DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	21-AFC-02
Project Title:	Willow Rock Energy Storage Center
TN #:	265987
Document Title:	Transcript of June 10, 2025 Preliminary Staff Assessment Workshop Day 2
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Yiming Luo
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	9/11/2025 3:13:09 PM
Docketed Date:	9/11/2025

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

PRELIMINARY STAFF ASSESSMENT

TECHNICAL AND MITIGATION WORKSHOP

WILLOW ROCK ENERGY STORAGE CENTER

DAY 2

REMOTE VIA ZOOM

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2025 2:00 P.M.

Reported by: Elise Hicks

APPEARANCES

CEC STAFF

Eric Veerkamp, Project Manager

Kaycee Chang, Supervisor

Hilary Anderson, Zoom Meeting Facilitator

Cameron Travis, Historian in Cultural Resources Unit

Gabriel Roark, Cultural Resources Unit Supervisor

Mark Hamblin, Visual Resources Expert

Karim Abulaban, Geosciences Unit Supervisor

ALSO PRESENT

Chris Huntley, Aspen Environmental Group, Contractor for California Energy Commission, Biological Resources Expert

APPLICANT PRESENTERS

Kate Moss, Biological Resources Expert, WSP

Laurel Lees, Senior Director, Development and Permitting, Hydrostor

Jeff Harris, Attorney, Climate Edge Law Group

Daryl Harrison, Visual Resources Expert, WSP

INTERVENORS

Zeynep Graves, Attorney, Center for Biological Diversity

TNDEX

INDEA		
		PAGE
1.	Welcome and Introductions	4
2.	Government Comment	6
	a. California Native American tribes	
	b. Government Agencies	
	c. Elected Officials	
3.	Public Comments	6
4.	Environmental Topics/Conditions of Certification Discussions	7
	a. Public Comment Opportunities	
5.	Next Steps	30
6.	Closing Comments	30
Adjournment		31

PROCEDINGS

2 | 1:05 p.m.

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2025

MR. VEERKAMP: All right. Welcome. My name is Eric Veerkamp with the Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division, or as we like to say, STEP.

Thank you for attending today's CEC staff-hosted continuation of the June 5th Preliminary Staff Assessment Workshop for the proposed Willow Rock Energy Storage Project. The public will have an opportunity to participate in today's discussions between CEC staff, the applicant, Gem A-CAES LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Hydrostor and its representatives, and intervenors, California Unions for Reliable Energy, or CURE, and Intervenor Center for Biological Diversity, or CBD.

Next slide, please.

We'd like to go over just a few logistical items. This meeting is virtual only on Zoom. Zoom closed captioning has been enabled today. Attendees can use the service by clicking on the live transcript icon and then choosing either show subtitle or view full transcript. The closed captioning service can be stopped by exiting out of the live transcript or selecting the hide subtitle icon.

Finally, the meeting is being recorded. The

meeting recording will be made available on the California Energy Commission's website. And if anyone is interested, the recording from the June 5th session is on the website already.

Next slide, please.

This slide provides an overview of today's agenda. There will be an opportunity for comments from California Native American tribes, from intervenors, government agencies, elected officials, and members of the public. Environmental topic areas discussed during the workshop on Thursday, June 5th, are water resources -- or were water resources, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, and visual resources. We will first entertain any follow-up discussion or questions on these topics. After that, the discussion can be expanded to other topics as well. After public comment, a brief overview of next steps will be provided.

Next slide, please.

Thank you again for joining us today to participate in our discussion on the Willow Rock, the proposed Willow Rock Energy Storage Center. As a reminder, Willow Rock would be a 500-megawatt net, 4,000-megawatt-hour advanced compressed air energy storage facility to be located on approximately 89 acres of private land immediately north of Don Road and between State Route 14

and Sierra Highway within unincorporated southeastern Kern County, California.

CEC staff published the Preliminary Staff
Assessment, or PSA, on April 29th, 2025. The PSA contains
the CEC staff's independent, objective evaluation of the
proposed energy storage project and recommended mitigation
measures to reduce identified environmental impacts of the
project.

