DOCKETED		
Docket Number:	15-AFC-01	
Project Title:	Puente Power Project	
TN #:	217101	
<b>Document Title:</b>	Applicant's Response to Staff's Proposed Schedule	
Description:	N/A	
Filer:	Paul Kihm	
Organization:	Latham & Watkins LLP	
Submitter Role:	Applicant Representative	
<b>Submission Date:</b>	4/17/2017 2:37:51 PM	
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	4/17/2017	

1	Michael J. Carroll				
2	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 650 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor				
3	Costa Mesa, California 92626-1925 Tel.: (714) 540-1235				
4	michael.carroll@lw.com				
5	Attorneys for Applicant				
6	State of California				
7	Energy Resources				
8	Conservation and Development Commission				
9	In the Matter of:	Docket No. 15-AFC-01			
10	Application for Certification for the PUENTE POWER PROJECT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO STAFF'S PROPOSED SCHEDULE			
11		11101 0222 201122 022			
12					
13	As directed by the Committee Memorandum issued on April 11, 2017 (TN #216971),				
14	Applicant hereby responds to the proposed schedule filed by California Energy Commission				
15	(CEC) staff on April 5, 2017 (TN #216809). The CEC staff's proposed schedule extends				
16	through filing of Reply Briefs, and is generally consistent up to that point with the proposed				
17	schedule filed by Applicant on April 3, 2017 (TN #216776).				
18	Subsequent to the filing of CEC staff's and Applicant's proposed schedules, in response				
19	to agency and intervener comments on its proposed Biological Resources Survey Methodology,				
20	Applicant agreed to conduct additional surveys for burrowing owl. As indicated in its Final				
21	Biological Resources Survey Methodology submitted on April 10, 2017 (TN #216937),				
22	conducting the additional surveys will delay submission of the Final Survey Results by three				
23	weeks beyond the date specified in Applicant's previously proposed schedule. Set forth below is				
24	a revised proposed schedule for the remainder of the proceedings that accommodates the delay				
25	associated with the additional burrowing owl s	urveys.			
26					
27					
28					

1	<b>D</b>	
1	Date	Event
2 3	March 10, 2017	Committee Order for Additional Evidence Issued
4	March 27, 2017	Applicant's Proposed Biological Resources
5		Survey Methodology Filed
6	March 28, 2017	Public Workshop on Coastal Hazards
7	March 31, 2017	Applicant's Proposed Schedule Filed
8	April 5, 2017	CEC Staff's Proposed Schedule Filed
9	April 7, 2017	Agency/Party Comments on Applicant's Proposed Biological Resources Survey
10		Methodology Filed
11	April 10, 2017	Applicant's Final Biological Resources
12		Survey Methodology Filed
13	April 17, 2017	Comments on CEC Staff's Proposed Schedule Filed
14	April 28, 2017	Committee Conference
15	June 15, 2017	All Parties' Testimony and Evidence
16		Related to the Following Matters Addressed in March 10, 2017 Committee Order Filed:
17		<ul> <li>Soil and Water Resources (supplemental coastal flooding</li> </ul>
18		analysis);
19		<ul><li>Alternatives; and</li><li>Compliance and Closure</li></ul>
20		<u> </u>
21	June 23, 2017	Applicant's Final Biological Resources Survey Report Filed
22   23	June 30, 2017	Pre-Hearing Statements Filed by All Parties Identifying:
24		Identity of live witnesses to be presented at evidentiary hearing and
25		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
26		

28

1 2 3		<ul> <li>time required for direct testimony;</li> <li>Identity of witnesses to be cross-examined at evidentiary hearing and time required<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	
4 5		One-Day Evidentiary Hearing to Present Additional Evidence Filed in Response to March 10, 2017 Committee Order <sup>2</sup>	
6	July 17, 2017	Transcripts from Evidentiary Hearing Filed	
7	July 27, 2017	Opening Briefs Filed <sup>3</sup>	
8	August 10, 2017	Reply Briefs Filed	
0	September 14, 2017	PMPD Issued	
1	October 5, 2017	Public Workshop on PMPD	
2	October 16, 2017	PMPD Comment Period Closes	
3	October 23, 2017	Revised PMPD Issued	
4	November 8, 2017	Final Commission Decision	
<ul><li>5</li><li>6</li><li>7</li></ul>	DATED: April 17, 2017 Respectfully submitted,		
8	/s/ Michael J. Carroll		
9	Michael J. Carroll LATHAM & WATKINS LLP		
0	Coun	sel to Applicant	
1 2			
3	1 Civan the limited scene of the additional evidentians because them is no need to be 11 and the		
4	Given the limited scope of the additional evidentiary hearing, there is no need to hold another Prehearing Conference.		
5	<sup>2</sup> If the evidentiary hearing cannot be held in the City of Oxnard the week of July 10, 2017 due t venue unavailability or the inability of the Committee or key CEC staff to travel that week, Applicant requests that the hearing be held in Sacramento (with English and Spanish language		
6 7 8	Webex) to maintain schedule.  The Parties have had since the close of the evidentiary hearings in February to begin preparing Opening Briefs. Given the limited scope of the additional evidentiary hearing, two weeks following the additional hearing is an appropriate deadline for submitting Opening Briefs.		