DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-IEPR-12
Project Title:	Nuclear Power Plants
TN #:	204253-5
Document Title:	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Description:	Attachment to Donna Gilmore comment
Filer:	Raquel Kravitz
Organization:	Donna Gilmore
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	4/20/2015 11:48:58 AM
Docketed Date:	4/20/2015

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED
3-20-15
04:59 PM

Joint Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) to Find the 2014 SONGS Units 2 and 3 Decommissioning Cost Estimate Reasonable and Address Other Related Decommissioning Issues	Application 14-12-007 (Filed December 10, 2014)

DONNA GILMORE'S PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT

March 20, 2015

Donna Gilmore
205 La Salle
San Clemente, CA 92672
(949) 204-7794
dgilmore@cox.net
SDG&E Customer

Dorah Shuey
P. O. Box 162
Davenport, CA 95017
(831) 427-0624
dorahbee@comcast.net
Advocate for Donna Gilmore

Jean Merrigan
P.O. Box 2615
Martinez, CA 94553
(925) 957-6070
jnmwem@gmail.com
Advocate for Donna Gilmore

I. INTRODUCTION

In their Joint Application, Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric (Utilities) request that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) find the Utilities' Decommissioning Cost Estimate for SONGS Units 2 and 3 (DCE) to be reasonable; approve the Utilities' request to reduce annual contributions to their respective SONGS Units 2 & 3 Nuclear Decommissioning Trusts (NDTs) to $0.00; approve an advice letter process for (a) authorizing disbursements from the NDTs, (b) reporting recorded SONGS Units 2 & 3 decommissioning costs and forecasted costs for future intervals, and (c) reporting remaining NDT balances; and to authorize a process for the years between the Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding applications that would allow the Utilities to file an annual application seeking an after-the-fact reasonableness review for decommissioning activities completed during the previous calendar year[1].

Donna Gilmore does not believe the DCE, as currently drafted, is reasonable. She does not support the suggested advice letter process. She opposes the after-the-fact reasonableness review process suggested by the Utilities. Further, as a respondent who is grounded in the current state of NRC regulations and the limitations and characteristics of various nuclear waste storage and transportation technologies that can significantly impact costs, she has information to present that will be useful to the Commission.

[1] See pp. 1 and 2 of Application No. 14-12-007: Joint Application of SCE and SDG&E to Find the 2014 SONGS Units 2 and 3 Decommissioning Cost Estimate Reasonable and Address Other Related Decommissioning Issues (Filed December 12, 2014).

II. DONNA GILMORE RAISES ISSUES RELATED TO THE COST OF DECOMMISSIONING; HER PARTICIPATION IS RELEVANT TO THIS PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE §8326(a), and 8327

Donna Gilmore's statements regarding technical issues related to the decommissioning of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) relate to the ***cost*** of decommissioning SONGS Units 2 and 3, which includes the costs for procurement and maintenance of the storage systems and other systems. Without discussion of the reliability and lifespan of the proposed storage systems for spent nuclear fuel and other radioactive waste, the inspection and repair capability for storage systems, and other aspects of the nuclear facility decommissioning and maintenance, the CPUC will not be able to evaluate the reasonableness of the Utilities' DCE nor to determine if the Utilities may be relieved of their obligation to pay into their respective Nuclear Decommissioning Trusts. Furthermore, the inclusion of technical issues in Gilmore's response[2] is based on the legal authority of the California Public Utilities Code within the Nuclear Facility Decommissioning Act of 1985[3]. Section 8326(a) of the Nuclear Facility Decommissioning Act of 1985 (Act) states:

> Each electrical utility owning, in whole or in part, or operating a nuclear facility, located in California or elsewhere, shall provide a decommissioning cost estimate to the commission or the board for all of the following:
>
> (1) An estimate of the costs of decommissioning.

[2] Donna Gilmore's Response to Joint Application of SCE & SDG&E Re: 2014 SONGS Units 2 and 3 Decommissioning Cost Estimates and Other Related Decommissioning Issues, filed January 9, 2015

[3] Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§ 8321-8330.

(2) A description of changes in regulation, technology, and economics affecting the estimate of costs.

(3) A description of additions and deletions to nuclear facilities.

(4) Upon request of the commission or the board, other information required by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission regarding decommissioning costs.

