



Issam Najm, President; Susan Gorman-Chang, Vice President; Gabriel Khanlian, Secretary; Andrew Krowne, Treasurer; David Balen, Signer; Asaad Alnajjar; Jason Hector; Alex Kim; Becky Leveque; Hassan Memarian; Jennifer Milbauer

**Ad Hoc Committee: Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility
Minutes**

Monday, January 8, 2018
5:00 – 7:00 pm
Porter Ranch Branch Library

11371 Tampa, Porter Ranch, CA 91326

PRNC = Porter Ranch Neighborhood Council
AQMD = Air Quality Management District
CARB = California Air Resources Board
AB = Assembly Bill
LACDPH= Los Angeles County Department of Public Health

Introductions

Susan welcomed the stakeholders who attended this meeting. The committee members introduced themselves as follows:

- Susan Gorman-Chang, Vice President Porter Ranch Neighborhood Council & Co-Chair Sustainability Committee & Chair of Ad Hoc Committee: Aliso Canyon Gas Facility
- Katie Butler, Health Impact Assessment Analyst, County of Los Angeles Public Health
- Andrea Polidori, Atmospheric Measurements Manager, AQMD
- Kevin Taylor, District Director for Senator Henry Stern
- Diane Gonzales, UC Berkley doctoral student (via cell phone)

Absent committee member is Jarrod DeGonia, Senior Field Deputy for County Supervisor Kathryn Barger. Jarrod was not able to attend tonight because the County Supervisor's staff is on storm watch.

Procedures for Ad Hoc Committee

Susan reviewed that this group is advisory only, and will return to the full Porter Ranch Neighborhood Council (PRNC) Board with recommendations. Our purpose is to come up with ideas for securing reliable, independent, permanent air monitoring. We desire a system the community can access it via our Smart phones. Before we had Argos Scientific monitors we were really blind (as far as methane monitoring system.)

Susan shared the screen shots from a stakeholder, Craig, with Andrea & Katie showing that during a recent spike in methane that was revealed on the Argo Scientific methane monitor, the SoCalGas monitors were all down. SoCalGas monitors show 0 methane, and SoCalGas explained in their FAQ section of their website, that when they show that, it means the monitors are not presenting us any data and are down. We have several files of screen shots showing spikes on Argos Scientific monitors and SoCalGas monitors being down. SoCalGas has explained that their methane monitors go down when the humidity is high or there is rain, but Susan noted that Argos Scientific methane monitor manages to do just fine under the same conditions. This is just one of the things that causes us to want an independent monitoring.

Follow Ups from Last Meeting

Jarrold

First update on the Agenda would be from Jarrod, who was not able to be here tonight, and we were going to ask him about any meetings with Supervisor Sheila Kuehl about SCAQMD funding a fence line system. Susan asked if anyone else know of any progress on this front, but no one did. (We will also table updates on the County Lawsuit, the motions regarding the 90 day report back on County's health authority, and AB 617 advocacy as Jarrod is not present.)

Andrea

Susan started with the two reports on SCAQMD website. Quantification of Gaseous Emissions from Gas Stations, Oil Wells & Other Small Point Sources <http://www.aqmd.gov/fenceline-monitoring>. This study started in September 2015, before the SS#25 well in Aliso Canyon blew, so Aliso Canyon is not part of this study. However, it is a really good study to read because Susan stated she found most surprising, oil & gas wells are what cause the most emissions in Los Angeles. Andrea stated yes, that is true, in terms of VOC output.

A stakeholder asked about storage tanks, and Susan read the various levels from the graph on page 6 of the report. Susan showed the stakeholders the bar graph, where the turquoise bar is oil and gas wells, and its emissions far exceeds all the others including gas stations, six large refineries, treatment sites/small refineries, tank farms/terminals/depots, uncategorized are sources, other sources, offshore facilities/activities. Andrea explained they had separate projects for each category, and Susan showed that we have the link on the agenda for any stakeholder who wants to go into these reports in-depth.

Andrea explained SCAQMD worked with a company from Sweden, who have a mobile monitoring vehicle and went around to measure the emissions for this study. Andrea explained that for refineries, traditionally they would calculate, based on the number of tanks and production units, what their emissions would be. This is called the Emissions Inventory. Emissions using this type of estimating was about 30%. What this study uncovered, however, is when SCAQMD actually measured emissions, the emissions are

actually 10 times more than that reported using their Emissions Inventory method. Susan clarified with Andrea that Emissions Inventory is a figure self-reported from the refineries.

Reports also states, on page 7, "Future studies aimed at improving the emission estimate resulting from this project should include a larger subset of units from all major source categories, and a better characterization of their spatial and temporal variability." Susan asked Andrea if a future study could perhaps include Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility?

Andrea stated that these studies started about he arrived at SCAQMD in around 2008. They did not really know the technology well, but learned. SCAQMD first did monitoring for 2 weeks and the refineries said that was not long enough, so they did 5 weeks and then they eventually did this longer study. Now, after this study, they will be doing more measurements from refineries, near the port area, and this is going to be a 2 year study.

