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a) The topic areas that are complete and ready to proceed to Evidentiary Hearing;
All topics are ready to proceed except biology.

b) The topic areas that are not complete and not yet ready to proceed to Evidentiary
Hearing, and the reasons therefor.
Biology is not ready to proceed because the Biological Assessment (BA) has not yet been
determined to be adequate by the USFWS.

c) The topic areas that remain disputed and require adjudication, and the precise
nature of the dispute for each topic;

Land Use. The project's compliance with ECAP and with the Williamson Act are in
dispute, and the Sierra Club claims that the project violates both. Sierra Club also claims
the project will cause Alameda County to violate its Climate Action Plan (CAP).

Alternatives. The adequacy of the discussion of the Alternatives is in dispute, and Sierra
Club claims that the No Action Alternative is grossly inadequate and legally insufficient.

Need. PG&E's need for the project is in dispute, and Sierra Club claims that PG&E does
not have any need for the project.

Hazardous Materials: The safety of PG&E's natural gas pipelines has not been discussed at
all in light of the disclosures about the San Bruno gas pipe line.
Air Quality. Steps proposed to mitigate the project arguably failed to lessen impact of criteria pollutants to residents of Alameda County and the San Francisco Bay Area. Emissions of ammonia should be mitigated. Testimony on greenhouse gas emissions by staff appears to be defective in significant respects. The proposed project apparently does not envision using Best Available Control Technology for Particulate Matter Emissions or NOX.

Public Health. To our knowledge, neither Staff or applicant have provided a public health assessment of the projects particulate matter impacts on human health in Alameda County and the San Francisco Bay Area.

d) The identity of each witness sponsored by each party (note: witnesses must have professional expertise in the discipline of their testimony); the topic area(s) which each witness will present; a brief summary of the testimony to be offered by each witness; qualifications of each witness; the time required to present direct testimony by each witness; and whether the party seeks to have the witness testify in person or telephonically;

Dick Schneider : Land Use, Co-Author of Measure D. Mr. Schneider will provide testimony on the intent of the citizens who voted for the Measure D which established many policies in the ECAP. Direct testimony should require 30 minutes. Mr. Schneider will also testify the project will cause Alameda County to violate its own CAP. 15 minutes. (In person)

Edward Mainland. Need, Alternatives. Mr. Mainland will provide testimony as to lack of demonstrated need for this project. Mr. Mainland is a Sierra Club energy expert. Direct testimony should require 30 minutes. (In person)

e) Topic areas upon which a party desires to cross-examine witnesses, a summary of the scope of each such cross-examination (including voir dire of any witness’ qualifications), and the time desired for each such cross-examination;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>LORS Compliance</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alameda Co.</td>
<td>LORS Compliance</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Gas Line Safety</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Project Impacts</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project Impacts</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Particulate Matter Assessment</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) A list identifying exhibits and declarations that each party intends to offer into evidence and the technical topics to which they apply (as explained in the following
section on Formats for Presenting Evidence):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Offered</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Ed Mainland – Need</td>
<td>1-21-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>Dick Schneider – CAP</td>
<td>1-21-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Topic areas for which the Applicant will seek a commission override due to public necessity and convenience pursuant to Pub. Res. Code § 25525.

Land Use, Alternatives, Need, Hazardous Materials

h) Proposals for briefing deadlines, impact of vacation schedules, and other scheduling matters

Sierra Club California proposes the opening brief be due three weeks after receipt of the recorded transcript. Reply briefs two weeks after opening briefs.

i) For all topics, any proposed modifications to the proposed Conditions of Certification listed in the Supplemental Staff Assessment (SSA) based upon enforceability, ease of comprehension, and consistency with the evidence.
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