



California Energy Commission

DOCKETED
12-AFC-02

TN # 69920

MAR. 14 2013

500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1600
Sacramento, CA 95814
main 916.447.0700
fax 916.447.4781
www.stoel.com

March 14, 2013

MELISSA A. FOSTER
Direct (916) 319-4673
mafoster@stoel.com

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Felicia Miller, Siting Project Manager
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Huntington Beach Energy Project (12-AFC-02)
Applicant's Correspondence Related to Air Quality

Dear Ms. Miller:

On behalf of Applicant AES Southland Development, LLC, please find enclosed herewith for docketing Applicant's correspondence between Applicant's consultants, Commission Staff, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District regarding the topic of air quality as such relates to the Huntington Beach Energy Project. Due to file size, attachments to the correspondence (air quality data) will be docketed under separate cover. Applicant is more than happy to provide any party a copy of the disk upon request.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Melissa A. Foster".

Melissa A. Foster

MAF:jmw

Enclosure

cc: Proof of Service List

From: jbaker@aqmd.gov
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 3:46 PM
To: John.Frohning@CH2M.com
Cc: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; slee@aqmd.gov; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com; tchico@aqmd.gov; CPerri@aqmd.gov
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions
Attachments: CostaMesa_for_Consultant_Revised.zip

Hi John,

We looked into your question regarding the wind speeds and found that the wind speeds we have in our input files are in meters per second, not miles per hour.

Attached are the files you requested. Please let me know if you have further questions.

Jillian Baker, Ph.D.
South Coast AQMD
21865 Copley Drive,
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Direct: 909.396.3176

From: John.Frohning@CH2M.com [mailto:John.Frohning@CH2M.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 5:54 PM
To: Jillian Baker
Cc: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; Sang-Mi Lee; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Jillian,

I am just following up on our conversation on Tuesday (2/19) of last week and checking on the status of the revised Costa Mesa AERMET files (including the Costa Mesa raw input data for Stage 1 of AERMET).

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
John Frohning
Air Quality Specialist
CH2M Hill

425-292-3087
1100 112th Ave. NE
Suite 400
Bellevue, WA 98004

From: Jillian Baker [mailto:jbaker@aqmd.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 8:57 AM
To: Engel, Elyse/SJC
Cc: Frohning, John/SEA; Beattie, Benjamin/SAC; Salamy, Jerry/SAC; McGregor, Keith/SAC; Tom Chico; Chris Perri; Sang-Mi Lee
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

**** WARNING **** This email contains a compressed file (e.g., ZIP), which is a file type often used to package & deliver viruses. Be VERY suspicious of ALL file attachments--ESPECIALLY if you do not know the sender. If you're in doubt about the legitimacy of this email, then DO NOT open the file attachment(s) before verifying with the sender.

Report suspicious emails to TAC, or your Regional IT Helpdesk if not supported by TAC.

File Name(s): CostaMesa_for_Consultant.zip
File Type(s): compressed/zip

The original message text is below.

+++++

Hi Elyse,

Attached are the files you requested.

Jillian Baker, Ph.D.
South Coast AQMD
21865 Copley Drive,
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Direct: 909.396.3176

From: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com [<mailto:Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 9:22 PM
To: Jillian Baker
Cc: John.Frohning@CH2M.com; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; Keith.McGregor@CH2M.com;
Tom Chico; Chris Perri
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Jillian,

Thank you for providing the revised 5-year dataset and clarification on the ozone data. To verify the responses to comments 2 through 9 below, based on our phone call last week, could you please provide the following additional data:

- Input and output files for AERMET Stage 1 through Stage 3
- Raw data used for AERMET Stage 1 processing

Please let me know if you have any questions about this additional request.

Thanks,
Elyse

From: Jillian Baker [<mailto:jbaker@aqmd.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2013 3:15 PM
To: Engel, Elyse/SJC
Cc: Frohning, John/SEA; Beattie, Benjamin/SAC; Salamy, Jerry/SAC; McGregor, Keith/SAC; Tom Chico; Chris Perri
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Elyse,

I believe that I have answered all your questions on the phone last week. The only outstanding response is how the missing data in the ozone file was calculated, which is described below. I am also attaching the csta5.sfc file for your use.

This file is the same file as the one which was previously provided to you, with a change in the station location, which does not affect the modeled results. You should already have the csta5.pfl file to use.

Response to #10.