Next slide, please.

So at this time, we would take any comment from any elected or other government officials.

Is there anyone who would like to provide public comment at this time?

MS. CHANG: If you would like to speak on behalf of a California Native American tribe, other governmental entity, or any legislative offices, please raise your hand on Zoom by clicking the Raise Hand feature on your screen -- it looks like an open palm -- or by pressing star 9 if joined by phone.

We are not seeing any raised hands.

MR. VEERKAMP: The next slide, then, in that case, please.

Are there any members of the general public that would like to comment at this time?

Seeing none, I think we can skip the next slide

1 which is the timer and go to the Environmental Topic Area 2 discussion. 3 There we go. Thank you, Hilary. 4 So -- excuse me -- we'll begin with the four, not 5 a recap, but with the four topics that were discussed on 6 Thursday, starting with water resources. I'll give the 7 applicant representatives an opportunity to ask any followup questions of CEC staff with regard to conditions of 8 9 certification or anything else related to water resources. 10 So not hearing anything, is there any follow-up discussion related to biological resources? 11 12 MS. CHANG: We have a hand raised from Kate Moss. 13 MS. MOSS: Hi. Are you able to hear me? 14 MR. VEERKAMP: Sure can. 15 MS. MOSS: Sorry, I would turn my camera on, 16 except I'm not quite sure where the buttons are. Hi, Chris. I was just hoping that I could have Chris or the 17 18 CEC summarize some of the takeaways that were discussed 19 last week regarding mitigation and restoration, and where 20 we sort of landed on conclusions for those, please. 21 MS. ANDERSON: Real quick, before you answer 22 those questions, would you be able to state your full name 23 for --24 MS. MOSS: Oh. I'm sorry. 25 MS. ANDERSON: -- the court reporter and where

1 you're from. 2 MS. MOSS: Absolutely. Sorry. My name is Kate Moss, and I am with WSP 3 4 Consulting. 5 MR. HUNTLEY: Kate, this is Chris Huntley with 6 Aspen representing staff. 7 I guess what I would ask you is, do you have a specific question or comment that you'd like to ask rather 8 9 than me attempting to summarize all of our discussions? 10 MS. MOSS: I guess two pieces. One, I just would 11 like to clarify for the group that our understanding on 12 restoration was that the purpose of that condition is for 13 weed management and not specifically restoration. 14 Is that correct? 15 MR. HUNTLEY: I think you've characterized that 16 accurately. 17 I will go back to the condition. To make sure we 18 are not asking for anything too onerous, and that was just 19 as a basis because we are treating those temporary impacts 20 as largely permanent. So our goal is just to prevent the 21 sites from becoming weed patches. 22 MS. MOSS: Thank you. That would be great. 23 And then with mitigation, I guess my further 24 question would be, is there additional information that we

could supply regarding species presence, species, habitat

25

suitability that would help with any edits to the PSA or COCs?

MR. HUNTLEY: I don't think there's any supplemental information regarding pocket mice, things like that. I know that regarding Mojave ground squirrel, we were hoping to get some supplemental data on the site as you saw in our PSA section, but I think the trapping window is closed on that, so I'm not sure you have any information on that topic.

Do you?

MS. MOSS: Not with regards to trapping, no.

MR. HUNTLEY: Okay. And I don't think we requested any supplemental data on species distribution related to those other species.

MS. MOSS: Okay.

MR. HUNTLEY: Just to be clear, I think what we did is we just drew a different conclusion on potential to occur after partnering with our agency folks on a couple of those species, but I don't think it fundamentally changes the impact analysis or anything like that.

MS. MOSS: Yeah. I think my question was specifically to do with the suitability of habitat for species not documented as present, such as burrowing owl, so if additional information would be helpful in that analysis.

