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(1:02 p.m.)
MS. DURR: All rise.
Environmental Appeals Board of the United States Environmental Protection Agency is now in session for a status conference in re pio Pico Energy Center.

Permit Number SD 11-01, EPA PSD Appeal Numbers 12-04, 12-05, and 12-06. Honorable Judge Kathie Stein presiding.

Please turn off all cell phones, and recording devices are not allowed. Please be seated.

JUDGE STEIN: Good morning, everyone. I'm Judge Stein serving as the lead Judge in this particular matter. And with me on my left is Nivea Berrios, Senior Counsel for the Board, and Suzanne Kolikowski, another Senior Counsel for the Board.

We decided to schedule the status conference in response to a flurry of motions that we were receiving. We thought the most
productive way to proceed would be to hear from you today, followed by submissions which are due next week so the Board can try and make an informed decision as to what next steps to take.

This matter has been under active consideration by the Board. We understand this is an important matter for all parties concerned and we appreciate your flexibility for being here today.

I'd like to begin by asking everyone to introduce themselves and their clients who may be present with them. And I think we'll start here in Washington and then we will proceed to Region IX and I believe we have people on the phone from Wisconsin and California and Australia.

Following introductions, I'm going to ask to hear first from the attorneys for Pio Pico; second, from the Region/General Counsel's Office; thirdly, from Sierra Club; and, fourthly, from Mr. simpson. I don't
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believe we have anyone here from Helping Hands, but anyone can correct me if I'm wrong. And why don't we begin with Pio Pico.

MR. WEDEKING: Good morning. Thank you for Pio Pico. Do you want me to come up --

JUDGE STEIN: Why don't you just --

MR. WEDEKING: Okay. Also from Pio Pico is Dave Sandler and David Buente. MR. SANDLER: Good morning. Dave Sandler and Dave Buente from Sidley Austin.

JUDGE STEIN: Thank you. MR. DOSTER: Brian Doster from the EPA Office of General Counsel.

JUDGE STEIN: Thank you.
MS. SPALDING: Joanne Spalding, Sierra Club.

MS. WALTERS: I'm Julie Walters, Office of Regional Counsel. And to my right is Lisa Beckham from the Air Permits Office. And to my left is Gerardo Rios. He's the head
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of our Permits Office here in Region IX.
Travis Ritchie from the Sierra Club, and Roger Kohn who's also from our Air Permits Office. JUDGE STEIN: Thank you. And do we have someone on the phone in Wisconsin? Mr. Bender?

MR. BENDER: Yes, Your Honor. I'm David Bender for Sierra Club.

JUDGE STEIN: I can't hear anything. Was Mr. Bender on the phone?

MR. BENDER: Can you hear me, Your

Honor?
JUDGE STEIN: NOw I can hear you.

Yes.
MR. BENDER: Okay. David Bender for Sierra Club, Your Honor.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay. And then Mr.
Simpson?
MR. SIMPSON: Yes. I'm here. I didn't hear who was before Mr. Bender at all. I'm also a Director with Helping Hand Tools. JUDGE STEIN: Thank you. Why
don't we -- I appreciate everyone making themselves available. Why don't we proceed with Pio Pico. Why don't you make some opening remarks and then I will probably have some questions afterwards.

MS. WALTERS: Excuse me, Your Honor. I just wanted to note we cannot hear the folks that are participating by telephone.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay. You can't hear them at all?

MS. WALTERS: NO.
JUDGE STEIN: Let's try this again. Can we see if Region IX can hear Mr. Bender and also Mr. Simpson.

MR. BENDER: This is David Bender, Your Honor.

JUDGE STEIN: we can hear. Can you hear, Region IX?

MS. WALTERS: NO.
JUDGE STEIN: I'm not sure why you're unable to hear. I -- there's obviously going to be a transcript made of this
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particular proceeding. I'm happy to allow a few minutes to see if we can solve this problem technically but, if not, I'm going to proceed with the conference because I think I'm largely going to ask the parties to -let's do this. Let's see if we can't get this technical glitch fixed.

MR. SIMPSON: I can hear you and Mr. Bender perfectly.

MS. WALTERS: Also, that because we have the Office of General Counsel attorney present, who I understand --

MR. SIMPSON: I can't hear.
MS. WALTERS: -- who I think would be particularly prejudiced to the proceeding, so if we can't fix the problem, I think it could be a problem.

JUDGE STEIN: One moment.

MR. DOSTER: Your Honor, can $I$ offer just a simple practical suggestion. Region IX, can you hear me?

MS. WALTERS: Yes.
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MR. DOSTER: Okay. One thing we often do at Headquarters to solve this problem is we have -- you all -- you could call in on the speakerphone and use that as the audio but keep -- and use the video.

MS. WALTERS: Okay.
MR. BENDER: That might be a simple fix, a quick fix to the problem.

MS. WALTERS: Okay. We have a call in over here, so let's try that.
(Pause.)
JUDGE STEIN: We'll just have to
do our best. Can you hear now?
MS. WALTERS: It is muted. Hold on a second. We're going to adjust -- figure out how to get the audio so it can be --
(Pause.)
Can you hear?
JUDGE STEIN: we can hear you. Mr. Bender, can you try speaking and see if Region IX can hear you now.

MR. BENDER: Yes. This is David Bender.

MS. WALTERS: Great. We can hear you now.

JUDGE STEIN: And Mr. Simpson?
MR. SIMPSON: Yes. I can hear Mr. Bender and I believe I heard Region IX there. JUDGE STEIN: All right.

MS. WALTERS: I can hear you. Thank you.

