STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| In the Matter of: | ) | Docket No. 09-AFC-03 |
| Application For Certification | ) | |
| For the Mariposa Energy Project | ) | **STAFF'S RESPONSE TO COMMITTEE'S** |
| | ) | **REQUEST FOR MORE INFORMATION ON** |
| | ) | **PG&E GAS PIPELINE, STAFF WORKSHOP** |

## I. INTRODUCTION

On February 7, 2011, the Mariposa Energy Project (MEP) Application for Certification Committee (Committee) held a Prehearing Conference to assess the parties' readiness for an evidentiary hearing, identify areas of agreement or dispute, and discuss the remaining schedule and procedures necessary to conclude the certification process.

During the Prehearing Conference, and in their respective Prehearing Conference Statements, Energy Commission Staff and the Applicant indicated they were in substantial agreement on all topic areas and ready to proceed with evidentiary hearings. Intervenors indicated a desire to present testimony and cross-examine on additional issues, including need for the project and the safety of the existing PG&E natural gas pipeline. However, after a considerable amount of discussion, all parties were ordered to submit briefs, focusing on two issues: 1) Does the Energy Commission have jurisdiction over the existing gas pipeline?; and 2) Even if the Energy Commission does not have jurisdiction over the existing gas pipeline, should the Energy Commission Staff analyze the potential for a significant adverse impact to public safety under the California Environmental Quality Act? Staff's response to both of these questions is an unequivocal "no."

## II. ANALYSIS

### A. The California Energy Commission Does Not Have Jurisdiction Over an Existing PG&G Gas Pipeline Permitted by the CPUC.

The PG&E pipeline at issue is an existing natural pipeline, permitted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and built by PG&E in 1972. The gas pipeline referred to is Line 002. The Energy Commission did not permit this existing pipeline as it was permitted by another agency; therefore, the Energy Commission does not, nor cannot assume jurisdiction over gas pipeline Line 002.

### B. The Safety of the Existing PG&E Pipeline Could Be Subject to CEQA Analysis, But Intervenors Have Presented No Substantial Evidence Regarding This Speculative Issue.

The proposed Mariposa project would require the construction of a new 580-foot, 8-inch diameter natural gas transmission line from the point of interconnection with the existing PG&E natural gas transmission system. The new pipeline, up to the new on-site metering station, would be designed, constructed, operated, maintained, managed by PG&E in accordance with 49 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 192 and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General Order No. 112. The regulations constitute an extensive regulatory program that Staff believes is sufficient to ensure the pipeline would be in built and operated in compliance with all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards (LORS), and without significant risk to public safety. Further, in analyzing the proposed pipeline, Staff reviewed the design of the proposed new pipeline to evaluate the risk to public safety. The proposed pipeline, the interconnection to the PG&E pipeline, and the existing pipeline in the immediate vicinity of the interconnection would be located in an area that is unpopulated, with the nearest residences about 3,000 feet from the new line. Significant impacts to public safety would not be expected to occur in this setting even in the event of a complete loss of containment of the new pipeline.

Staff's analysis was limited to the new pipeline up to the point of interconnection. Recent pipeline incidents notwithstanding, Staff contends that the current existing regulatory programs applicable to natural gas transmission lines protect the public from significant risk from the new pipeline and from the existing pipeline. In the absence of evidence that such a program is insufficient to protect the public, CEQA allows a lead agency to rely on such programs.

Intervener Robert Sarvey contends that the addition of the proposed Mariposa Energy Project will result in impacts to the PG&E natural gas transmission system Line 002 from increased gas flows and potential pressure fluctuations. Furthermore, Mr. Sarvey contends that Line 002 has corrosion and pipeline wall loss identified in 2001, resulting in a reduction in allowable operating pressure and repairs by PG&E. Mr. Sarvey also asserts that the Tracy power plant's minimum gas delivery pressure is above the derated Line 002 pressures. However, Mr. Sarvey has not clarified if the corrosion was on Line 002 or the adjacent Line 401, if the repairs performed by PG&E subsequent to 2001 corrected all identified defects and restored previous operating pressures on Line 002, or if PG&E would make such repairs prior to operation of the Mariposa Facility. At the February 16, 2011, Staff Workshop, a representative from PG&E indicated that Line 002 was inspected again in 2006 as part of their integrity management program and regular inspections.

