

ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

601 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, SUITE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080-7037

TEL: (650) 589-1660

FAX: (650) 589-5062

rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com

SACRAMENTO OFFICE

520 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 350
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4721

TEL: (916) 444-6201

FAX: (916) 444-6209

DANIEL L. CARDOZO
THOMAS A. ENSLOW
TANYA A. GULESSERIAN
JASON W. HOLDER
MARC D. JOSEPH
ELIZABETH KLEBANER
RACHAEL E. KOSS
LOULENA A. MILES
ROBYN C. PURCHIA

FELLOW

AARON G. EZROJ

OF COUNSEL

THOMAS R. ADAMS
ANN BROADWELL
GLORIA D. SMITH

June 25, 2010

DOCKET
09-AFC-8

DATE JUN 25 2010

RECD. JUN 25 2010

California Energy Commission
Attn Docket No. 09-AFC-8
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Re: Genesis Solar Energy Project; 09-AFC-8

Dear Docket Clerk:

Enclosed are an original and one copy of **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DAVID S. WHITLEY ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA UNIONS FOR RELIABLE ENERGY ON CULTURAL RESOURCES FOR THE GENESIS SOLAR ENERGY PROJECT**. Please docket the original, conform the copy and return the copy in the envelope provided.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

/S/

Rachael E. Koss

REK:bh
Enclosures

2364-088a

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**Energy Resources Conservation
and Development Commission**

In the Matter of:

The Application for Certification for the
GENESIS SOLAR ENERGY PROJECT

Docket No. 09-AFC-8

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DAVID S. WHITLEY ON BEHALF OF
THE CALIFORNIA UNIONS FOR RELIABLE ENERGY
ON CULTURAL RESOURCES FOR THE GENESIS SOLAR ENERGY
PROJECT**

June 25, 2010

Rachael E. Koss
Tanya A. Gulesserian
Marc D. Joseph
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000
South San Francisco, CA 94080
(650) 589-1660 Voice
(650) 589-5062 Facsimile
rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com
tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com

I. Introduction

I am a professional archaeologist. I received a Ph.D. in Anthropology, with a specialization in Archaeology, from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1982. I have been previously employed as Chief Archaeologist at UCLA; have served as US Representative and on the Council of Directors for the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS); and was appointed as Prehistoric Archaeologist to the State of California, Historical Resources Commission (1986-7). In 2001 I received the Thomas F. King Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management from the Society for California Archaeology. I have provided cultural resources consulting services for CEQA and NEPA applications for over 30 years. My professional publications include over 100 articles and book chapters, and seventeen books and monographs, and I fully meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications as a Principal Investigator for archaeological projects (see 36 CFR Part 61). A summary of my education and experience is attached to this testimony as Attachment 1.

The California Unions for Reliable Energy (CURE) retained my firm, ASM Affiliates, Inc., to review the cultural resources Staff assessments for the Genesis Solar Energy Project (Genesis or Project) and to prepare expert testimony regarding strategies for the identification, avoidance and mitigation of cultural resources impacts associated with Genesis project development, especially with respect to compliance with CEQA guidelines and standards.

The June 2010 CEC Revised Staff Assessment concludes that: "With the adoption and implementation of the entire complement of cultural resources conditions, Conditions of Certification **CUL-1** through **CUL-17**, the GSEP project would be in conformity with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards" (C.3-2). In the following testimony, I demonstrate that the CEC Staff analysis and recommended Conditions of Certification instead fail to comply with the letter and intent of CEQA.

II. Points of Concurrence

The June 2010 Revised Staff Assessment of the Genesis Project cultural resources has changed significantly since the earlier March 2010 preliminary analysis. The March 2010 Staff Assessment/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SA/DEIS) estimated that the Genesis Project would have significant direct impacts to 14 archaeological sites, and significant indirect impacts to one ethnographic resource. The June 2010 Revised Staff Assessment analysis upward revises these figures to include significant direct impacts to 27 archaeological resources, and significant indirect impacts to 248 cultural resources.

CEC Staff has, appropriately, begun to appreciate the gravity of the significant adverse impacts to cultural resources that will result from the Genesis Project. They have also correctly acknowledged the cumulative adverse impacts that will result from this project in combination with similar development applications in the California deserts.