On page 10 of their Joint Application, the Utilities have proposed that the application be designated as a “ratesetting” proceeding under the definition provided in California Public Utilities Code § 1701.1(c)(3) and the Commission has accepted this proposal. Section 8327 of the Act reads: “The commission or the board shall review, in conjunction with each proceeding of the electrical utility held for the purpose of considering changes in electrical rates or charges, the decommissioning costs estimate for the electrical utility in order to ensure that the estimate takes account of the changes in the technology and regulation of decommissioning. The review shall specifically include all costs estimates, [and] ***the basis for the cost estimates***….” (Emphasis added). Gilmore’s Response to the Utilities’ Joint Application relates to the "basis for the Utilities’ cost estimates". She has extensive knowledge regarding the San Onofre Nuclear Facility, with special knowledge of storage systems for on-site high level radioactive waste. Gilmore’s presence in this proceeding will provide information that the Commission can use to help ensure that the requirements of CPUC Code sections 8326 and 8327 are met.

The NRC values Donna Gilmore's knowledge and input regarding onsite spent nuclear fuel storage issues to such an extent that she was a panelist at the Fourth Annual Division of Spent Fuel Management Regulatory Conference, held November 19-20, 2014 at NRC headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. Gilmore’s presentation may be viewed online at

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z-pai5nu2WE. In addition, Gilmore's Question and Answer session with NRC and nuclear industry panelists demonstrates the depth of knowledge regarding issues that are important to California ratepayers. See Q&A video at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZpT_fHNnfc0

In order to meet the requirements of Sections 8326 and 8327, the CPUC must be assured that this Cost Estimate reflects all current "changes in regulation, technology, and economics". By her participation in this proceeding, Gilmore intends to aid the Commission in understanding the impact of changing regulation, technology and economics on the reasonableness of the Decommissioning Cost Estimate, so that the CPUC and the Utilities will make prudent and cost-effective decisions regarding the decommissioning of the plant.

The NRC does not evaluate costs or approve costs of systems. That is the purview of the CPUC, just as the costs of the SONGS Steam Generator Replacement Project was the purview of the CPUC. There are a number of similarities between the steam generator project and various decommissioning projects, such as the spent fuel dry storage system.

Expected Lifetime – Unsubstantiated Promises

SCE claimed the steam generators would last 40 to 60 years or longer. Unit 3 failed in 11 months; Unit 2 in less than two years, resulting in the permanent shutdown of SONGS, and billions of dollars in added costs to ratepayers, and the shortened lifespan of the reactors. The NRC cited SCE for mismanagement of this project.[4]

[4] NRC EA-13-083 San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station -- Final Significance Determination of White Findings and Notice of Violation, NRC Inspection Report 05000361/2012009 and 05000362/2012099, December 23, 2013 (ML13357A058 https://sanonofresafety.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/ml13357a058-2013-12-23nrc-unit3-songs-white-finding-letter-final-131223.pdf

If the proposed dry storage system fails before the needed useful life of the system, billions of dollars in additional ratepayer funds will be needed to replace all or part of it and to dispose of the old system. NRC's technical experts stated that once a crack initiates in a thin steel canisters (like the 51 NUHOMS canisters currently in use at SONGS and the Holtec MPC canisters SCE plans to procure), the canister could have a through-wall crack in 16 years.[5] The NRC staff stated crack initiation would not occur for at least thirty years because they assumed that it would take at least that long for the canister surface temperature to drop low enough (below 86 degrees C) for moisture to remain on the canister and dissolve the salt. However, a Diablo Canyon Holtec canister was found to have all the conditions for cracking after only two years of use.[6] It was checked for temperature and a portion of the surface was scraped for corrosive particles. Highly corrosive magnesium chloride salts from the marine environment were found and the temperature was low enough so that moisture would remain on the canister and dissolve the salts, which can trigger the corrosion and cracking process. SONGS is located in a similar marine environment and had similar metal components fail from a through-wall crack from corrosive marine salts.[7]

None of the thin steel canisters at SONGS or at any other California or U. S. nuclear power plant have been inspected for cracks, since no currently available technology can be used to

