Compilation of Email Communications
2-10-22 to 6-17-22

Canadian Update on Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF)

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 8:51 AM
To: Daniel Stetson; Manuel Camargo; Martha McNicholas
Subject: (External):Re: Canadian update on SNF

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Use caution when opening links or attachments *****
Thanks. I think we should share this more widely w CEP next time we give them updates.

From: Daniel Stetson
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 at 6:09 AM
To: David G. Victor, Manuel Camargo, Martha McNicholas <
Subject: Canadian update on SNF

Hi Manuel
Thanks for briefing me on Canadian progress.
Dan

https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://www.nwmo.ca/en/More-information/News-and-Activities/2022/06/15/19/52/NWMO-and-South-Bruce-mark-important-milestone-sign-memorandum-of-understanding__;!!Mih3wA!EljdzBfKPDklUcHL9iYWJfAOQ7lFd7Xk93i7o8FQLnYTdWjR5eUf3uED0fJ2M8ajNL-Xce88v6bncyLxBfXZ$

No Attachment. Direct link within text.
~~~~~~

Dana Point Times Articles: Researchers Report Artificial Reef Progressing Toward Success, Marine Life Restoration

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 7:22 AM
To: Daniel Stetson
Cc: Manuel Camargo; McNicholas, Martha
Subject: (External): Re: Researchers Report Artificial Reef Progressing Toward Success, Marine Life Restoration | Dana Point Times

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Use caution when opening links or attachments ***

Excellent. Let's include in next circular

Sent from limited typing device

> On Jun 16, 2022, at 8:06 AM, Daniel Stetson <danstetson@me.com> wrote:
~~~~~~

>
> Article on Wheeler North Reef.
> Dan
>
> https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://www.danapointtimes.com/researchers-report-artificial-reef-progressing-toward-success-marine-life-restoration/__;!!Mih3wA!ERlVgWQj-6sHGhSOG2lqSl_JZB_aGTBo5K-7btlZTawvovUj3xMSMQuA5pz_9F4I-M3ncP8PT3A_8zmUbWcA$

No Attachment. Direct link within text.
~~~~~~

SONGS Notice of Violation from NRC

From: Manuel Camargo
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:49 PM
To: David G. Victor; Daniel T. Stetson; Martha McNicholas; Mike Balsamo; Lisa Bartlett; Garry Brown; Jim Desmond; Chris Duncan; Rob Howard; Sam Jammal; Scott Kibbey; Marni Magda; Val Macedo; Ted Quinn; John Taylor; Mel Vernon; Michael Villar; Laura Ferguson; Kristal Jabara; Mike Frost; Mark Riddlebarger; Mike Sappingfield; Ken Schultz; Diep, Tyler; Christian Abueg
Cc: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom; Doug Bauder; John Dobken; Liese Mosher; Vincent J Bilovsky; Albert Bates
Subject: For awareness: SONGS notice of violation from NRC

Dear CEP Members and Alternates,

SCE takes responsibility for the inadvertent mishandling of some security-related documents many years ago and concurs with the NRC's conclusion that it was not intentional and did not jeopardize station security (reference attachment). The legacy documents were discovered while dismantling office equipment during demolition activities. SCE immediately self-reported the issue to the NRC and implemented corrective actions, including a thorough review of all abandoned office spaces prior to deconstruction.

SCE remains in full compliance with the NRC's security and safeguard regulations. SCE also continues to maintain a strong nuclear security presence — in some respects, exceeding regulatory requirements — at the retired San Onofre nuclear plant throughout its decommissioning.

More information on SONGS safety and security measures is available here.

Sincerely,

Manuel C. Camargo Jr.
Principal Manager for Strategic Planning
SONGS/SCE

Attachment #1 – SONGS Notice of Violation from NRC - ML22081A238, March 24, 2022 (posted to ADAMS on 6/14/22)
~~~~~~

Direct Link to Senator Markey's 5/6/22 Hearing

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2022 7:41 PM
To: Nina Babiarz
Cc: Charles Langley; Manuel Camargo
Subject: (External):Re: Direct link to Senator Markey's 5/6/22 Hearing