I concur with Staff's identification of the Prehistoric Trails Network Cultural Landscape (PTNCL) and the Desert Training Center California-Arizona Maneuver Area Cultural Landscape (DTCCL) as historical districts/cultural landscapes. I also concur with their recommendation that these cultural landscapes be considered eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). I also concur with Staff's determination that significant direct adverse impacts to 27 archaeological sites will occur as a result of the proposed Project.

III. Failure to Follow Standard Archaeological Practice for CEQA Compliance and Implementation

As is widely understood, the CEQA Guidelines encourage state and local agencies to develop their own implementation procedures for regulatory compliance. As is further understood, although this permits some agency-specific latitude, such procedures must satisfy the CEQA requirement that "each significant environmental effect" be identified, and that the potential mitigation measures for each adverse effect must be discussed (CEQA Guidelines 15126.4(a)1). CEQA lead agencies and agency staffs have both formally and informally adopted a set of standard archaeological procedures intended to comply with these requirements. For the preparation of a DEIR, the widely followed CEQA standard practice includes a Phase I archaeological survey (intensive site "inventory"), and a Phase II test excavation and determination of significance. Final recommendations for the management of cultural resources are developed, and included in a DEIR, based on the results of these two procedures.

As is discussed below, these two procedures are necessary to develop appropriate mitigation measures for each identified adverse impact. Such measures will vary depending upon the nature of the specific resource, and the significance values that these procedures identify. A prehistoric village containing a cemetery, for example, will likely be determined significant based both on its religious importance to Native Americans, and its potential to yield valuable scientific information about the past. A prehistoric tool-making workshop, in contrast, may be identified as significant solely due to its potential to provide archaeological information.

As the Revised Staff Assessment acknowledges, the Applicant's archaeological consultants have completed site inventories but ***not*** determinations of significance, based on test excavations that provide affirmative information concerning the size,

integrity and nature of each cultural resource. Determinations of significance for the sites are proposed by the Staff instead, based on, in effect, a “laboratory exercise,” using extrapolations from the Phase I survey data.

The completion of a Phase II test excavation and determination of significance, as standard CEQA practice, represents the tacit acknowledgment that survey level data alone are inadequate for accurate significance determination. That is, the completion of test excavations, as standard CEQA practice, reflects the well-known archaeological fact that surface evidence obtained during site surveys is at best incomplete and, at worst, may be entirely misleading. Certainly, survey level data do not necessarily provide information concerning all of the significance values a resource may include. The use of survey level data alone, hence, is considered inadequate to develop appropriate mitigation measures.

Staff’s justification for this departure from CEQA standard practice cites federal regulations (36 CFR 800.14b) that allow for the resolution of “complex” cultural resource project situations through the development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA), providing for site evaluations and mitigation measures after project certification. Two points are important to emphasize in this regard:

(1) The proposed Project involves approximately 2,000 acres and contains 27 archaeological sites. There is nothing complex about the Genesis Project from the cultural resources survey perspective, especially relative to numerous CEQA-regulated California land developments. Within the last four years alone, for example, I have conducted two projects for land developments, each involving acreage figures an order of magnitude larger than the Genesis application, each with double or more the number cultural resources. In both cases, Phase I archaeological surveys and Phase II test excavations were required by the CEQA lead agencies (Los Angeles and Kern counties) as base-line data for the DEIRs. My firm, similarly, is currently conducting evaluations (equivalent to CEQA Phase II test excavations) for another federal agency involving 85 archaeological sites; the fieldwork timeline for this project is six weeks.

As the SA/DEIS makes clear (C.3-16 – 17), CEQA implementation for the proposed Project was determined not by the CEC Staff, and not to ensure adequate regulatory compliance, but instead by the Project Applicant, for reasons of expediency alone. Insofar as I am aware, nothing in the CEQA statutes or guidelines directs agencies to ensure regulatory compliance predicated on the overriding importance of expediency for an Applicant.