[5] NRC Summary of August 5, 2014, Public Meeting with the Nuclear Energy Institute on Chloride Induced Stress Corrosion Cracking Regulatory Issue Resolution Protocol (Page 4)
http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1425/ML14258A081.pdf
[6] Diablo Canyon: conditions for stress corrosion cracking in 2 years, D. Gilmore, October 23, 2014
https://sanonofresafety.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/diablocanyonscc-2014-10-23.pdf
[7] Chloride-Induced Stress Corrosion Cracking Tests and Example Aging Management Program, NRC, Darrell S. Dunn, August 5, 2014 http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1425/ML14258A082.pdf

perform such an inspection.[8] The NRC plans to allow up to a 75% through-wall crack in these thin canisters. However, the NRC has not required a seismic evaluation of cracked canisters. And there are numerous technological challenges to be overcome in order to inspect or monitor for cracks in the thin steel canisters and related components, such as the concrete infrastructure of the systems.[9]

The NRC plans to allow vendors five years to develop inspection technology for these thin steel canisters. We have only promises of future solutions.

The CPUC should not approve funds for non-existent technology and for unproven systems, such as the Holtec International HI- STORM Underground Maximum Capacity (UMAX) Storage System. Instead, the CPUC should direct SCE to solicit bids from vendors of other commercially available storage systems that do not rely on vendor promises of future solutions and that have proven track records for longer term storage.

No repair technology currently exists that can adequately repair loaded thin steel canisters. Dr. Kris Singh, CEO of Holtec, has stated, "It is not practical to repair a canister if it were damaged...if that canister were to develop a leak, let's be realistic; you have to find it, that crack, where it might be, and then find the means to repair it. You will have, in the face of millions of curies of radioactivity coming out of canister; we think it's not a path forward…you can easily isolate that canister in a cask that keeps it cool and basically you have provided the next confinement boundary, you're not relying on the canister. So that is the practical way to

[8] NRC Summary of August 5, 2014, Public Meeting with the Nuclear Energy Institute on Chloride Induced Stress Corrosion Cracking Regulatory Issue Resolution Protocol
http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1425/ML14258A081.pdf
[9] Available Methods for Functional Monitoring of Dry Cask Storage Systems, Xihua He, et.al, November 2014
http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1432/ML14323A067.pdf

deal with it and that's the way we advocate for our clients… A canister that develops a microscopic crack (all it takes is a microscopic crack to get the release), to precisely locate it… And then if you try to repair it (remotely by welding)…the problem with that is you create a rough surface which becomes a new creation site for corrosion down the road. ASME Sec 3. Class 1 has some very significant requirements for making repairs of Class 1 structures like the canisters, so I, as a pragmatic technical solution, I don't advocate repairing the canister."[10]

Spent Fuel Pool Removal

SCE plans to remove the spent fuel and transfer pools after fuel is unloaded, eliminating the only existing method to replace failed storage canisters. No costs are allocated to mitigate this issue. The pools should not be removed until the spent fuel is removed from the SONGS site.

No NRC License and No Confidence for Over 20 years of Storage

The NRC has not yet approved the Holtec UMAX model that SCE plans to procure. The NRC is requiring an NRC License Amendment from Holtec before approval of this system in high seismic risk areas, such as SONGS. It will be months before any approval can be issued and 30 days of public comment will be allowed. Donna Gilmore and others made public comments to both the Holtec UMAX system and the Areva NUHOMS 32PTH2 system that SCE was considering. This resulted in the NRC withdrawing both systems from approval in September 2014 and June 2014, respectively.

[10] Dr. Singh, Community Engagement Panel, October 14, 2014 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=euaFZt0YPi4

The NRC plans to only license the Holtec UMAX system for 20 years due to the lack of confidence and information to support a 40 year license. **The NRC has excluded evaluation of any aging issues or other failure mechanisms that may occur after 20 years**.[11] It is unacceptable for ratepayers to spend almost $1.3 billion for a system that even the NRC has not evaluated nor will certify for longer than 20 years. Donna Gilmore has participated in numerous NRC technical workshops where critical information not readily available to the public is shared. Therefore, her expertise will inform the CPUC decision making process.

The spent fuel must cool in the pools for a number of years, so there is time to do this right the first time. SCE has provided inadequate information to inform the CPUC process. The Decommissioning Cost Estimates lacks information regarding changes in regulation, technology, and economics that will affect the decommissioning of Units 2 and 3 at SONGS. Donna Gilmore intends to help provide this missing information.

