

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	16-IEPR-02
<b>Project Title:</b>	Natural Gas
<b>TN #:</b>	211484
<b>Document Title:</b>	Gene Nelson, Ph.D. Comments: Toxic Heavy Metal Contamination Appears to be Connected to ACSF Natural Gas Leak
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Gene Nelson, Ph.D.
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	5/15/2016 1:24:51 AM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	5/16/2016

*Comment Received From: Gene Nelson, Ph.D.*

*Submitted On: 5/15/2016*

*Docket Number: 16-IEPR-02*

## **Toxic Heavy Metal Contamination Appears to be Connected to ACSF Natural Gas Leak**

Attached find some news updates regarding so-called "Clean Natural Gas" stored at the Aliso Canyon Storage Facility (ACSF). SB 380, tightening ACSF operations was signed into law by Governor Brown on 10 May 2016. In a breaking news story on 14 May 2016, toxic heavy metal contaminants have been found in homes near ACSF well "Standard-Sesnon 25."

There is also concern about potential rolling blackouts in the Los Angeles area this summer as a consequence of the unavailability of natural gas from ACSF. If a vocal minority had not succeeded in shutting down San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) in early 2012, it is unlikely that these rolling blackouts would occur since SONGS was generating roughly the equivalent of 3.5 Hoover Dams electric power for southern California annually before its premature closure. The defective replacement steam generators at SONGS could have been repaired for far less cost than the costs associated with its premature closure - and it is likely that insurance policies would have defrayed some of those costs.

As a consequence of improper ex-parte communications between Southern California Edison (and Sempra) officials and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), the case determining the apportioning the multi-billion dollar costs related to the premature SONGS closure was reopened by the CPUC on Monday, 9 May 2016.

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*



## Study Finds Toxic Metals In Homes Near Aliso Canyon Gas Leak

May 14, 2016 12:42 PM

<http://losangeles.cbslocal.com/2016/05/14/study-finds-toxic-metals-in-homes-near-aliso-canyon-gas-leak/>

Filed Under: [Aliso Canyon](#), [Gas Leak](#), [Porter Ranch](#), [SoCal Gas](#)



(credit: CBS)

**LOS ANGELES (AP)** — Homes located near a gas well blowout that spewed the nation's largest-known release of methane had higher levels of toxic metals that could have caused symptoms residents of surrounding communities say they have suffered from for months, public health officials said.

**Tests found barium, manganese and vanadium more frequently and in higher concentrations in dust in homes located near the Aliso Canyon [gas](#) storage facility, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health said Friday.**

The contaminants could be responsible for eye, nose, throat and skin irritation, but are not expected to cause long-term problems, the report said.

Some 8,000 families moved out of their San Fernando Valley homes after the gas well blowout in October, with many people complaining of persistent headaches, nausea and nosebleeds. Even after Southern California Gas Co. permanently sealed the well nearly four months later, a survey found a majority of homes continued to report health problems.

Health officials initially attributed symptoms to the stinky odorant added to make the gas detectable, but ailments such as rashes and bloody noses were not known to be caused by that chemical.

“It’s really interesting to see all these metals come out to confirm there’s probably more than one reason people have become sick,” said Alexandra Nagy, an environmental activist who wants the facility shut down.

The unusual patterns of metals found appear to have come from the well where gas is stored in a vacant oil field deep underground, said Michael Jerrett, chairman of the Environmental Health Sciences Department at the University of California, Los Angeles.

**Some of the metals are trace elements of oil, and barium was an ingredient in the muddy brine used in unsuccessful attempts to plug the high-pressure leak, said Jerrett, who performed environmental testing in Porter Ranch homes.**

During attempts to plug the well, an oily mist was sprayed into the air and [residents](#) received robocalls telling them to stay inside.

“In a sense, we have a fingerprint that there was something that intruded into a large portion of houses related to hydrocarbons,” Jerrett said, though he couldn’t say for sure that the well was the source. “Barium would be the most direct link to the well leak itself.”

Health officials suggested residents take several measures to thoroughly clean and ventilate homes.

SoCalGas, which expects the leak to cost \$665 million, mostly for relocation costs, said the report showed it’s safe to return [home](#). Thousands of families remain uprooted.

“It is time for the residents who chose to remain relocated to exit the relocation program, and for the community as a whole to return to normal,” the company said in a statement.