Intervenor Sarvey's claim that the downstream pipeline will be rendered unsafe by the Mariposa project is purely speculative, and does not constitute substantial evidence of a significant impact. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15384 ["Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative . . . does not constitute substantial evidence."].) Mr. Sarvey is not an expert on gas pipeline safety, and his claims are otherwise unsubstantiated. However, if one assumes that the project does have an impact on the safety of the existing PG&E gas pipeline, Staff agrees that any resulting safety hazards would properly fall within the ambit of CEQA analysis. Although Staff does not concede that this issue, raised very late in the proceeding immediately prior to the Prehearing Conference, is supported by any substantive basis, Staff has responded to the Committee's direction to look at this issue.

Staff's review indicates that the project would have no significant impact on pipeline safety. The addition of MEP, at a maximum of approximately 2,000 MMBtu/hr, should not have a significant effect on the flows and pressures of Line 002, as higher gas pressures are not necessary to supply the project. The operators of the Mariposa project design their project for a range of gas flow rates and pressures. Power plants include on-site natural gas compressors to boost delivered gas up to combustion turbine injection pressures. Discussions with PG&E indicate that the PG&E is planning to serve the Mariposa project gas demand without making any physical changes to their gas transmission system (e.g., compressors, resized piping, valves or pressure regulators). Additionally, PG&E has not indicated that the Mariposa gas demand would cause significant effects on the Line 002 gas flow rates and pressures, requiring them to operate Line 002 outside the current range of normal, safe and prescribed operating procedures. Staff does not believe that the interconnection of the Mariposa project to Line 002 would have significant impacts or effects on the operation of Line 002.

The design and operation of Line 002 consistent with applicable codes renders potential pressure fluctuations by the proposed project insignificant to the safety of the pipeline. Furthermore, Line 002 is designed for a Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (MAOP) and PG&E is required to maintain pressure below this limit. This limit is less than 80 percent of the pressure that would cause the hoop stress in the line to exceed the Specified Minimum Yield Strength of the steel pipe wall. The codes that apply to the design of Line 002 address cyclic loading through specification of pipeline steel grading and requirement for ductility of the steels that can be used. Steels used in manufacturing of pipe used for high pressure natural gas transmission must be tested to ensure both ductility and toughness and it is explicit that this testing renders cyclic loading insignificant in normal pipeline operation and allows design based on yield strength alone to insure safe operation of natural gas pipelines where pressures are maintained below the MAOP.

Staff has requested that a PG&E representative be in attendance at the Evidentiary Hearings. However at this time, there has not been a commitment by PG&E to attend.

## III. PROPOSED HEARING/WITNESS SCHEDULE

During the Prehearing Conference, Hearing Officer Celli presented the parties with a pie chart indicating the percentage of time the Intervenors indicated that they were interested in providing direct testimony, and cross-examining either the Applicant or Staff's witnesses. A tentative schedule for the first day of hearings would begin at 10:00 a.m. and extend to 10:00 p.m. or later, depending on the length of public comment. In addition to the 12-hour hearing schedule, Staff and other parties located in Sacramento would add another 3-4 hour commute time, for a 16-hour day, ending around midnight.

At the direction of the Mariposa Committee, Staff, the Applicant and Intervenors held a workshop on February 16, 2011, to identify if any issues could be resolved in order to reduce the amount of outstanding issues at the Evidentiary Hearing. In addition to the Applicant and Staff, the following Intervenors participated: Andy Wilson with CalPilots, Robert Sarvey, Rob Simpson, Edward Mainland with Sierra Club and Rajesh Dighe. Jass Singh and Mountain House Community Services District were unable to participate.