JUDGE STEIN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Doster, for that suggestion. If people could move the phone closest to who's going to be speaking in order to assist the court reporter in transcribing.

MR. WEDEKING: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jim Wedeking for Pio Pico. As I understand the purpose of this meeting is to generally figure out what's going on with the plant; more specifically, will it still be built and, if it will, will it retain the same purpose and design as permitted by Region IX. The answer to those questions is yes.

I could take each one of these questions in just a little more detail if you'd like.

JUDGE STEIN: I'd appreciate that. MR. WEDEKING: First, I'd like to back up a little bit and briefly touch on the California Regulatory Agency --

JUDGE STEIN: If you could speak up a little bit so everybody could hear, that would be great.

MR. WEDEKING: To begin with, Pio Pico does not require CPUC's approval to construct and operate the plant. The CPUC regulates San Diego Gas \& Electric, not Pio Pico. CPUC must approve San Diego's contracts to buy power.

Pio Pico has obtained a license from the California Energy Commission and the San Diego Regional Management District that has all the licenses it needs to build and operate the plant and sell them to the California ISO as far as the state is
concerned. So the CPUC decision only deals with whether San Diego can buy the power that Pio Pico generates.

Assuming that the Board would uphold Region IX's PSD permit, Pio Pico would like to begin construction of the plant in the first quarter of 2014 . So they have a contractor, they purchased equipment, design and engineering is ongoing, and they're ready to go.

As far as the purpose and design of the plant, will it remain the same, it's still going to be constructed as a peaking plant and it's still going to use the same modern turbines. It will still require the same quick startability. It will still need to easily scale through those. It's going to be the same plant as permitted by Region IX and it's still going to provide peaking generation to San Diego Gas \& Electric.

The CPUC decision only found that San Diego Gas \& Electric would require the
peaking generation capacity in 2018 as opposed to 2014 as the PPTA originally required. The CPUC actually ordered San Diego Gas \& Electric to amend the PPTA with Pio Pico or it could start the whole request for the process over again. Pio Pico and San Diego Gas \& Electric are amending the PPTA, as ordered by the California Public Utility Commission. The only thing that changes is the delivery date. JUDGE STEIN: So you're telling me that you're in the process of amending that PPTA with San Diego?

MR. WEDEKING: That's correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE STEIN: When will that process be completed?

MR. WEDEKING: The end of this month and it should be resubmitted to the CPUC in the beginning of May. This will leave an interim period between the time that Pio Pico expects the plant to come online, which is about September 2015 -- or 2018, when the
revised PPTA should come into effect.
During those times, Pio Pico will still sell power to San Diego Gas \& Electric through a resource adequacy contract. These are short-term one-year contracts which do not require CPUC approval.

So all that's being done --
JUDGE STEIN: So let me understand this. California has said that there's no need for this plant until 2018.

MR. WEDEKING: Correct.

JUDGE STEIN: And the contract, which was relied on both by Pio Pico and by the Region in determining facts for the facility, cannot be consummated at this time --

MR. WEDEKING: I'm sorry. I didn't catch the last part.

JUDGE STEIN: The contract --
MR. WEDEKING: Yes, ma'am.
JUDGE STEIN: -- cannot be consummated in its current form but will be
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amended to provide for a start date of 2018?
MR. WEDEKING: That's correct.
JUDGE STEIN: If you're going to build this plant -- and so how is San Diego going to buy power from you now?

MR. WEDEKING: Through resource adequacy contracts. These are short-term contracts. The fact is San Diego Gas \& Electric still believes it needs the power to meet other regulatory requirements.

So what it can do is it's going to reshuffle the power it takes from other providers. It wants to reduce reliance on older less efficient power plants. It needs to take the power. And it can do so through a different form without CPUC approval.

JUDGE STEIN: And when that arrangement is consummated, are those public documents, are those private documents? What's the nature of the arrangement?

MR. WEDEKING: They're -- I believe they're still submitted to CPUC but
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they don't require a formal adversary hearing and approval process.

JUDGE STEIN: And do you have a time frame when you know when that might be in place?

MR. WEDEKING: It would come into place by the time that the plant came online, which is around september 2015, I believe.

JUDGE STEIN: So this would not be in place in the middle of this year?

MR. WEDEKING: I'm sorry. What would not be in place?

JUDGE STEIN: In other words, the arrangement to amend the PPTA is intended to occur sometime sooner?

MR. WEDEKING: Yes, ma'am.
JUDGE STEIN: But --
MR. WEDEKING: At the end of this month. Right now, there's a draft of an amended PPTA circulated among the parties. They're taking comments. They should finalize it by the end of April for submission to the
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CPUC by the beginning of May.
Now, again, nothing changes about the PPTA except for the delivery date. It's the same plant using the same design.

JUDGE STEIN: Yes. But if you were originally planning for a start date of 2018, the notion of determining that in 2013 for something five years away, presumably that might change considerably over that period of time.

MR. WEDEKING: Construction will -- right now, as planned. Construction would begin in the first quarter of 2014. It takes about 16 to 18 months to complete construction, which would put it online around June to september 2015. That's when it would be operating. Pio Pico's well aware that if the PSD permit is approved, it has 18 months to begin construction or it must reapply. JUDGE STEIN: So what you're proposing is to operate this as a merchant plant?
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MR. WEDEKING: Technically that's how it would operate, even though the power is still going to San Diego Gas \& Electric.

JUDGE STEIN: And for those of us that are less well-informed than you may be, can you tell me a little bit about what a merchant plant is and whether it needs any particular approvals?