MR. HUNTLEY: I don't think additional 1 2 information would be helpful on that topic. The project 3 site supports habitat for burrowing owl, as does much of 4 the alignment. The applicant elected to seek take 5 authorization for those species -- that species -including Crotch's bumblebee. So we are treating the 6 7 entire site as potential habitat for that species, and we 8 are providing take coverage for those species, both on the 9 project site and along the alignment. 10 So should any of these animals occur, I know -- I 11 think you documented over 44 different burrows along the 12 access routes and other locations, we would have take 13 coverage for owl should they occur in your project 14 location. 15 MS. MOSS: Thank you. I don't -- oh. 16 I don't believe I specifically have more 17 questions. There may be others from the applicant side that do. 18 19 MR. HUNTLEY: Thank you, Kate. 20 MS. CHANG: There are folks from --21 Sorry. This is Laurel Lees, MS. LEES: 22 L-A-U-R-E-L L-E-E-S. I'm wondering if -- I see Jeff Harris 23 has been promoted to speaker. Thank you, Kaycee. 24 I was wondering, Jeff, if you have any comments. 25 We were working on promoting you to panelists as we were

1 discussing biological resources and Kate Moss was asking 2 questions. 3 I just got a text message that he's having some 4 technical difficulties. My apologies. If we could just 5 hang on for just a moment, see if we can grab him again. 6 And Kaycee, I'll toss it back to you. Sorry for 7 interrupting. 8 MS. CHANG: No problem. 9 Jeff, if there's anyone on the applicant side or intervener or the public who would like to make comments, 10 11 we are discussing biological resources right now. Please 12 raise your hand and we'll open up your line. 13 And like Hilary mentioned, please state and spell 14 your name for the court reporter before you speak. 15 MR. VEERKAMP: Thank you. Kaycee, is there 16 any -- can we can we solicit any comments from Center for Biological Diversity or CBD at this time on biological 17 18 resources? Maybe we can help fill the time a little bit. 19 Jeff, we are sending some technical issues. 20 Anyone from CBD? 21 I haven't even seen what's in these. 22 representative from CBD on the Zoom? 23 MS. CHANG: Yes. I just opened your line. 24 MS. GRAVES: Thank you. This is Zeynep Graves, 25 Z-E-Y-N-E-P G-R-A-V-E-S, and I am an attorney for the

```
1
    Center for Biological Diversity.
 2
              We don't have any comments at this time, but
 3
    we'll be providing feedback on the PSA by the comment
 4
    deadline.
 5
              MR. VEERKAMP: Okay. Thank you. Great.
              Is there anyone -- is there a representative from
 6
 7
    CURE on the Zoom? We'll just keep it the same.
 8
    comment from the intervener CURE on biological resources?
9
              It looks like we might not have any
    representative for CURE with us.
10
11
              How's Jeff doing? Any update for us, Jeff or
12
    Laurel?
13
              MR. HARRIS: Yeah, Eric, I'm back.
                                                   I've been
14
    promoted and I'm going to go back on mute unless you need
15
    me.
16
              MR. VEERKAMP: Oh, great. Good to hear your
17
    voice, Jeff.
18
              MR. HARRIS: Thank you.
19
              MR. VEERKAMP:
                             Just wanted to know if you had any
20
    -- I thought you were prepared to contribute to the
21
    discussion on the biological resources, maybe a comment
22
    from Thursday or additional clarification, or was there
23
    anything on bio that you had?
24
              MR. HARRIS: No. You know, Kate, I think asked
25
    the questions that we had. So I think we are good unless
```