Based on the limited issues presented in the Prehearing Conference briefs, and the reduction of issues at the Staff Workshop, Staff believes it is both unreasonable and unnecessary to hold an evidentiary hearing for 12 hours or longer on any one day. The Applicant and Staff have expressed that they are in substantial agreement in all technical areas and do not plan to cross or cross extensively any of the Intervenors' witnesses. The Intervenors have proposed one land use witness, three witnesses for aviation, one witness for Alternatives and Mr. Sarvey for Air Quality, Worker Safety, Alternatives, and Socioeconomics. The areas of Need and the PG&E gas pipeline are not under the Energy Commission's jurisdiction. The remaining filings were by non-expert Intervenors in the area of environmental justice and impact to housing prices.

### A. There are no remaining issues regarding Environmental Justice.

The time management pie chart presented at the Prehearing Conference indicated that there was a request by the Intervenors for 15% of the time to be allocated to Socioeconomics, with a large portion of the time to be allocated for cross-examination of Staff on environmental justice issues. Staff has discussed this topic with the Intervenors at three workshops, and, after the workshop held on February 16, 2011, concluded that no issues of environmental justice have been articulated by the Intervenors.

In 2003, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research published an 81-page document, entitled *Environmental Justice in State Government*. In the first chapter, the document describes the historical context of environmental justice.

> Historically, many EJ communities have raised issues related to the unequal enforcement of environmental, civil rights, and public laws; differential exposure of minority and low-income populations to health risks in the home, school, neighborhood, and workplace; and, faulty assumptions by government agencies and private entities in calculating and assessing risks to minority and low-income populations. In addition, discriminatory zoning and land use practices and exclusionary policies and practices have limited the effective participation by minority and low-income residents in governmental processes and have fueled the EJ movement. (*Environmental Justice in State Government,* OPR. October , 2003, p. 1)

The Natural Resources Agency, the umbrella agency over the California Energy Commission, describes environmental justice as follows:

> The concept behind the term "environmental justice" is that all people – regardless of their race, color, nation or origin or income – are able to enjoy equally high levels of environmental protection. Environmental justice communities are commonly identified as those where residents are predominantly minorities or low-income; where residents have been excluded from the environmental policy setting or decision-making process; where they are subject to a disproportionate impact from one or more environmental hazards; and where residents experience disparate implementation of environmental regulations, requirements, practices and activities in their communities. Environmental justice efforts attempt to address the inequities of environmental protection in these communities. (*Environmental Justice in State Government,* OPR. October , 2003, Appendix)

The criteria by which Staff evaluates environmental justice is set forth in large part in EPA's 1998 Guidance on the issue, buttressed by the Council on Environmental Quality Guidance from the same period. These Guidance documents require, at a minimum, 1) a protected population within a zone of impact; 2) an impact that is "high and adverse" (i.e., "significant" in terms of CEQA); 3) that the high and adverse impact disproportionately affect minority and low income persons. (See EPA, Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's Compliance Analyses (April 1998); Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act (CEQ 1997).) None of these criteria are met in the present case: there is no impact that can reasonably described as significant after mitigation measures are applied; there is no "protected population"; there is no disproportionate effect on minority and low income persons.

The Intervenors claim the affluent, well-educated population residing in the Mountain House community meets the criteria set forth in the Executive Order and federal guidance as an environmental justice community. As explained at three workshops, Staff did the required screening and determined, based on available data which included the 2000 Census and a survey completed by the Mountain House Community Services District (the 2010 census is not yet available for California demographics), that the area around the project is not an environmental justice community. However, Staff still conducted the recommended outreach to the Mountain House community, held publicly noticed workshops, and has had considerable public participation in the process as evident by the number of Intervenors and public interest expressed in the project.

More important, Staff determined in each technical section that, with the proposed conditions of certification, the project will not create a significant, unmitigated, adverse impact; therefore, it will not create a disproportionate impact on any one segment of the community, including the Mountain House residents. Staff has discussed this issue several times at workshops, and will be present at the hearings to address the issue again if requested; however, we do not see the benefit to continue a

lengthy discussion at the evidentiary hearing considering, even if there were an EJ community involved, Staff would have handled its analysis the same. We respectfully suggest that the cross-examination for Socioeconomics be limited to 30 minutes.