As you are aware, the 3 years of met data and ozone data posted on our website was sufficient for use in non-PSD permitting projects. As indicated on our website, we request that applicants contact us for the most recent and updated met data plus ozone or NO₂ data for all PSD projects. The method used for filling-in missing ozone data for purposes of Tier 3 NO₂ modeling was updated in response to the new federal 1-hour NO₂ standard and has been used on previous PSD projects within the District. The procedure is as follows:

1 to 3 Consecutive Hours of Missing Data

1, 2, or 3 consecutive hours of missing ozone data was filled in by linear interpolation between non-missing ozone data on either side of the missing period.

More than 3 consecutive Hours of Missing Data

Ambient ozone in southern California exhibits a strong and distinct diurnal and seasonal pattern. That is, ambient ozone concentrations are highest in the spring and summer months and during the mid-day hours. Filling-in missing ozone data with the highest hourly concentration is overly and unreasonably conservative. For instance, it is unreasonable to use the peak hourly ozone concentration for the modeling period to fill-in missing hours at nighttime when ozone concentrations approach zero.

Instead, we extracted the maximum value for each hour of the day and month of the year. Thus, there were 12 sets (representing each month of the year) of 24 hourly (representing the 24 hours in the day) ozone values. In this manner, the diurnal and seasonal ambient ozone patterns are preserved. So missing ozone at 1 a.m. in December would be filled in with the maximum 1 a.m. ozone concentration for all the Decembers in the modeling period. Similarly missing ozone at 2 p.m. in July would be filled in with the maximum 2 p.m. ozone concentration for all the Julys in the modeling period.

Please let me know if you have further questions.

Jillian Baker, Ph.D.
South Coast AQMD
21865 Copley Drive,
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Direct: 909.396.3176

From: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com [<mailto:Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:49 AM

To: Jillian Baker

Cc: John.Frohning@CH2M.com; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; Keith.McGregor@CH2M.com

Subject: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Jillian,

Thank you for your time yesterday to discuss the revised 5-year Costa Mesa meteorological dataset processed with the updated version of AERMET (version 12345). We just wanted to follow-up on our observations from comparing the revised dataset to the original 3-year dataset. As discussed, we also reviewed the revised Ozone data and had a question about the inconsistencies between the previous 3-year dataset and the new 5-year dataset. We understand that many of the questions about the differences could be accounted for by using the new version of AERSURFACE; however, they are repeated below for verification.

Please review the following questions / comments and let us know if you would like to discuss in more detail:

1. SFC Files: The revised 5-year dataset processed with version 12345 has a coordinate inconsistent with the Costa Mesa station location. The coordinate included appears to be for the Crestline station. Please verify that Stages 1 and 3 of AERMET were preprocessed with the correct station location for Costa Mesa.
2. SFC Files: The surface roughness length is not consistent between the old and new datasets. We understand this may be an artifact of using the updated version of AERSURFACE, but please confirm. Please also confirm that the correct coordinate for the Costa Mesa station was used in AERSURFACE.
3. SFC Files, Albedo: The albedo between the old and new datasets do not match for many hours. Again, this may be an artifact of using the updated version of AERSURFACE, but please confirm.
4. SFC/PFL Files, Wind Direction: It appears that the updated dataset rounded wind direction to the nearest degree. Why was AERMET version 12345 run with different raw surface data? Please note, however, that not all wind directions appear to be rounded to the nearest degree as there are some cases when there is a value after the decimal point (example: January 5, 2005, hour 4).
5. SFC/PFL Files, Wind Speed: Again, it appears that there has been some rounding to the nearest tenth of a m/sec; however, there are some cases where the wind speed differences between the old and new datasets differ by more than a tenth of a m/sec. Why was the valid raw data input into AERMET different for the new dataset?
6. Wind Speed/Wind Direction: What are the starting thresholds for both the wind speed and wind direction sensor? Based on our conversation, many of the previously identified 'calms' were now modified to a wind speed of 0.28 m/sec. Please confirm this value is the greater of the wind direction or wind speed sensor starting thresholds.
7. SFC File, Missing Data Inconsistencies: In contrast to comment 6, there are now some instances when data previously identified as valid are now considered missing/invalid (example: January 11, 2005, hours 12, 13, 14, and 15). Please confirm.
8. SFC File, Pressure: The pressure values between the old and new datasets vary greatly. Please verify the difference.
9. SFC File, Cloud Cover: The cloud cover varies greatly between the old and new datasets. Please verify the difference.
10. Ozone Data: It appears that missing data in the new dataset was filled in differently compared to the old dataset. Please provide the guidance followed to fill in the missing data and the justification to change methodologies compared to data previously obtained through the SCAQMD website.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,
Elyse and John

