

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**Energy Resources Conservation and  
Development Commission**

In the Matter of:

Docket No. 08-AFC-13C

The Application for Certification for the  
Calico Solar Project Amendment

**SIERRA CLUB REPLY BRIEF RE JURISDICTION OF THE CALIFORNIA  
ENERGY COMMISSION**

June 3, 2011

Gloria D. Smith  
Sierra Club  
85 Second Street, Second floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 977-5532 Voice  
(415) 977-5739 Facsimile  
gloria.smith@sierraclub.org

Travis Ritchie  
Sierra Club  
85 Second Street, Second floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 977-5727 Voice  
(415) 977-5739 Facsimile  
travis.ritchie@sierraclub.org

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**Energy Resources Conservation and  
Development Commission**

In the Matter of:

Docket No. 08-AFC-13C

The Application for Certification for the  
Calico Solar Project Amendment

**SIERRA CLUB REPLY BRIEF RE JURISDICTION OF THE CALIFORNIA  
ENERGY COMMISSION**

Sierra Club continues to object to the California Energy Commission’s (“Commission”) exercise of jurisdiction over Calico Solar, LLC’s (the “Applicant”) request for permission to develop a solar photovoltaic (“PV”) facility. Sierra Club alerted the Commission to its lack of jurisdiction in this proceeding over six weeks ago by filing a Motion to Dismiss the Petition to Amend on April 20, 2011. Several parties filed briefs on May 23, 2011 addressing the issue of the Commission’s jurisdiction as it relates to the Applicant’s newly proposed solar PV project. As discussed in more detail below, those briefs do not articulate any legal foundation upon which the Commission can assert jurisdiction over the PV Facility.

**I. STAFF AND THE APPLICANT FAIL TO ADDRESS THE THRESHOLD MATTER THAT THE WARREN-ALQUIST ACT EXPRESSLY EXCLUDED SOLAR PV FACILITIES FROM THE COMMISSION’S JURISDICTION**

The Warren-Alquist Act authorized the Commission to exert extraordinary authority over the permitting of thermal powerplants that are greater than 50 MW. (Pub. Resources Code § 25500 *et seq.*) However, the limits of this extraordinary authority are clear. “‘Thermal powerplant’ does not include any wind, hydroelectric, or solar

photovoltaic electrical generating facility.” (Pub. Resources Code § 25120.) The Commission cannot enlarge its jurisdiction to include matters outside of this legislatively circumscribed sphere. 61 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 127 (1978).<sup>1</sup> Neither Staff nor the Applicant addressed this plain and unambiguous statutory language.

The Modified Project is a solar PV facility. Phase 1 of the Modified Project is 100% PV. There is no component of Phase 1 that will result in the generation of electricity from thermal technology. Phase 2 of the Modified Project is speculative at best. The Applicant admitted that SunCatchers are not commercially available in the near future,<sup>2</sup> there is no transmission capacity or power purchase agreement for Phase 2, and the Applicant has no binding agreement with the manufacturer of SunCathers to purchase any solar thermal components.<sup>3</sup> Whatever labels Staff or the Applicant attempt to attach to the Modified Project, it is presently solar PV facility, and the Warren-Alquist Act expressly excluded such a facility from the Commission’s jurisdiction.

## **II. THE COMMISSION DOES NOT HAVE UNLIMITED JURISDICTION OVER A “SITE”**

The Applicant argued that the Modified Project is within the Commission’s jurisdiction because the Applicant proposed to locate it on the same footprint as the previously approved project site. The Commission would set a disturbing principle if it followed the Applicant’s strained logic. The Applicant’s rationale would allow any

---

<sup>1</sup> Neither can the Commission subsume environmental review of a solar PV project into its certified regulatory program under the guise that it is reviewing the “whole of the project.” The Commission must conform to “those provisions of CEQA from which it has not been specifically exempted by the Legislature.” *Sierra Club v. State Bd. of Forestry* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1215, 1228. The Legislature specifically exempted the siting of **thermal** powerplants from portions of CEQA by approving the Warren-Alquist Act’s certified regulatory procedure. This exemption from CEQA does not extend to a solar PV facility. The PV facility proposed by the Applicant falls under the normal CEQA provisions that require, among other things, a Draft EIR, public review and comment of the Draft EIR, and a Final EIR that is subject to judicial review in California Superior Court. CEQA Guidelines §§ 15080 *et seq.*; Pub. Resources Code § 21167.

<sup>2</sup> Hearing Transcript, April 20, 2011, p.24:4-9.

<sup>3</sup> Exhibit A to BNSF Railway Company’s Brief Regarding Jurisdiction and Baseline, at p. 83, lines 14-22.

company to perform a “bait and switch” with the Commission. The Original Project’s footprint is 6,215 acres. The Applicant asserts that it can request authority to build **anything** it wants to within this footprint as long as it includes at least 50 MWs of thermal generation.<sup>4</sup> Taken to the extreme, the Applicant could have proposed a golf course or housing development at the Calico site, as long as it included a plan to build a 50 MW gas generator somewhere on the site. This absurd result cannot be the intended purpose of the Warren-Alquist Act.

Even more disturbing than this extreme example is the very real possibility that speculators will waste the State’s resources and abuse the Commission’s process to lock-down prime renewable energy locations upon which they never intend to construct the originally proposed facilities. The Commission and intervenors expended considerable resources to carefully consider and evaluate the Original Project. Allowing a developer to obtain a license and then immediately change the project undermines the Commission’s entire process. Such an action is even more egregious where, as here, the Applicant switches to a technology that the Commission clearly does not have jurisdiction to authorize. Allowing the Applicant to proceed in this manner would send a dangerous signal to other solar project developers that could lead to speculative applications for renewable energy sites. If the Applicant wishes to build a different project with solar PV technology, it should withdraw its existing license and re-file a new application with the appropriate state and federal agencies.