### B. Issues relating to Measure D (ECAP) Have Been Adjudicated In Previous Siting Cases.

Mr. Sarvey is sponsoring Dick Schneider to testify that the project is not compatible with the East County Area Plan (ECAP) modified by Measure D. The fact is that Mr. Sarvey and Mr. Schneider both raised and testified to the same issue in two previous cases before the Commission, the East Altamont Energy Center, and the Tesla Combined Cycle project. In both cases, the Commission decided that the projects, significantly larger than the Mariposa plant, are consistent with local land use LORS, giving appropriate deference to Alameda County. Once again, although Staff will be available to answer any additional questions, we do not believe that allotting another 22% of the time to re-adjudicate an issue previously decided on by this Commission is a productive use of time. Therefore, we respectfully request the time for cross-examination for Land Use be limited to 30 minutes.

### C. Staff Objects To Mr. Sarvey's Exhibit 415.

During the Prehearing Conference, Staff asked the Committee if it should file comments prepared by David Vidaver addressing some of the previously filed Need testimony solely as an informational document, and the Committee replied that Staff should. Subsequently, on February 14, 2011, Mr. Sarvey filed rebuttal testimony to Mr. Vidaver's "opening testimony" as Exhibit 415. Mr. Vidaver did not file opening testimony and the document filed was not characterized as such. Therefore, Staff objects to Mr. Sarvey's "rebuttal testimony" and any further discussion of need.

### D. There are Limited Aviation Issues Remaining.

During Staff's Workshop, Andy Wilson of CalPilots identified concerns with air traffic patterns that would be affected by the licensed but not yet built, East Altamont power plant in conjunction with the Mariposa project. The Applicant agreed to provide additional information on the status of the East Altamont project that may alleviate all of the concerns raised by CalPilots. Therefore, Staff requests that, if this issue is resolved prior to Evidentiary Hearings, witnesses for Traffic and Transportation be excused.

### E. Staff's Proposed Condition, Haz-8 is Acceptable to Mr. Sarvey.

After reviewing Mr. Sarvey's rebuttal testimony, Staff proposed a condition of certification to prevent gas blows, **Haz-8.** At the Staff Workshop, Mr. Sarvey indicated he had no objections to Staff's proposed condition.

### F. The Applicant and Tracy Fire Will Meet and Confer.

In the technical area of Worker Safety and Fire Protection, the main concern presented is that property taxes and sales tax from the project will go to Alameda County for fire protection services and the Tracy Rural Fire Protection District may provide a majority of responses without receiving any reimbursement. The Applicant and representatives from Tracy Fire plan to meet and determine if additional funding could be provided through a mutual aid agreement or other funding means. This issue may be resolved prior to the evidentiary hearings.

### G. Mr. Sarvey Has Not Raised Any Specific Visual Impact Issues.

At the Staff Workshop, Mr. Sarvey was asked about issues he raised at the Prehearing Conference in regards to lighting. Mr. Sarvey would not address lighting and stated only that the project is an "eyesore." Thus, Staff believes Mr. Sarvey no longer has a lighting issue. At the workshop, Mr. Sarvey wanted to discuss landscaping

despite the fact that there were no landscaping issues raised at the Prehearing Conference. At the workshop, Mr. Sarvey did not specifically identify any landscaping issues except in regards to the Tracy Peaker Plant, at which many plants did not survive. Mr. Sarvey also participated in the Tracy Combined Cycle proceedings and is aware that issue was resolved. Therefore, Staff does not believe there are any outstanding Visual Resources issues, and respectfully requests that the Staff Visual Resources witness be excused from attending the Evidentiary Hearings.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Staff has responded to the questions presented by the Committee regarding PG&E's Line 002, which is beyond the first point of interconnection and is the responsibility of another agency. In reply to the Committee's order, it is Staff's expert opinion that there will not be a significant change to the gas pipeline or a risk to the public if MEP is built and operated. Mr. Sarvey, who is not a gas pipeline expert, has not provided any substantial evidence to support his claims, only speculation.

