

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	17-SIT-01
Project Title:	2017 Incident Reporting for Power Plant Compliance
TN #:	222393
Document Title:	SMUD Comments on Compliance Incident Reporting â€œ Letter To Interested Parties
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	SMUD
Submitter Role:	Public Agency
Submission Date:	1/29/2018 4:00:55 PM
Docketed Date:	1/29/2018

Comment Received From: Joe Schofield

Submitted On: 1/29/2018

Docket Number: 17-SIT-01

SMUD Comments on Compliance Incident Reporting “ Letter To Interested Parties

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION**

In the matter of:)	Docket No. 17-SIT-01
)	
Siting Compliance Incident Reporting)	SMUD Comments On <i>Compliance Incident Reporting – Letter To Interested Parties</i>
)	
)	
)	January 29, 2018

Comments of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District on: *Compliance Incident Reporting – Letter To Interested Parties*

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to COM-13, the compliance incident reporting condition included in new power plant permit certifications. SMUD understands that the Energy Commission recognizes a need for more timely notification of events at power plants that may impact public health and safety or operational readiness of those facilities. SMUD understands that the Energy Commission desires all jurisdictional power plants to voluntarily follow the new proposed language for compliance incident reporting.

SMUD has the following specific comments on the proposed changes to COM-13 found in the November 14, letter from Christine Root, Compliance Office Manager.

- A. SMUD notes that the initial two enumerated items at the bottom of page 1 of the letter are nearly identical, both addressing instances where there is "...activation of onsite emergency fire suppression equipment...". The first item includes the additional phrase "... or any other use of this equipment outside of routine maintenance readiness testing, or training."

Here, SMUD has two recommendations. First, the Energy Commission should eliminate the first item and retain the second. The Energy Commission does not need to be informed about use of this equipment unless there is an actual fire, and that is exactly what the second item covers. Other than an actual fire, the emergency fire suppression equipment may be activated due to a sensor fault, but these situations present no danger and no risk of significant facility outages, so should not be reported to the Energy Commission.

Second, the Energy Commission should clarify that activation of emergency fire suppression equipment refers only to the main power plant deluge/carbon dioxide emergency systems for large generator fires. An expansive definition of emergency fire suppression equipment may include activation of common wall fire extinguishers in a kitchen, break room, or yard situation, and these do not need to be reported to the Energy Commission.

- B. With respect to listed item 3, SMUD notes that chemical, gas, or hazardous materials releases are routinely reported to the Sacramento Environmental Management District (SAC EMD) within 24 hours of a spill. SAC EMD also auto reports these incidents to Cal OES (Governor's Office of Emergency Services). Both agencies will follow up directly with the respective plant manager. SMUD suggests that the power plants be allowed to submit the identical report or a link to that report at SAC EMD to fulfill this reporting requirement. In addition, SMUD suggests that the Energy Commission clarify that any emissions that are within the permit conditions of the power plant are not subject to this reporting requirement. This reporting requirement should not be thought of as an avenue to question the common, permitted operation of a power plant.
- C. With respect to listed item 4, SMUD notes that Cal/OSHA regulations require that employers must report any Serious Injury/Illness or Fatality to the nearest Cal/ OSHA District Office. SMUD suggests that the Energy Commission clarify that the reporting requirement be slightly narrowed to only require reporting for **significant** on-site injuries related to fire, materials release, or security incident. Reporting to the Energy Commission should not be required for on-site injuries that are already governed by workplace safety regulations administered by Cal/OSHA and that are not related to distinctive risk areas of concern for the Energy Commission. For example, an employee that falls from an improperly secured ladder or acquires a cut on a finger that requires an ambulance visit and some stitches is not the type of event that should trigger the Energy Commission to be notified.
- D. SMUD suggests that the new monthly status report requirement after an incident is initially reported should be significantly narrowed. Such a monthly report is only necessary for significant, ongoing incidents – a major fire or spill or mechanical failure. One way to narrow the requirement would be to include in the initial reporting (within 6-days) a requirement for the power plant owner to indicate the "status" of the incident, by indicating that it is resolved or ongoing, and/or that it is not expected to reoccur on a regular basis, etc. A minor incident that has been resolved should not need monthly reporting. Another suggestion would be that the Commission's Compliance Program Manger be required to respond to an initial 6-day report with a statement

indicating that monthly reports are not required or that monthly reports are expected to be required for a defined number of months.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment early in the rulemaking process.

/s/

JOE SCHOFIELD
Deputy General Counsel
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
P.O. Box 15830, MS B406
Sacramento, CA 95852-0830

/s/

TIMOTHY TUTT
Program Manager, State Regulatory Affairs
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
P.O. Box 15830, MS A404
Sacramento, CA 95852-0830

cc: Corporate Files (LEG 2018-0046)