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COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: We’re for a status conference for the Huntington Beach Energy Project Amendment. The Energy Commission assigned a Committee of two Commissioners to conduct these proceedings. I’m Karen Douglas, the Associate Member of this Committee. Andrew McAllister, the Presiding Member of the Committee, is unable to be here today.

I’m going to start by introducing some of the people here today. My Advisors, Jennifer Nelson to my right, and Le-Quyen Nguyen, to her right.

And our Hearing Officer is to my immediate left, Susan Cochran. Patrick Saxton, Advisor to Commissioner McAllister, is to her left. And Kristy Chew, Technical Advisor to the Commission on siting matters to his left. Alana Mathews, the Public Adviser, is here in the back of the room.

And with that, I will ask the parties to introduce themselves, starting with Petitioner.

MR. O’KANE: Good afternoon, Steven O’Kane with AES Southland Development.

MS. CASTAÑOS: Good afternoon, Kristen Castaños with Stoel Rives, counsel to the Applicant.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you very much.
And now, staff.

MR. BELL: Good afternoon, Kevin Bell, Senior Staff Counsel. With me here is Project Manager John Heiser. And we have various and sundry staff present, as well.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Thank you. And now, I’ll turn to public agencies who may be in the room or on the phone. Is anyone here representing federal, state or local government agencies, or on the phone, or WebEx? If you are, go ahead and speak up.

Are there any officials representing Native American tribes or nations or, again, any federal, state or local government agencies or jurisdictions?

All right. Well, at this point, I will turn this meeting over to the Hearing Advisor, Susan Cochran.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you very much and good afternoon.

This is the second status conference on the amended Huntington Beach Energy Beach Project that I will refer to as the original license. AES Southland, LLC, who I may refer to as AES or the Petitioner, is seeking permission to amend the previous license granted to AES for the Huntington Beach Energy Project.

The petition proposes to reduce the nominal generation capacity of the project from 939 megawatts to 844 megawatts, with 644 megawatts generated from combined-cycle
technology and 200 megawatts from simple-cycle technologies.

The project site is located in the City of Huntington Beach, just north of the intersection of the Pacific Coast Highway and Newland Street.

The project would be located entirely within the footprint of the existing AES Huntington Beach Generating Station and Operating Power Plant.

On January 14, 2016, the Committee docketed its scheduling order, setting this status conference and other milestones for the project. The scheduling order required, among other things, the filing of status reports on the first of each month.

The Committee would like to thank the parties and the South Coast Air Quality Management District for their timely filings. It helps us keep abreast of developments in the case.

On February 16, 2016, the Committee held a status conference. Since that time there have been several developments that may impact the schedule. And I would like to go through those today and talk about how we are going to continue to move this matter forward.

The first topic I want to discuss is air quality. On March 9, 2016, following discussion at the prior status conference on February 16, the Committee filed an amended scheduling order. The primary change was to create a softer
deadline for the filing of the Preliminary Staff Assessment, what we usually refer to as the PSA.

The PSA is now required to be filed three weeks after South Coast Air Quality Management District, and to save myself time, I’m just going to call them South Coast or the District, filed its Preliminary Determination of Compliance, or PDOC.

The schedule that you see on the screen is that amended schedule. And you’ll see that it now has a deadline for the PDOC of April 1, 2016 or earlier. And then the Preliminary Staff Assessment to be published three weeks after the issuance of the PDOC.

I think when we last adjourned, we anticipated that we would be a few days from the issuance of the PSA. I’m going to look at Mr. Bell and ask, is it likely that we’re going to see a PSA on Friday?

MR. BELL: I wish I could say that it was.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you. I’ll take that as a no. Which makes sense because in early March, AES submitted changes to South Coast regarding the operating profile for the proposed project.

And if you would like to see what those changes look like, you can find them on the Energy Commission’s docket at transaction number, or TN, 210807.

AES has revised the number of monthly and annual cold
starts for the combined cycle combustion turbine units and revised the maximum monthly and annual auxiliary boiler fuel consumption and emissions.

