site was considered potentially feasible if it was close to two of the three identified infrastructure needs. Therefore, no alternative was eliminated simply because it was not in close proximity to both a high voltage transmission line and a substation.

**Data Request No. 98:** Please clarify why the Alternative A site would not tie into the existing 138 kV line TL 13822 that crosses the Alternative A site given the agreement described between the applicant, SDG&E and CAISO to use the 138 kV line.

**Response:**

At the time of the initial evaluation of Alternative A site, the Applicant had not contemplated nor discussed with SDG&E and the CAISO the possibility of connecting into the existing 138 kV line TL 13822 and therefore this possibility was not contemplated. The Applicant agrees that if Alternative A site were feasible, it would likely be possible to connect into this line. As described in the Alternatives Analysis, however, Alternative A site is not feasible or practicable for a number of reasons, including that it is unlikely to be available and it would not reduce any environmental impacts as compared to the proposed Project site.

**Data Request No. 99:** (a) Explain why alternative sites are suggested that are significantly larger than the 10-acre site required for the project and made up of multiple parcels and multiple owners.

(b) Explain the rationale for choosing a 430-acre site comprising multiple parcels with multiple zone districts for Alternative 1. Is there a 10-acre site zoned light industrial available within the larger 430-acre site?

(c) Explain the rationale for choosing a 33-acre site comprising two parcels with two zone districts for Alternative 3. What is the acreage of the Rural Residential parcel?

**Response:**

To identify alternative sites for the proposed Project, the project team reviewed aerial photographs of the entire SDG&E service area and applied the screening criteria described in the Alternatives Analysis to all currently undeveloped areas. Because many of the undeveloped areas include large acreages, the alternative sites identified often contained more than the 10 acres necessary for the Proposed Project. Had any of the larger areas been found to be potentially feasible, then the Applicant would have completed further analysis to determine if the larger area contained 10 acres which could be utilized for the proposed Project. As described in the Alternatives Analysis, however, none of the alternative sites are feasible.

As with the other Alternatives Sites, Alternative Site 1 was chosen because it included undeveloped area in SDG&E service territory. Alternative Site 1 as a whole is not feasible because it would require a change in the point of interconnection and therefore could not be developed in a reasonable timeframe. Further, it would require construction of a 1.5-mile long gen tie and a 3-mile long gas line. Given these factors, further analysis of whether there is a 10-acre parcel that is zoned light industrial was deemed unnecessary.

The rationale for choosing Alternative Site 3 was the same as the rationale described above, that is that it represented an undeveloped area within SDG&E service territory. Alternative 3 was not deemed infeasible due to zoning or land use constraints, therefore, the amount of acreage that is zoned Rural Residential is not relevant to the analysis.

**Data Request No. 100:** What information did the applicant review to confirm that the nearest substation located 0.5 miles from the Alternative Site 1 would not have capacity to serve the proposed project?

**Response:**

The information regarding the nearest substation to all potential alternative sites including Alternative Site 1 was obtained from SDG&E, in personal communications.

**Data Request No. 101:** Given that the Alternative Site 2 would tie into the same substation as the proposed project, please explain how the POI would be different and why it would require additional CAISO studies.

December 31, 2012

Page 4 -- Quail Brush Generation Project (Docket No. 11-AFC-03)

**Response:**

The conclusion in the Alternatives Analysis that Alternative Site 2 would require a different POI and additional CAISO studies was in error. The POI would be the same as the proposed Project. However, as explained in Section 1.5.5.10, Alternative Site 2 is not a feasible alternative as it would require construction of additional infrastructure including a 2.4-mile gas line as well as a 3.5-mile gas line.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Richard Neff', written in a cursive style.

C. Richard Neff  
Vice President

cc: Docket (11-AFC-03)



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 12/28/2012)

SERVICE LIST:

APPLICANT

Cogentrix Energy, LLC  
C. Richard "Rick" Neff, Vice President  
Environmental, Health & Safety  
John Collins, VP Development  
Lori Ziebart, Project Manager  
Quail Brush Generation Project  
9405 Arrowpoint Boulevard  
Charlotte, NC 28273  
rickneff@kogentrix.com  
johncollins@kogentrix.com  
loriziebart@kogentrix.com

CONSULTANTS FOR APPLICANT

Tetra Tech EC, Inc.  
Connie Farmer  
Sr. Environmental Project Manager  
Sarah McCall  
Sr. Environmental Planner  
143 Union Boulevard, Suite 1010  
Lakewood, CO 80228  
connie.farmer@tetrattech.com  
sarah.mccall@tetrattech.com

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

Mr. Rob Simpson, CEO  
Helping Hand Tools  
1901 First Avenue, Suite 219  
San Diego, CA 92101  
rob@redwoodrob.com

Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter  
c/o Law Office of Robert W. Wright  
Robert W. Wright  
716 Castro Street  
Solana Beach, CA 92075  
bob.wright@mac.com

Sunset Greens  
Homeowners Association  
c/o Briggs Law Corporation  
Cory J. Briggs  
Isabel E. O'Donnell  
99 East "C" Street, Suite 111  
Upland, CA 91786  
cory@briggslawcorp.com  
isabel@briggslawcorp.com

INTERVENORS (cont'd.)

HomeFed Fanita Rancho, LLC  
c/o Allen Matkins Leck Gamble  
Mallory & Natsis LLP  
Jeffrey A. Chine  
Heather S. Riley  
501 West Broadway, 15<sup>th</sup> 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

\*California Pilots Association  
Andy Wilson  
31438 Greenbrier Lane  
Hayward, CA 94544  
andy.wilson@calpilots.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

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

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

ENERGY COMMISSION –  
PUBLIC ADVISER

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

COMMISSION DOCKET UNIT

California Energy Commission –  
Docket Unit  
Attn: Docket No. 11-AFC-03  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512  
docket@energy.ca.gov

OTHER ENERGY COMMISSION  
PARTICIPANTS (LISTED FOR  
CONVENIENCE ONLY):

*After docketing, the Docket Unit  
will provide a copy to the persons  
listed below. **Do not** send copies  
of documents to these persons  
unless specifically directed to do  
so.*

KAREN DOUGLAS  
Commissioner and Presiding  
Member

ANDREW McALLISTER  
Commissioner and Associate  
Member

Raoul Renaud  
Hearing Adviser

Eileen Allen  
Commissioners' Technical  
Adviser for Facility Siting

Galen Lemei  
Adviser to Commissioner Douglas

Jennifer Nelson  
Adviser to Commissioner Douglas

David Hungerford  
Adviser to Commissioner McAllister

Patrick Saxton  
Adviser to Commissioner McAllister

Eric Solorio  
Project Manager

Stephen Adams  
Staff Counsel

DECLARATION OF  
SERVICE

I, Margaret Pavao, declare that on December 31, 2012, I served and filed copies of the attached Applicant's Response to CEC Staff's Data Requests 96 through 101, dated December 31, 2012. This document is accompanied by the most recent Proof of Service list, which I copied from 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, as appropriate, in the following manner:

(Check one)

For service to all other parties and filing with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:

- I e-mailed the document to all e-mail addresses on the Service List above and personally delivered it or deposited it in the US mail with first class postage to those parties noted above as "hard copy required"; OR
- Instead of e-mailing the document, I personally delivered it or deposited it in the US mail with first class postage to all of the persons on the Service List for whom a mailing address is given.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I am over the age of 18 years.

Dated: December 31, 2012



\_\_\_\_\_  
Margaret Pavao