(2) Whereas federal regulations allow for these kinds of data gaps and procedures in the development of a DEIS, CEQA has no such dispensation for cultural resources information and significance evaluations. CEQA instead requires

that each potential adverse impact be identified, and appropriate mitigation measures be identified, described and considered.

Staff's analysis fails to acknowledge that the proposed Project has not complied with standard CEQA practice with respect to cultural resources, nor complied with the kinds of base-line data and analysis required by CEQA.

IV. Failure to Identify All Potential Project Impacts

As both the SA/DEIS and Revised Staff Assessment acknowledge, the final Project area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been determined inasmuch as the route for a secondary access road has not been established. Unless and until that route has been specified, and archaeological studies completed on it, it is not possible to identify each of the Project's adverse impacts, as is required by CEQA.

V. Failure to Identify Appropriate Mitigation Measures for Significant Adverse Impacts

As noted above, appropriate mitigation measures for the Project's adverse impacts to each cultural resource have not been identified or considered. This failure results from the Staff's analysis which has either inferred or, at the Applicant's request, assumed that all 27 of the sites within the APE are significant with respect to a single significance value: scientific research importance. The proposed mitigation measures—data recovery (salvage excavations)—reflect Staff's unsupported assumption that research importance is the only potential value that the sites may contain, and that salvage excavations are in every case adequate to mitigate the sites' destruction.

Staff's conclusions in this regard fail to apprehend the fundamental point: while scientific value qualifies the sites as significant under CEQA, these sites may contain additional heritage values which might also qualify them as CEQA significant, and these must also be considered when developing appropriate mitigation measures. Indeed, as the CEQA Guidelines explicitly acknowledge: "Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites" (15126.4(b)2(A)). Nowhere does Staff's analysis consider this CEQA preferred mitigation measures, for example through Project re-design. Yet there are many cases where preservation in place is the only appropriate mitigation measure, because of the nature of an archaeological site's significance values.

A well-known recent example of this fact—and a demonstration of the inadequacy of the proposed compliance approach—is provided by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Playa Vista project, in the City of Los Angeles. In a fashion similar to the Genesis Project, the Corps failed to require test excavations prior to project approval, instead assuming that a PA and archaeological data recovery

would serve as the appropriate mitigation for a known archaeological site, following project approval. The result was the discovery, removal and therefore destruction, of an early 19th century Tongva-Gabrielino tribal cemetery containing 386 burials, at an archaeological cost of greater than \$12 million.

At least three of the prehistoric archaeological sites within the Genesis APE, based on the surface evidence alone as described in the Revised Staff Assessment, appear to represent lakeshore village sites that have the potential to contain burials/cemeteries. (Staff's categorization of these sites as "temporary camps" is misleading and inappropriate in light of the last century of archaeological research in the California deserts.) Adequate determination of the appropriate mitigation measures for these and the other sites requires the identification of each site's significance values, not the selection of a single value, as if this is necessarily appropriate to all cultural resources. The Staff's proposed CEQA compliance, in this respect, is not based on the responsible stewardship and treatment of the cultural resources, but instead on the procedure that is most expedient for the Applicant.

VI. Inappropriate Conditions of Certification

Staff's recommended Conditions of Certification include measure CUL-17, which is directed at large, complex sites with sub-surface archaeological deposits. Staff proposes that the excavation of systematically located backhoe trenches will serve to adequately mitigate the adverse impacts resulting from the destruction of these sites.

Even under archaeological supervision, the use of backhoe trenches to excavate large and complex prehistoric sites is massively inappropriate, if not literally offensive to the sensibilities of Native Californian tribal peoples and the professional California archaeological community. Large and complex sites are exactly the kinds of sites that commonly contain human burials and other kinds of sensitive remains and features. The use of a backhoe in such circumstances is as likely to destroy these kinds of archaeological remains as allow for their recovery and analysis.

Following long and widely-accepted professional California archaeological practice, subsurface testing and data recovery procedures should include the controlled hand-excavation of sites, not the mechanical excavation of the sites.