### **III. THE MODIFIED PROJECT IS NOT A “HYBRID FACILITY”**

Staff attempted to find Commission jurisdiction by arguing that the Modified Project is a new type of “hybrid” facility that the Warren-Alquist Act never envisioned.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> “What the Warren-Alquist Act does *not* say is that *only* a ‘thermal powerplant’ or ‘electric transmission line’ may be constructed on a ‘site.’” Calico Solar LLC’s Brief re Jurisdiction of Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, p. 4 (emphasis in original).

<sup>5</sup> Staff’s Response to Committee Briefing Order, p. 4.

The Modified Project is not a hybrid facility. At best, it is a solar PV facility that may one day be co-located with a solar thermal facility. These facilities, should the latter materialize, would rely on completely different types of technology that do not interact with each other. They do not even produce the same type of current. PV modules convert solar energy into direct current (DC) whereas SunCatchers use heat to create mechanical energy that produces alternating current (AC).

Staff based its argument that the PV and thermal facilities constitute a single integrated “hybrid” plant on the premise that the PV modules and SunCatchers will, “operate from a single control room, utilize the same transmission interconnection system, access a common water system and road network, and depend upon the same construction and operation personnel.”<sup>6</sup> The proposed sharing of infrastructure does not create a single facility. An applicant could similarly construct a large steel mill with a 50 MW gas generator on the site. Both the steel mill and the gas generator could use the same control room, the same parking lot, the same water supply, the same employees, and so on, but the Warren-Alquist Act clearly would not allow the Commission to exert jurisdiction over the steel mill. The only difference between this hypothetical case and the present scenario is that the co-located facility would produce power rather than steel. This difference, however, does not alter the determination of jurisdiction because it is indisputable that the Warren-Alquist Act expressly excluded solar PV facilities from the Commission’s jurisdiction.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Sierra Club respectfully requests that the Commission dismiss the Petition to Amend.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at p. 3.

Dated: June 3, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Travis Ritchie*

Travis Ritchie

Sierra Club

85 Second Street, Second floor

San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 977-5727 Voice

(415) 977-5739 Facsimile

[travis.ritchie@sierraclub.org](mailto:travis.ritchie@sierraclub.org)



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  
AMENDMENT**

**Docket No. 08-AFC-13C  
PROOF OF SERVICE  
(Revised 5/25/2011)**

**APPLICANT**

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

**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, Partner  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[ella.gannon@bingham.com](mailto:ella.gannon@bingham.com)

**INTERVENORS**

Society for the Conservation of  
Bighorn Sheep  
Bob Burke, Gary Thomas  
1980 East Main St., #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*  
[atomicloadbranch@netzero.net](mailto:atomicloadbranch@netzero.net)

California Unions for Reliable  
Energy (CURE)  
c/o: Tanya A. Gulesserian,  
Marc D. Joseph  
Adams Broadwell Joseph  
& Cardozo  
601 Gateway Boulevard,  
Ste. 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](mailto:gloria.smith@sierraclub.org)  
[travis.ritchie@sierraclub.org](mailto:travis.ritchie@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, California Program Director  
1303 J Street, Suite 270  
Sacramento, California 95814  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[kdelfino@defenders.org](mailto:kdelfino@defenders.org)

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

BNSF Railroad  
Cynthia Lea Burch,  
Helen B. Kim,  
Anne Alexander  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
2029 Century Park East, Suite 2700  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3012  
[cynthia.burch@kattenlaw.com](mailto:cynthia.burch@kattenlaw.com)  
[helen.kim@kattenlaw.com](mailto:helen.kim@kattenlaw.com)  
[anne.alexander@kattenlaw.com](mailto:anne.alexander@kattenlaw.com)

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

\*indicates change

**INTERESTED**  
**AGENCIES/ENTITIES/PERSONS**

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  
Rich Rotte, Project Manager  
Barstow Field Office  
2601 Barstow Road  
Barstow, CA 92311  
[richard\\_rotte@blm.gov](mailto:richard_rotte@blm.gov)

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

County of San Bernardino  
Ruth E. Stringer,  
County Counsel  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415

BNSF Railroad  
Steven A. Lamb  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
2029 Century Park East, Suite 2700  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3012  
[steven.lamb@kattenlaw.com](mailto:steven.lamb@kattenlaw.com)

**ENERGY COMMISSION**

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

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

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

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

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

Kerry Willis  
Staff Counsel  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[kwillis@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kwillis@energy.state.ca.us)

Stephen Adams  
Co-Staff Counsel  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[sadams@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:sadams@energy.state.ca.us)

Craig Hoffman  
Project Manager  
*e-mail service preferred*  
[choffman@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:choffman@energy.state.ca.us)

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



DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Jeff Speir, declare that on June 3, 2011, I served by U.S. mail and filed copies of the attached Reply Re Jurisdiction, dated June 3, 2011. 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: [[www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/calicosolar/compliance/index.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/calicosolar/compliance/index.html)].

The documents have been sent to both 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:

- sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list;
- by personal delivery;
- by delivering on this date, for mailing with the United States 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 "email preferred."

**AND**

FOR FILING WITH THE ENERGY COMMISSION:

- delivering an original paper copy and sending one electronic copy by e-mail to the address below (*preferred method*);

**OR**

- depositing in the mail an original and 12 paper copies, as follows:

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION**

Attn: Docket No. 08-AFC-13C  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512  
[docket@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:docket@energy.state.ca.us)

I declare under penalty of perjury 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.

/s/ Jeff Speir  
\_\_\_\_\_