there's anything else that got raised during my coming on 1 2 and off that you want me to address, but I think we had 3 just a couple of questions for Chris, and appreciate his 4 insights and willing to continue to talk with us about 5 these issues. So I think I'm good, Eric. 6 7 MR. VEERKAMP: Okay. Thank you. So I think with that, we can move on to the topic 8 9 of cultural, unless -- are there any members of the general 10 public that would like to provide comment on biological 11 resources at this time? It doesn't sound like it. So with that, we'll 12 13 move on to cultural and tribal cultural resources. 14 Laurel or Jeff, do you have anything on this 15 topic? 16 This is Laurel Lees, L-A-U-R-E-L MS. LEES: 17 L-E-E-S. I'm just looking for my subject matter expert. 18 And do we have Clint looking on the panelists? 19 MR. ROARK: Laurel, this is Gabriel Roark at CEC. 20 I haven't seen his name on the panelists or 21 attendees list. 22 MS. LEES: If he doesn't join, I think I am 23 prepared to ask. I mean, it's a light touch general 24 question, but I want to give Clint an opportunity should he 25 be behind the scenes. I'm just texting.

MR. ROARK: Yes. There we go. 1 2 MR. VEERKAMP: Our cultural team does have some 3 comments --4 MS. LEES: Okay. 5 MR. VEERKAMP: -- on cultural and tribal, but I 6 thought if you - you know, first we could maybe have them 7 respond to any question that you had first. 8 If not, we can just go to Gabriel and hear what 9 he has to say. 10 MS. LEES: Let's go to Gabriel. 11 MR. VEERKAMP: Okay. 12 MR. ROARK: Okay. Great. 13 Hi, Gabriel Roark, G-A-B-R-I-E-L R-O-A-R-K, CEC Cultural Resources Unit Supervisor. I'm actually going to 14 15 pass this directly off to Cameron Travis, Historian in the 16 Cultural Resources Unit, because he has some follow on from last week's helpful discussion. 17 18 Take it away, Cameron. 19 MR. TRAVIS: Hi, this is Cameron Travis, CEC. 20 So following last week's discussion, 21 specifically of the feasibility issues with our full nine, 22 the moving the poles is not feasible. 23 So we considered WSP's suggestion of archival 24 research and detailed documentation of the Tropico Gold 25 Mine Historic District elements and the setting, and we

1 believe that that was appropriate, and we are working on a 2 condition to replace that that would incorporate those 3 suggestions that we think together with CUL-10 would reduce 4 impacts to the historic district to less than significant. 5 We are still working on that, but we are, we have 6 the bones of it pretty far along. 7 MS. LEES: This is Laurel again, L-A-U-R-E-L 8 L-E-E-S. 9 Thanks so much. High five. That's exactly what I was going to ask about. Lovely, look at that 10 11 collaboration. 12 Is there anything you want from us to -- or 13 anything to help us provide PSA comments better to you, or do you have it under control? Because we are going to 14 15 comment as such, as we indicated, you know, as we 16 discussed. So we are trying to do that. But if there's 17 any other detail you need us to provide, please let us 18 know. 19 MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. I'm not thinking of any 20 individual details unless Gabriel has one that I can't

think of at this time.

But if you do have any specific concerns or comments, that would always be helpful to know.

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LEES: I think we are good at this point. mean, it's pretty simple and straightforward. We'll just provide our comments as we vocalized that, you know, nine is infeasible, and we would recommend CUL-10 and any other, you know, as you indicated, archival research.

You know, you could tell I'm not a cultural subject matter expert, but we are on the same page here.

Thank you for your time.

MR. TRAVIS: Awesome. Thanks.

MR. ROARK: This is Gabriel. Thanks for that,
Laurel. That's helpful to know. Just a couple quick
notes. Unless someone on our, on our team decides that we
should name or number the condition something different,
it's probably going to be CUL-9 again. But we'll see. It
will appear as CUL-9 or CUL-11, I'm sure, just so you know
what to look for.

Also, if you've had any discussions at all, either Hydrostor or particularly WSP while doing their earlier research, where they might have had any discussion with County of Kern staff about how they prefer managing or developing around cultural resources like this one. That would be helpful to include in your comments.

It's not a big deal if those discussions have not occurred. They can always occur as part of the mitigation described in our position.

MS. LEES: Understood.

MR. ROARK: Right on.