ATTACHMENT 1

David S. Whitley, Ph.D., RPA
Principal/Principal Archaeologist

Total Years of Experience: 35 years

Education:

Ph.D. 1982/Anthropology/University of California, Los Angeles
M.A. 1979/Geography/University of California, Los Angeles
B.A. 1976/Anthropology and Geography/University of California, Los Angeles

Registrations:

1979 Register of Professional Archaeologists

Professional Profile:

David S. Whitley, Ph.D., specializes in the prehistoric archaeology and ethnography of far western North America, with particular interests in sacred sites, rock art, chronometrics and cultural heritage management. He has also worked in southern Africa, the European Upper Paleolithic and Guatemala. His professional publications include 17 books/monographs and approximately 100 articles and chapters. Included among his recent books are *The Rock Art of California* (University of Utah Press, 2000), the edited volume *Handbook of Rock Art Research* (AltaMira Press, 2001), and *Introduction to Rock Art Research* (Left Coast Press, 2005), which received a *Choice* Outstanding Academic Book Award for 2006. His latest book is *Cave Paintings and the Human Spirit: The Origin of Creativity and Belief* (Prometheus Books, 2009).

Whitley has written the nominations for 470 sites that are now listed on the NRHP, and has a nomination for an 89 site NHL district that is currently under consideration. For a decade he served on the Council of Directors of the ICOMOS International Rock Art Committee. In 2001 he received the Thomas King Award from the Society for California Archaeology for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management.

Selected Project Experience:

Coso NHL Management Plan, NAWS China Lake, Inyo County, California, 2009-ongoing. Co-Principal Investigator and report co-author of a management plan for the Coso NHL district, a 57-square-mile area containing the largest concentration of petroglyph sites in North America. This has involved coordination with stakeholders, including Native American tribes; the development of management and conservation protocols; and the identification and prioritization of future preservation tasks for the only rock art NHL west of the Rockies.

Carrizo Plain Ecological Reserve Land Management Plan, Jodi McGraw Consulting, Carrizo Plain, San Luis Obispo County, California, ongoing. Principal investigator, field director and report author for an archaeological reconnaissance, overview and management plan for cultural resources on four California Department of Fish and Game units totaling 39,016 acres; and authorship of cultural sections for a Fish and Game Land Management Plan.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Twentynine Palms Marine MAGTF Land Expansion, TEC Inc., San Bernardino County, California, ongoing. Co-Principal Investigator and co-author for cultural resources sections of a NEPA draft EIS for a proposed 150,000-acre land expansion.

Tejon Mountain Village Project, Tejon Mountain Village LLC, Tejon Ranch, Kern and Los Angeles counties, California, 1999–2009. Principal Investigator and report author for a Phase I survey of 28,000 acres and Phase II testing of 38 prehistoric sites, for CEQA compliance.

Assessment of CA-INY-434 and -7117, Epsilon Systems Solutions, NAWA China Lake, Inyo County, California, 2008. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for condition assessments of petroglyph sites CA-INY-434 and -7117, involving site documentation and mapping; evaluation of current conditions and identification of natural and cultural impacts to the sites; and management recommendations for long-term preservation.

Rosamond Space-Port Survey, United Engineering Group, Rosamond, Kern County, California, 2008. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for Phase I archaeological survey of 546 acres, resulting in the identification and recording of nine sites.

Clipper Windpower Class III Inventory, Clipper Windpower, Inc. Barstow, San Bernardino County, California, 2008. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for Class III inventory of seven anemometer pads and access roads.

Boeing Corporation Santa Susana Field Lab Projects, MWH Americas, Inc., Los Angeles County, California, 2001–2008. Principal investigator, field director and report author for six Class III inventories/Phase I surveys required for maintenance, hazardous waste clean-up and other activities on the Santa Susana Field Lab; and evaluation and preliminary condition assessment for NRHP listed rock art site CA-LAN-1072 (Burro Flats).

Carrizo Plain National Monument Projects, Carrizo Plain National Monument/BLM Bakersfield Field Office, San Luis Obispo and Kern counties, California, 2001–2008. Principal Investigator, field director and senior report author for six projects/contracts, consisting of NHPA Class II and III inventories of over 14,400 acres for Section 110 compliance; documentation and condition assessment of the Saucito pictograph site; NRHP nomination and listing, at national level of significance, of a 24 site district, for Section 106 compliance; and a NHL nomination of an 89-site district for Section 106 compliance.