MR. WEDEKING: A merchant plant is simply a plant that sells electricity into the wholesale power market. That means it doesn't have any particular buyer in mind. Its electricity is purchased on the stock market. The approval for these things vary from state to state. It's my understanding California's a little strange in that few states actually provide these types of long-term 20-, 25-year power purchase agreements. Most power plants that require a PSD permit are merchant plants. So if you can think back to the last PSD permit that was litigated before the Board, almost certainly it was a merchant plant.

JUDGE STEIN: Does this require a different kind of financing? I mean, I don't want to delve into the details of your financial arrangements, but does this mean that from a financial perspective there are a bunch of other things that have to happen that are contingent, or is what you're saying that this is really a pretty firm go?

MR. WEDEKING: Final change secured.

To sum it all up, the last thing that Pio Pico is waiting on are these proceedings.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay.
MR. WEDEKING: And once that is done and the PPTA is amended, they' re ready to go.

JUDGE STEIN: And do you need any additional permits from the state?

MR. WEDEKING: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE STEIN: Okay. Let me move to a different set of questions that has been
on my mind, which is that the -- and I'll pose these questions to the Region also -- but in the response to comments for this permit, the Region relied extensively on the San Diego contract as dictating the need for the plant. And the -- many of their petitioners had argued that you should have been building a combined cycle rather than a single cycle plant, and basically what we have in the current record is something which says, No, we had to build what we built because of our contract with San Diego.

Now we have a circumstance where you're telling me that, you know, that you're likely to have a contract with San Diego that will kick in in 2018. Before then, in the interim period, you're going to try to sell the power to san Diego and others. If you were writing this decision, and in order to agree with everything that Pio Pico and the Region said, then where in the administrative record would I look for support for your
arguments?
MR. WEDEKING: Well, arguments -JUDGE STEIN: Well, with respect to the BACT issue. Because what I see in that record largely -- and I'm not saying that the Board is looking on this -- is I see San Diego made us do it, San Diego made us do it, and the administrative record is replete with that.

So one question that $I$ have is whether, you know, assuming everything that you say is correct, whether or not this permit nonetheless needs, because of a change of circumstances, either the response to comments to be amended or there to be some additional process so that the record in fact reflects what you're now proposing to do as opposed to what you were proposing to do before the PUC --

MR. WEDEKING: So what I would write in the opinion, I would say something to the effect of, "Contrary to Petitioner's
arguments, Region IX could not rely on the San Diego Gas \& Electric specifications to justify the BACT determination," citing, for instance, Prairie State Generating Company as affirmed by the sierra club. I would remind them that the Applicant decides what type of source it chose to build. In this case, Pio Pico decided to build a peaking unit. Now, the Region supplied the public with lots of information about why Pio Pico chose to build a peaking unit and why it chose the specific equipment it did to satisfy that role. However, the Applicant decides to define the source the way it sees fit.

And while the Region did look at alternative processes to see if it could have a lesser-polluting process that would still allow pio Pico to fulfill its role as a peaking unit, never before -- to my knowledge, at least -- has the Region required -- my apologies -- the Board required permitting authorities to premise a PSD permit on whether
or not the Applicant complied with third party technical specifications.

In the end, Pio Pico decided to build a peaking plant. And they did that -or they seek to build that, regardless of whether it has a contract with a buyer or not. JUDGE STEIN: Well, I'm more hung up about the fact that there's a contract than I am about the wording of the response to the comments. And I'm not saying that $I$ thoroughly reviewed it, but as Sierra club argued in its motion papers, there is an extensive amount of information in this record about the 2009 request for offer in the contract.

I'm not saying we've decided that question. We haven't decided anything. But I'm asking you to help us through this. And if I recall, Prairie State, that was a redefining the source case. MR. WEDEKING: That's correct. JUDGE STEIN: This is not.
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MR. WEDEKING: No, but it does go to the very basic premise that the Applicant defines the source. That's not terribly controversial. Pio Pico decided to build a peaking plant. The Region would be -- it can functionally serve as a peaking plant with a combined cycle unit. It found that based on the technical requirements for a peaking plant, not necessarily because of the contract, but no peaking plant could use a combined cycle unit. I think that's well supported in the record.

I would be very -- I think it would have substantial ramifications if a decision was phrased in the sense that that is substantially based on whether an applicant complied with technical specifications by a third party.

JUDGE STEIN: No. I think the question for $u$ is now we're in a changing circumstances. Is the design and purpose of the plant still the design and purpose that it
was before?
MR. WEDEKING: It is exactly the same and it must still comply with San Diego Gas \& Electric's request for offer. It will still have to comply with that, just in 2018 as opposed to 2014.

JUDGE STEIN: So that wouldn't change the configuration of the plant?

MR. WEDEKING: It would not. To say it more directly, I can't --

MR. BUENTE: The response that the Company will file -- the response that the company will submit next week will document these representations with declarations so that the Board has in the record an assurance that it's not going to change. The company's not changing the nature of the parties.

JUDGE STEIN: That's very helpful. I think that's all the -- I think that's all the questions that $I$ had for Pio Pico. Did you have anything else that you wanted to leave us with? I understand that a lot is
going into the planning and development of this plant, and the Board does not lightly ask these questions. We've had a number of cases before us in the past where when a circumstance like this developed, the realistic prospect that the plant would be built went from a very high likelihood to a very low likelihood. So the nature of our questions relates to really needing an assurance of where we stand.