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Use caution when opening links or attachments *****
Thanks. copying Manuel—can you include this link in the next CEP email circular so it becomes part of the public record. David

From: Nina Babiarz
Date: Thursday, May 19, 2022 at 7:38 PM
To: David G. Victor
Cc: Charles Langley
Subject: FW: Direct link to Senator Markey's 5/6/22 Hearing

Dr. Victor – We'll be posting the hearing on our website. – her you go – Safe travels, Nina
https://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/hearings?ID=A7B4032A-BC11-4DE6-BBF3-4C223A448974

No Attachment. Directs links within text.
~~~~~~

NRC Decommissioning Rulemaking and SONGS

From: Manuel Camargo
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 10:58 AM
To: David G. Victor; Daniel T. Stetson; Martha McNicholas; Michelle Anderson; Mike Balsamo; Lisa Bartlett; Garry Brown; Jim Desmond; Chris Duncan; Rob Howard; Sam Jammal; Scott Kibbey; Marni Magda; Val Macedo; Ted Quinn; John Taylor; Mel Vernon; Michael Villar; Laura Ferguson; Kristal Jabara; Mike Frost; Mark Riddlebarger; Mike Sappingfield; Ken Schultz; Diep, Tyler; Cristian Abueg
Cc: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom; Doug Bauder; John Dobken; Liese Mosher; Vincent J Bilovsky; Albert Bates; Amy F Pressler; James Peterson
Subject: FYA: NRC Decommissioning Rulemaking and SONGS

Dear CEP,

For your awareness, provided below is background information on the NRC's current efforts around decommissioning rulemaking. SONGS is too far along in decommissioning and the accompanying regulatory process for this to have much effect on our work, but the matter has been in the news so we wanted to give you some context.

First, at present, the NRC generally only has regulations for operating nuclear plants, not decommissioning sites. Some of you who have served on the CEP for some time may recall that at times
~~~~~~

we have had to go through an exemption process to recognize vastly different plant conditions and a substantially reduced risk profile. The risk of an offsite release of radiological material is greatly reduced for a plant with the fuel permanently removed from the reactors. With the spent fuel at SONGS in passive dry storage, there are no credible events that result in an offsite release. Yet, from a public perception standpoint, the current exemption framework can carry negative connotations.

The process underway at the NRC will establish prescribed rules and regulations for plants entering retirement and decommissioning to adhere to, doing away with the exemption process that SONGS has gone through. This should make it more clear to third party stakeholders what is expected of plant owners as they work through the process of decommissioning, covering everything from emergency preparedness and insurance to security and document retention.

In the next year or so, as the new decommissioning rule works its way through the various NRC internal and external comment processes, we will continue to monitor the effort and let you know if any changes may affect SONGS decommissioning.

Looking forward to our CEP meeting tomorrow night.

Best regards,

Manuel

Manuel C. Camargo Jr.
Principal Manager for Strategic Planning
SONGS/SCE

From the Federal Register (includes an executive summary): 2022-03131.pdf (govinfo.gov)

From Utility Dive:

DIVE BRIEF

NRC seeks public comment on nuclear plant decommissioning rule

Published March 7, 2022
By
Jason PlautzContributor



Entergy

Dive Brief:

- The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is accepting public comment on revisions to its rules on decommissioning nuclear power plants. The changes seek to align recent regulations with the reduced safety risk posed by decommissioning plants.
- The NRC approved decommissioning rules in November after a seven-year rulemaking process prompted by the high number of requests to decommission older nuclear plants. In a regulatory filing published last Thursday, the NRC said it will amend those regulations to incorporate lessons learned from recently transitioned plants.
- The proposed rulemaking would create a four-step graded approach based on the stage of the plant, aligning safety regulations with the radiation risk. That would make the decommissioning process more efficient and predictable, reducing the number of licensing actions in the process, the agency said in a regulatory filing.

Dive Insight:

As nuclear plants faced competition from cheaper gas-fired generation and renewable resources, the number of planned closures rose in the last decade. That prompted the NRC to review its safety regulations, which it said did not differentiate between commercial operation and plants that either had defueled or permanently closed. Among the issues that needed review, the NRC said, were

emergency preparedness, physical security, cybersecurity, training requirements, the use of decommissioning trust funds and drug and alcohol testing.

