DOCKETED

Docket Number:	12-AFC-02C
Project Title:	Huntington Beach Energy Project - Compliance
TN #:	210678
Document Title:	Report of Conversation with CEC Staff and Tom Luster, California Coastal Commission RE: New Information for AES Huntington Beach
Description:	Report of Conversation with CEC Staff regarding Huntington Beach
Filer:	Cathy Hickman
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	3/11/2016 12:27:54 PM
Docketed Date:	3/11/2016

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

REPORT OF CONVERSATION

Siting, Transmission and Environmental Protection Division	**FILE: 12-AFC-02C**	
	PROJECT TITLE: Huntington Beach Energy Project	**Docket:**
TECHNICAL AREA(S): Socioeconomics		
☒ **Telephone**	☒ **Email**	☐ **Meeting Location:**
NAME: John Heiser	**DATE:** 03/11/2016	**TIME:** 9:10 am
WITH: Tom Luster, California Coastal Commission		
SUBJECT: New Information for AES Huntington Beach		

COMMENTS:

From: Luster, Tom@Coastal
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 9:10 AM
To: Heiser, John@Energy
Cc: Veerkamp, Eric@Energy; Davis, Chris@Energy
Subject: RE: new information for AES Huntington Beach

Hi John and all,

Just following up on my voicemail yesterday to you, John. I mentioned providing you some new information we've received that addresses the previously-identified conflicts between the Poseidon and AES site plans, but that also raises new concerns about sea level rise, flooding, and tsunami inundation for both projects.

First, re: Poseidon – the first attachment above is Poseidon's updated site plan that shows they've re-routed their water intake/discharge lines on the AES site to avoid the new AES layout. The second is their updated tsunami runup analysis, which I'm providing to you primarily for its illustrations of expected areas of inundation at both the Poseidon and AES sites. We still have concerns about their accompanying analysis – for example, it focuses on just the "worst case," but doesn't evaluate or show the more likely and more frequent flooding/inundation of the sites and surrounding areas that would occur due to other events.

Some of those other events are described in this link to a recent presentation on USGS modeling that identifies SLR/climate change-related hazards along the Southern California shoreline, including Huntington Beach: http://www.ci.marina.ca.us/Search/Results?searchPhrase=cemex+cal-am+mining&page=1&perPage=10 . The hazards include increased storm and wave energy, both with and without SLR, loss of site protection currently provided by the beach, etc. USGS has so far released preliminary data for one of its 42 identified scenarios (available here:

http://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/coastal_processes/cosmos/socal3.0/index.html) and expects to release the full set of scenarios early this summer. I was able to get some of this information a little early, which is shown in the third attachment above, and illustrates the expected water levels of up to ~10.5 feet above MSL at the AES site during a 100-year storm event without accounting for any SLR. Poseidon has provided some additional information about the expected loss of beach width in front of the AES site, but we're still working to combine that information with the information from USGS. We're not done with our evaluation yet, but I think we can say at this point that both the AES and Poseidon proposals will have very little protection from some of these expected events during their operating lives.

So – I know this is a lot to absorb in one email, but I'm happy to answer any questions and to discuss with you next steps – i.e., whether you'd like me to docket these new documents, whether you want to include these and others in your PSA or wait to have them addressed in our follow-up 30413(d) report, the timing of our report, etc.

Hope this is of use for now,

Tom L.

cc:	Date:	Signed:
		Name