Moreover, of the few issues that were raised by Intervenors in their Prehearing Conference Statements, several of them may be resolved prior to the Evidentiary Hearings. Staff proposes the attached Evidentiary Hearing and Witness Schedule for the Committee's consideration.

DATED: February 17, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kerry A. Willis

KERRY A. WILLIS
Senior Staff Counsel

## STAFF'S PROPOSED EVIDENTIARY WITNESS SCHEDULE

| Topic Area | Witness(es)* | Issues Remaining | Estimated Time for Staff Direct | Suggested Maximum Time for Intervenor Cross-Ex of Staff Witnesses | Staff's Proposed Agenda |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Thursday, 2/24/11** |
| **Air Quality/Public Health/GHG** | Matthew Layton*, Jacquelyn Leyva, Wenjun Quian, Obed Odoemelam, Brenda Cabral, BAAQMD | | 15 minutes | 30 minutes | 10 am-12:30 pm |
| | | | | | *Lunch 12:30-1:00 pm* |
| **Socioeconomics** | Kristin Ford, Amanda Stennick*, Craig Hoffman | Impacts to Property Values | 10 minutes | 20 minutes (Jass Singh, Rajesh Dighe) | 1:30-2:00 pm |
| **Land Use** | Lisa Worrall, Amanda Stennick* | Height Limits Williamson Act | 10 minutes | 20 minutes | 2:00-3:00 pm |
| **Traffic and Transportation** | Amanda Koch, Shaelyn Strattan | Status of East Altamont | 10 minutes | 30 minutes (CalPilots) | 3:00-4:30 pm |
| | | | | | Dinner Break 4:30-5:00 |
| **Public Comment** | | | | | 5:00-7:00 |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Topic Area** | **Witness(es)*** | **Issues Remaining** | **Estimated Time for Staff Direct** | **Suggested Maximum Time for Intervenor Cross-Ex of Staff Witnesses** | **Staff's Proposed Agenda** |
| | | | | | **Friday. 2/25/11** |
| **Hazardous Materials** | Rick Tyler PG & E ** | No issues remain under the CEC's jurisdiction | 20 minutes to answer Committee questions | None | 10-10:30 am |
| **Worker Safety & Fire Protection** | Rick Tyler | Applicant and Tracy Fire will meet and confer | 5 minutes | 10 minutes | 10:30-11:00 |
| **Biological Resources** | Sara Keeler, Rick York* | Update on BA Mitigation Adjacent to Plant Noise impacts on cows | 10 minutes | 10 minutes | 11:00-11:30 |
| **Visual Resources** | David Flores* | No Identified Issues | 5 minutes | 10 minutes (Bob Sarvey) | 11:30-12:00 pm |
| **Soil and Water** | Mark Lindley | Recycled water | 10 minutes | 10 minutes (Bob Sarvey) | 12-12:30 |
| | | | | | Lunch 12:30-1:00 pm |
| **Alternatives** | Craig Hoffman | | 15 minutes | 1 hr. | 1-3:00 pm |

*Denotes Supervisor added to panel

**Representative of PG&E has been invited by Staff to answer the Committee's questions regarding Line 002, past the first point of interconnect.

# RESUME

# GERALD R. BEMIS

## Experience Summary

Over thirty years of experience in the energy field, including electric power plant facility siting, advanced electricity production technologies, regulatory compliance and modification; energy research and development; energy transportation technology and policy and analysis of regulatory issues.

## Education

B.S.; Civil Engineering (CSU Sacramento, 1969)
M. Engr; Civil/Environmental Engineering (UC Davis, 1978).

Registered Professional Civil Engineer (California).

## Experience (at California Energy Commission)

**2009-present** – Air Resources Supervisor, Systems Assessment and Facilities Siting Division. Supervise and lead the review and evaluation of power plant proposals, identify issues and resolutions; coordinate with other agencies; and prepare testimony, in the areas of:

- Air quality resources and potential impacts, and mitigation measures;
- Transmission Line Safety and Nuisance.

Coordinate with local air quality districts, the Air Resources Board (ARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA).