After several years of delay, a proposed rule was approved in a 2-1 vote last year. The new rule laid out areas where plant operators could meet less stringent regulations during the decommissioning process, such as no longer needing a physical security plan for the reactor core after fuel had been removed. Specifically, the rule would allow the NRC to implement incremental changes to requirements without going through an exemption or license amendment process.

The rulemaking is a "positive step forward" that "has potential to modernize the regulatory framework in ways that will aid the efficient, timely and safe completion of future decommissioning projects and allow communities to revitalize former plant sites sooner," Rodney McCullum, senior director of decommissioning and used fuel at the Nuclear Energy Institute, said in an email.

The proposed rules will be available for comment through May 17, including two online public meetings in March. The rule could be finalized this year after public comment.

The November proposal faced some opposition. Massachusetts Democratic senators Ed Markey and Elizabeth Warren said in a joint statement that the rules were insufficient and did not include public and stakeholder participation, establish a set of decommissioning and cleanup regulations or address safety concerns for onsite storage of spent fuel. With Entergy's Pilgrim Power Station in Plymouth, MA, having shut down in 2019, the senators wrote that the NRC needed to "strengthen this decommissioning rule before finalization in order to better prioritize safety and security."

After the November vote, NRC Commissioner Jeff Baran — the lone dissenter — wrote on Twitter that the rule "misses the mark" and would hand too much power to licensees to make decommissioning decisions, "tilting the regulation even more towards the interests of industry."

In a statement last week, NRC Chairman Christopher Hanson said the commission "maintains its rigorous oversight of the decommissioning process from start to finish" and that the revision process will "ensure it is protective of public health and safety."

According to the Department of Energy (DOE), there are 93 nuclear reactors operating in the U.S. providing 52% of the nation's clean electricity. However, the difficult economics of nuclear power — with its high up-front capital costs and difficulty in shutting down and restarting plants — has made many of them uneconomical. DOE announced plans last month for a $6 billion program designed to keep nuclear power plants online using funds from the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

From Exchange Monitor:

NRC staff aiming to get final decom rule to commissioners by fall '23

By ExchangeMonitor March 11, 2022

Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff working on a proposed decommissioning rules change are planning to have the final version of the updated regulations on the commissioners' desks by next year, the project's manager said at an annual agency conference this week.

The final decommissioning rule, a draft of which went live for public comment March 3, should be ready for final approval by the fall of 2023, NRC project manager Daniel Doyle said during a virtual panel Wednesday at the commission's Regulatory Information Conference (RIC). Close to the height of the COVID-19 omicron surge this winter, NRC moved the conference entirely online, canceling some planned in-person participation.

NRC is accepting comments until May 17. The agency is also planning to hold a series of public sessions on the proposed rule in the coming weeks, Doyle said.

The proposed rule, which was approved by the commission on a 2-1 vote in November, would lower certain regulatory guidelines for nuclear power operators transitioning their plants to decommissioning, such as altering emergency preparedness requirements and extending the deadline for a low-level waste shipment tracking requirement.

A spokesperson for NRC told *RadWaste Monitor* via email Thursday that the rule "is aimed at establishing clear regulatory standards and milestones for nuclear plants transitioning to decommissioning."

If the decommissioning rulemaking proceeds to plan, it would appear during a "very interesting" couple of years for the NRC, Bruce Watson, the agency's reactor decommissioning chief, said Wednesday. Between 2022 and 2024 the commission is staring down the barrel of ten license termination reviews for nuclear plants, most recently the Fort Calhoun plant in Nebraska.

Meanwhile, Commissioner David Wright, who in November voted alongside NRC Chairman Christopher Hanson to approve the proposed decommissioning rule, defended it during his Tuesday remarks at RIC.

"[I]n my time and experience with the NRC, at no time have I felt that the staff put forward a recommendation that would remove needed requirements or did not provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection," Wright said. "Our staff are highly trained professionals, with integrity and a focus on our safety mission."