1 Cameron, is there anything else? Jeff had 2 something if you don't. 3 MR. HARRIS: I did. 4 MR. TRAVIS: Sorry. Go ahead, Jeff. 5 MR. HARRIS: Sorry, Cameron, I didn't mean to 6 step on you. It's the technology. So yeah, we'll look at. 7 Thank you, number one, I think that's a really nice compromise. I think it actually provides real benefit in 8 9 terms of archival documentation for the mine. So that's 10 great. 11 In drafting the condition, I guess I would ask 12 that you put as much of the discretionary stuff into the 13 verification as you can so that your experts and our 14 experts -- people who actually know things, not the 15 lawyers -- can decide, you know, what makes the most sense. 16 But I think this is a really good development. I 17 think it's the right result. I just want to say thank you. 18 I think it's taking us in the right direction. So again, 19 Cameron, thank you. 20 MR. HARRIS: You bet. Thank you, Jeff. 21 With that, I think that's everything for cultural 22 resources, Eric. At least from the applicant and certainly 23 staff. 24 MR. VEERKAMP: Thank you, Gabriel and Cameron and 25 Jeff.

Are there any comments from any of the intervenors from any of our potentially governmental representatives or members of the public on cultural resources or tribal cultural resources.

Not seeing any and not hearing any, we'll move on to the topic of biological resources.

Just double-checking to make sure there isn't any more discussion on biological resources. Okay. Visual resources, checking the note here.

MR. HARRISON: Daryl Harrison here. Folks can hear me?

MR. VEERKAMP: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. HARRISON: Okay, I'm Daryl Harrison D-A-R-Y-L H-A-R-R-I-S-O-N with WSP, related to section 5.15 visual resources.

So for some comments and questions to clarify here from Mark, following up on our last session, WSP would like to provide some of the simulations, and we'd like to, at this time, seek any input from CEC staff about those simulations with the color treatments that are intended to revise our demonstration of potential visual impacts, and that may have influence or effect on staff's determination of the unmitigated insignificant effects.

So I'll pause there to see if broadly, Mark, you had any kind of general thoughts or concerns about us

1 providing those. 2 MR. HAMBLIN: No. I don't. 3 MR. HARRISON: Okay. 4 MR. HAMBLIN: Yeah. No, I don't have any 5 comments at this time. 6 MR. HARRISON: Okay. I had a couple that I had 7 for you just to help us scope doing that to support staff's 8 assessment. So we are looking to provide simulations for all 9 of the viewpoints that the KOPs in the original VIA. 10 11 there were seven. We can provide all seven of those to you 12 as part of the information, the update to the application. 13 And if you have any thoughts or comments on that, 14 but just as a confirmation. 15 MR. HAMBLIN: No. Actually, I don't have any 16 comment at this time. 17 MR. HARRISON: Okay, sounds good. 18 MR. HAMBLIN: Yeah. I guess the only thing is --19 yeah, submit them. You'll be submitting them in the 20 package for the June's prior to -- well, either on or prior to June 16th. And I'll take a look at it at that point and 21 22 review the matter. 23 MR. HARRISON: Okay. I did have a question 24 because in that presentation for one of the simulations we 25 provided for KOP-4 in in the PSA assessment.

We provided for discussion a couple of options 1 2 for the transmission component structures. One was COR-TEN 3 steel and the other was a vertical gradation for preparing 4 the simulations. 5 Did you have any comment on a preference for seeing those or leaving it to us to provide an -- or the 6 7 applicant to provide a preferred option. 8 MR. HAMBLIN: I'll leave it with the applicant. 9 MR. HARRISON: Okay. Okay. 10 Yeah. And then the other comment I was going to 11 make was, you know, as a part of providing these 12 simulations. The intent is to have, as we discussed in the 13 last meeting, the comments on the VIS-1 (phonetic) 14 condition to kind of reflect some of the information that's 15 coming out of the simulation, so standard use of BLM 16 standard color and color selection process. Those kinds of 17 things. 18 So there's some consistency there, but just 19 between what we are presenting as information and the 20 overall comments we have on the VIS-1 condition. 21 MR. HAMBLIN: Okay. I'll take a look at what you 22 submitted. 23 MR. HARRISON: Yeah. Sounds good. 24 That was it for me. I'll lower my hand. 25 MR. VEERKAMP: Thank you.

