In a Proceeding Before the
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
State Energy Resources
Conservation and Development Commission

In the Matter of:

Huntington Beach Energy Project DOCKET NO. 12-AFC-02

PREHEARING STATEMENT OF MONICA RUDMAN ON THE HUNTINGTON BEACH ENERGY PROJECT

As an intervenor and in accordance with the Siting Committee’s direction, I submit the following Prehearing Statement pursuant to the July 24, 2014 Notice of Continued Evidentiary Hearing and Staff Workshop. While I’m employed at the California Energy Commission as an Energy Specialist, the views expressed here are my own and do not represent the views of the Energy Commission.

Issues That Are in Dispute

1) Land Use. Compliance with laws, ordinances and standards is disputed.

2) Water Resources. Wastewater from the Brookhurst Street treatment plant is available in sufficient quantities to act as a substitute for potable water for industrial and construction purposes. Parties disagree about the feasibility of using this water.

3) Soils and Geology. Numerous earthquake faults are located in the project vicinity. Seismic events may lead to adverse changes in soils that must be accounted for in the design, construction and maintenance of the project. Fracking of local oil wells may lead to increased seismic activity. Evidence has been provided that the project site is subject to flooding due to sea level rise, storm surges, and wave run up. The site is in a tsunami zone. The site contains an abandoned oil well and the ground water is most likely contaminated. The effects of these hazards on critical supportive facilities (such as gas pipelines and a 24,000 gallon aqueous ammonia storage tank) have not been fully assessed. Parties disagree on whether the site: a. complies with the state of California’s adaptation policies; b. is appropriate to locate a critical facility and c. on the details of the compliance conditions such as the roles and responsibilities regarding compliance with building codes and engineering safety standards.
4) Greenhouse Gases. HBEP, if operated as fully permitted, will not be in compliance with California’s current greenhouse gas emission performance standard of 1,100 pounds of CO2 per net Megawatt hour with equipment degradation. A revised (lower) standard is pending and HBEP does not meet the lower revised standard. Staff claims that HBEP’s impact on greenhouse gases will be less then significant because HBEP is designed to ramp quickly and thus will facilitate renewable power. This is in dispute.

5) Compliance Conditions. Parties disagree on whether the demolition plans have been adequately described and addressed. Compliance Condition 15 describes a process to develop a closure plan for HBEP and outlines topics that the closure plan should address. It is not closure plan. It is unclear on important details.

A demolition plan for HBGS (the existing units 1-4) has not been provided.

Compliance Conditions specifying enforceable prohibitions against market manipulation and disallowance of “Reliability Must Run” or “Reliability Must Take” contracts have not been developed.

**Cross Examination**

I request cross-examination in the following subject areas:

1) Land Use. My proposed scope of questions concerns consistency with the Huntington Beach General Plan and on issues raised by the California Coastal Commission. This is relevant to assessing compliance with laws, ordinances and standards. My questions should take approximately 20 minutes.

2) Hazardous Materials. My proposed scope of questions concerns the impact analysis and mitigations proposed so that the use and storage of hazardous materials on the site considers the site’s soils and geologic hazards. This is relevant to assessing public safety. My questions should take approximately 15 minutes.

3) Water Resources. My proposed scope of questions concerns the extent of the applicant’s efforts to partner with the Orange County Sanitation District and others to utilize wastewater for industrial and construction purposes and also will be related to the factors, basis and metrics for determining feasibility. My questions should take approximately 20 minutes.

4) Soils and Geology. My proposed scope of questions concerns the analysis done to ensure that the facilities will be safe given the geologic hazards
and the impacts of potential fracking of oil wells. Questions will also concern the measurements made and analysis done regarding the assessment of potential impacts of sea level rise, storm surges, wave run up and tsunami on the site and facilities. This is relevant to assessing the likelihood and significance of impacts. My questions should take approximately 20 minutes.

5) Greenhouse Gases. My proposed scope of questions concerns the details of the analysis conducted that led Energy Commission staff to determine that the project would not have a significant impact on greenhouse gases. This is relevant to assessing compliance with laws, ordinances and standards. My questions should take approximately 30 minutes.

6) Compliance Conditions. I propose to question the witnesses on the details and milestones of the closure and demolition plans for HBEP. In addition, I propose to question the parties on the details and milestones of the demolition plans for HBGS (the existing units 1-4). This is relevant to ensuring the completeness, accuracy and appropriateness of the project description and is relevant to ensuring that the project is clearly understood, defined and feasible. My questions should take approximately 20 minutes.
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