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SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 2015

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:07 A.M.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: This is a status conference on the Redondo Beach Energy Project.

Before we begin I’d like to introduce the Committee, and then ask the parties to introduce themselves for the record. I’m Karen Douglas. I’m the presiding member of this Committee. And to my immediate left is our Hearing Advisor and -- Susan Cochran. And to her left, I’m sorry, is Janea Scott, Associate Member of the Committee.

Okay, so let’s go to Advisors. On Commissioner Scott’s left, Leslie Kimura-Szeto.

MS. DEMESA: Rhetta.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Oh, Rhetta. Sorry, Rhetta. Rhetta DeMesa.

And is Lezlie coming?

MS. DEMESA: I think she’s on the phone upstairs.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Oh, Lezlie is on the phone upstairs.

Eileen Allen is at the far end of the table. She’s the technical advisor for the Commissioners on citing. And to my right are my Advisors Jennifer Nelson and Le-Quyen Nguyen. Let’s see, Public Advisors Office, Shawn Pittard is
And let’s go now to the Petitioner.

MR. WHEATLAND: Good morning. I’m Greg Wheatland. And with me is Samantha Pottenger. We’re here on behalf of the Applicant. On the phone today is Stephen O’Kane. And I believe that Jeremy Salamy will also be on the phone today.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you very much. And Staff?

MS. WILLIS: Good morning. I’m Kerry Willis, Senior Staff Counsel. And with me is Keith Winstead who is our new project manager.

MR. WINSTEAD: Good morning, Council Members.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: All right. Thank you. And let’s see here, Intervener James Light, Building a Better Redondo.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Is he on -- is he on the phone maybe?

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Click “stop sharing” and it will take you back to the quick start menu.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What’s his name?

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Unmute everyone and see if he’s here. His name is James Light, Building a Better Redondo.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: All right, just a
James Light, go ahead and speak up. Are you on the phone? Okay.

We’re still unmuted. What about City of Redondo Beach?

MR. WELNER: Yes, good morning. This is Jon Welner here for the City of Redondo Beach. And I believe Michael Webb is on the phone or will be on the phone shortly.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Great.

MR. WEBB: Correct. This is -- this is Michael Webb, City Attorney for the City of Redondo Beach.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Wonderful. Thank you. Welcome.

Intervener City of Hermosa Beach, are you on the phone?

MS. COATES: Hi, good morning. This is Shahiedah Coates on behalf of the City of Hermosa Beach.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Great. Are there any representatives of federal or state or local agencies on the phone or in the room who have not identified themselves, and this includes also Native American Tribes or Nations.

MR. LUSTER: This is Tom Luster with the Coastal Commission.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Great. Welcome.
Anyone else?

MR. LEE: This is Andrew Lee from the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you. Anyone else?

All right.

So with that I’ll turn this over to Hearing Advisor Cochran.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you and good morning. The Committee scheduled today’s status conference on March 30th to discuss further activities in the case. The Application for Certification was filed on November 20th, 2012. Staff filed its Preliminary Staff Assessment on July 28, 24th — 2014, sorry — 24th, good, Susan — with the comment period ending on August 27th, 2014. However, shortly after the publication of the PSA, Preliminary Staff Assessment, AES presented an initiative to the City of Redondo Beach to rezone the project site for mixed-used development known as the Harbor Village Plan, including residential, commercial, hotel, and open space with the power plant being phased out under the Harbor Village Plan by 2020. Based on the pendency of that initiative, on September 3rd, 2014 the Committee issued an order suspending the proceedings until April 1st of this year.

The election on the Harbor Village Plan occurred on
March 3rd when it was defeated. On March 20th, AES, the project applicant, sent a letter to the Committee asking that the Committee issue a new scheduling order in light of the failure of the ballot measure.

The Committee wishes to hear from all of the parties, including the interveners, on the current status of the project and how best to proceed from here. Late yesterday afternoon we received a status conference from the City of Redondo Beach as -- in its capacity as an intervener. Copies are available here in the room. They’re also available on the screen if -- if need be. And there are some, I think some issues that will affect the schedule, but I would like to hear from the parties. In specific, the following are the issues I think that we need to get some understanding of before we can then proceed to talking about some scheduling.

First, and I’m glad that Mr. Lee has joined us, the Air District has not issued the final determination of compliance. Do we have a time estimate on when that may be issued? Have there been any changes to the regulations applicable to this project? And what impact, if any, may those changes have on the timing of future events?