Cost Benefit Analysis and Alternatives

California Energy Commission (CEC) policy is to expedite spent fuel out of the pools and into a dry storage system. However, given the August 26, 2014 NRC decision that recognizes the reality that spent fuel may need to stay at SONGS and all other U.S. nuclear power plants **"…beyond the licensed operating life of reactors over three timeframes: for 60 years (short-term), 100 years after the short-term scenario (long-term) and indefinitely**,"[12] dry storage system requirements have changed. The system needs to be inspectable, repairable,

[11] List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: Holtec International
Notice of Final Rule HI-STORM Underground Maximum Capacity [UMAX] Canister Storage System, Certificate of Compliance No. 1040, Federal Register Volume 80, Number 44, March 6, 2015, Pages 12073-12078
http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-06/html/2015-05238.htm

[12] NRC Approves Final Rule on Spent Fuel Storage, August 26, 2014
http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1423/ML14238A326.pdf

maintainable, monitorable, and have a life span much longer than 20 years. Replacement costs, maintenance costs and related expenses need to be addressed. The Holtec UMAX system SCE chose does not meet all those requirements. This is like buying a car that cannot be inspected, repaired or maintained and that has no warning lights if something is going wrong. Would you buy that car?

Donna Gilmore will be able to inform the CPUC on these issues in sufficient detail to enlighten them on apparent contradictory statements from SCE.

Alternative dry storage systems available in the commercial marketplace that may better meet these requirements need to be included in a cost benefit analysis. Selection should be based on the most cost effective solution and the one that best meets these new requirements.

The NRC does not proactively look for the best technology and then set standards accordingly. Instead, the NRC waits for a vendor to apply for a dry storage system license. A vendor will only apply for a license if they have a customer, because the process takes 18 to 30 months and requires millions of dollars. The customer is ultimately the CPUC, acting on behalf of the ratepayers. Therefore, it is up to the CPUC to set the requirements for how long we need the system to last in order to minimize replacement and maintenance costs and to ensure the most cost effective use of our funds; and to evaluate if adequate funds will be available in the Decommissioning Fund.

SCE has the option to sue the federal government for reimbursement of some dry storage management costs, but there is no guarantee of the amount that will be awarded or when or

even if it will be awarded.[13] In the interim, who will pay for this and does it affect the priority of where and when the decommissioning funds are spent? These issues needs to be addressed in this proceeding. The dry storage system is integral to the issue of when and how funds are allocated for the various portions of the decommissioning projects and activities and to determine the sufficiency of the decommissioning funds.

There are two main types of interim dry storage systems used in the U.S. and internationally: Thin steel welded-lid canisters (1/2" to 5/8" thick) with thick concrete overpacks that were designed for very short-term storage, and thick metal bolted-lid casks (up to 20" thick) that do not require concrete overpacks and were designed to be inspected, maintainable, repairable and allow for relocation of fuel without destroying the cask. The thick metal casks are the main type used in the rest of the world.

SCE only solicited bids from the thin steel canister vendors so we have no cost information on the thick cask system alternatives. SCE needs to solicit bids from thick metal cask vendors and include them in a cost benefit analysis so ratepayers are assured of the best available system for the new requirement of longer term storage.

No aging management was designed into the thin steel/thick concrete systems. The NRC continues to have numerous projects and meetings to identify all the potential aging management issues (of which they have found many). The NRC staff have not addressed the resolution of these issues.

[13] U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellant, 2010-5147, Appeal from the U.S. Court of Federal Claims in case no. 04-CV-109, Judge Lawrence M. Baskir, DECIDED: August 23, 2011
https://cases.justia.com/federal/appellate-courts/cafc/10-5147/10-5147-2011-08-23.pdf

The NRC is not considering looking at alternative dry storage systems that do not have these aging management issues, unless a vendor submits an application for a dry storage system license. The NRC will not have these aging issues resolved before SCE spends almost $1.3 billion on a new system. Therefore, it is up to the CPUC to ensure that the most cost effective and maintainable system that meets these new requirements is selected.

The NRC still needs to approve the system for safety. The NRC has approved site licenses for thick metal cask systems, such as the French forged steel Areva TN-40 and TN-40HT thick casks used at Prairie Island, and the German thick ductile cast iron Castor thick cask. Most U.S. utilities use the thin steel canister technology because of lower short-term costs. "Cost considerations drove the [U.S.] cask industry away from all-metal [thick] cask designs and toward [steel/]concrete designs for storage..."[14] However, requirements must now include longer term storage and effective aging management.