Elyse Engel
Staff Engineer
Environmental Services Business Group

CH2M HILL
1737 North First Street, Suite 300
San Jose, California 95112
Direct 408.436.4936 x37432
Fax 408.436.4829
elyse.engel@ch2m.com

[REDACTED]

From: John.Frohning@CH2M.com
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 4:29 PM
To: jbaker@aqmd.gov
Cc: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; slee@aqmd.gov; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com; tchico@aqmd.gov; CPerri@aqmd.gov
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Thanks Jillian,

We have reviewed this revised 5-year AERMET dataset for Costa Mesa. Updating the coordinate in AERMET has corrected the parameters in the SFC file to be consistent with the Costa Mesa station. We will move forward with this revised 5-year meteorological dataset for the AERMOD analysis.

Thanks for taking the time to address our comments on the initial dataset.
Have a great afternoon!

Regards,
John Frohning
Air Quality Specialist
CH2M Hill

425-292-3087
1100 112th Ave. NE
Suite 400
Bellevue, WA 98004

From: Jillian Baker [mailto:jbaker@aqmd.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 3:46 PM
To: Frohning, John/SEA
Cc: Engel, Elyse/SJC; Salamy, Jerry/SAC; Sang-Mi Lee; Beattie, Benjamin/SAC; Tom Chico; Chris Perri
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi John,

We looked into your question regarding the wind speeds and found that the wind speeds we have in our input files are in meters per second, not miles per hour.

Attached are the files you requested. Please let me know if you have further questions.

Jillian Baker, Ph.D.
South Coast AQMD
21865 Copley Drive,
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Direct: 909.396.3176

From: John.Frohning@CH2M.com [mailto:John.Frohning@CH2M.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 5:54 PM
To: Jillian Baker
Cc: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; Sang-Mi Lee; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Jillian,

I am just following up on our conversation on Tuesday (2/19) of last week and checking on the status of the revised Costa Mesa AERMET files (including the Costa Mesa raw input data for Stage 1 of AERMET).

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

John Frohning
Air Quality Specialist
CH2M Hill

425-292-3087
1100 112th Ave. NE
Suite 400
Bellevue, WA 98004

From: Jillian Baker [<mailto:jbaker@aqmd.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 8:57 AM
To: Engel, Elyse/SJC
Cc: Frohning, John/SEA; Beattie, Benjamin/SAC; Salamy, Jerry/SAC; McGregor, Keith/SAC; Tom Chico; Chris Perri; Sang-Mi Lee
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

**** WARNING **** This email contains a compressed file (e.g., ZIP), which is a file type often used to package & deliver viruses. Be VERY suspicious of ALL file attachments--ESPECIALLY if you do not know the sender. If you're in doubt about the legitimacy of this email, then DO NOT open the file attachment(s) before verifying with the sender.

Report suspicious emails to TAC, or your Regional IT Helpdesk if not supported by TAC.

File Name(s): CostaMesa_for_Consultant.zip
File Type(s): compressed/zip

The original message text is below.

+++++

Hi Elyse,

Attached are the files you requested.

Jillian Baker, Ph.D.
South Coast AQMD
21865 Copley Drive,
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Direct: 909.396.3176

From: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com [<mailto:Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 9:22 PM
To: Jillian Baker
Cc: John.Frohning@CH2M.com; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; Keith.McGregor@CH2M.com; Tom Chico; Chris Perri
Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Jillian,

Thank you for providing the revised 5-year dataset and clarification on the ozone data. To verify the responses to comments 2 through 9 below, based on our phone call last week, could you please provide the following additional data:

- Input and output files for AERMET Stage 1 through Stage 3
- Raw data used for AERMET Stage 1 processing

Please let me know if you have any questions about this additional request.

Thanks,
Elyse

From: Jillian Baker [<mailto:jbaker@aqmd.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2013 3:15 PM

To: Engel, Elyse/SJC

Cc: Frohning, John/SEA; Beattie, Benjamin/SAC; Salamy, Jerry/SAC; McGregor, Keith/SAC; Tom Chico; Chris Perri

Subject: RE: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Elyse,

I believe that I have answered all your questions on the phone last week. The only outstanding response is how the missing data in the ozone file was calculated, which is described below. I am also attaching the csta5.sfc file for your use. This file is the same file as the one which was previously provided to you, with a change in the station location, which does not affect the modeled results. You should already have the csta5.pfl file to use.

Response to #10.