An additional issue is land use, LORS compliance, LORS standing for Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and
Standards. The City of Redondo Beach approved Urgency Ordinance number 3120-14 on July 14, 2014 which imposed a moratorium until November 2015 on the approval of any conditional use permit, coast development permit, or any other discretionary city permit.

In the PSA, Staff concluded that the moratorium was not applicable LORS to the project because of the lack of approval by the Coast Commission. Both the City of Redondo Beach and Intervener James A. Light, Building a Better Redondo, disagree with Staff’s conclusion.

The question I specifically have for the City of Redondo Beach is what’s the status of that moratorium, and in particularly, whether it has been forwarded to the Coastal Commission under the Local Coastal Plan?

In addition, I am also glad that Mr. Luster from the California Coastal Commission has joined us today because we were interested in whether the Coastal Commission would be providing a report on this project.

Finally, there is a scheduling template. And one of the questions there obviously is, is the applicant merely reinstituting the existing application for certification or are there any changes to the site plan or anything else?

I noted in the status conference statement from the City of Redondo Beach that there is some indication that
there may be a storage component or a desalinization plant proposed for the site.

Additional questions that the Committee has is, is the plant still producing electricity, and if so, how much?

From Staff I would like to know if there’s a new comment period necessary? And what you’ve thought about relative to Staff workshops? Is there anything else?

And that’s where we are right now.

So let’s turn to the Applicant first, please.

MR. WHEATLAND: Thank you. I’d like to mention that when the applicant provided notice and requested the proceeding resume, we also proposed to the Committee a schedule for the resumption of the proceeding. We used as our template for the timelines the scheduling guide that had been proposed by the Committee in the Alamitos proceeding. So we, with very minor modifications, we proposed the same template and timeframe that would have been considered by the Committee for -- for Alamitos.

You asked a number of questions and I’ll see if I -- with respect to the applicant. And I’ll do my best to answer your questions. If I’ve missed any of the questions, please let me know.

You asked is the -- are there any changes in the application from what was originally proposed or what was on
the table at the time of the suspension last year? And the
answer is, no, there are no changes to the application.
The -- the applicant is asking the Committee and the
Commission to consider the same project that was proposed at
that time. The applicant felt that that was the best or
optimal project for the site at the time that it was
considered last year.

Now over the course of time the applicant has
considered a range of alternatives. Some of them were power
plant -- non-power plant alternatives that were put to the
voters in Redondo Beach. Some were alternative forms of
energy development. And it’s true that a whole range of
alternatives have been considered by the applicant. But
after careful study those alternatives are not part of this
application, are not being proposed by the applicant. We
still feel that this project that you have before you is the
one that we feel is best and we’d like you to go forward
with. So there aren’t any changes to the -- to the project
that we are asking the Commission and the Committee to
consider and approve.

You also asked if the plant is producing
electricity, and if so, how much? And to answer that
question I’d like to ask Mr. O’Kane if you could respond to
the Committee’s question regarding the current production of
electricity?

MR. O’KANE: Certainly. This is Stephen O’Kane with AES Southland Development, the applicant.

Yes, the current existing facility, AES Redondo Beach Generating Station, is currently fulfilling a need for capacity in the local area and reliability district. It’s dispatched when needed. Its annual capacity factor last year was less than 5 percent but it had a plant service factor in excess of 35 percent, meaning about 35 percent of the time we need at least one of the units at that power plant online, providing electrical support for the local region.

It’s -- the plant is -- will continue to run through -- through its current contracted period, and most likely runs right through to the end of the existing plant, right through to the end of its OTC deadlines in 2020, at which point hopefully the Redondo Beach Energy Project will then replace it as local capacity.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WHEATLAND: So those were the two questions I think that were posed to us. If there -- if you had any other questions for us I’m pleased to answer.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I think that’s good. I think now we’ll turn to Staff.

MS. WILLIS: Thank you. As far as the comment
period, at the time when we were publishing the PSA we hadn’t quite published it as when the first press indication said the project was -- may not be moving forward. So I do believe that an extended comment period time needs to be added, because I’m assuming that others did not pursue reviewing the -- reviewing the document.

One of the other questions, Mr. Winstead has some issues that we’re going to need some more information from the applicant for their -- obviously, with nine months going by there’s some updating that’s going to be taking place. There are some additional projects on our cumulative list, and he can go over some others.