Wright said that NRC had received feedback about the proposed rule claiming that it "does not appropriately account for risk or involve the public."

In November, NRC Commissioner Jeff Baran blasted the decommissioning rule on Twitter, writing that the proposed changes, which included lowering certain emergency preparedness requirements and extending a reporting window for tracking shipments of low-level radioactive waste, amounted to "laissez-faire." Baran also said the rule tipped the balance of regulation in favor of industry and away from NRC.

Wright appeared to jab at Baran's comments at the time, telling members of Congress during a Senate Environment and Public Works Committee meeting in November that he did not agree with "recent media statements and social media posts regarding NRC decisions and rulemakings suggesting that the staff's recommendations are not safe, or simply reflect the industry viewpoint."

NRC chair Hanson also defended the proposed rule in a November interview with *RadWaste Monitor*, saying it was "primarily focused on safety."

Also from Exchange Monitor:

Public Comment for Proposed Decom Rule This Week; Another LLRW Tracking Exemption

By Benjamin S. Weiss March 4, 2022

A proposed change to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's nuclear decommissioning rulemaking, which includes updates to tracking requirements for

low-level nuclear waste shipments, is scheduled to go live for public comment this week, an agency spokesperson said this week.

A public comment request on the proposed decommissioning rule was published Thursday in the *Federal Register*. After the comment period expires May 17, agency staff should "draft a final rule for Commission consideration," an NRC spokesperson told *RadWaste Monitor* Monday. The commissioners approved the proposed rule on a 2-1 vote in November.

The proposed rules changes are broadly aimed at streamlining the decommissioning process for nuclear plant operators by lowering some regulatory barriers deemed unnecessary for such activities. Among the proposals, NRC staff suggested changing its current requirements for tracking low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) shipments.

As it stands, the agency requires operators to track shipments and notify the commission if the waste packages don't reach their final destination within 20 days. The proposed decommissioning rule, if it becomes final, would extend that window to 45 days.

The proposed rule has been the subject of some controversy, both within the commission and on Capitol Hill.

During a Senate Environment and Public Works Committee hearing in December, Sen. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) derided the rule, saying that the agency "has decided that the best way to shield itself from criticism around the decommissioning process is to take itself out of the process."

Markey's concerns were echoed earlier by Commissioner Jeff Baran, who voted against the proposed rule in November. Baran called the rule "laissez-faire" at the time, and said that it tipped the regulatory scales towards industry and away from NRC.

Commission chairman Christopher Hanson defended the rulemaking in a November interview with *RadWaste Monitor*, saying that it is "primarily, focused on safety."

As NRC prepares to put the proposed rule on an open forum, the agency on Feb. 25 issued an exemption to its LLRW regs to Holtec International for its decommissioning work at Indian Point Energy Center in New York, according to a *Federal Register* notice.

Holtec, which plans to ship Indian Point's LLRW to Waste Control Specialists' (WCS) disposal facility in west Texas, asked the agency in November to extend the deadline to 45 days. NRC issued a similar extension to Holtec in October for Massachusetts' Pilgrim plant, which the company is also dismantling.

Holtec has said that a 20-day window is adequate for truck shipments, but waste that goes to WCS travels by rail — a process that the company said has taken up to 56 days in the past. Both Pilgrim and Indian Point do not have direct rail access, Holtec has said, so waste shipments must be loaded on trucks and taken to rail yards, where they may idle for some time as a train is loaded.

As part of its contract with WCS for handling Indian Point's LLRW, the Dallas-based waste disposal company provides Holtec with "onsite support to ensure packaging and shipment arrangements are made in accordance with state and federal guidelines," Friday's *Register* notice said. WCS also provides the company with an online tracking portal, and daily reports of railcar locations are sent to Holtec's waste manager at Indian Point, the notice said.

Meanwhile, it could be a while before a final rule, including the LLRW tracking change, goes into effect. An NRC spokesperson told *RadWaste Monitor* Monday that it is "difficult to say" when the rulemaking would take effect if it is approved, since the commission might take some time to review it.