SCE rejected the ductile cast iron cask technology without even allowing the vendor to bid, for reasons not related to the critical functions of the casks. These casks have been in use for over 40 years. And SCE did not consider the Areva thick steel casks. Areva thick steel casks, stored in concrete reinforced buildings, were used at Fukushima and withstood a record-setting major earthquake and tsunami.

It is important that the CPUC be aware of California's options for investing in the highest quality longest lasting dry storage systems on the market, and not just trust SCE on this critical

[14] National Research Council of the National Academies (2006), Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage, National Academies Press, Washington D.C., page 63. http://bit.ly/SNFstorageNAP2006

issue. A cost benefit analysis including both types of storage systems should help inform that decision.

New and Untested Design

The SONGS steam generators were, in essence, an experimental system – never used or tested anywhere else in the world. SCE's claim that the generators would work was based on modeling and other assumptions. SCE's redesigned system resulted in the shutdown of SONGS, leaving ratepayers with a multi-billion dollar expense and two nonoperational reactors. The Steam Generator Replacement Project was a failure on the part of SCE and did not meet the CPUC requirement to provide Californians with safe, clean, and reliable energy at just and reasonable rates.

The Holtec International HI- STORM Underground Maximum Capacity (UMAX) Canister Storage System is also a new and untested design – never used anywhere in the world. The only other Holtec underground system was installed in 2008 at Humboldt Bay. The Humboldt Bay system is significantly different from the system proposed for SONGS and holds very different fuel. For example, the Humboldt Bay fuel cooled 35 years in the pools, so it does not require a dry storage cooling system with convection air vents to the environment. It also did not contain high burnup fuel,[15] which requires longer cooling times and has significant storage and transport challenges.[16]

[15] High burnup fuel is low enriched uranium that burns longer in the reactor. The NRC defines it as equal or greater than 45 gigawatt days/metric ton of uranium.

[16] NRC Spent Fuel Project Office Interim Staff Guidance - 11, Revision 3, Cladding Considerations for the Transportation and Storage of Spent Fuel http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/isg/isg-11R3.pdf

Underground systems present inspection and degradation challenges not found in above ground systems. Donna Gilmore has attended NRC workshops where experts identified numerous issues that could result in premature failure of this system. The NRC is still in the state of identifying issues, but hasn't addressed potential solutions partly due to technology limitations.

Metal Failure and No Early Warning Before a Leak

The steam generators showed accelerated premature wear that went undetected until a Unit 3 steam generator metal tube failed and leaked radiation into the environment. The steam generators were not designed with an early warning system, so operators only knew after the radiation leak.[17] Steam generators in both Unit 2 and Unit 3 reactors showed unprecedented wear in thousands of steam generator tubes.

The Holtec thin metal canisters and the current SONGS Areva NUHOMS thin metal canisters are subject to stress corrosion cracking from our coastal environment, as well as other corrosion factors. Like the SONGS steam generators, the Holtec and Areva thin metal canisters have no early warning system. There is temperature monitoring, but this does not provide information to warn of a pending leak. A radiation leak is in essence the only notification that the canister can no longer perform its function and must be replaced. Thick cask systems have an early warning system, and action can be taken to avoid the need to replace the cask. The NRC does not evaluate cost. The need to replace canisters is a cost-related issue, which brings dry storage system selection under CPUC purview.

[17] NRC Regulatory Guide 1.83, Inservice Inspection of Pressurized Water Reactor Steam Generator Tubes http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML0037/ML003740256.pdf (page 2, second column)

No License Amendment – No Independent Review

The steam generators did not have a NRC License Amendment process. Therefore, there was no independent review, no public review, and no statements made under oath.

The Holtec UMAX underground storage facility, officially called the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI), will also not have an NRC License Amendment process, even though this system is very different from the current SONGS above ground Areva NUHOMS Horizontal dry storage facility.

The NRC plans to inspect the ISFSI facility shortly before the spent fuel is loaded into the canisters. They do not plan to review the plans for this system before it is built. This has implications for the cost of the system and shows the need for CPUC oversight.

