Message

From: Russell.Worden@sce.com [Russell.Worden@sce.com]
Sent: 12/5/2012 10:02:20 PM
To: Darling, Melanie [melanie.darling@cpuc.ca.gov]
Subject: RE: SONGS OII - Follow up questions

FILED
7-02-15
04:59 PM

ALJ Darling:

My plan would then be to file the ex parte notice and limit it to my comments on these few issues.

When you get a moment, I'd be grateful if you could consider my other question -- whether you would like SCE to notice the public hearing to all customers throughout the service territory, or a regional notice to the customers in the southern end of the SCE service territory.

Thanks very much,

Russ

From: "Darling, Melanie" <melanie.darling@cpuc.ca.gov>
To: "Russell.Worden@sce.com" <Russell.Worden@sce.com>,
Date: 12/05/2012 01:55 PM
Subject: RE: SONGS OII - Follow up questions

Mr. Worden: I appreciate your scrupulous attention to the rules. To the extent your comments exceeded provision of the procedural status of any SGRP litigation (i.e., an arbitration could commence in CA in 2013) in relation to possible timing of the OII phases, and widely reported information (e.g., SCE & MHI are working together to discover what went wrong), I can see where you could find a comment or two reportable (e.g.,no internal root cause analysis has been completed, whether the MHI report provided to NRC was publicly available.)
ALJ Darling

From: Russell.Worden@sce.com [Russell.Worden@sce.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 1:17 PM
To: Darling, Melanie
Subject: RE: SONGS OII - Follow up questions

Your Honor:

I agree that the bulk of discussion was on the procedural and logistical issues surrounding the public hearing and phasing of the OII.

My recollection is that I made some observations about SCE's interface with MHI, the terms of the arbitration under the contract and SCE's expectations about recovery of damages. And, that SCE had been working closely with MHI at the SONGS site to understand what had gone wrong with the replacement steam generators. I also volunteered my understanding of what root cause analyses had been performed to date, and whether or not MHI considers part of its root

cause evaluation to be proprietary because of the FIT III software used to model the steam generator design.

I will follow your direction on this.

Russ

CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED AND/OR ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT PROTECTED

From: "Darling, Melanie" <melanie.darling@cpuc.ca.gov>
To: "Russell.Worden@sce.com" <Russell.Worden@sce.com>,
Date: 12/05/2012 12:14 PM
Subject: RE: SONGS OII - Follow up questions

Mr. Worden: I don't recall going beyond procedural matters, including broad concept of phases of testimony. Do you refer to my query about the arbitration?
ALJ Darling

From: Russell.Worden@sce.com [Russell.Worden@sce.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 10:38 AM
To: Darling, Melanie
Subject: SONGS OII - Follow up questions

ALJ Darling:

I have a couple of follow-up items in the wake of our discussion yesterday.

1. Do you want SCE to notify all customers about the upcoming Public Participation Hearing, or just customers in selected zip codes perhaps in the southern region of SCE's service territory? In the case of the windstorm hearing, we sent a postcard to customers across the region affected by the storm.

2. Upon reflection, I think I have an obligation to file an ex parte notice recounting my end of our conversation yesterday. If you feel differently, please let me know and I won't file.

3. Jim Walsh, counsel for SDG&E will call you today about his company's role in the hearing.

4. I have been working with Eric Greene about the status of the various root cause analyses, and Commission access to them. As soon as I get clarification internally, I'll forward copies to him. I hope today or before week's end.

Best,

Russ

626/ 302-4177