MR. HARRISON: Thank you.

MR. HARRIS: I just want to ask Mark if you have any advice for us on what we submit, based on what he heard. I thought we had a very good session down in the desert. So, and he may not, but I just wanted to -- I always feel like I should ask the subject matter experts what they thought.

So if you have any advice for me in my filing, Mark?

MR. HAMBLIN: What I would advise is kind of follow the evaluation flow chart on page 17 of the staff report. Also take a look at the worksheets at the back. In noticed there's some formatting issues but take a look at the KO -- I'll start with the KOP-4 worksheet that all the worksheets are the same, because at the end of that, we still have to come to a conclusion. I mean, color is just one part of the ingredient in the baking of the cake. And the cake, what we are trying to get to, is a determination on the visual character or quality of the public viewer site and its surroundings, whether it's a significant impact, a significant effect, or a less than significant effect.

And follow that through, and we should get -- I'm confident enough that we would -- whatever the determination is will be covered in the courtroom if we

have to get there. 1 2 MR. HARRIS: And let's stay out of the courtroom. 3 And by the way --4 MR. HAMBLIN: That's our objective. 5 MR. HARRIS: -- so I can't eat cake. I'm gluten 6 intolerant, but I get the metaphor. 7 So yeah, we understand you have a methodology. 8 Daryl's been looking at that. Please understand that Daryl 9 also has some opinions on methods and analysis that will be supplemental to what you're doing, so please don't take 10 11 offense at --12 MR. HAMBLIN: Not at all. 13 MR. HARRIS: -- sharing those additional kind of 14 methodologies. And I think having all of that in front of 15 everybody is very helpful, so I appreciate that additional 16 direction, since I asked for it. 17 I asked for a recommendation from a waiter, I 18 always take it. So yeah, I appreciate your extra advice 19 there, and look for us to take a look at your analysis. 20 And also, you know, Daryl, as you can tell, has some really 21 good ideas, and we'll try to figure out. 22 If you change your mind about having a preference 23 on the transmission lines, you can always, you know, ping 24 us. But I think that to me was the most interesting thing

I had seen in a long time in an Energy Commission hearing.

25

```
1
    I guess I don't get surprised very often, but I thought
 2
    that was really kind of cool. So I appreciated Daryl's
 3
    work on that.
 4
              MR. HAMBLIN: And by all means, I'm open to -- I
 5
    mean, again, Jeff, we've talked previously. I've had a
    paper. And I'm always, it's not necessarily direct
 6
 7
    one-on-one comments and stuff, but it's how people read
    this staff report and read the technical -- well, I don't
 8
9
    call it technical, but my paper. And, you know, I start
10
    synthesizing what's being said, and it kind of -- it helps
11
    me.
12
              It's de facto peer review, I guess. I don't
13
           That's not quite the proper term, but for the
14
    benefit of speed, I'll say it that way.
15
              MR. HARRIS: Okay. Well, I appreciate that.
                                                             And
16
    I appreciate the way you approach these issues, Mark.
17
    You're a true professional.
18
              So thank you.
19
              MR. HAMBLIN:
                            Thank you.
20
              MR. HARRIS: I appreciate it.
21
              MR. VEERKAMP:
                             Thank you, John.
22
              MR. HARRIS: Yeah. I'm good. Thank you, Eric.
23
              MR. VEERKAMP: Is there any comment from any
24
    members of any government representatives, California
25
    Native Tribal representatives, or elected officials, or
```

```
members of the public? Anyone on Zoom?
1
 2
              No.
                   We are all on Zoom.
 3
              Are there any other topics -- any other
 4
    environmental topic areas that we should devote any
 5
    discussion to on the applicant side or on the CEC side?
 6
    Anything at all?
 7
              MS. CHANG: We have a hand raised from Erika
 8
    Giorgi.
9
              MR. VEERKAMP: Okay. Please go ahead, Erika.
10
              Erika, are you there?
11
              MS. ANDERSON: She's unmuted, but we are not
12
    hearing any sound coming through.
13
              MR. VEERKAMP: Maybe try another audio device,
14
    possibly?
15
              MS. ANDERSON: I think she's logging off and will
16
    come back in.
17
              MR. VEERKAMP:
                              The lawyers are starting to get a
18
    little paranoid. We are the only ones who've been
19
    silenced, but that's okay.
20
              It's a joke, Erika.
21
              MR. VEERKAMP: Okay. She says she can talk, but
22
    that's not coming through here for some reason.
              I also see a hand from Karim.
23
24
              MR. ABULABAN: Yeah. I just wanted to relay what
25
    Erika was going to ask for, because she messaged me and she
```