These changes would also alter the emission rates for the turbines, both during commissioning and during operations. These changes are also memorialized in a filing that AES made with the Committee -- or the Commission, excuse me, on April 6, 2016. And that can be found at TN201969.

Based on these changes, South Coast, in its status report dated March 31st, stated that it would not be issuing the PDOC on April 1st. And that a better estimate of the PDOC’s issuance would be included in its May status report.

I’m going to look, again, to see if anyone from South Coast has phoned in or is available online today. South Coast, anyone?

Seeing none, I guess the first question I would ask of the Applicant is why were the changes to the operating profile not discussed at the last status conference? I know that there was some indication that the PDOC was soon to be issued and a few weeks later we get these changes, which has now sort of taken the rest of the schedule someplace else.

MR. O'KANE: Certainly. Thank you, Hearing Officer. The reason we filed that was the imminent filing of the PDOC and through discussions with South Coast we had a better understanding of how they would write the permit conditions,
which would be very specific to the operating profile presented to them.

So we, in order to have the appropriate amount of flexibility in the operating profile, we needed to revise the number of cold starts that could be possible in a single month.

If you follow the submission very closely, we’ve actually now proposed something that’s almost physically impossible. But if they’re going to restrict you to a certain number of starts, certain number of cold starts, certain number of hours of operating in a month, you need to have all that lined up. Well, you can’t really have 15 cold starts in a month and operate the unit every hour and every day. Needless to say, that’s the way the South Coast does their analysis.

So, understanding that, we made those submissions. And in further conversation with the South Coast, I believe the PDOC will be ready imminently. I believe it’s under their review, final management review. Unfortunately, they’re not on today.

And, hopefully, their May 1st status update will be that they filed it.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. And so, I think you just answered what my next question was going to be, but I just want to make sure. That you say that it’s due
imminently, but we don’t have a firmer fix than that, as we sit here on the 19th.

Are there any outstanding data requests or anything of that nature that would --

MR. O’KANE: There are no outstanding data requests, no information left for the Applicant to provide.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: So, the schedule was predicated on having a decision or a PSA probably later this week, which Mr. Bell has now said he’d like to tell us, yes. And, obviously, that’s not going to happen.

Paul, if you could scroll up just a little bit so we can see some of the later dates, then, in the schedule? So, you can see that the rest of the schedule, then, is basically assuming that the PSA was going to come off about April 23rd, that there would be staff workshops and such.

Do we have a discussion, then, about what is going to happen with the rest of the scheduling order? And in this discussion that we’re about to have, I would like to know how this delay may affect power delivery under the PPA and whether this may have any impact on the elimination of once-through cooling.

In other words, was the approval and then construction and operation of the amended HBEP going to allow, then, other plants to be retired that are still reliant on OTC?
I also know that HBEP, the amended HBEP has been a big priority, both with the Commission and the District, who, in some cases the exclusion of other projects, like Alamitos. And the question is, you know, are we going to continue in that vein?

And I will open that up to whoever would like to speak first.

MR. O’KANE: If I may, we hope this delay doesn’t affect the schedule. You know, for us it’s the end date, 2016 approval in our -- in our schedule, I think we have a tentative October or November final decision.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I believe October. It’s at the very end of the schedule.

MR. O’KANE: There we go, thank you. October 2016. Provided we can reach decision, final decision within 2016, it would fit.

I’d like to make a couple of comments. Forgive me if it was this Committee or the Alamitos Committee, when we did explain some of the scheduling issues. That there is coordination of commissioning, operation and subsequent shutting down of units. There’s more than the end date, the final. We really have to look out when these things happen. We certainly can’t take units off in the peak California season. So, we are -- we need to maintain the schedule of conducting the commissioning and the last stages
of the construction of this project in the winter of 2019 and 2020 in order to meet the 2020 summer schedule.

We pushed that. We’re going to have to wait because we need to make sure there’s enough capacity online during the peak times.

So, all that being said is you slip a few months, you could slip an entire year. There’s a certain stage you go over. But we should be able to maintain an approval schedule here for 2016, then that would be acceptable.