MR. WEDEKING: I would only leave you with the fact that $P$ io $P$ ico is ready to go. They would not look forward to a remand or a stay because they want to begin construction as soon as they're permitted to. We don't believe that a remand is necessary as there is no additional information that the Region would have to review. Everything about how the plant would be built is exactly the same.

Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE STEIN: Thank you very much.
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Why don't we hear from Region IX, Mr. Doster. I'm not sure which of you is --

MR. DOSTER: Ms. Walters.
JUDGE STEIN: Ms. Walters.
MS. WALTERS: Can you hear me okay?

JUDGE STEIN: Yes.
MS. WALTERS: Great. In terms of
the questions that the Board posed to the Region in its order, we considered those questions and provided a sort of detailed explanation of the basis for our position.

MR. SIMPSON: I'm sorry Could you --

JUDGE STEIN: It's Ms. Walters from Region IX.

MR. SIMPSON: I can't hear her.
MS. WALTERS: Let's try unhooking the phone and seeing -- and I'll move the video conference and see if you can hear me that way.

> Can you hear me now?
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MR. SIMPSON: Oh, yes.
JUDGE STEIN: You're fine in the courtroom.

MS. WALTERS: Okay. Great.
MR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.
MS. WALTERS: So in following up on the questions that the Board is interested in hearing from the Region on as described in its order, we have considered those questions and wanted to provide a sort of brief further explanation today and, if there is further briefing that the Board would request, we'd like to discuss the timing of that, considering the fact that we haven't yet seen the permittee's filing that will explain in more detail its plans and intent for the plant from this point forward.

In terms of our BACT analysis, I think this is sort of a unique case in which, as Pio Pico said, we actually had a contract in place that we could look at that provided a lot of detail about the purpose and design
of the facility that the Applicant was proposing. In most cases, we don't have a piece of paper that describes it other than the application itself.

So in reviewing the analysis and -- the analysis and application and doing our own analysis, we referenced a lot of information in the PPA and the RFO because that is -- those were the documents that were referred to in the PSD permit application that describes the purpose and design of the facility.

But our feeling is that whether or not there was such a contract or not, since the application merely describes the same information that appeared in the PPA and the RFO, and the Applicant has -- Pio Pico has said generally the entity to define the purpose of the project and associated design elements, our analysis is exactly the same, but I think the references in the record to the PPA and the RFO are a little confusing
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because those documents were referenced in the application itself.

So there's a lot of discussion of those documents, but the documents themselves were not driving our BACT analysis or ultimate determination that a combined cycle facility would not be technically feasible to meet the purpose and associated design elements that the Applicant put forth.

We had also had a discussion with the Applicant whereby it provided a brief description of the fact that the project would not be changing, the contract terms would not be changing other than dates, and that the purpose and design of the project would remain exactly the same, regardless of the CPUC's disapproval of the current PPTA.

So based on that, we didn't believe there was any reason we would need to reopen our analysis or any of the permit terms.

JUDGE STEIN: So I want to ask you
the same question that I asked counsel for Pio Pico. If I were -- or if the Board were to decide that this BACT analysis should be upheld, it's your position that despite whatever confusion there may be, there's sufficient analysis in the record that the Region would not be asking to reconsider supplementing the response to comments but would basically stand on the record that's here? If you don't have an answer to that, you can answer it next week, but --

MS. WALTERS: You know, we haven't seen the filing from the permittee but, at this point, we don't think there's any need to reopen the record, particularly because this issue was raised after the record was closed and we think that it could be addressed adequately through briefing.

The question is whether the CPUC's disapproval somehow undoes or calls into question the basis for the Region's determination. As I said earlier, the
determination was that based on the purpose and design of the project as a peaking and load-shaping facility, we haven't seen and there's no information in the record to indicate that a combined cycle unit has been used to serve as a peaking facility. We didn't receive comments that demonstrated that. And we don't believe there is a need to reopen the issue because the substance of it is not going to change.

JUDGE STEIN: Is there anything else that you want to -- I understand you have a timing question. What is it that the Region would be seeking? I know that the order currently specifies that Pio Pico and the Region are to file on the same day. What is it that you need that's not provided in the current order?

MS. WALTERS: What we discussed is that it would be helpful to see some of the documentation that Pio Pico has indicated it will be providing. We think that would be
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instructive both to the Region and to the Board in terms of our -- providing our contention about whether anything would change about the contract, whether anything would need to be reopened.

The other consideration is I'm the lead attorney on the matter. I'm supposed to report to jury duty this Monday. So what we would propose is that at our final review on April 29th, which is two weeks from the 15 th, if my jury duty service is very short, we would endeavor to file something as soon as possibly, hopefully before that date, and then we would suggest that the other parties' responses would be due a week after the week of the filing.

JUDGE STEIN: I think that that's way too long. I'm, you know, prepared to entertain some additional time for the Region, but it seems to me that given that this is a PSD permit, which the Board, as you know, endeavors to get out as promptly as possible,
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I can't envision a two-week period of time. But we will take the request under advisement and we will set out a revised schedule.

I am prepared to give you some time, but I'm just concerned about -- I want to give you sufficient time to look at it, but at the same time we want to be able to keep moving forward.

Mr. Buente, did you have a comment?

MR. BUENTE: No, Your Honor.
MR. DOSTER: Your Honor, if I could just ask, the timing issue is -- the length of time is based solely on the fact that Ms. Walters is assigned to jury duty.

JUDGE STEIN: Right.
MR. DOSTER: It is not -- she doesn't need --

MR. SIMPSON: I'm sorry. I can't hear the speaker. This is Rob Simpson.