asked me if we should ask for this preliminary Geotech and Geological Hazard Report by EIA and Associates dated March 28th, 2024.

So if that's handy, we'd like to get a copy of that one.

MR. HARRIS: Yeah. Erika, this is Jeff Harris. Erika had asked me about that in the desert and told her I was checking with our team. I'm looking at the email right now.

I think we are good. I just need a couple people above my pay grade to concur that we've identified the right document and there's nothing approaching confidential. A lot of times these things have a disclaimer that says that they can't be shared with any third parties. And if that's the case, then we may have to file it under confidential designation. But I don't see any problem getting that GGH (phonetic) and associate report in some form to you all in a way that you can use it.

And I guess I'll publicly apologize to Erika on that. She asked me before the PSA came out, and I didn't deliver, and then I thought maybe it wasn't relevant anymore, but when you assume -- so anyway, I've corrected that assumption and we are going to get it together here. I know it will either be publicly documented or else it

```
1
    will be filed through Kiteworks and with a request for
 2
    confidential designation, once I run the traps internally
 3
    and figure out whether there's anything proprietary or
 4
    otherwise limiting in that. But I think we are good.
 5
              MR. ABULABAN: Okay. Sounds good. Thanks.
              MR. HARRIS: Sure, Karim.
                                         Thank you.
 6
 7
              MR. VEERKAMP: I'm just going to pause for a
 8
             I think staff might be deliberating just briefly
9
    internally about whether there are any other items we want
10
    to talk about.
11
              MR. ABULABAN: Yeah.
                                    If you can update us on any
12
    new activities or communication with the DSOD regarding
13
    that jurisdictional dam.
14
              MR. VEERKAMP: Anything you can share, Jeff?
15
              MR. HARRIS: Nothing that I've been involved
16
    with, but I probably ought to check with Laurel who might
17
    have a better idea.
              Is Laurel still there?
18
19
              MS. LEES: Oh. My voice cracked.
20
              Hi. Laurel, L-A-U-R-E-L L-E-E-S.
21
              I don't have an update on DSOD, but I can track
22
    that down.
23
              MR. ABULABAN: Okay. Thanks. Yeah. We'd like
24
    to know. And this is Karim Abulaban again, for the
25
    reporter. I'm sorry I didn't say that before.
```

1 So, yeah. Thanks, Laurel. 2 MR. HARRIS: Karim, candidly, we are a little focused on our filing deadline next Monday, giving the PSA 3 4 comments and stuff. 5 MR. ABULABAN: Okav. MR. HARRIS: But it doesn't mean we don't 6 7 understand the importance of the issue, and that we are not 8 working on it. There are people -- we've worked with 9 Samrat and Andrew, some of our engineers, who are, I think, 10 trying to work through those issues as well. But we will 11 provide you anything that we have going forward, of course. 12 MR. ABULABAN: All right. Appreciate it. Thank 13 you. 14 MR. HARRIS: Thanks, Karim. 15 MR. VEERKAMP: I'm trying to think if there was 16 something else. There's something scratching at my brain. 17 MS. CHANG: I see Chris Huntley has his hand raised. 18 19 MR. VEERKAMP: Yes. Chris, please. 20 MR. HUNTLEY: Thank you, Kaycee. Thank you, 21 This is Chris Huntley, Biological Resources. 22 wanted to make sure we were clear on a couple of things. 23 At the last workshop, I know that the applicant 24 had asked us to clarify some survey requirements and things 25 like that, Jeff and Kate, so I'm going to be changing some