No Attachments. Direct links within text.
~~~~~~

SCE Update re: Injury at SONGS

From: Manuel Camargo
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 9:52 AM
To: David G. Victor; Daniel T. Stetson; Martha McNicholas; Michelle Anderson; Mike Balsamo; Lisa Bartlett; Garry Brown; Jim Desmond; Chris Duncan; Rob Howard; Sam Jammal; Scott Kibbey; Marni Magda; Val Macedo; Ted Quinn; John Taylor; Mel Vernon; Michael Villar; Laura Ferguson; Kristal Jabara; Mike Frost; Mark Riddlebarger; Mike Sappingfield; Ken Schultz; Diep, Tyler; Christian Abueg
Cc: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom; Doug Bauder; John Dobken; Liese Mosher Vincent J Bilovsky
Subject: (Update) RE: For awareness: Injury at SONGS

Hello all,

We want to provide an update regarding the last few weeks since our colleague at SONGS was injured, we stopped work, and the important steps we have taken to revisit and strengthen our safety and training programs. Thankfully, our colleague is recovering well.
~~~~~~

SCE and our decommissioning contractor, SONGS Decommissioning*Solutions*, have been working collaboratively to fully understand not only the April incident, but also the recent first aids and close calls to ensure we have all the right safeguards in place to prevent these events going forward. During this time, we designed an enhanced training program on specific skill development and the use of our "human performance" tools to ensure roles and responsibilities are clear for field activities, and there is appropriate supervision and oversight so that our teams can focus on the work at hand. This relationship between ensuring all workers feel knowledgeable of their work, having the right skills and tools, and oversight is crucial to our success.

This effort we've undertaken to enhance industrial safety is not over. But we have enough of an understanding to move forward again with all work activities. A deeper evaluation of overall site safety is continuing. Some of the interim actions put in place to allow work to proceed will become permanent, such as supervisory oversight commitments.

Safety is a core principle in our decommissioning of SONGS. Everything we do is with the goal of having everyone go home safely every day.

Sincerely,

Manuel

No Attachments.
~~~~~~

Response to Rochelle Becker Re: SONGS CEP Budget

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 8:10 AM
To: Rochelle Becker; Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Cc: Manuel Camargo
Subject: (External): Re: (External): Re: SONGS CEP budget

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Use caution when opening links or attachments ***
Let me add my thanks. And we should make this email thread and attachment part of our publicly available correspondence. All best, David

From: Rochelle Becker
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 at 8:06 AM
To: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Cc: David G. Victor, Manuel Camargo
Subject: Re: (External): Re: SONGS CEP budget

Thank you, Lorraine.

In peace
Rochelle
~~~~~~

On Mon, May 2, 2022 at 8:00 AM Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom wrote:

Dear Rochelle,

Per your request, the SONGS CEP recorded costs (in both 2014$ and year of expense) for the last 6 years are provided in the file attached. The information was sourced from the SCE advice letters as noted in attached summary. The 2021 advice letter was issued this week.

Thank you,

Lorraine Sandstrom
Community Affairs and Relations, Senior Specialist
Community Engagement Panel (CEP) Management and Stakeholder Engagement (AWS Bldg. D-D23)
Southern California Edison, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS)

From: Rochelle Becker
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2022 11:52 AM
To: David G. Victor
Cc: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Subject: (External): Re: SONGS CEP budget

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Use caution when opening links or attachments *****

Thanks David for getting back so quickly and hello Lorraine. I am looking at Charters and budgets at CAB/CEP's nationwide. The inclusion of your perspectives on the SONGS CEP have been a valuable resource as we attempt to improve our DCDEP.

Again I appreciate your reaching out to SCE to help me find this information.

In peace

Rochelle

On Thu, Apr 14, 2022 at 11:24 AM David G. Victor wrote:

Thanks so much Rochelle. I don't know that answer—it should be in the recovery filings for CEP-related costs. Lorraine: could you point Rochelle to those docs? David

From: Rochelle Becker
Date: Thursday, April 14, 2022 at 11:18 AM
To: David G. Victor
Subject: SONGS CEP budget

Hi David,

Can you steer me to any publicly available site that would allow me to view and download the SONGS CEP budget/expenses for the for the last 5 years?