MR. DOSTER: MY apologies, Mr. Simpson. This is Brian Doster from the Office
of General Counsel. I just wanted to add on the --

MR. SIMPSON: That's much better.
MR. DOSTER: -- the timing point of the motion. She's the lead counsel for Region IX on this case. She's not going to have the opportunity next week to review that information if she's in jury duty. We can do our best among legal offices to try to find a substitute counsel, but she's in the best position and the best understanding of the record.

It's not that we feel we need that much time to write the response if she's available, but she may not be available.

JUDGE STEIN: I see. I used to practice law in California. I'm well familiar, having served for five weeks on a jury in California, so $I$ just want to be sure that we don't end up delaying this indefinitely.

MR. DOSTER: That is not our
interest at all either. It's just a difficult situation with the uncertainty of knowing whether she's going to be available.

JUDGE STEIN: Well, Ms. Walters, will you have any information for us next week about the status that you could provide the Board? I mean, obviously, if you're going to end up serving on a long-term jury, the Agency's going to have to go forward, and the Board can obviously go forward as well, but -MS. WALTERS: I will do my best not to serve on a long jury. But right now, I'm scheduled to call in on Sunday night to find out whether I need to report on Monday, so probably by the early part of next week I'll know whether I'm done or whether I'll be continuing, what the schedule might look like. JUDGE STEIN: Okay. And why don't we proceed with the fact that Pio Pico's brief is still due on the 15 th and then we will go ahead and set a subsequent date for everyone else.

NEAL R. GROSS One more question for you, Ms. Walters. Is the Region saying that assuming the representations made in the courtroom today are followed up with declarations, that its analysis of the permit would have been the same had the PPTA and RFO not existed at the time it considered the application?

MS. WALTERS: Yes, assuming the project purpose and design was the same. We can't really speculate as to whether the project might have been different somehow or the purpose might have been different if those documents had not been in place, but we don't think that they are critical to the purpose and design. They were merely illustrative of the purpose and design.

JUDGE STEIN: Under what circumstances would the Region feel a need to reconsider or reopen this particular permit? Is there a set of circumstances that you think would require that, or you want to wait and see the documents and you can let us know the
answer to that question next week?
MS. WALTERS: Yeah. I think in general if there were some reason to believe that the purpose and design would change substantively; for example, if the permittee wanted to build a base load facility, say, instead of a peaking facility, obviously that would call into question the entire premise of the analysis that we did. But the information that's been provided to date doesn't suggest that there's any substantial difference between what was originally proposed and what will be built and operated moving forward.

JUDGE STEIN: Thank you very much, Ms. Walters. Mr. Doster, do you have anything else to add?

MR. DOSTER: One small detail. This is Brian Doster again. One detail I think -- that I think it's important to note, Your Honor, is that the PPA is not actually in the administrative record. What the Region did here is rely on the Applicant's
representation of its intentions based on the PPA. Is that correct, Ms. Walters?

MS. WALTERS: Yes.
MR. DOSTER: Confirm that. That's my understanding. So to -- you know, to the extent -- what you're focused on -- you're focused on the contract itself, but the contract is simply a piece of information. The Applicant could have stated the exact same information in his application and the Region would have treated that information and relied on it in exactly the same way. The form of the information $I$ think is not -- is not that significant here. It's the information itself that was represented in the application which was referring to the contract as the basis for that information, but it's the same information, and $I$ think that's what the Applicant and the Region has been telling you, is the information itself is not changing.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay. Thank you. I think at this point I would like to hear from
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the sierra Club and I don't know whether I'm going to be hearing from Mr. Bender or Ms. Spalding, or both.

MS. SPALDING: How about I start and Mr. Bender can chime in on what I'm sure I'll miss. Joanne spalding with the sierra Club. Just a few short points. One thing I want to point out is that the Applicant and the Region keep describing this plant as a peaking plant. It's not a peaking plant. It's a peaking and intermediate load plant that is permitted to operate over 4,000 hours in a year. The record contradicts the position that -- of both Pio Pico and the Region --

JUDGE STEIN: I'm sorry. Can you speak up a little?

MS. SPALDING: Sure. Is that better?

JUDGE STEIN: Yes.
MS. SPALDING: That -- that it's a peaking plant that would be built -- that the
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Region did not rely on the power purchase agreement and the RFO. The statement of basis and the responsive comments explicitly connect the application, the project purpose, and the PPA.

The -- the Region did not actually perform an analysis of the alternatives. It was relying on the CPUC process to do that. So I don't see how the Region could now say it need not revisit this.

Our position is that the permit should be remanded to the Region for reconsideration in light of this new information and potential changes that might occur.

The resource adequacy contracts are not the RFO. We don't know what they will say. And they are -- there's been no determination of need by any entity -- any regulatory entity at this point because neither the Region nor the CPUC -- the California Public Utilities Commission -- made
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that determination.
The --

JUDGE STEIN: And why is it that the PUC has made a determination of need?

MS. SPALDING: The PUC has made a determination that there is no need until 2018, and by 2018 things might be very different and control technology might be very different. The Region has stated that there's no evidence that a combined cycle unit could be used for this purpose. However, the combined cycle technology is evolving rapidly and the newest units on the market are made to support renewable, they're made to be -- to be load-shaping units that can -- with fast start capabilities that we believe there's adequate information in the record to show that they could satisfy --

JUDGE STEIN: Right. No, I understand the main arguments that you've raised and obviously, you know, if we go ahead and decide this permit appeal, we're going to
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get into the merits of those arguments. What I'm trying to figure out is --

MS. SPALDING: Well, and I don't mean to reiterate that, but the -- but my point is that by 2018 -- if the power is not needed until 2018, then it's premature to build a technology that's -- to rely on BACT at this point because there's no need until five years from now and --

JUDGE STEIN: But I'm assuming that what the company is saying is that during these four years, it's going to operate by selling power to others.