language in the conditions of certification to be clearer on what we want to do on mice. I know we talked about that, that we weren't going to ask you to do some of the stuff like that.

But I did want to make sure we are all walking into this clear-eyed that for Mojave ground squirrel, typically CDFW only allows a one-year window for the surveys. And I think we've now passed that one-year window. We are coming into a period where we won't be able to survey for it.

I think Energy Commission staff is comfortable allowing project or ground disturbance to occur in those areas on the project site if it happens prior to the next season. But if, for example, we don't start construction until March, April, May, or June of next year, we want you to get out there and conduct another round of trapping or camera trapping or trapping just to make sure that they're not there. But if you guys start construction before that time, ground disturbance and things like that, we would just have you do routine clearance surveys and monitoring, things of that nature.

So we all want to be flexible on that, not hold the project up for a year. We think we have reasonable data to give us a comfort level on that. But I just wanted to make sure your team was aware of that.

It sounds like if the 1 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. 2 window's open, you want us to jump through it. And if not, 3 we'll work with the clearance surveys. 4 We'll look for your language, Chris. That sounds 5 very reasonable to me. And again, my constant refrain, if we can put a 6 7 lot of that into the verification so that you all in the field have enough flexibility, that -- you know, that's 8 9 important to us, the verification language. 10 MR. HUNTLEY: I understand. I'll talk with my 11 bosses about that. 12 MR. HARRIS: Understood. Yeah. Thank you. 13 MR. HUNTLEY: That's all I had, Kaycee and Eric. Thanks, Chris. 14 MS. CHANG: 15 We had a hand raised from Kate. It looks like 16 Kate might have lowered it, but Kate, your line is open if 17 you would like to add. 18 MS. MOSS: Kate Moss, Jeff beat me to it, so I 19 was just going to agree with that. 20 Thanks for the clarification, Chris. 21 appreciate you adding that to the CSE language. 22 MR. HUNTLEY: No worries. Thank vou. 23 MR. VEERKAMP: Thank you for that discussion. 24 I'll just ask one more time if there's any other 25 topic areas that we want to discuss during this forum.

there's a lot to choose from, I should say.

Okay. One more ask for public comment or any other government agencies, intervenors, representatives.

Any public comment at this time?

Okay. Hearing none, I'll ask for the next slide, which I think is a slide calling for a break, or a discussion and then a break. I'm going to guess that we probably don't need a break.

So next slide, please.

I just wanted to go over again briefly the next steps in the CEC process for this Application for Certification process.

Sorry about that. I muted it, but it must be another device that's not muted.

The agency and public comment period runs from April 29th to June 16th. The preferred method to submit written responses is to submit written responses through the CEC's electronic commenting or filing system, e-comment and E-filing. Per the committee's fourth scheduling order, CEC staff will be filing the final staff assessment by July 16th of 2025, and the committee will be hosting evidentiary hearings August 18 and 19 of this year, 2025.

The committee has tentatively scheduled October 2025 for issuance of the Proceeding Members Proposed Decision, or PMPD. The committee's proposed decision will

```
be available for a 30-day public comment period. And a
1
2
    final decision by the full commission is expected by the
 3
    end of this calendar year 2025.
 4
               Next slide, please. With that, I'll just thank
5
    everyone for joining us. Very much appreciate your time.
               That concludes our meeting.
 6
 7
                 (The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 11th day of September, 2025.

ELISE HICKS, IAPRT CERT**2176

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367

September 11, 2025