#### PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY Spaulding Hydroelectric Powerhouse Data Response – December 19, 2013

PG&E Data Request No .:	SED2013-12-04			
PG&E File Name:	SHP_DR_SED20131204.doc			
Request Date:	12-04-2013		Requester DR No.:	N/A
Date Sent:	12-19-2013		Requesting Party:	SED
PG&E Contact:	Redacted		Requester:	James Cheng

We respectfully call your attention to the fact that accident reports and other information or materials that may be submitted as part of a Data Response are provided solely for the confidential use of the Commission and its staff and are not open to public inspection pursuant to General Order 66-C and Public Utilities Code section 583.

#### **QUESTION 1**

The CPUC would like to request a copy of the following information associated with the injury accident that occurred on 11/15/2013 at the Spaulding Hydroelectric Powerhouse.

Which Cal-OSHA Field office responded to the incident report?

#### ANSWER 1

The injury was reported to Cal OSHA SF District Office on 11/15/13 at 10:03pm 415-577-0100, Operator 109, "Maricela" was provided the incident information. As of this date the company has not been contacted by a field office.

#### **QUESTION 2**

What is the CAL-OSHA report number? Please provide any copies received.

#### ANSWER 2

As of this date, Cal-OSHA has not provided a report number or made contact with the Company with regard to this incident.

#### **QUESTION 3**

Were any fines were levied? Please provide any citations issued.

#### ANSWER 3

As of this date Cal-OSHA has not provided any details regarding an ongoing investigation or indication of pending citations.

Page 1

#### **QUESTION 4**

Were drugs or alcohol involved? Please provide any associated reports.

#### ANSWER 4

Drugs and alcohol were not suspected in this incident.

#### **QUESTION 5**

Was the employee current in safety training? Please provide all current Safety Training records for the employee.

## ANSWER 5

The employee is current in all required Safety Training. The employee's training record reflecting the most current Safety training is attached.

• Safety Training Record: SHP\_DR\_SED20131204\_Attch\_01.pdf

## **QUESTION 6**

Were any corrective actions taken or what corrective actions are expected to be taken to prevent this from recurring? Please send all associated work orders or changes to procedures made (current or expected; with dates).

## ANSWER 6

After the incident the following actions were taken:

- The Maintenance Manager and Supervisor for Operations and Maintenance as well as the Supervisor of Hydro Construction conducted meetings with their respective crews on 11/18/13. The following topics were discussed at the meeting:
  - Accessing the Tram and alternate use of stairway
  - Proper seat position on the Tram during operation
  - Limiting the number of passengers per bench seat to 2
  - Best seating position of Tram operator
  - Methods of securing equipment which led to installation of cargo box
  - Reviewed safe use of stairway
  - Discussion on future potential improvements such as an access road to the powerhouse
  - A review of the preliminary draft of new tram procedures

Page 2

2. A new caution sign was installed on the tram in view of all the passengers containing the following verbiage:

# CAUTION WHEN TRAM IS IN MOTION

- KEEP HANDS AND FEET INSIDE SIDE RAILS
- SECURE ALL ITEMS
- 2 EMPLOYEES PER BENCH SEAT



- 3. The Tram operating procedures have been re-written and were approved and published effective 12/13/2013. Attached are the previous and current versions:
  - Previous Procedure: SHP\_DR\_SED20131204\_Attch\_02.pdf
  - Revised Procedure: SHP\_DR\_SED20131204\_Attch\_03.pdf

## **QUESTION 7**

Why was the CPUC incident report not filed in a timely manner?

## ANSWER 7

General Order 167, Section 10.4 addresses the reporting of safety-related incidents. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of General Order 167 "Hydroelectric facilities licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission are exempt from Sections 7.0, 8.0, 10.3, 10.4 and 15.1" of the General Order. Accordingly, the reporting of the incident was not untimely under Section 10.4.

The Spaulding Hydroelectric Powerhouse incident occurred late on a Friday afternoon at the end of the work shift. Due to the seriousness of the injury, PG&E's Serious Incident Analysis standard SAFE-1004S was immediately initiated. On the following Monday morning, the responsible Director was told to notify the CPUC and attempted to report the incident on the CPUC web page. The Director reported the incident via the "power plant" link and later found out the reporting was rejected. The Director then used the "Electric" link to report the incident.

Page 3