Jerrett said he's going to recommend that several homes where elevated levels of cancer-causing benzene and hexane, a neurotoxin, be tested further.

The report said it's possible other contaminants are present in homes and ambient air, noting that the facility is the single-largest emitter of formaldehyde in the region.

It also said methane levels continue to be higher than expected and could be coming from another source.

*(© Copyright 2016 The Associated Press. All Rights Reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.)*

---

<http://www.latimes.com/nation/sns-bc-us-california-gas-leak-20160514-story.html>

## Los Angeles Times

### Study finds toxic metals in Los Angeles homes near gas leak

**BRIAN MELLEY** Associated Press

Homes located near a gas well blowout that spewed the nation's largest-known release of methane had higher levels of toxic metals that could have caused symptoms Los Angeles residents have suffered from for months, public health officials said.

Tests found barium, manganese and vanadium more frequently and in higher concentrations in dust in homes located near the Aliso Canyon gas storage facility, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health said Friday.

The contaminants could be responsible for eye, nose, throat and skin irritation, but are not expected to cause long-term problems, the report said.

Some 8,000 families moved out of their San Fernando Valley homes after the gas well blowout in October, with many people complaining of persistent headaches, nausea and nosebleeds. Even after Southern California Gas Co. permanently sealed the well nearly four months later, a survey found a majority of homes continued to report health problems.

Health officials initially attributed symptoms to the stinky odorant added to make the gas detectable, but ailments such as rashes and bloody noses were not known to be caused by that chemical.

"It's really interesting to see all these metals come out to confirm there's probably more than one reason people have become sick," said Alexandra Nagy, an environmental activist who wants the facility shut down.

The unusual patterns of metals found appear to have come from the well where gas is stored in a vacant oil field deep underground, said Michael Jerrett, chairman of the Environmental Health Sciences Department at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Some of the metals are trace elements of oil, and barium was an ingredient in the muddy brine used in unsuccessful attempts to plug the high-pressure leak, said Jerrett, who performed environmental testing in Porter Ranch homes.

During attempts to plug the well, an oily mist was sprayed into the air and residents received robocalls telling them to stay inside.

"In a sense, we have a fingerprint that there was something that intruded into a large portion of houses related to hydrocarbons," Jerrett said, though he couldn't say for sure that the well was the source. "Barium would be the most direct link to the well leak itself."

Health officials suggested residents take several measures to thoroughly clean and ventilate homes.

SoCalGas, which expects the leak to cost \$665 million, mostly for relocation costs, said the report showed it's safe to return home. Thousands of families remain uprooted.

"It is time for the residents who chose to remain relocated to exit the relocation program, and for the community as a whole to return to normal," the company said in a statement.

Jerrett said he's going to recommend that several homes where elevated levels of cancer-causing benzene and hexane, a neurotoxin, be tested further.

The report said it's possible other contaminants are present in homes and ambient air, noting that the facility is the single-largest emitter of formaldehyde in the region.

It also said methane levels continue to be higher than expected and could be coming from another source.

Copyright 2016 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

## Aliso Canyon bill to temporarily ban gas injections passes hurdle in Sacramento



Crews from SoCalGas and outside experts work on a relief well at the Aliso Canyon facility above Porter Ranch. (Photo by Dean Musgrove/Los Angeles Daily News)

By [Mike Reicher](#), Los Angeles Daily News

Posted: 04/28/16, 2:33 PM PDT | Updated: 2 weeks, 2 days ago

<http://www.dailynews.com/government-and-politics/20160428/aliso-canyon-bill-to-temporarily-ban-gas-injections-passes-hurdle-in-sacramento>

### [0 Comments](#)

The state Assembly on Thursday passed a bill that would temporarily ban injecting gas at the Aliso Canyon storage facility, essentially making law out of an existing prohibition.

[Senate Bill 380](#), authored by Senator Fran Pavely, D-Agoura Hills, passed by a vote of 68-1. It now heads back to the Senate for final approval.

Lawmakers have been pushing for tighter regulation of underground natural gas storage facilities, after Aliso Canyon leaked nearly 100,000 metric tons of methane, a potent climate-warming gas, and displaced thousands of families. Thursday's vote comes as a bevy of legislation, rules and regulations are considered throughout Sacramento.