MS. SPALDING: But there's been no determination of need and the Region never visited that question of need or alternatives because they were relying on the California Public Utilities Commission for that determination.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay.
MS. SPALDING: And I think that's all I have to say and I would just ask if Mr.
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Bender has anything to add. Thank you.
JUDGE STEIN: Before -- I have one more question for you. What is the significance of pio Pico also being an intermediate plant?

MS. SPALDING: Well, an intermediate -- a peaking plant has -- does not operate nearly as often and so it's -- an intermediate plant can -- runs more frequently and it's -- the combined cycle technology is used for intermediate purposes all the time, and combined cycle with duct burners can operate as an intermediate load and peaking plant. So there -- so the technology -- so saying it's simply a peaking plant is a misrepresentation of what the permit actually allows.

JUDGE STEIN: Right. But I'm assuming what they're saying is since it's going to serve starting in 2018 this peaking function, that it still needs to have the capability of operating as a peaking plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. SPALDING: Right, but a peaking and intermediate plant is different than a simple cycle peaking plant that is only a peaking plant. The technological question is different.

JUDGE STEIN: Is this an issue that was raised in your motion?

MS. SPALDING: I believe we did raise this, but that would be a good question to ask Mr. Bender just to make sure. Thank you.

JUDGE STEIN: Mr. Bender.
MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor. I don't have much to add other than to reiterate that my understanding of the arguments today from the Applicant and from the Region are that everything would be exactly the same and, you know, we should effectively go back to the application, to the statement of basis, to all the public review documents, and to the response to comments. And every time there's a reference to the
specific $R F O$ and $P P A$ requirements starting next year, we should cross that out and write "peaking plant" instead. And we should also assume that peaking plant means a combustion turbine and nothing else and so nothing would change. And those are premises that sierra Club does not agree with and had the public review documents said that, the application said that, the comments would have been different and this case would have been different.

Additionally, the representations today, as I understand them, are that there will be a PPA for San Diego Gas \& Electric in 2018 and that the plant will be the same to meet that PPA. My understanding from the California Public Utilities Commission decision is that --
JUDGE STEIN: I'm sorry. I'm
having difficulty hearing you.
MR. BENDER: Can you hear me now? JUDGE STEIN: You said "my
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understanding $\qquad$ . ."

MR. BENDER: My understanding of the California Public Utilities Commission decision is that the plant is not needed until 2018, if then. Even if the PPA is revised to provide power under contract beginning in 2018, the Applicant would still have to demonstrate to the Agency -- to that California agency that it would be needed in that year, you know, and what could well happen is that it's not needed in that year either, and so we'd be in a series of applications and denials and revisions and applications and denials and revisions. And so what is actually approved for a PPA may be something very different than simply crossing out the year in which it starts.

JUDGE STEIN: So your suggestion is that this should be remanded to the Region for reconsideration and reopening of public comment period; is that Sierra Club's position as you see it now?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. BENDER: That's correct, Your Honor. That's correct, Your Honor, because both that's what we read the regulations and the precedents for support, but also because Sierra Club's comments and presumably the comments of the other Petitioners in this case would have been different if the project purpose and the application had contained what's being described now as kind of "We'll sell it to the market without a contract for a few years and then try to get a new contract approved in the future" or whatever finally evolves and might be approved by the California Public Utilities Commission.

The comments would have been different and the arguments in this case would have been different.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay. Thank you very much. I'd like to hear from Mr. Simpson at this point.

MR. SIMPSON: Thank you. Well. from what I'm hearing, Pio Pico is scrambling
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trying to figure out what their next plant is going to be. They say, well, maybe it's going to be a merchant plant and they say they've bought some equipment, maybe a resource adequacy contract. I didn't see any of that on the record for this -- for this action or I would have commented on it.

The Region points out that it was confusing their reliance on the PPA and, yes, it was confusing and it sort of derailed this process. The response to comments on page 73 in my -- in response to my comments about the lack of need for this facility, the EPA points out, "The EPA has not conducted a detailed need analysis for the CPUC. Available information in the record for EPA permit decisions indicates that there is in fact need for the project. In Section 7.13 of the facts sheet, the Applicant has a 20 -year power purchase agreement with San Diego Gas \& Electric. The purpose of this project is to meet the specific objectives of SDG\&E's 2009
request for offers."
Now, it's true that maybe sometime in the future, San Diego's gonna need some more electricity from these old-style plants. But to saddle San Diego with this plant now when there is no demonstrated need when the EPA told me they relied on -- there is in fact need kind of has made a process that I as a member of the public can't keep up with. I can't figure out why we would be saddled with what's not even that technology for today on the hopes that this facility can get some agreement to sell its products sometime in the future just so, in addition to the BACT analysis for today's peaking facilities -there's peaking facilities that are combined cycle. They just wrote their projects or it wouldn't -- it wouldn't appear that that worked for this one. It worked for other ones. So it doesn't make sense that this couldn't be a more efficient facility.

So part of my concern with this
process, too, is if we're -- if -- by going through this process, we're extending that permit.

JUDGE STEIN: I didn't hear the last sentence.

MR. SIMPSON: By going through this appeal process, are we extending that permit? Does that permit -- does that 18 months for this permit to start happen from when the permit was issued or from when we're finished with this action?