One issue that we did have, if -- if the application goes forward we would need a new construction schedule and demolition schedule, because obviously the schedule in place would -- is probably, I’m assuming, outdated. And that would be one thing that would -- we would need.

MR. WINSTEAD: Hello, everybody. I’d also like to address the schedule as -- as a suggestion to publication of the FSA, 45 days after the FDOC is published.

The staff -- I’m going to move to information from the applicant. We’d like to have comments on the -- we’d
like to have comments on the preliminary staff assessment, PSA, prior to the workshop. That will be helpful.

Staff is also waiting on Air Quality. Staff is also waiting for the applicant’s submittal of cumulative impact assessment to determine whether to combine air quality impacts of proposed project, neighboring electrical generating facilities, and other reasonably foreseeable local projects would result in significant air quality related impacts during operation.

Visual; Staff would like to have the site screening and landscape concept plan to allow ample time to review for review and consideration of the final staff assessment.

We also may need to update our cumulative analysis for the FSA to include a waterfront project on Portofino Way, .65 miles away, and a 202-room hotel development on 7760 North Francia Avenue (phonetic) that’s .17 miles away. There’s also a demolition of an existing structure and construction of a 2-story 80,000 square foot, 96-suite assisted living facility 1.6 miles away. We also need the applicant to update the health and risk assessment for our public health analysis.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I’d like to just ask a couple of questions here. So is Staff anticipating then issuing a revised PSA or are these things needed simply for
preparation of the FSA?

    MS. WILLIS: Well, it could go either way. I mean, at this point our staff is just starting to review what they had written some time ago and to figure out what needs to be updated. At this point in time we’re not anticipating republishing the PSA. It’s something that, you know, we would also not necessarily, you know, oppose, but we aren’t – we aren’t proposing to do that. We had hoped to discuss most of the issues that -- that have developed in the intervening time at workshops.

The other issue that I didn’t mention that Mr. Welner just reminded me of is that we were, at the time, preparing to do a meet and confer on LORS with the city because we did have differing opinions on the building moratorium.

    HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I didn’t mean to interrupt. Is there anything else that you wanted to say relevant to the comment period?

    MR. WINSTEAD: As far as the comment period, we would like to have the comment period proceed 30 days after the PSA is resumed per the direction of the Committee and the schedule.

    HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. And then I want to make sure that I understood what you said relative to Staff
workshops on the PSA. Would that be during the comment period or after the close of the comment period? What’s your -- I mean, I didn’t understand the preference.

MR. WINSTEAD: Okay. Well, once the comment period starts, then two to three weeks into that process we would like to have a scheduled workshop with the applicant and discuss any -- all the parties and the public.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. I’m sorry, go ahead. Is that -- does that complete Staff’s presentation?

MS. WILLIS: Yes, thank you. And we’re --

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you.

MS. WILLIS: -- available for questions.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Turning now to the interveners, has Mr. Light joined us yet? Mr. Light, are you on the phone? Going once. Okay.

The City of Redondo Beach is present, so perhaps we can hear from them next.

MR. WELNER: Okay. Thank you very much. Again, this is Jon Welner, outside Counsel to the city. And also, Michael Webb is on the phone, City Attorney. He may be called on during these comments to -- to supplement with some information.

I’d like to first respond to -- quickly to some of the items that we heard just now. One is in terms of what
the project manager has just described in terms of the
schedule for the PSA and the comments, our immediate reaction
to what he’s proposing is that typically the workshop --
typically the comment period and the workshop are scheduled
in such a way that the workshop has -- that the period for
comments is sufficiently beyond the workshop so that
information that comes out in the workshops can be reasonably
incorporated into the comments that are submitted.

And so I would just ask that when you’re putting
the schedule together that if you -- if the workshop is
scheduled at the very end of the comment period there would
not be sufficient time for the parties to incorporate
information that comes out of the workshops into their
comments.

With regard to resuming the PSA process, as we
noted in our status conference statement a lot of information
and some new statements have come to light in the intervening
nine months that we think materially change the application.
And therefore we understand the desire on the part of the
applicant to simply step back into the process as it was
before it was suspended, however a couple of things have --
have resulted in material changes.