**2001-2009** – Developed and updated the statewide California Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions inventory, including training ARB to take over responsibility for the GHG inventory as part of Assembly Bill 32 (in 2007). Also developed a strategy to enable California's light-duty vehicle sector to do its "fair share" of emissions reductions to meet a 2050 goal of reducing statewide GHGs to a level 80 percent below 1990 levels.

**1994-2001** – Managed Fuel Resources Office. This consisted of a staff of 23 professionals who performed various activities related to fuel supply adequacy, including natural gas for power plants and petroleum for transportation.

**1991-1994** – Supervised Heavy-Duty Alternative Fuels Program. This group was responsible for the $100 million Safe School Bus Program and provided funding for several clean fuel transportation technology research and grant activities.

**1982-1991** – Supervised or performed technical analyses and support for several activities, including the Energy Technologies Status Report used to document the commercial availability of advanced technologies which were alternatives to conventional power plants during Energy Commission siting cases.

**1977-1982** – Reviewed and evaluated large thermal power plant siting proposals, coordinating with the U.S. EPA, ARB and local air quality districts.

# DAVID FLORES

## WORK EXPERIENCE

November 2009 to Present

**Planner 3-Supervisor.** California Energy Commission, Energy Facilities Siting and Protection Division.

Perform a variety of supervisory, administrative, and analytical tasks. As supervisor, I am responsible for a staff of technical specialists and consultants performing analysis in the areas of natural gas power plant and solar thermal siting, electrical transmission line corridor planning, electrical transmission line corridor planning and energy policy/planning.

September. 1998
to November 2009

**Planner 2.** California Energy Commission, Energy Facilities Siting and Protection Division.

Provide written technical analysis of proposed energy planning, conservation, transmission design, and development programs on land use, visual and traffic and transportation resources. Specific tasks include: the analysis of potential impacts; identification of suitable mitigation measures; preparation of testimony; participate in public workshops; present sworn testimony during evidentiary hearings, and propose monitoring to ensure compliance with local, state and federal environmental laws and regulations.

March 29,1988
to September 12, 1998

**Senior Planner.** County of Yolo Planning and Public Works Department

Senior Planner - Current and Advanced Planning (Resources Management and Planning)

Responsibilities included the following:

Administered the establishment of Planning schedules and timeframe completion schedules to four, associate planners; Administration and staff support to Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors; Staff support and liaison to citizen's committees. Preparation of Environmental documents (Negative Declarations, preparation of Environmental Impact Reports and Categorical Exemptions) in accordance with State and Federal Regulations.

June 1, 1976
to March 25, 1988

**Manager of Resources** Citizens Utilities Company of California

Responsibilities included the following:

Coordinated, planned and developed semi-annual and annual construction and operating and maintenance budgets for all Northern California operations. Assisted in the development of rate and fee schedules before the California Public Utilities Commission for all Northern California Operations. Directed five employees and twenty-five employees in the outlying operations. Extensive experience in specification writing, project planning and scheduling, construction management, and site supervision

## EDUCATION

California State University @ Sacramento
University of California @Davis
Major: Environmental Studies
Minor: Business Administration

# MATTHEW S. LAYTON

## Experience Summary

Twenty five years of experience in the electric power generation field, including regulatory compliance and modification; research and development; licensing of nuclear, coal-fired, peaking and combined cycle power plants; and engineering and policy analysis of regulatory issues.

## Education

B.S., Applied Mechanics, University of California, San Diego.

Registered Professional Engineer - Mechanical, California.

## Experience

**1987-present** – Senior Mechanical Engineer, Systems Assessment and Facilities Siting Division, California Energy Commission. Review and evaluate power plant proposals, identify issues and resolutions; coordinate with other agencies; and prepare testimony, in the areas of:

- Air quality resources and potential impacts, and mitigation measures;
- Public Heath; and
- Transmission Line Safety and Nuisance.

Prepared Commission demonstration project process; contributed to the Energy Technology Status, Energy Development, and Electricity Reports; Project Manager for demonstration projects; evaluated demonstration test plans, procedures, data and reports; disseminated test results; and managed research and development contracts.