Dead End Canyon Site Assessment, Epsilon Systems Solutions, NAWA China Lake, Inyo County, California, 2007. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for a petroglyph site condition assessment; and an NRHP evaluation of a large village for Section 106 compliance, involving surface collection and mapping of house pits.

Lancaster Retention Basin Survey, Impact Sciences, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, 2007. Principal investigator and report author for Phase I archaeological survey of 1.5-acre retention basin.

Vintage Well Pad Survey, Vintage Production California, Tejon Ranch, Kern County, California, 2006. Principal Investigator and report author for a Phase I archaeological survey of a well-pad.

Hueneme Pipeline Survey, City of Hueneme, Wastewater Division, Hueneme, Ventura County, California, 2006. Principal Investigator, field director, report author for a Class III inventory/Phase I survey of a 3400 linear feet pipeline route, requiring SHPO consultation.

Searles Lake High-Stand Shoreline Survey, Bureau of Land Management, San Bernardino County, California, 2005. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for a Class III inventory of the high-stand (Late Pleistocene) pluvial lake shoreline (2,343 acres) of the Christmas Canyon sub-basin of Searles Valley.

Tejon Ranch Water Management and Exchange WRMWSD 850 Canal/Reservoir No. 1 Pumpback Project, Tejon Ranch Company, Tejon Ranch, Kern County, California, 2003-2004. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for a Phase I archaeological survey of 1268 acres related to water rights and usage.

Christmas Canyon Site Assessment, Bureau of Land Management, San Bernardino County, California, 2003. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for an assessment of 16 surface sites within the Christmas Canyon area of the Searles Lake Basin.

Hoover Dam By-Pass Project, CH2M Hill, Colorado River Valley, California and Nevada, 2000. Principal Investigator and report co-author of an ethnohistoric overview and Traditional Cultural Properties nomination for sites associated with the Hoover Dam By-Pass.

Newhall Ranch Projects, Newhall Land and Farms/Lennar Homes, Valencia, Los Angeles County, California, 1993-2009. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for 24 separate studies/contracts involving Phase I CEQA studies and NHPA Class III inventories of approximately 20,000 acres, Class II test excavations at 11 prehistoric sites, and Class III data recovery at one site.

Golden Queen Mine Projects, Golden Queen Mining Company, Rosamond, Kern County, California, 1994-2007. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for five projects/contracts involving a CEQA Phase I study of 640 acres total, Phase II test excavations

of nine historical (1900-1910 mining related) sites, and Phase III data recoveries (including HABS/HAER documentation) of four sites, one of which was a large historical mining ghost town with about 60 structures.

Fort Irwin Rock Art Projects, NTC Fort Irwin, Barstow, San Bernardino County, California, 1997-1999. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for three projects/contracts, involving a NHPA Class III inventory of 2000 acres at "The Whale;" rock art site documentation and assessment of three petroglyph sites; testing, rock art documentation and Section 106 evaluation at Sally's Rockshelter.

BLM Land Exchange Inventories and Assessment, Conservation Partners, Inc., Santa Barbara, Tulare, Kern and Kings counties, California, 1999-2000. Principal Investigator, field director and report author for seven projects/contracts requiring Class III inventories of 5,221 acres, and one project requiring limited testing and determinations of NRHP eligibility for four sites.

Class II Inventory, NAWS China Lake, Inyo and San Bernardino counties, California, 1982-1983. Co-principal Investigator, field director and report co-author of a sample survey of the North and South Ranges of the China Lake NWC, representing approximately 10,000 inventoried acres.

LADWP Well Pad Study, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Inyo County, California, 1982. Principal Investigator, field director and report author, archaeological assessments of four geothermal well pads locations in the Coso KGRA, adjacent to Sugarloaf Mountain.

DECLARATION

I, David Whitley, declare as follows:

I have reviewed the above testimony regarding the Genesis Solar Energy Project. To the best of my knowledge, all of the facts in my testimony are true and correct. To the extent that this testimony contains opinion, such opinion is my own.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. This declaration is signed at Tehachapi, California.