The first is, as was mentioned by others, there
have been discussions about energy storage and desalination
at the site. What I’d like to emphasize is that these aren’t, you know, these aren’t simply rumors or things that we’re assuming, these are statements that were made to both the press and to city officials regarding more than passing interest in either incorporating energy storage as part of this proposal or using the site for desalt, either -- we don’t -- we’re not sure, either in conjunction with this proposal or instead of this proposal. The energy storage issue is particular significant because the CPUC, as you know, did not approve a PPA for this site, in part because it does not comport with the kinds of preferred resources that the CPUC is looking for. Battery storage would make this facility potentially more appealing to the CPUC in terms of something that could be approved. And therefore, strategically speaking it might make sense for AES to incorporate as part of its project a major energy storage component.

So this is a real substantive change. And what we would say is while right now at this status conference we’re hearing from the applicant that, oh no, these things were considered and have now been rejected, we’d like to see this more formally addressed before we proceed. Is there, in fact, a significant possibility of energy storage being planned for the site? And if so, we believe that’s a
material change and requires an amendment to the AFC.
Likewise, is there a significant chance of desalt -- a
desalination project being propose for the site? And if so,
we believe that’s a material change significant to the AFC.

So that’s the first item. And we would urge you,
before issuing a schedule, and certainly if you’re
considering issuing a schedule today, that these questions
need to be asked and answered before we proceed because they
are fundamental to the proposed project.

Secondly, as we noted in our conference statement,
there were statements made again to the press and to the city
that amount to admissions regarding the no-project
alternative, statements that, of course, either they wouldn’t
have proposed an initiative to shut down the site and create
a development there if they believed it was impossible or
would have extremely negative impacts to close this power
plant. Therefore, the staff’s PPA, we believe, should be
amended to incorporate -- to incorporate the applicant’s own
admission that the impact of closing this facility would be
negligible in terms of the stability of the electric grid.
Moreover, there were numerous admissions made as part of the
campaign in support of Measure B explaining why eliminating
the power plant itself would be of great benefit to the
community.
So these are admissions against interest. They were made, obviously, because there was a campaign going on to eliminate the power plant. But again, we think these are material admissions. No discussion about the future of the site would be complete without collecting those admissions and addressing them and analyzing them in the staff report. It doesn't make sense to save that for the final staff report because then those analyses can't be responded to. We think that there's been enough change in this nine-month period to direct staff to revise the PSA, incorporate these new facts, do the proper investigation, and then reissue the PSA, and then issue a schedule.

Finally, we simply urge that the Commission note that both Commission staff and the intervening parties have essentially stood down on this issue for nine months. Our staff and our experts have moved on to other issues. They need to be re-familiarized with this application before moving forward, and also incorporate these new material facts into their analyses. We therefore urge the Commission to be generous in terms of the amount of time allowed to the parties before there is a workshop, which we will need to do significant preparation for, and before comments are due. And as I said at the beginning, we would very much appreciate having time following the end of the workshops to adequately
prepare comments.

I think that covers our -- our comments.

I would like to address the question that was raised about the Coastal Commission -- or rather the LORS issue with regard to the city’s ordinance. I think for the most recent information about that I would ask City Attorney Mike Webb to briefly update us on the status of that ordinance and what, if anything, has happened. I believe everything was suspended because of the initiative.

But, Mr. Webb, if you could address that, that would be helpful.

MR. WEBB: That is correct. A majority of our council and our mayor supported the initiative. So everything was put on hold once the initiative went forward. We’ll be going to the -- we’d already taken one ordinance prior to the initiative being filed, one sample ordinance to the Planning Commission to consider. We’ll be taking that back to the Planning Commission in May for them to move forward on a permanent ordinance.

The -- and I think it was Ms. Willis, I can’t tell, but as for the Coastal Commission, the ordinance -- the moratorium was not submitted to the Coastal Commission. Because as she had indicated, Staff had set up a meet and confer with the city and then suspended that or postponed
that. We respectfully believe that, and we’ve put that in our papers, that that moratorium explicitly under case law is not subject to Coastal Commission review. And our concern is the Coastal Commission is taking a position contrary to very clear State Law.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I think that that queues up then Mr. Luster who is online from the California Coastal Commission. He’s at the bottom of the screen.

MR. WELNER: Okay. And I’m sorry, I just have one -- one quick --

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Sure.