**1983-1986** -- Control Systems Engineer, Bechtel Power Corporation. Managed a multi-disciplined effort to environmentally qualify client's safety related nuclear plant equipment. Performed analyses, calculations and reviews against vendor test reports, NRC guidelines and plant normal and postulated accident conditions. Initiated purchase orders for testing and formulated test objectives and test plans. Developed and implemented plant equipment maintenance and surveillance program based on test results, vendor recommendations and industry operating experiences. Trained client in environmental qualification engineering analysis and equipment maintenance program. Prepared client for NRC audits and presentation.

**1981-1983** -- Engineer, GA Technologies, Inc. Supervised design and procurement of full-scale test assembly used to evaluate design changes to operating reactor graphite core assembly. Conducted experiment to determine the relationship of graphite oxidation rate to water concentration, temperature, and helium pressure. Environmentally qualified essential and safety related nuclear power plant equipment to comply with NRC guidelines.

# AMANDA STENNICK - ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER

**Education**
B.A., Urban and Economic Geography, University of California, Davis, 1986

Ms. Stennick is an environmental planner with more than 22 years experience in land use, socioeconomic, and public policy analysis for power plants and energy infrastructure, and industrial and residential development projects in California. Ms. Stennick has extensive professional planning experience in both the public and private sectors; her expertise includes NEPA and CEQA document preparation, land use analysis and regulatory requirements for Williamson Act cancellations, assessment of land use alternatives, socioeconomic and public policy analysis, and environmental justice analysis. A partial list of projects where she has written assessments or managed the preparation of environmental documents is provided below.

## Land Use Assessment for Energy Projects

Ivanpah Solar Project (FSA/EIS)
Blythe Transmission Line (FSA/EIS)
Analysis of service district boundaries (LAFCO/San Diego County) Orange Grove Energy Project
Land use and Williamson Act analysis for Panoche Energy Center, Starwood Power Project, Pastoria Energy Facility, Hydrogen Energy California
Land use and California Coastal Act consistency analysis for Humboldt Bay Repowering City of Pittsburg Trans Bay Cable Project
LNG facility, Port of Long Beach, CA.

## Environmental Justice Analysis

2001, 2003, and 2005 Environmental Performance Report for CEC
San Francisco Energy Cogeneration Project, Morro Bay Power Plant Project, El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project

## Infrastructure Projects

Project Manager for EIR/EA for the Mammoth County Water District. Analyzed impacts resulting from lake water transfers and maintenance of in-stream flows in the Mammoth Lakes Basin; prepared land use, socioeconomics, recreation, and public services and utilities sections of EIR/EA.

Project Manager for Effluent Treatment Plant EIR for Simpson Paper Company (Humboldt County). Prepared land use, socioeconomics, recreation, public services and utilities, cumulative impacts sections, and mitigation monitoring.

Project Manager for Folsom/SAFCA Reoperation. Determined parameters of project description with respect to water modeling, project geographic boundaries, and agency jurisdictional boundaries; ensured compliance with federal, state, and local plans and policies.

Project Manager. Yolo County Powerline Ordinance. Developed land use policies and mitigation measures for placement of powerlines and substations in Yolo County.

Project Manager and principal author for Energy Component of the Public Services and Facilities Element of the Sacramento County General Plan.

## Redevelopment and Residential Projects

Project Manager: EIR for a Planned Development, General Plan Amendment, and rezone request for a 504-acre Business and Industrial Park expansion for the Port of Sacramento. Prepared work scope and budget for Public Improvements Plan and Specific Plan for an 80-acre Mixed Use/Water Related development, including a Mitigation Monitoring Plan and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the City of West Sacramento. With CDFG, developed regional approach to mitigation for project-impacted endangered species.

Project Manager : EIR for the Wildhorse Residential/Recreational Planned Development, (Davis, CA). Prepared land use, project alternatives, cumulative impacts sections; determined project alternatives based on traffic models and allowable housing densities.