As you are aware, the 3 years of met data and ozone data posted on our website was sufficient for use in non-PSD permitting projects. As indicated on our website, we request that applicants contact us for the most recent and updated met data plus ozone or NO₂ data for all PSD projects. The method used for filling-in missing ozone data for purposes of Tier 3 NO₂ modeling was updated in response to the new federal 1-hour NO₂ standard and has been used on previous PSD projects within the District. The procedure is as follows:

1 to 3 Consecutive Hours of Missing Data

1, 2, or 3 consecutive hours of missing ozone data was filled in by linear interpolation between non-missing ozone data on either side of the missing period.

More than 3 consecutive Hours of Missing Data

Ambient ozone in southern California exhibits a strong and distinct diurnal and seasonal pattern. That is, ambient ozone concentrations are highest in the spring and summer months and during the mid-day hours. Filling-in missing ozone data with the highest hourly concentration is overly and unreasonably conservative. For instance, it is unreasonable to use the peak hourly ozone concentration for the modeling period to fill-in missing hours at nighttime when ozone concentrations approach zero.

Instead, we extracted the maximum value for each hour of the day and month of the year. Thus, there were 12 sets (representing each month of the year) of 24 hourly (representing the 24 hours in the day) ozone values. In this manner, the diurnal and seasonal ambient ozone patterns are preserved. So missing ozone at 1 a.m. in December would be filled in with the maximum 1 a.m. ozone concentration for all the Decembers in the modeling period. Similarly missing ozone at 2 p.m. in July would be filled in with the maximum 2 p.m. ozone concentration for all the Julys in the modeling period.

Please let me know if you have further questions.

Jillian Baker, Ph.D.

South Coast AQMD
21865 Copley Drive,
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Direct: 909.396.3176

From: Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com [<mailto:Elyse.Engel@ch2m.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 7:49 AM

To: Jillian Baker

Cc: John.Frohning@CH2M.com; Benjamin.Beattie@CH2M.com; Jerry.Salamy@CH2M.com; Keith.McGregor@CH2M.com

Subject: Costa Mesa Meteorological Data Questions

Hi Jillian,

Thank you for your time yesterday to discuss the revised 5-year Costa Mesa meteorological dataset processed with the updated version of AERMET (version 12345). We just wanted to follow-up on our observations from comparing the revised dataset to the original 3-year dataset. As discussed, we also reviewed the revised Ozone data and had a question about the inconsistencies between the previous 3-year dataset and the new 5-year dataset. We understand that many of the questions about the differences could be accounted for by using the new version of AERSURFACE; however, they are repeated below for verification.

Please review the following questions / comments and let us know if you would like to discuss in more detail:

1. SFC Files: The revised 5-year dataset processed with version 12345 has a coordinate inconsistent with the Costa Mesa station location. The coordinate included appears to be for the Crestline station. Please verify that Stages 1 and 3 of AERMET were preprocessed with the correct station location for Costa Mesa.
2. SFC Files: The surface roughness length is not consistent between the old and new datasets. We understand this may be an artifact of using the updated version of AERSURFACE, but please confirm. Please also confirm that the correct coordinate for the Costa Mesa station was used in AERSURFACE.
3. SFC Files, Albedo: The albedo between the old and new datasets do not match for many hours. Again, this may be an artifact of using the updated version of AERSURFACE, but please confirm.
4. SFC/PFL Files, Wind Direction: It appears that the updated dataset rounded wind direction to the nearest degree. Why was AERMET version 12345 run with different raw surface data? Please note, however, that not all wind directions appear to be rounded to the nearest degree as there are some cases when there is a value after the decimal point (example: January 5, 2005, hour 4).
5. SFC/PFL Files, Wind Speed: Again, it appears that there has been some rounding to the nearest tenth of a m/sec; however, there are some cases where the wind speed differences between the old and new datasets differ by more than a tenth of a m/sec. Why was the valid raw data input into AERMET different for the new dataset?
6. Wind Speed/Wind Direction: What are the starting thresholds for both the wind speed and wind direction sensor? Based on our conversation, many of the previously identified 'calms' were now modified to a wind speed of 0.28 m/sec. Please confirm this value is the greater of the wind direction or wind speed sensor starting thresholds.
7. SFC File, Missing Data Inconsistencies: In contrast to comment 6, there are now some instances when data previously identified as valid are now considered missing/invalid (example: January 11, 2005, hours 12, 13, 14, and 15). Please confirm.
8. SFC File, Pressure: The pressure values between the old and new datasets vary greatly. Please verify the difference.
9. SFC File, Cloud Cover: The cloud cover varies greatly between the old and new datasets. Please verify the difference.
10. Ozone Data: It appears that missing data in the new dataset was filled in differently compared to the old dataset. Please provide the guidance followed to fill in the missing data and the justification to change methodologies compared to data previously obtained through the SCAQMD website.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,
Elyse and John