MR. WELNER: -- item before we move to that, and that is on the Air District question with regard to their determination of compliance. I have a question for the applicant which is the last we saw there was a letter that was sent to the South Coast Air Quality Management District, similar to the one that was sent to the Energy Commission asking that the process be suspended. At least that’s my recollection. In any case, that’s what -- that’s what Air District staff had told us, that they were suspending the analysis pending the initiative.

My question for either the applicant or, I’m sorry, for the staff person who’s here from the Air District is: What is the status of that review? Has it been resumed or is
it still suspended and, you know, what’s the timeframe on that?

But that’s my final observation. And we’re available for questions. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Thank you.

Let’s do talk to Mr. Luster first from the California Coastal Commission. And then we’ll queue up Mr. Lee from Air Quality.

Mr. Luster, are you still with us?

MR. LUSTER: Yes. Thank you very much. I guess just a couple brief points.

We are planning to submit our Section 30413(B) report. The timing of -- of when we can submit that depends on getting some clarification based on some of the statements I’ve heard today. You know, we’d like to get clarification as to what project we’ll be reviewing. There may be some changes to it. We have, as we’ve noted in our -- some of our correspondence last year, some concerns on wetlands and land use. There may be some other issues that come up, as well, but those are the two significant ones we’d like to weigh in on.

And also the -- the potential for project changes. It’s not clear right now if the battery storage and desalt, if those are -- actually become part of the project if those
are properly within the AFC proceeding or if those would be outside and require coastal development permits from the city and/or the Coastal Commission. That’s more the standard route those sorts of facilities would take.

And so I guess depending on what all is decided today it sounds like there are some uncertainties. I would recommend that a schedule not be developed today but postponed until we get some clarity on these issues. If the schedule were to start up today I think the soonest we could provide our report, we have to take our report to our commission first, but the sooner we could do that would be June or July at this point. But if -- if instead there’s some time to work out, to clarify what exactly the project is, address some of the issues that Energy Commission staff just raised about additional information, I think we’d have a much more complete record to base our report on. So that’s where we are with things.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Lee, on behalf of the Air Quality District, are you still with us?

MR. LEE: Yes, I am.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you very much. So there were some specific questions posed to you.

MR. LEE: Yes. Basically, we had submitted our
preliminary determination of compliance back in June 13th, 2014. On August 20th, 2014 we received a request from the applicant to suspend our review. On September 3rd, 2014 our district basically agreed with that and we held suspension until further notice.

On March 18th, 2015 we did receive a request from the applicant to resume processing of those applications, and we have done that. We have received -- during the public notice period back in June 13, 2014 we received five -- requests from five persons to respond to questions, as well as two requests for a Title 5 public hearing. We’re in the process of determining whether those two requests for the public hearing are pertinent, and therefore whether we should hold them or not. So -- but we have continued to answer the questions that we received from the five respective persons in regards to the questions on the facility.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: And is it Mr. Lee or Dr. Lee?

MR. LEE: It’s Mr. Lee.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Mr. Lee, is the project that’s being reviewed, does it include storage or any of the desalinization issues that have been discussed this morning?

MR. LEE: No, they do not.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. So in -- in a
MR. LEE: Yes. That -- that actually is the sticking point. Because if the determination is to have the public hearing we’d actually have to notice for a minimum of 30 days before the hearing can take place. And then whatever questions or comments come out from that hearing we would need time to review and respond to those, as well.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: And do --

MR. LEE: So we’re looking at --

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: I’m sorry. Go ahead.

MR. LEE: I’m sorry. Go ahead.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: No. You first.

MR. LEE: Oh. If a hearing is not required, we’re looking at potentially two months. But if a hearing is required, we’re looking at six months from now.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Thank you. Is there anything else that you’d like to say, Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: No. There’s nothing additional, other than we had submitted the notice for the preliminary determination of compliance back in June 13, 2014. So those records are still available.
HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay.

MR. LEE: And if anyone wishes to comment, we are still willing to listen to what those comments are. As I said before, we did receive comments from five areas, and we’re actually looking at them as we speak.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Do you know when the determination of whether the public hearing that’s been requested will occur, how long it’s going to take to make that decision?

MR. LEE: I believe it will take about another two weeks.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Thank you.

Turning back to our interveners, I believe Ms. Coates is on the line on behalf to the City of Hermosa Beach?

MS. COATES: Yes, that is correct. This is Shahiedah Coates from the City Attorney’s Office for the City of Hermosa Beach. And thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proceedings.