JUDGE STEIN: The 18 -month period begins to run, it's my understanding, is once the permit is final. So it's after the Board rules. So the 18 -month period doesn't begin -- let's -- if hypothetically the Board were to affirm the permit, the 18 -month period I believe, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Doster, would run from then or whenever the Federal Register -- whenever the applicable notification takes place after the Board ruling. But the 18 -month period is not
running now.
MR. SIMPSON: That's my understanding. And -- well, I suppose that can't be avoided, but to delay this process while the Applicant tries to figure out what their next move is, $I$ just see it as a smokescreen.

JUDGE STEIN: So what is it that you're asking the Board to do then? I mean, the question the Board is trying to figure out is whether it's gonna go ahead and decide the appeal based on what we have before us or whether the Board is going to take some additional action to ship this back to the Region for some further analysis.

Are you suggesting you're opposed to a delay in the Board ruling on the current appeal? The Sierra Club seems to be asking us --

MR. SIMPSON: Yes. I would not like to -- pardon?

JUDGE STEIN: Sierra Club I
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believe has asked us to ship this back to the Region for reconsideration and reopening of the comment period. Are you suggesting that you want the Board to go ahead and decide this based on the present record?

MR. SIMPSON: I'm saying that it should be remanded today and not a year from now and I'm saying that the Board should understand that nobody's built a merchant plant in California in the last 15 years. So the likelihood of somebody building a merchant plant now is -- it's just not gonna happen. They're just -- they're just grasping at straws.

So while we commented on what the Region told us this permit was about, we haven't had a chance to comment on -- we don't really know what it's about now. Until the Applicant tells us what their real plan is, none of us really know what positions we have. So I think the Board can remand this expeditiously and save everyone a lot of time.
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Thank you.
JUDGE STEIN: Okay. Thank you very much. At this point, I would like to hear if there are any final comments from Pio Pico.

MR. WEDEKING: Just a few brief points, Your Honor. The comments by sierra Club and Mr . Simpson, they appear to request a remand to look at need again. And we've heard a lot of characterizations about what the CPUC decided.

I'd just like to point your attention to page 18 of the CPUC's decision, the bottom paragraph. "For all these reasons, we direct San Diego Gas \& Electric to procure up to 298 megawatts of local capacity to come online beginning in 2018." So, therefore, the fact that it needs additional capacity by 2018 is not in question.

He continues further, "As discussed previously, San Diego Gas \& Electric may seek to meet this need using either the

Quail Brush Energy Project or the Pio Pico Energy Center if the proposed PPTAs are amended to correspond to the identified unit." So it seems to be pretty clear that the CPUC has determined that the need is there, just at a different year.

Now, this takes me to the second point. Never has a facility been required to demonstrate the need for its product in order to get a PSD permit. This would be a very strange conversation if Pio Pico were proposing a chemical plant and, therefore, there would need to be some discussion of whether a certain industry needed those chemicals. Need has always been for PSD purposes a business decision. If the applicant says we would like to build a peaking plant or it says we would like a build a base load plant and if there are state regulatory agencies that examine that, then they're the ones who examine that. Remanding for need is not necessary in this case and
we' 11 be happy to supply the documentation required to show exactly what San Diego Gas \& Electric and Pio Pico intend to do from here on out.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay. Now, as I understand the need question, I see it tied in with this question of alternatives which is central to some of the issues that have been raised in the appeal. And I guess one of the questions that ultimately may come to play is if the PPTA and RFO had not specified what they specified, would combined cycle have been considered? And, you know, that's obviously an issue that's been raised in this appeal. We're going to need to look at that question.

MR. WEDEKING: I'm not sure -- I'm not sure if the plant would be built if san Diego Gas \& Electric hadn't requested a peaking plant. I'm not sure how they would have decided to spend their money anyway -otherwise. I think remand -- sierra club claims that its comments would be different
now that the PPTA will be amended. The fact that their comments in front of the Region was, You must use a combined cycle plant. If this were remanded, their comments will be, You must use a combined cycle plant. The analysis would be exactly the same by the Region. There's no new information to renew here. They -- I don't doubt that they would phrase things differently, but that's what the debate is all about. Can you use a combined cycle turbine for peaking? Nothing has changed in the interim. You can't according to the Region IX's analysis. And unless there's some ground-shaking new technological developments between then and now, the analysis will be exactly the same.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay.
MR. WEDEKING: Thank you.
JUDGE STEIN: Let me just confer with my colleagues for a moment.
(Pause.)
Okay. Any final comments from

General Counsel's Office in Region IX?
MS. WALTERS: This is Julie Walters in Region IX. I just had a couple of points that I wanted to make to follow up on some of the statements that were made.

In terms of the need issue that the counsel for Pio Pico described, I did want to clarify that contrary to some of the statements made by counsel for the sierra Club, Region IX specifically determined it would not decide the need for the project. I think there was a statement that we relied on the CPUC for a needs determination. However, we did not do so. We typically don't make those determinations, given the complexity of the market and the regulatory regime in California. We did not do so here and we don't believe it's necessary to do so in order to resolve the appeal of this PSD permit. And with respect to the argument that comments would have been different if the project were described as a peaking or
intermediate unit versus referencing the PPA and RFO, we strongly disagree with that. We believe the information in the record and the application make clear that the nature of the unit that was being proposed was a peaking and load-shaping unit and the analysis was based primarily on the need to ramp up and ramp down various amounts of energy quickly, come online from a cold start quickly, turn off quickly, and really respond to the renewable energy market and the fact that there would be these needs that would come and go very quickly. And we think that was very clear from the record and the response to the comments, and so we agree with counsel for Pio Pico that the nature of the comments that could have been made originally wouldn't change now based on the fact that the PPA may be changed in terms of the ultimate state when SDG\&E would be expecting electricity from Pio Pico under its contract.