Elyse Engel
Staff Engineer
Environmental Services Business Group

CH2M HILL
1737 North First Street, Suite 300
San Jose, California 95112
Direct 408.436.4936 x37432
Fax 408.436.4829
elyse.engel@ch2m.com



**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
1-800-822-6228 – WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE
HUNTINGTON BEACH ENERGY PROJECT**

**Docket No. 12-AFC-02
PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 03/07/2013)**

SERVICE LIST:

APPLICANT

AES Southland, LLC
Stephen O’Kane
Jennifer Didlo
690 Studebaker Road
Long Beach, CA 90803
stephen.okane@aes.com
jennifer.didlo@aes.com

APPLICANT’S CONSULTANTS

CH2MHill
Robert Mason
Project Manager
6 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 700
Santa Ana, CA 92707
robert.mason@CH2M.com

APPLICANT’S COUNSEL

Melissa A. Foster
Stoel Rives, LLP
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1600
Sacramento, CA 95814
mafoster@stoel.com

INTERVENOR

Jason Pyle
9071 Kapaa Drive
Huntington Beach, CA 92646
jasonpyle@me.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
e-recipient@caiso.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES (Cont’d.)

California Coastal Commission
Tom Luster
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219
tluster@coastal.ca.gov

California State Parks
Huntington State Beach
Brian Ketterer
21601 Pacific Coast Highway
Huntington Beach, CA 92646
bketterer@parks.ca.gov

City of Huntington Beach
Planning & Building Department
Jane James
Scott Hess
Aaron Klemm
2000 Main Street, 3rd floor
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
jjames@surfcity-hb.org
shess@surfcity-hb.org
aaron.klemm@surfcity-hb.org

City of Huntington Beach
City Council
Cathy Fikes
Johanna Stephenson
2000 Main Street, 4th floor
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
cfikes@surfcity-hb.org
johanna.stephenson@surfcity-hb.org.

INTERESTED AGENCIES (Cont’d.)

Santa Ana Regional
Water Quality Board
Gary Stewart
3737 Main Street, Suite 500
Riverside, CA 92501-3339
gstewart@waterboards.ca.gov

Huntington Beach
Wetlands Conservancy
Jack Kirkorn, Director
21900 Pacific Coast Highway
Huntington Beach, CA 92646
jfk0480@aol.com

ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF

Felicia Miller
Project Manager
felicia.miller@energy.ca.gov

Kevin W. Bell
Staff Counsel
kevin.w.bell@energy.ca.gov

**ENERGY COMMISSION –
PUBLIC ADVISER**

Blake Roberts
Assistant Public Adviser
publicadviser@energy.ca.gov

COMMISSION DOCKET UNIT

California Energy Commission –
Docket Unit
Attn: Docket No. 12-AFC-02
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.ca.gov

*Indicates change

**OTHER ENERGY COMMISSION
PARTICIPANTS (LISTED FOR
CONVENIENCE ONLY):**

After docketing, the Docket Unit will provide a copy to the persons listed below. Do not send copies of documents to these persons unless specifically directed to do so.

ANDREW McALLISTER
Commissioner and Presiding Member

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Associate Member

Susan Cochran
Hearing Adviser

*Hazel Miranda
Adviser to Commissioner McAllister

David Hungerford
Adviser to Commissioner McAllister

Patrick Saxton
Adviser to Commissioner McAllister

Galen Lemei
Adviser to Commissioner Douglas

Jennifer Nelson
Adviser to Commissioner Douglas

Eileen Allen
Commissioners' Technical
Adviser for Facility Siting

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Judith M. Warmuth, declare that on March 14, 2013, I served and filed copies of the attached Applicant's Correspondence Related to Air Quality dated March 14, 2013. This document is accompanied by the most recent Proof of Service, which I copied from the web page for this project at:
http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/huntington_beach_energy/index.html.

The document has been sent to the other parties on the Service List above in the following manner:


(Check one)

For service to all other parties and filing with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:

- I e-mailed the document to all e-mail addresses on the Service List above and personally delivered it or deposited it in the US mail with first class postage to those parties noted above as "hard copy required"; **OR**
- Instead of e-mailing the document, I personally delivered it or deposited it in the US mail with first class postage to all of the persons on the Service List for whom a mailing address is given.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I am over the age of 18 years.

Dated: March 14, 2013



Judith M. Warmuth