I would like, very much strongly like to try and maintain the October deadline, the October date, considering that this is a petition to amend. We’re still on the same site. We still are a gas-fired power plant. We’ve actually downsized it somewhat.

And the differences in the environmental attributes between the approved project and the new project are very minor.

And then I’d also like to address one of the comments you made there, that you said the Committee and this agency has put a priority on Huntington Beach over projects, including Alamitos. And that is a bit of a troubling statement. One in that we either don’t see any difference in priority between the two projects, Alamitos and Huntington Beach, or if anything, the Alamitos project should take priority of Huntington Beach in that is still in an AFC
process and not in a petition to amend.

Both of these projects are under the same schedule. These are the only capacity planned to replace the once-through cooling in Western Los Angeles. So, if I was an agency planning my resources, I would be strongly considering how the Alamitos project is going.

This isn’t the Alamitos hearing, but I did want to address that comment a little bit.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you very much.

Mr. Bell, did you have anything you wished to offer?

MR. BELL: I do. I do wish I could say that the PSA would be filed this Friday. I can tell you that staff has been working diligently in each of the technical areas. And most of those sections have been completed and are going through the final review right now.

It’s out of our hands when the PDOC is going to be done and we’re really not in a position where we can file a PSA without that PDOC, nor do we have control over when the FDOC will be filed at the end of the process.

But I can tell you, staff is doing everything we can to move this along.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Aside -- if we were to bifurcate, when do you foresee that the rest of the PSA, exclusive of those sections reliant on the PDOC, when might those be publishable?
MR. BELL: It would just be a guess, a pure guess.

At this point, I really can’t speak to the review process as it goes through final review before we’re able to publish it. But I can tell you that the sections have been, for the most part, complete. There are a few outstanding issues that we’re dealing with right now, and in addition with the PDOC.

I’m not sure that bifurcating, from staff’s perspective, would be our preference. I think we would like to have a single document that comes out. Because I don’t see that speeding up or slowing down the process at all. We would just end up with two documents being filed, but still stuck with the same timeline that we have now.

I shouldn’t say stuck to the same timeline. Sticking to the same timeline that we have right now, we would just have two different documents that are filed.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay.

MR. BELL: And, of course, that could require more conferences and possibly more hearings, in addition to what we already have. Staff’s perspective, I think, is that we keep it all together.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I appreciate that. And I would like to remind the parties, and especially staff, that in both the PSA and the FSA, as we set forth in our orders after the prehearing conference -- not the prehearing
conference, after the site visit, that what the document and analysis, I think that the Committee is looking largely for, is something akin to what we saw in Carlsbad, where the focus truly was on those changes between the approved project, which has not been approved for very long, and whatever the changes are that might be wrought because of the proposed amendments.

And I know that previously we’ve identified areas, such as air quality, public health, maybe bio resources, traffic to a certain extent, land use because of the height of the buildings, those types of things. And that staff would really sharpen their pencils on those issues and focus on those.

Because I think what Mr. O’Kane said is true, is that this is an amendment, as opposed to the full-blown AFC that Alamitos is.

MR. BELL: Right. And, of course, staff appreciates that direction. Our practice has been with amendments, whether it’s a Committee-assigned amendment, or an amendment that’s reviewed by staff and presented to the Commission, without having a committee assigned, is to look at those incremental changes between the licensed project and the project as proposed.

Of course, you know, we still look at all the other possible impacts, such as cumulative impacts, as well.
HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Correct.

MR. BELL: We’re really looking at the incremental changes.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. I just like to make --

MR. BELL: If any.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I just like to make a pitch for that, whenever possible, because it will also then, in some ways, make the drafting of the PMPD easier on us, as well, as we just focus then on those things that truly are changes that may be significant impacts on the environment, or for some other issue.