## Professional and Continuing Education

California Environmental Quality Act (UC Davis, 1988)
Subdivision Map Act (UC Davis, 1989)
Fiscal Impact Analysis (UC Davis, 1991)
APA Conference (San Francisco, 1994)
Environmental Justice Conference (UC Berkeley, 1994)
California Environmental Quality Act (California Energy Commission, 1998)
Roundtable on Environmental Justice US/Mexico Border 1999
Local Agency Formation Commission - LAFCO (UC Davis, 2000) 2000
Geographic Information System – GIS (UC Davis, 2005)
Mapping Your Community: GIS and Community Analysis (Sacramento, CA, 2006)
Conservation Strategies, Easements, and the Williamson Act (Valley Springs, CA, 2008)
Tribal Energy in California; Law Seminars International (Cabazon, CA, 2009)

**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 *MARIPOSA ENERGY PROJECT* (MEP)**

***Docket No. 09-AFC-3***

***PROOF OF SERVICE***
**(Revised 2/8/2011)**

APPLICANT

Bo Buchynsky
Diamond Generating Corporation
333 South Grand Avenue, #1570
Los Angeles, California 90071
b.buchynsky@dgc-us.com

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

Doug Urry
2485 Natomas Park Dr #600
Sacramento, CA 95833-2975
Doug.Urry@CH2M.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Gregg Wheatland
Ellison, Schneider & Harris L.L.P.
2600 Capitol Avenue, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95816-5905
glw@eslawfirm.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
*E-mail Service Preferred*
e-recipient@caiso.com

INTERVENORS

Mr. Robert Sarvey
501 W. Grantline Road
Tracy, California 95376
Sarveybob@aol.com

Edward A. Mainland
Sierra Club California
1017 Bel Marin Keys Blvd.
Novato, CA 94949
emainland@comcast.net

Rob Simpson
27126 Grandview Avenue
Hayward CA. 94542
Rob@redwoodrob.com

California Pilots Association
c/o Andy Wilson
31438 Greenbrier Lane
Hayward, CA 94544
andy_psi@sbcglobal.net

Rajesh Dighe
395 W. Conejo Avenue
Mountain House, California 95391
dighe.rajesh@gmail.com

Morgan K. Groover
Development Director
Mountain House Community
Services District
230 S. Sterling Drive, Suite 100
Mountain House, CA 95391
mgroover@sjgov.org

Mr. Jass Singh
291 N. Altadena Street
Mountain House, California 95391
jass.singh2000@gmail.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

*KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Presiding Member
KLdougla@energy.state.ca.us

*JEFFREY D. BYRON
Commissioner and Associate Member
jbyron@energy.state.ca.us

Kenneth Celli
Hearing Officer
kcelli@energy.state.ca.us

*Galen Lemei
Advisor to Commissioner Douglas
*E-Mail Service preferred*
glemei@energy.state.ca.us

Kristy Chew
Advisor to Commissioner Byron
*E-Mail Service preferred*
kchew@energy.state.ca.us

Craig Hoffman
Siting Project Manager
choffman@energy.state.ca.us

Kerry Willis
Staff Counsel
kwillis@energy.state.ca.us

Jennifer Jennings
Public Adviser
*E-mail Service Preferred*
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us

*indicates change

## DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Rhea Moyer, declare that on February 18, 2011, I served and filed copies of the attached Staff's Response to Committee's Request for More Information on PG&E Gas Pipeline, Staff Workshop_. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit, are accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at:
[http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/mariposa/index.html]. 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, in the following manner:

(*Check all that Apply*)

FOR SERVICE TO ALL OTHER PARTIES:

__x__ sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list;

_____ by personal delivery;

__x__ by delivering on this date, for mailing with the United States Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to the name and address of the person served, for mailing that same day in the ordinary course of business; that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date to those addresses NOT marked "email preferred."

*AND*

FOR FILING WITH THE ENERGY COMMISSION:

__x__ sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed and emailed respectively, to the address below (*preferred method*);

*OR*

_____ depositing in the mail an original and 12 paper copies, as follows:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
Attn: Docket No. 09-AFC-3
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, that I am employed in the county where this mailing occurred, and that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the proceeding.

/s/ Rhea Moyer
_____
Rhea Moyer