The governor issued an executive order in January prohibiting Aliso Canyon gas injections until Southern California Gas Co. thoroughly tests its wells for corrosion and leaks. **Seven of the 114 Aliso Canyon wells have been taken out of operation**, and one passed all of the required tests, according to the Department of Conservation [website](#). Before any injections can resume, each well must either be temporarily plugged or pass a series of tests.

Pavley's bill basically codifies those requirements and adds another layer of scrutiny: By July 1, 2017, the state has to begin considering whether it should shut down Aliso Canyon. From the hills above Porter Ranch, the facility supplies gas to millions of homes and about 17 power plants, especially [during summer and winter months](#).

Sacramento is awash in natural gas storage legislation and regulation efforts. Another bill introduced by Pavley, [SB 887](#), would provide minimum standards for the inspection, monitoring, and testing of gas storage wells. While that bill is working through committees, the Department of Conservation has enacted emergency regulations that require stricter testing and oversight at the state's 14 underground gas storage reservoirs. It plans to make many of those rules permanent. The department now requires daily pressure monitoring of the wells, for instance.

"If we had had this requirement before, we likely would have detected the leak at Aliso Canyon sooner," Jason Marshall, the department's chief deputy director, told a Senate panel earlier this week.

Regulators at that hearing said that SoCalGas was subjecting its wells at Playa del Rey to the same rigorous tests as those required at Aliso Canyon. Already, the company has detected two minor leaks in Playa del Rey.

**Also, the gas company is converting its Aliso Canyon and Playa del Rey facilities to inject and withdraw gas from just the inner tube of the wells, instead of both the inner and outer tubes, according to SoCal Gas vice president for transportation and storage Rodger Schwecke.** He told lawmakers that using the inner tubing only is safer. The well that ruptured at Aliso Canyon, SS-25, was injecting and withdrawing gas through both spaces.

---



<http://www.signalscv.com/section/36/article/151948/>

## **Pavley/Wilk Aliso Canyon moratorium bill signed by Governor Brown**

1 Comments

Source: Assemblyman Scott Wilk's office

Posted: May 10, 2016 5:35 p.m.  
Updated: May 10, 2016 5:35 p.m.



Assemblyman Scott Wilk, R-Santa Clarita

**SACRAMENTO** –Today, Governor Jerry Brown signed into law Senator Fran Pavley's, D-Agoura Hills, Senate Bill 380, of which Assemblyman Scott Wilk, R-Santa Clarita, is a coauthor.

SB 380 provides a moratorium on new natural gas injections at the Aliso Canyon facility by requiring rigorous testing protocols developed by the U.S. Department of Energy's National Laboratories be developed and followed before operations resume.

Before being unanimously approved in the Senate, Assemblyman Wilk presented SB 380 on the floor of the Assembly on April 28, where it passed with overwhelming

bipartisan support.

“I thank Senator Pavley for her leadership on this issue, as well as thank the Legislature and Governor Brown for capitalizing on this opportunity to put the safety of Porter Ranch first, before Aliso Canyon resumes any injections,” Wilk said.

“Many of my Porter Ranch constituents and their families affected by the gas leak remain worried about moving back into their homes and SB 380 is a major step in allowing life in the community to finally return to normal.”

SB 380 aligns with the safety requirements established by Governor Brown’s State of Emergency order and requires that all 114 wells undergo two more tests to detect any possible leaks. Wells can only be put back into use after passing four additional structural integrity tests.

*Note: The Signal delivers press releases from reliable sources to provide up-to-the-minute information to our website readers. Information directly from news sources has not been vetted by The Signal news room. It may appear subsequently in news stories after it has been vetted.*

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2016 3:33 PM

## California PUC's big scandal over San Onofre closure heats up

San Onofre nuclear power plant shut down  
Secret deal stuck ratepayers with most costs  
As probe continues, PUC reopens the case



Beachgoers walk near the San Onofre nuclear power plant in San Clemente. The plant was shut down in 2012. That closure led to a secret deal to have utility ratepayers bear most of the cost, then a scandal when the deal was disclosed. Now the Public Utilities Commission is reopening the case. Lenny Ignelzi Associated Press file

By Dan Walters [dwalters@sacbee.com](mailto:dwalters@sacbee.com)

<http://www.fresnobee.com/news/politics-government/article76830177.html> and

[http://santamariatimes.com/news/opinion/editorial/columnist/dan\\_walters/utilities-scandal-over-san-onofre-secret-deal-heating-up/article\\_2d9501e5-3eed-5b48-a96d-5524cb0d1389.html](http://santamariatimes.com/news/opinion/editorial/columnist/dan_walters/utilities-scandal-over-san-onofre-secret-deal-heating-up/article_2d9501e5-3eed-5b48-a96d-5524cb0d1389.html)

The long-simmering scandal in the state Public Utilities Commission over a secret deal to stick ratepayers with most of the costs of shutting down the San Onofre nuclear power plant just got more interesting.