MR. BELL: Right. And we really do want to focus on those changes. We don’t want to provide any third-party or, you know, anybody else who’s involved in the proceeding the opportunity to reopen something that’s already been litigated. You know, not only would that be improper, but that’s also not a good use of the Committee’s time, either.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

So, at this point, then, let’s move on to something else that may affect the schedule, and that is --

I’m sorry, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: No, I was just going to -- oh, no problem. I was just going to ask you a quick question,

Mr. Bell, when you say that all of the sections, aside from
air quality, are for the most part ready and under review, are there any significant issues where you’re waiting on information, or where you’ve got gaps you’re trying to fill in the other sections? Or, are those really under review and --

MR. BELL: I don’t believe so right now. For the sections that I personally reviewed, I can say that staff has all the information that they need.

I know with air quality, you know, of course we’ll need to take a look at the PDOC. But if I can have just a second?

No, staff’s not waiting for any information that’s really going to cause a “C” change in our analysis at all.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Okay, thanks. I just want to encourage you. I mean, we are not seriously considering bifurcating the analysis. Obviously, we -- there are significant benefits to having one single document move through the process. And at the same time, I just really want to encourage you to not -- to get the other sections wrapped up as soon as possible so you can really focus in on the air quality section, when the PDOC’s ready, and get that one done and out.

And I do think that will help us hold to the schedule as well as we can.

MR. BELL: As I said, the staff has been working
diligently on all those technical areas. And their efforts, thus far, have been a model of efficiency.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Moving on, then, to another area where we’re, in some ways, reliant on another agency, other than ourselves, and it’s always good to be self-reliant, if we can. And that concerns the City of Huntington Beach.

You’ll recall that last time they adopted a resolution that helped us in our findings for variance when the buildings were over-height, as well as approving, in some ways, the visual enhancements. While the Committee -- the Commission obviously retained the ultimate jurisdiction on the visual enhancements, getting the buy off of the jurisdiction that’s going to be most affected by them is very helpful.

In AES’s March status report, they indicated that the revised architectural treatment was considered by the City’s Design Review Board on March 10th. And that the Design Review Board recommended approval of the plans. And here they are.

It also indicated that the City Council was going to have a study session on them yesterday, I believe.

Can someone update me on where we are on that? And what this is showing is the sphere wall that is to replace...
the surfboard treatment from last time. And the spheres are 24-inch blue, plastic spheres on cable netting. And I think that’s a detail there.

So, can someone let me know, did the study session occur? What was the outcome? And when is the Council scheduled to take any formal action? For example, the adoption of a new resolution?

MR. O’KANE: Steven O’Kane again, with the Applicant. That’s correct. On the Design Review Board meeting of Huntington Beach, I could say that they unanimously approved the design for Huntington Beach, very enthusiastically, actually, that the new screening and architectural treatment for the project, by that committee.

It was moved on to the City Council study session yesterday, which I attended, and presented with the Senior Planning staff of the City of Huntington, to the Council. They could ask questions, take a look at it. It was received positively, but there’s no action that comes out of a study session.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Right.

MR. O’KANE: That’s sort of their pre-application. And the May 2nd City Council meeting, the intent -- Senior City Planning staff did make a statement they would proposed an amended resolution on the May 2nd, City Council staff -- agenda, sorry. As the resolution was worded, should they --
but for this Committee’s authority, they would approve the height variance and the architectural treatment. So, that will be on as an administrative item on the May 2nd, City Council meeting.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you very much.

And, staff, if you ever want to jump in, just jump in.

MR. BELL: Staff is aware of and appreciates the efforts of the project owner to mitigate any potential significant adverse environmental effects. And also, to conform with the applicable Coastal Act provisions.

Staff is waiting to see the final design plans. I believe we have a condition or two that covers that.

And on a personal note, I will miss the surfboards. But we’re looking forward to seeing this come to a conclusion.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you.

Turning now, then, to yet another agency that may weigh in on the proceedings, and that’s the Coastal Commission. I noted that the docket discloses a number of communications and contacts between Energy Commission staff and the Coastal Commission that seem to reference the Coastal Commission is going to file a report, or something of that nature.

Do we have any update on the status of that, like the
timing of it? When it might be considered at a Coastal
Commission meeting? I know that that can be difficult
because of their meeting schedule versus ours.