No Coastal Commission Approval

SCE submitted a permit request to the California Coastal Commission for the installation of the Holtec underground ISFSI facility. SCE's request does not meet California Coastal Act requirements, so the disposition of this issue has many uncertainties that should be addressed before CPUC approve funds for this system.

Lessons Learned?

If the steam generator multi-billion dollar boondoggle has taught us anything, it is that we cannot trust SCE to make good decisions for the ratepayer – or even themselves. It is up to the CPUC to ensure that ratepayer's financial interests are protected.

Reasonableness Review

The steam generator failures cost ratepayers and the Utilities billions of dollars, and a large amount of after-the-fact time and effort by the CPUC, NRC, ratepayer advocates, citizens,

other regulatory agencies, and federal, state and local elected officials. A reasonableness review prior to approval may well have prevented this.

Dry cask storage failures will costs billions more and, unlike the reactors, the spent nuclear fuel cannot be shut down. Ratepayers will be responsible for paying for storage for decades or longer.

There is no guarantee that the federal government will reimburse all costs. There is no guarantee that the federal government will remove the fuel from the current site in the foreseeable future.

This is a problem that won't go away, so a reasonableness review is imperative prior to approving funds for these projects. Such a review is in line with the explicit legislative intent of the Nuclear Facility Decommissioning Act[18]: "It is the intent of the Legislature in enacting this chapter to protect electric customers, from the risks of unreasonable costs associated with ownership and operation of nuclear powerplants. To that end, the commission … shall develop regulations and guidelines that promote realism in estimating costs … and provide for decommissioning cost controls."

Spent Fuel Pool Cooling System Island

The DCE contains a proposal for replacing the spent fuel pool cooling system, but adequate details on this project have not been provided to the NRC, the California Coastal Commission (CCC), the CPUC, or the public. SCE's Community Engagement Panel received a brief statement that there would be a new pool cooling system that does not rely on ocean cooling, but no significant details were provided.

[18] At Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 8323

This is a critical system where failure is not an option and it requires a reasonableness review prior to approving funds. SCE needs to provide the CPUC with sufficient information to determine if this is a cost-effective decision before ratepayer funds are invested. They need to provide independent assurances that the system is reliable and maintainable for the duration of time the pools will be needed, which is undetermined at this time. This system overlaps with the requirement to have a spent fuel pool in order to unload failed dry storage canisters. This is currently not being taken into consideration.

SCE asked the Coastal Commission for a permit waiver for this system and stated they plan to start installing it March 20, 2015 with a May 2015 implementation.[19] After public comments from Donna Gilmore and others, that waiver was not granted.

Reasonableness Review Before Approving Funds

SCE's current pattern of asking for forgiveness rather than for permission needs to stop. The CPUC must live up to its legal responsibilities to California ratepayers. The Commission must conduct a thorough reasonableness review of significant DCE projects before approving funds. The Commission must exercise strong leadership, and not rubber stamp SCE's proposals. The ratepayers cannot afford another multi-billion dollar boondoggle from SCE.

Procedural Schedule

Gilmore agrees with the timing of schedules proposed by TURN and ORA, but believes the extra time should be devoted to pursuing the reasonableness review, and not to pursuing

[19] Notice of Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver, February 26, 2015 [not approved] https://sanonofresafety.files.wordpress.com/2013/06/w10-3-2015cca-edisonwaiverreqspfi.pdf

settlement negotiations, which both TURN and ORA have suggested in their Protests. Settlement negotiations are not a substitute for ratepayer's right to a reasonableness review.

Donna Gilmore intends to participate in this proceeding by conducting discovery, participating in any workshops or site visits, preparing testimony, attending evidentiary hearings, and filing briefs.

Donna Gilmore is in the process of communicating with other parties to reach agreement about proceeding scope and will conclude that process no later than March 30, pursuant to ALJ Bushey's ruling.

Dated: March 20, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Donna Gilmore

_____

Donna Gilmore
205 La Salle
San Clemente, CA 92672
(949) 204-7794
dgilmore@cox.net

/s/ Jean Merrigan

_____

Jean Merrigan
P. O. Box 2615
Martinez, CA 94553
(925) 957-6070
jnmwem@gmail.com

/s/ Dorah Shuey

_____

Dorah Shuey
P. O. Box 162
Davenport, CA 95017
(831) 427-0624
dorahbee@comcast.net