The City of Hermosa Beach echoes largely the concerns of the City of Redondo Beach. In light of the new information that has come out during the campaign for the ballot measure the city is concerned that the PSA may not adequately reflect all of the alternatives to the project that is proposed in the application, and, you know, in
particular the no-project alternative which was presented to the voters. This is particularly concerning because such an accelerated schedule is now being proposed.

The City of Hermosa Beach became an intervener at the end of July, just before the proceedings were suspended pursuant to the applicant’s request. And in light of the suspension the city has basically suspended its work on this -- this project as well. And so the city has not had really an opportunity to delve into the documentation and the materials connected to this proceeding and the application. And it would be significantly disadvantaged as a party if it were rushed, you know, along in accelerated schedules to really look into those -- those materials and analyze the potential impacts of the project to the city and its community.

And so the City of Hermosa Beach does request a longer schedule that affords, you know, greater opportunity for comments to be provided. And you know, in particular, if new information related to the project will be presented during the workshops as opposed to in a revised PSA the city would appreciate an extended comment period after the workshop so that it can appropriately respond. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you.

Turning back to Staff, you said that there were
some issues that you wish to explore and that you would need additional information from the applicant, including things like air quality, cumulative, those types of things. Am I remembering correctly?

MR. WINSTEAD: Let me check my notes.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Air quality, cumulative, visual, the new demolition and construction schedule, and the new health risk assessment. Are you anticipating doing those as data requests or -- or it just more in the nature of an update? And how long do you think it would take to get a list to applicant of what you need?

MR. WINSTEAD: Well, these -- all these items are in the PSA. And the applicant should respond to those in their comment period. There -- there -- as are as the additional information, these cumulative projects will be added just because they’ve popped up. And so as far as the air quality section regarding the cumulative impact assessment, some of that is going to be tied with the air district also. So I don’t see a real -- just depending on how things, the schedule goes, we’re just going to have to go with that. Yeah. And the applicant needs to, you know, depending on how the information comes to us, how soon, we’d like to have it, you know, prior to the workshop would be helpful. That way we can discuss it and have these issues
flushed out, if there’s any.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. Let’s turn back to the applicant once more.

MR. WHEATLAND: Thank you. Well, let’s start with the very last point. If there’s any specific information that the staff would like to see from us, we are reviewing the PSA now. But if there’s anything specifically there that they need from us or would like us to respond to, please let us know and we’ll do our best to provide that specific information to you prior to the workshop on the PSA.

It’s a natural part of any AFC process that there are changes in the surrounding community as the Energy Commission’s process evolves over a year. I haven’t seen a case yet where there haven’t been changes of that nature that have occurred. But it’s also a natural part of our process to have the staff consider those changes. And if they arise after the PSA to incorporate them in the FSA. I’ve also seen the staff, even when there are changes after the FSA, include those into the evidentiary hearing. So it’s an evolving process. It’s a normal thing. The applicant doesn’t believe that we need to issue -- reissue the PSA or issue a supplemental PSA to address those types of concerns.

Mr. Welner raised a number of suggestions about potential alternatives for these -- for the project, battery
storage or desalinization. He suggested that these might make the project better. These are not part of our project, and I want to stress that. This is not the project we’re proposing to the Commission. However, if parties feel that those are alternatives and they’re worthy of consideration, then that again is what the Energy Commission’s process is for. The city is free to suggest an expanded view of the alternatives analysis in their comments on the FSA. If they want to put forward a battery storage project for this site, that’s something that can be considered as part of the alternatives analysis. And you know, we’re happy to have a discussion about those issues.

Similarly, Mr. Welner suggested what ought to be considered in the no-project alternative. The staff has examined that in the PSA. But the city is free to comment on the PSA, no-project alternative. And if there’s additional issues or concerns they want to raise then there’s a place for that. We don’t think these are pre-conditions to restarting the scheduling. We think these are the types of concerns that are a natural part of any AFC decision.

And then finally, Mr. Welner mentioned that the parties have essentially stood down. I want to be very clear about this point. When the Committee suspended the proceeding they didn’t suspend it until further notice, they
suspended it until a date certain, until April 1st. So at the time of the suspension all parties were on notice that this proceeding would resume on April 1st. We gave the Committee and the parties the courtesy of notifying everyone before April 1st that we were prepared to proceed. But it shouldn’t be a surprise that this proceeding is -- is resuming, and in light of the vote in the City of Redondo Beach and the Committee’s notice of a date certain. We have proposed the comment period being 30 days from April 1st. But certainly it would be reasonable to have a 30-day clock run from the time of the issuance of the Committee’s scheduling order.