MR. BELL: I’m not aware of the timing of the report,
if a report’s even going to be filed. I do note that they
did file the report that they’re required to, in the
underlying proceeding, itself. Whether or not they’re
planning on filing -- no, we’re not aware of any efforts by
the Coastal Commission to update a report or file a new
report.

We have had some communications from the Coastal
Commission and we’re working out issues with them.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Right, that was all the
storm, the run up, the tsunami, you know, the sea level rise,
those types of issues.

MR. BELL: Yeah, we can say that the Coastal
Commission does have some issues with the Poseidon
desalinization plant next door. And it does appear to staff
that the Coastal Commission is confusing the two projects.

In fact, the Coastal Commission’s position has been,
all along, that this is one project site and we should be
analyzing the entire project site. We made it very clear
where the boundaries of our project site are.

Poseidon, while we may be considering cumulative
impacts between and amongst the two projects, the Poseidon
project is a separate project, under a separate jurisdiction,
and will have its own, separate licensing phase.

   So, while the Coastal Commission may have some issues
with Poseidon’s analysis for a tsunami and flooding issues,
staff’s analysis for -- our staff’s analysis for the
Huntington Beach Energy Project is thorough and robust.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay, thank you.

Applicant, did you want to offer anything or moving
on?

MS. CASTAÑOS: We agree.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you.

   So, having reviewed all of the documents, I do have a
couple of sort of off-the-wall questions that may or may not
be answerable today, but that I hope we can get some
clarification on.

   In AES’s April 6th filing, in Section 5.1.2 there’s a
reference to the access to the site using the bridge over the
Huntington Beach Channel and walking path being contingent
upon a suitable access agreement.

   Who’s that access agreement with? How is that going
to come into play? What happens if there is no such
agreement forthcoming?

MR. O’KANE: Steven O’Kane, with the Applicant,
again. Good question. Yes, the plan was to use, where we
could, to reduce some traffic. While we don’t find
significant impacts to mitigate as a reason to use that bridge, it would be -- it would help with local community and with our own logistics to potentially use that as a pedestrian bridge.

However, that is a -- that’s private property. That’s the Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy. If we can’t reach an agreement to use such a bridge, we would not need it, nor does the project depend on it, or would it change any of the potential impacts from the project should we not get access to that.

So, it is fully contingent on the landowner, as with any of our -- we have some offsite areas which we intend to use for parking and laydown areas. Those two are the -- the underlying assumption there is that we come to a suitable agreement with the private landowner.

And I can report that those discussions are going well, so we don’t have any other project changes coming.

But that land bridge, no, it’s not a necessity to the project, nor would the exclusion of that from the project description cause any change to project impacts.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: And does staff agree with that?

MR. BELL: Yes, staff is aware of the issue and it’s something that we’re tracking.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay.
MR. BELL: But we don’t believe that that’s going to affect the schedule.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. And since you brought it up, we did receive a letter, yesterday, from the Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy. Does anybody wish to speak to that, comment on it? Will that be included in staff’s analysis?

They raised a number of points, that’s why I bring it up today.

MR. BELL: Assuming any comments received by any other party, government agency, or individuals will be addressed by staff.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay.

MR. BELL: In some form.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Perfect, thank you.

I know that we’ve had -- last time we had a significant discussion about the use of clutches, synchronous condensers, whatever you want to call them, as it related to the combined cycle.

Has there been any discussion with CalISO, because of the letter they put in -- let me rephrase that.

Last year, in November I believe, CalISO copied the Energy Commission on a letter that was being sent to the PUC, about consideration of clutches and/or synchronous condenser technology in the approval of power plants, sort of as a
generic basis.

So, has anyone made contact with CalISO about such improvements? Not for the combined cycle, but for the simple-cycle portion of this project? Is it being considered as an alternative in the PSA? Are we -- so, two questions. Has anyone contacted CalISO and, if so, what was the outcome of that?

And second, is this something that we might be considering in an alternatives analysis on the simple-cycle portion, only? I think Mr. O’Kane was very specific last time that it would not work in the combined cycle portion.

MR. LAYTON: Good afternoon.