Thanks

In peace

Rochelle

Rochelle Becker, Executive Director
Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility
PO 1328
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406
www.a4nr.org

Attachment #2 – SONGS CEP Forecasted & Recorded Costs (04-28-2022)
~~~~~~

SCE Responses to Questions from Nina Babiarz' Regarding SONGS Waste Shipments

From: Nina Babiarz
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 2:40 PM
To: Jabara, Kristal
Cc: Charles Langley
Subject: [External] RE: SONGS question follow-up from SD County Supvr. Desmond's Office

Kristal – Your follow-up on this community concern is greatly appreciated along with hopes that, as the demolition continues, you will stay abreast of what – if any – radioactive demo materials should land in or travel via San Diego County as Public Watchdogs truly believes that the public has a right to know.

I commend you on your research, as I know it can be an arduous task, and appreciate the true community engagement communicated on Supvr. Desmond's behalf.
Most Sincerely, Nina

From: Jabara, Kristal
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 1:05 PM
To: Nina Babiarz
Subject: SONGS question follow-up

Nina,

Good afternoon. I am currently out of the office, but I wanted to follow up on our previous email.

I have confirmed that none of the SONGS dismantled debris stays in California and / San Diego. Depending on the type of debris the final location can be Utah, Arizona, or Texas (and maybe one other). I do not believe any is traveling through San Diego County and the reference to "traveling south" was a reference to Texas, meaning southern United States.

Best regards - Kristal

Kristal K. Jabara
Director of Community Relations
Office of Supervisor Jim Desmond – San Diego Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Coast Hwy, RM 335
San Diego, CA 92101

SIGN UP FOR NEWS ALERTS FROM SUPERVISOR DESMOND

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2022 5:13 PM
To: Manuel Camargo
Subject: (External):FW: Email to Supervisor Desmond & CEP mistep...

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Use caution when opening links or attachments *****
Pls add this and attachments to the email record. David

From: Nina Babiarz
Date: Thursday, February 10, 2022 at 5:02 PM
To: Jabara, Kristal
Cc: Desmond, Jim, David G. Victor, Dan Stetson (NE, Charles Langley, Doug Bauder
Subject: RE: Email to Supervisor Desmond & CEP mistep...

Thank You Kristal. Happy to do it. See attached. I also included the updated version of it that I read from today @ the CEP mtg. – Nina

P.S. I'd appreciate it if someone reading this that has Martha's email address could forward to her since she's the one that posed my questions to Bauder. Irony is not lost on me that none of the CEP member's contact info is actually posted on the CEP web site. This is a foundational misstep for anyone that might want to 'engage' the community…

P.S. S. Also noting here for the written record, that as you can see from the attached, I referred 3 times in my questions to '*testing, monitoring'* as well as '*3rd party testing, monitoring'. That the CEP panel members let Bauder answer using the term 'survey' is just another demonstrations of how the CEP consistently misses that mark when given a genuine opportunity to engage the community..*

From: Jabara, Kristal
Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2022 3:16 PM
To: Nina Babiarz;
Cc: Desmond, Jim
Subject: Email to Supervisor Desmond

Ms. Babiarz,

Good afternoon. Today on the CEP meeting you mention an email you had sent to Supervisor Desmond that has gone unanswered. I apologize for not receiving a response, we are searching the Supervisor's email to see if we can find that email, but in the meantime if you would like to forward the email to me, I will make sure Supervisor Desmond see it and our office responds.

Feel free to reach out to me anytime.

Best regards -Kristal

Kristal K. Jabara
Director of Community Relations
Office of Supervisor Jim Desmond – San Diego Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Coast Hwy, RM 335
San Diego, CA 92101

SIGN UP FOR NEWS ALERTS FROM SUPERVISOR DESMOND

Attachment #3 – Public Watchdogs' Question Regarding SCE Sept. 16th CEP Meeting, 11-17-21
Attachment #4 - Nina Babiarz' Edison CEP Testimony & Questions, 2-10-2022
~~~~~~
~~~~~~