**The PUC announced Monday that it is reopening the deal that its former president, Michael Peevey, privately negotiated in 2013 with a Southern California Edison executive, mostly during a 2013 meeting in Warsaw's Hotel Bristol.**

As part of the \$4.7 billion settlement, which would cost ratepayers an estimated \$3.3 billion, SCE donated \$25 million to a Peevey-sponsored UCLA climate change research project.

After the secret negotiations surfaced, Peevey resigned, the PUC fined SCE \$16.7 million for failing to disclose the "ex parte" negotiations with him, and the state Department of Justice launched a criminal investigation. It focuses not only on Peevey, a former SCE president before his PUC appointment, but fellow Commissioner Michael Florio, who was overseeing the San Onofre case, and PUC Administrative Law Judge Melanie Darling.

"There is probable cause to believe that Michael Peevey ... used his position to influence SCE's commitment of millions of dollars to UCLA to fund a research program," says an affidavit from a Department of Justice investigator in support of a search warrant request. The agent, Reye Eugene Diaz,

also declared that **Peevey and SCE executive Stephen Pickett “conspired to engage in prohibited ex parte communications regarding the closure of a nuclear facility, to the advantage of SCE and to the disadvantage of other interested parties.”**

Meanwhile, former San Diego City Attorney Michael Aguirre, now in private practice, launched his own investigation, pressing the PUC to reopen the case because some of the burden from the San Onofre closure would fall on ratepayers of San Diego Gas and Electric, a part-owner of the plant.

Aguirre is also demanding release of emails Aguirre says could implicate Gov. Jerry Brown in the secret San Onofre deal, but Brown and the PUC have resisted those demands, with the commission maintaining that only the appellate courts can deal with the issue.

The commission is appealing Superior Court Judge Ernest Goldsmith's recent order that Aguirre could seek the emails, saying, **“Withholding records of allegedly ex parte secret deals resulting in a shifting of utility losses to ratepayers cannot possibly be a regulatory function of the PUC.”**

Reopening the San Onofre settlement is another Aguirre victory. “We have been doing the work of the CPUC and the California attorney general,” Aguirre said in a statement, “so today's decision to revisit and examine the evidence of fraud is a huge step forward.”

Monday's PUC order dryly declares that **“the record must be reopened and the settlement agreement should be reviewed in light of the intervening ex parte disclosures and commission decision imposing sanctions as a predicate to considering further procedural actions.”**

In other words, the PUC could scarcely fine SCE for its role in the secret negotiations and then allow the resulting deal to remain in force.

*Dan Walters: 916-321-1195, [dwalters@sacbee.com](mailto:dwalters@sacbee.com), @WaltersBee*

Comment From the Santa Maria Times website:

**Bill G1** May 13, 2016 2:14pm

The central issue here is: Does the PUC really protect the public.

First, approving shut down of the powerful, green San Onofre nuclear plant was a huge blow to California's environment. The PUC well knows fossil fuel sources would immediately start generating electricity to fill the gap left by shutting San Onofre. The PUC also knows that this large additional use of gas makes California's carbon emissions greater, not smaller as sought in State legislation.

Thus, the PUC participated in compromising our fight with global warming.

Second, the PUC should know that increasing energy output by fossil fuel endangers the health of every Californian, and that of neighboring states. The World Health Organization, the Cancer Society, the American Lung Association and many more have, for decades, thoroughly documented the injury and death caused by fossil fuel pollution. It is especially harmful to children. This is very well known.

Yet the PUC, as a State government entity is sworn first and foremost to work for the well being of State residents - not public utility companies, not the natural gas industry - acted contrary to the well being of State citizens in direct violation of its reason for existence.