But I think those are all the points. Let me just check here if there’s anything. And thank you for being able to respond to those comments and concerns.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you. We’re off the record for a minute.

(Off the record)

(On the record)

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Okay. We’re back on the record. One of the important pieces in our process, obviously, is the Air Quality District. And given that Mr. Lee has represented that it’s going to take them approximately two weeks to make a determination of whether
they have to have the Title 5 public hearing, the Committee has determined not to issue the scheduling order today but would like status reports in writing from the parties no later than April 24th, including information from the Air District on its determination relative to the Title 5 public hearing, at which time a scheduling order will be forthcoming.

What I will do today is I will post the sort of scheduling guide that we’ve used in Alamitos. It gives you an outline of the sort of weeks after things happen. Obviously, the big one will be what time the new comment period or that comment period will start, as well as the timing of preliminary staff workshops.

At this point are there any questions, comments, protests?

Yes, Mr. Wheatland?

MR. WHEATLAND: Well, two comments on that. The first is that the Commission, in several cases, has not linked the issuance of the FDOC to the Commission’s ability to process the rest of the application. For reasons that are outside the control of the Commission there may be delays in the FDOC, but that’s not cause for -- air quality is only 1 of more than 20 different subject areas that the Commission has to decide.
And so we would strongly encourage the Commission to move forward with the consideration of other aspects of the application and not let the air quality be the issue that determines your ability to meet your statutory deadlines. The FDOC, the Commission has actually considered the FDOC even after issuance of a PMPD. So there’s no statutory reason or reason under your rules why you need to delay the rest of the proceeding.

The second thing is that regardless of when the FDOC comes out, it’s not an issue with respect to the comment period on -- on the PSA because the FDOC is always expected under the Commission’s schedule to come out sometime after issuance of the PSA, and doesn’t need to be received by the close of the comment period on the PSA. So we would strongly encourage you to at least set a schedule with respect to the comment period on the PSA and with respect to the PSA workshop, even if you defer for a couple of weeks setting the schedule for the rest of the proceeding.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: We understand that, but we would still like the information. And so we think that that information would be helpful to further consideration of the issues. We are also mindful of the issues raised by the parties today that while it was a date certain there were many uncertainties within that time period. And to think
that there’s going to be a cold start from April 1st when the suspension was lifted is not acceptable to the Committee. And as I’ve said, we would like that information. Similarly, though, we take the representations that you have made not once but twice today that the project is the project, that there is no storage component or desalinization as part of the project description, as being therefore the direction to those who have to participate more fully in this proceeding, including but not limited to the Coastal Commission, Air Quality, and the other interveners. Yes, Mr. Wheatland?

MR. WHEATLAND: Could you at least make a clear that this proceeding has now resumed, that there is a PSA that’s issued, and parties should begin in earnest to review the PSA and be prepared to submit their comments so that people don’t continue to stand down? We -- I think it’s very important that people know that we have resumed a proceeding, that the Commission has a statutory deadline, and that we all need to be working to meet that deadline.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: There is no further suspension order. As you’ve pointed out, the suspension order expired by its own term on April 1. So, yes, the parties should be working on this. However, we will be issuing a complete schedule for the remaining balance of the
proceedings necessary after we receive the information on April 24th. So sometime within the week after that you’ll have a full schedule from this Committee.

MR. WHEATLAND: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Are there any other questions from the parties? You might want to let Mr. Luster and Mr. Lee and Ms. Coates and Mr. Webb speak if they need to.

Any comments from any of the other parties online?

MR. LUSTER: This is Tom Luster, Coastal Commission. Nothing more from me. Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER COCHRAN: Thank you. Anyone else?

Okay.

At this point we’ll open it up for public comment. I’ll look first in the hearing room.

Mr. Pittard, have we received any comment cards?

So no one in the hearing room.

Is there anyone online who would make -- like to make a public comment?

Seeing none, I don’t think there’s a need for a closed session. Okay. And with that we are therefore adjourned. Thank you everyone for participating today.

(The Meeting of the California Energy Commission Amendments Committee adjourned at 9:57 a.m.)
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