

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	13-AFC-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	Alamitos Energy Center
<b>TN #:</b>	214556
<b>Document Title:</b>	Intervenor Comments on Schedule
<b>Description:</b>	November 23, 2016 email from Elizabeth Lambe (Los Cerritos Wetlands Trust) to Hearing Officer Ken Celli
<b>Filer:</b>	Paul Kramer
<b>Organization:</b>	Energy Commission Hearing Office
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Committee
<b>Submission Date:</b>	11/23/2016 12:59:26 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	11/23/2016

## Kramer, Paul@Energy

---

**From:** Celli, Ken@Energy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 23, 2016 11:12 AM  
**To:** Kramer, Paul@Energy  
**Subject:** FW: Intervenor Comments on Schedule or AEC

---

**From:** Elizabeth Lambe [ejlambe@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 23, 2016 10:44 AM  
**To:** Celli, Ken@Energy; [sgn@eslawfirm.com](mailto:sgn@eslawfirm.com); [mathew.layton@energy.ca.gov](mailto:mathew.layton@energy.ca.gov); Winstead, Keith@Energy; Davis, Chris@Energy; [JDH@eslawfirm.com](mailto:JDH@eslawfirm.com)  
**Cc:** Babula, Jared@Energy  
**Subject:** Re: Intervenor Comments on Schedule or AEC

So sorry.

I forgot to include Jared Babula.

My apologies.

Elizabeth

On Nov 23, 2016, at 10:41 AM, Elizabeth Lambe <[ejlambe@verizon.net](mailto:ejlambe@verizon.net)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Celli,

We are writing in support of staff's request for time to review the FDOC and prepare Part Two of the FSA. And we strongly oppose the schedule proposed by the Applicant.

We want to remind the Committee that, unlike the Applicant, the Land Trust does not have a consulting firm and law firm available at all times. Therefore, whatever benefit the Applicant receives from a dramatically compressed schedule comes at the cost of thorough opportunity for public participation. And as staff has noted, rushing the process, only to have to repeat the process to correct errors, is a waste of everyone's time.

We recommend:

allowing staff whatever time they need to finalize Part Two of the FSA to ensure consistency with the FDOC;

allowing staff ample time to review and modify the FSA to ensure the findings and conclusions in Part Two are consistent with the analyses in every

subject area in Part One, including cumulative impacts exacerbated by air quality degradation. [We would very much appreciate the FSA Part Two include a "strike out" version of Part One to assist the public in identifying any modifications to Part One in the FSA after inclusion of air quality degradation information];

once the FSA is published and available to the public, we request a status conference to discuss the FSA Part 2 and preparation for the Part Two evidentiary hearing;

at a minimum we request three weeks to recruit experts, gather evidence, and prepare Opening Testimony. We request that three week time period for preparation of evidence, witness list and Opening Testimony not include December 21 through December 27 when staff and the public will likely be enjoying the holidays;

once Opening Testimony is published, we request a minimum of a week to prepare rebuttal.

For example, if the staff prepares the FSA Part Two, including review and modification of Part One where necessary, by December 9, that would mean:

a conference on the FSA Part Two on or about December 14;

witness list, evidence and Opening Testimony due January 11;

Rebuttal due January 18;

Evidentiary Hearing in late-January or early-February.

Thank you for your consideration,

Elizabeth Lambe