Dated:

24 June 2010

Signed:

David S. Whitley

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Bonnie Heeley, declare that on June 25, 2010 I served and filed copies of the attached **REBUTTAL Testimony of David S. Whitley on Behalf of the California Unions for Reliable Energy on Cultural Resources for the Genesis Solar Energy Project**. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit, is accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/genesis. The document has been sent to both the other parties in this proceeding as shown on the Proof of Service list and to the Commission's Docket Unit electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list and by depositing in the U.S. Mail at South San Francisco, CA with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed as provided on the Proof of Service list to those addresses NOT marked "email preferred." I also sent a copy via email and an original and one copy via U.S. mail to the California Energy Commission Docket Office.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at South San Francisco, CA on June 25, 2010.

_____/S/_____
Bonnie Heeley

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION Attn: Docket No. 09-AFC-8 1516 Ninth Street MS 4 Sacramento, CA 95814-5512 docket@energy.state.ca.us	Ryan O'Keefe, Vice President Genesis Solar LLC 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, Florida 33408 Ryan.okeefe@nexteraenergy.com EMAIL ONLY	Scott Busa/Project Director Meg Russell/Project Mgr Duane McCloud/Lead Engr NextEra Energy 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, FL 33408 Scott.busa@nexteraenergy.com Meg.Russell@nexteraenergy.com Daune.mccloud@nexteraenergy.com Matt Handel/Vice Pres. Matt.Handel@nexteraenergy.com VIA EMAIL ONLY Kenny Stein, Environmental Srvs Mgr Kenneth.Stein@nexteraenergy.com VIA EMAIL ONLY
Mike Pappalardo Permitting Manager 3368 Videra Drive Eugene, OR 97405 Mike.pappalardo@nexteraenergy.com	James Kimura, Project Engineer Worley Parsons 2330 East Bidwell St., #150 Folsom, CA 95630 James.Kimura@WorleyParsons.com	Tricia Bernhardt/Project Manager Tetra Tech, EC 143 Union Blvd, Suite 1010 Lakewood, CO 80228 Tricia.bernhardt@tteci.com
Kerry Hattevik, Director West Region Regulatory Affairs 829 Arlington Boulevard El Cerrito, CA 94530 Kerry.hattevik@nexteraenergy.com	Scott Galati Galati & Blek, LLP 455 Capitol Mall, Suite 350 Sacramento, CA 95814 sgalati@gb-llp.com	California ISO e-recipient@caiso.com VIA EMAIL ONLY

Allison Shaffer/Project Mgr. Bureau of Land Management Palm Springs South Coast Field Office 1201 Bird Center Drive Palm Springs, CA 92262 Allison Shaffer@blm.gov	James D. Boyd Commissioner/Presiding Member California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 jboyd@energy.state.ca.us	Robert Weisenmiller Commissioner/Associate Member California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 rweisenm@energy.state.ca.us
Kenneth Celli, Hearing Officer California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 kcelli@energy.state.ca.us	Mike Monasmith Siting Project Manager California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 mmonasmi@energy.state.ca.us	Caryn Holmes, Staff Counsel California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 cholmes@energy.state.ca.us
Robin Mayer, Staff Counsel California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 rmayer@energy.state.ca.us	Jennifer Jennings Public Adviser's Office California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us	Tanya A. Gulesserian Marc D. Joseph Rachael E. Koss Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo 601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000 South San Francisco, CA 94080 tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com
Michael E. Boyd, President Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE) 5439 Soquel Drive Soquel, CA 95073-2659 michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net	Alfredo Figueroa 424 North Carlton Blythe, CA 92225 lacunadeaztlan@aol.com	Tom Budlong 3216 Mandeville Cyn Rd. Los Angeles, CA 90049-1016 tombudlong@roadrunner.com
Larry Silver California Environmental Law Project Counsel to Mr. Budlong VIA EMAIL ONLY larrysilver@celproject.net	Lisa T. Belenky, Sr. Attorney Center for Biological Diversity 351 California St. #600 San Francisco, CA 94104 lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org	Ileene Anderson Public Lands Desert Director Center for Biological Diversity PMB 447, 8033 sunset Blvd. Los Angeles, CA ianderson@biologicaldiversity.org