$$
\text { The last point that } I \text { wanted to }
$$

make is there's been a lot of discussion of the fact that the revised agreement would not go into effect until 2018 and the Region is not -- did not base its analysis on the dates in which power would be requested by SDG\&E. We looked at the nature of the facility that was being proposed. And we're not aware of any requirement in PSD that a plant operate within a particular period of time. There is a deadline for construction of the plant and completion of construction in $5321-\mathrm{R}$ of 40 C.F.R. Part 52, but there's been a lot of discussion of when will the plant operate and will that still be -- you know, would the same BACT analysis have been made at that time. And I think the PSD program is set up so that construction needs to begin within a certain time frame and then operations will follow. We've never focused on the date when the facility will start operating per se. And I think it's very difficult to do that. Plants may have different needs and things that are
tied to the construction date that are pretty speculative to, I think, get into that type of detail when making a PSD determination. And we did not look at that at all in making our determination here.

JUDGE STEIN: If the PPTA/RFO had not sort of described -- I don't know whether "described" is the right word -- but if the original BACT analysis wasn't in some way constrained or relied on that, would combined cycle have been considered in a different way? MS. WALTERS: No, it would not. When we looked beyond the contract documents, we said, What is the purpose of this project? What are the design elements that are necessary to meet that purpose? This is a peaking facility with some load-shaping and they want to have the flexibility to turn the unit on and off as needed very quickly and we haven't seen evidence that a combined cycle can meet that need. It can't be designed to offer the same type of flexibility that these
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peaking units can, and that's why we ultimately decided that that was not technically feasible. We didn't think it was appropriate for the Region to try to redefine the source and tell the Applicant it needed to serve a different purpose that might be -- you know, have reduced emissions in some other way but wouldn't really satisfy the purpose that the Applicant was proposing to meet.

JUDGE STEIN: Thank you. Any other comments? Mr. Doster?

MR. DOSTER: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE STEIN: Sierra Club, any further comments?

MS. SPALDING: Your Honor, I will defer to Mr. Bender. I just would like to say that with regard to the comment about need and reliance on the CPUC, we really think that might be a question of how we characterize what the response to comments say and we will address that in our written document.

JUDGE STEIN: Mr. Bender, any
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final comments?
MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor. I think just to reiterate, you know, we do not agree that combined cycle cannot serve a peaking and intermediate load purpose, and the response to comments was that a combined cycle plant would be too large for this PPA or -- and/or would not ramp up and ramp down at the specific time -- 10-minute, 30-minute time increments that this PPA requires.

You know, we fundamentally disagree that everything would have been the same in the background documents, the comments, and the response to comments, if the Region had said peaking and intermediate load plant rather than specifying this specific technology called for by this specific power purchase agreement.

JUDGE STEIN: Thank you. Mr.
Simpson, any final comments?
MR. SIMPSON: Sure. Just briefly.

Thank you. This facility is adjoining another facility that serves the same function and --

JUDGE STEIN: Can you please speak up? I'm having trouble hearing you.

MR. SIMPSON: Oh, sure. I'm sorry. This facility that sits right on the border of Mexico is adjoining another facility that serves the exact same purpose but barely functions. This would just be an addition -it's not -- the Region is trying to say it's designed to meet some need but it's a manufactured need. So what that means is if it gets built, they're gonna try and get it into play. They're gonna try and use it for whatever scenario comes up which, without definition of what scenario's coming up, we don't know if this is a facility that's needed. We're pretty clear that it's not. But with this nebulous it shows some need if that need happens to meet this exact contract doesn't -- doesn't satisfy the damage -- to offset the damage it will do to the
environment.

I think that it -- trying to backload this thing is putting the cart before the horse, that we need to -- we need to see whether EPA wants to do it or is going to rely on the state to do it, somebody needs to say, This is what's needed, so let's build this. Not let's build this and put it into whatever need happens to come up just because we happen to have a PSD permit.

Thank you.

JUDGE STEIN: All right. I want to thank everybody for their time today. I think the way I want to proceed is that the -Pio Pico, can your brief come in on the 15 th? Are you able to do that, or do you need a little more time in light of this to get your brief in?

MR. WEDEKING: I think the 15th will be fine, Your Honor.

JUDGE STEIN: Okay. Why don't you get your brief in the 15th. I will take under
advisement the Region's request that it have two weeks. I will give you at least a week. But $I$ would like to wait and hear from the Region early next week after Ms. Walters figures out the jury duty situation in California, whether I will give you up to two or not, but you'll have at least a week. And then $I$ will allow for reply briefs sometime after that.

We'll issue a scheduling order next week but, in the meantime, I don't think I'm going to issue anything until such time as I've got further information about the Region's time frame.

MR. DOSTER: Your Honor, would it be helpful if we submitted a status report or something on Monday?

JUDGE STEIN: That would be helpful. I unfortunately have had a personal experience in California which was most unfortunate, having spent -- having arrived to a new job and spent five weeks on jury duty,
and I have carried that with me since 1981 , but I know it can be quite unpredictable and I think a short period of time is fine, but I don't want to extend this too long.

Thank you, everybody, for your time. I greatly appreciate it and I appreciate also the presence of the various clients of the Region and of the company to let us know your views here. Thank you.
(Whereupon, the conference was concluded at 2:11 p.m.)
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