MR. BELL: Matt Layton can address that.

MR. LAYTON: No, we have not talked to the ISO. The letter talks about procurement decisions. We still struggle with whether or not this is a need assessment that somehow staff is deciding that there are mega bars needed and, therefore, a synchronous clutch might be appropriate.

In past proceedings, we’ve looked at the physical constraints about putting a clutch in. I think you might be able to fit a clutch there but, again, I don’t -- the PUC has not authorized anybody to pay for that clutch. So, I think it’s still hard for us to suggest that it’s a good idea for AES to do it.

I think we would have a very generic discussion, as
we have in other cases. Yes, it would be limited to -- if a clutch might be feasible on the simple-cycle and what that might mean, but that would be very limited and very general.

In other discussions with the ISO, I think we’d be hard-pressed to get them in here to offer very many specifics.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I appreciate that. Thank you so much.

Did you want to say anything, Mr. O’Kane or Ms. Castaños? I know this is your favorite subject.

MR. O’KANE: Right. I’m not sure what I can add at this time. But, certainly, when the time comes for the simple-cycle, and that schedule, should commercially-available technology be there, and we can figure out a way to have the appropriate parties pay for changes, we would not be -- object to looking at that kind of technology.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you so much.

MR. O’KANE: Or other types.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Yet to be determined.

Finally, our next, and last currently, scheduled status conference is June 22nd. Is there any thought as to whether we need another status conference, maybe next month? Is there a desire to have that? What’s folks’ availability?

Without South Coast being here, I don’t want to have a status conference and then not have that input. So, is
there any thoughts about a status conference next month?

Yes? No? Stupid idea?

MR. BELL: Well, it’s not a stupid idea, of course not. Status conferences are actually very helpful, especially when we have issues that need to be resolved, where we have scheduling concerns that need to be discussed.

But aside from the efforts of South Coast to get us a PDOC, there doesn’t appear to be any other issues that are holding up the project right now, from staff’s perspective. I don’t believe that additional status conferences are necessary.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay.

MS. CASTAÑOS: This is Kristen Castaños. The only minor amendment I might make is if we do hear from South Coast at the next filing of status reports, on the schedule for the PDOC, it may be helpful to come back and review the rest of the schedule.

However, I think -- I don’t know if there’s a way for us to wait until after the next status report to find out what the schedule is for the South Coast issuance of the PDOC in order to decide whether we need another status conference in May, as opposed to June.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: The only issue, as always, is people’s schedule. And the fact that we have to provide at least ten days’ notice, which makes us not very
maneuverable in terms of getting these set, as well as the
physical constraints of is there a conference room, you know,
are the players all going to be available.

So, that’s why I asked. I try to do these things
earlier, rather than later. But at this point, I’m not
hearing a firm desire to have one, pending what South Coast
may have to say in the next two weeks. Okay.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: All right. Well, this has
been helpful and we’ll stay tuned in terms of whether the
parties think an additional status conference is needed.

If it’s not needed, let’s not do it. If it is
needed, let us know early enough that we can get all of the
logistics taken care of that Susan just mentioned.

So with that, we’ll move on to public comment. Is
there anyone in the room who would like to make a public
comment?

Is there anyone on WebEx who would like to make a
public comment? Please speak up, if you would.

All right. With that, we’re adjourned.

(Off the record at 2:09 p.m.)
(On the record at 2:09 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Go ahead.

MR. O'KANE: Sorry about that. Perhaps I could
humbly suggest the Hearing Officer give the South Coast a
call, since they didn’t join the status conference today.
And maybe you can get a better idea of schedules or any
issues that might be coming up.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: There may be some issues
about ex parte and off-record discussions. I think what
we’ll do is maybe staff would be a better avenue to contact
them and docket a conversation.

MR. LAYTON: We’d be happy to call South Coast.
Moisen and Andrew have been very helpful. But again, the
PDOC has not been delivered. But, they’re always willing to
talk to us.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Layton.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: All right, we’re really
adjourned this time. Thank you, everyone.

(Thereupon, the Hearing was adjourned at
2:10 p.m.)
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