Twice I contacted the Office of the Public Advisor at the PUC asking why environmental and health aspects of the San Onofre closure were approved by the PUC given the inevitable harm to State residents. Twice I received no answer whatsoever.

Maybe it is time to remove the word "Public" from the title of the Public Utility Commission of California.

William Gloege  
Santa Maria, CA



[http://santamariatimes.com/news/state-and-regional/california-regulators-reopen-san-onofre-settlement/article\\_897c1740-86a9-5e31-a76b-055c9ada37ab.html](http://santamariatimes.com/news/state-and-regional/california-regulators-reopen-san-onofre-settlement/article_897c1740-86a9-5e31-a76b-055c9ada37ab.html)

## California regulators reopen San Onofre settlement

Updated Monday, May 9, 2016

SAN FRANCISCO (AP) — California regulators said Monday they will re-examine a settlement that made consumers responsible for covering some \$3.3 billion in costs for closing the San Onofre nuclear power plant.

The Public Utilities Commission said parties involved in the case can submit briefs commenting on whether the deal reached in 2014 should be amended or is "still reasonable," legal and in the public interest.

The decision by a commissioner and a PUC administrative law judge also bars the parties from having private communications with PUC "decision-makers" and advisers to commissioners.

That follows revelations that an executive of Southern California Edison, the primary owner of the nuclear plant, held private discussions with then-PUC President Michael Peevey before the PUC adopted the agreement. Edison was fined \$16.7 million by the PUC last year for failing to report the back-channel talks.

Edison said it was reviewing the new order but continues to believe that the settlement "remains in the public interest," a company statement said.

The San Onofre twin-reactor plant, located between Los Angeles and San Diego, was shut down in 2012 after a small radiation leak led to the discovery of extensive damage to hundreds of tubes inside the virtually new generators.

The plant never produced electricity again. Edison closed San Onofre for good in 2013 amid a fight with environmentalists over whether the plant was too damaged to restart safely.

In 2014, the PUC approved a settlement between Edison and The Utility Reform Network, a consumer group better known as TURN, that had ratepayers paying \$3.3 billion in costs stemming from the plant decommissioning, with shareholders of Edison and minority owner San Diego Gas & Electric covering \$1.4 billion.

TURN staff attorney Matthew Freedman said the improper communications cast a pall over the settlement deal.

San Francisco-based TURN "looks forward to the opportunity to fight for better results for consumers," Freedman told the San Diego Union-Tribune (<http://bit.ly/1VR7FPU>).

"This proves that when a small group of people come together to fight to the end, justice can be done," Michael Aguirre, an attorney who sued to overturn the agreement, told the paper.

"This will have to be done openly and on the record," he said. "We can win a fair fight."

**The San Diego Union-Tribune**

## **WATCHDOG: State to reopen \$4.7 billion San Onofre deal**

**Deal left ratepayers to pay most of cost for premature shutdown of failed nuclear power plant**



By Jeff McDonald | 4:55 p.m. May 9, 2016

<http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/2016/may/09/san-onofre-reopened/>

State utility regulators on Monday reopened the agreement they approved in 2014 that assigned ratepayers the lion's share of the multibillion-dollar cost for premature shutdown of the failed San Onofre nuclear power plant.

The action represents a significant turnaround for the California Public Utilities Commission, which stood behind the settlement agreement for 18 months amid growing criticism — even from parties to the \$4.7 billion deal — that the process and the outcome were stacked against the public and for utility companies.

Reopening the settlement terms could mean a better deal for utility customers. It could also prove an important test of the commission's latest posture toward the power companies it regulates, as those companies have continued to say the deal was good for ratepayers and the process was above-board and open to the public.

To approve such a settlement, the commission must find that it is "reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest."

Latest: CPUC

- State to reopen \$4.7 billion San Onofre deal
- CPUC meets with Wall Street types, too
- Consumer attorney raises question: Whose side is the attorney general on?
- CPUC now wants \$12.3 million for legal fees

- Brown's judge friend removed from CPUC case
- Governor's aide attended data center meeting

## MORE WATCHDOG

Since the commission approved the settlement, there have been repeated revelations about undisclosed meetings that helped form its substance — calling into question whether it was properly deemed reasonable in light of the whole record.

Commissioner Catherine J.K. Sandoval and Administrative Law Judge Maribeth Bushey said, in taking action to reopen the settlement, that it needs to be held up anew against that standard.

“The parties should prepare their best assessment of whether the settlement agreement is reasonable in light of the record, consistent in the law and in the public interest,” their order states.

The order also immediately prohibits any further ex parte, or private, communications between parties to the proceeding and commissioners or their advisers, even on procedural matters.

“Such procedural communications may be directed to the assigned administrative law judge,” the order stipulates.

Backchannel communications between utility executives and regulators are at the heart of separate state and federal criminal investigations into commission practices.

The criminal cases have been open since 2014 but no charges have been filed. The commission is proposing to spend more than \$12 million of ratepayer funds on private lawyers to respond to subpoenas, search warrants and demands from investigators.

Commission spokeswoman Terrie Prosper declined to say what prompted the change of heart on Monday.

Majority plant owner Southern California Edison issued a statement saying that company officials are reviewing the commission ruling but Edison nonetheless stands by the 2014 deal resolving costs related to closing the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station.

“SCE continues to believe the SONGS settlement remains in the public interest,” the statement said.

San Diego Gas & Electric owns 20 percent of the power plant on the north San Diego County coast, which closed amid a radiation leak in January 2012 after a faulty replacement steam generator upgrade.

The 9-page ruling from the commission calls on Edison to file a status report by June 2 detailing what the utility has done to date as far as implementing the 2014 order.

The order also directs other parties to file briefs by July 7 discussing the adopted settlement. By July 21, all parties were directed to submit reply briefs and recommendations about how the case should proceed.

San Diego consumer attorney Michael Aguirre, who sued the commission to overturn the agreement, said the commission decision speaks to the perseverance of activists like himself and others.

“This proves that when a small group of people come together to fight to the end, justice can be done,” he said on Monday.

Aguirre said it will be difficult to defend the settlement terms as they were approved in 2014 because the agreement was modeled on a framework sketched out in a private 2013 meeting between then-commission President Michael Peevey and an Edison executive in a Warsaw, Poland, hotel.

There’s no case to be made for the settlement,” Aguirre said. “They have to go back to square one. There’s no more Warsaws, so this will have to be done openly and on the record. We can win a fair fight.”

The commission ruling comes 18 months after regulators unanimously approved the settlement, reached between Edison and the San Francisco consumer group the Utility Reform Network or TURN.

TURN staff attorney Matthew Freedman said the improper communications cast a pall over the settlement deal.

“TURN looks forward to the opportunity to fight for better results for consumers and to force the shareholders of Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric to assume a greater share of the costs of the debacle at San Onofre,” he said.

The deal was unveiled in March 2014, first portrayed publicly as a \$1.4 billion “rebate” for utility customers — because that’s the amount of premature closure costs that would be covered by utility companies.

As the agreement received additional scrutiny, attention turned to the amount utility ratepayers would be funding — \$3.3 billion. The deal began receiving sharp criticism from certain consumer groups.

In September 2014, the deal was amended to include \$25 million for greenhouse-gas emissions research — a key deal point included on notes from the 2013 meeting between Peevey and Edison executive Stephen Pickett in Warsaw.

The climate-change research funding has been another focus of the criminal investigation of the utilities commission.

University of California, Los Angeles, researchers were in contact with Peevey about securing the \$25 million in funding at least nine months before Commissioner Michel Florio publicly proposed adding the money to the agreement.

The commission's order on Monday directs parties to the San Onofre case to weigh in on whether the greenhouse gas research funding was properly handled.

In February 2015, days after The San Diego Union-Tribune reported that the commission's handling of the San Onofre closure had become part of an expanding criminal investigation, Edison publicly acknowledged the Warsaw meeting for the first time.

The utility said Peevey did most of the talking at the Warsaw meeting and the deal should stand because it was negotiated fairly and served all sides well.

Last spring, Sen. Ben Hueso, D-San Diego, publicly called for scrapping the San Onofre deal. Then the commission's Office of Ratepayer Advocates suggested the plant owners should rewrite terms of the settlement and return more than \$600 million to customers.

Almost a year ago, TURN repudiated the deal it negotiated and called on the commission to reopen the agreement.

In August, the judge overseeing the proceeding found that Edison had committed 10 separate violations of commission rules governing ex parte communications in open proceedings. Four months later, the commission fined the utility almost \$17 million for the violations.