Susan asked if this follow up 2 year study will be in the same geographic area. Andrea stated, there is another 2 year study, and we are in year one so far. SCAQMD will measure emissions from refineries and measure emissions within the communities near the refineries, so yes. One area of particular concern is Signal Hill, where there are processing facilities right in the middle of residential areas, so SCAQMD is measuring those areas as well.

Susan asked if after this 2 year study, is there any possibility of including Aliso Canyon? Andrea said that while they had the vehicles from Sweden driving around and measuring VOC at the refineries as part of the project, that is the subject of the SCAQMD report noted above, they did also come up into this area of Porter Ranch and Granada Hills, near Sunshine Canyon dump, and those drive arounds did not find any VOC in these areas.

Executive Summary of Aliso Canyon air quality monitoring:

<http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/compliance/aliso-cyn/report/executive-summary.pdf?sfvrsn+4>

The above named report is the executive summary, and Andrea stated that the final detailed, complete technical report is about 95% complete, but has to go through the review process internally in SCAQMD and then also pass through the Los Angeles County Department of Health before it is released. Andrea also said this report is mostly from CARB (California Air Resources Board) but does contain some air quality measurements and readings from SCAQMD.

The report basically says amounts are back to background level. Katie stated that it is important to note that this report is based on the SS-25 well blow out incident. The report covers only the incident (October 2015) up to July 2017. The measurements and this report, then, was BEFORE reinjection (of Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility), which occurred at the end of July 2017.

Stakeholders expressed some confusion between the Executive Summary of Aliso Canyon air quality monitoring report and the one time drive around by the company from Sweden

in a mobile monitoring vehicle to scan for VOC. Andrea explained that the report is talking about the stationary monitors in Porter Ranch which were CARB and SCAQMD. Andrea then explained the Swedish vehicle that was a mobile monitor, was used for the first report, *Quantification of Gaseous Emissions from Gas Stations, Oil Wells & Other Small Point Sources*. Also, methane monitors always catch some methane, because there are background levels of methane naturally, while VOCs are harder to catch because you actually have to capture the plume.

Stakeholder asked if SCAQMD has access to something else other than when SCAQMD inspectors comes out for a sniff test. Is there a vehicle that could be deployed when, say, multiple people smell gas in Porter Ranch? Yes. Andrea stated that last year they requested and received funds for mobile monitoring vehicle and one costs \$1.3 million and requires three month of training. It will be ready July 1, 2018. Interpreting the results takes more training. Two of Andrea's staff will be dedicated to this vehicle. Plus, there is a second mobile vehicle SCAQMD has access to, that measures methane, VOC, particulate matter, NO2 and more.

Acknowledgement of SCAQMD issuing Violation Notice to SoCalGas

We thanked SCAQMD for issuing that Notice of Violation on 12/22/2017 for leak that occurred 12/1/2017. Andrea said he is not with compliance, so that is not him of course, but we acknowledged that nevertheless.

Stakeholder asked about levels of violations and actions taken by SCAQMD. Again, Andrea is not in the compliance section. He does not know the specifics. An inspector can come out and get a grab sample and take it to the lab, or a unit can come out with a vehicle if needed. If they find a problem they assess the severity of the problem and then figure out how to respond.

Stakeholder said there are flaws in the system. Susan stated that is why we have this Ad Hoc and are working towards getting funding for a permanent fence line system. Stakeholder said another system would not cover it, and Susan reiterated that a \$1 million fence line would cover the entire facility, and Andrea concurred. Susan reminded everyone that Jarrod could not be here tonight for the update on how the advocacy of Sheila Kuehl, who is on the SCAQMD Board, is going to get this funding approved and paid for by SCAQMD.

Andrea stated he sees stakeholders point, and yes, SCAQMD only has so many inspectors to cover 10,000 square miles, and usually they are here in a couple hours, but sometimes it is the next day. Is it sufficient? There are steps we are taking to improve the steps. This monitoring equipment is a step. The mobile vehicles is another step, that they will be able to deploy to find out where the leak is, since they can drive around for 3 hours and find the area where the leak is the strongest, as opposed to just the inspector going to the one residence that smells something. Leak may not be at that residence; it could be a distance away.

Kevin stated that this type of monitoring is getting cheaper and cheaper. This makes it so much easier to fund monitors, and to fund various type of monitors whether it be government or independent sources. There is more advocacy out there now. So much of this has started in Porter Ranch like fenceline. Again, there is more advocacy and more organizations fighting out there for monitoring.

Axetris methane monitor 40 day co-location study

SCAQMD co-located an Axetris monitor in a resident's back yard alongside Argos Scientific methane monitor for 40 days. Argos and SCAQMD talked to each other and will be comparing data.

Also Don Gamiles from Argos Scientific will be coming to Porter Ranch with a second monitor which is a tunable diode laser from Unisearch Associates. It will be co-located next to the Boreal monitor for about 40 days, then deployed into another back yard somewhere else in Porter Ranch. Stakeholder asked who is paying for Argos Scientific monitors, and Susan believes it is Argos Scientific themselves.

Susan reiterated our long term goal is to get a permanent fenceline system around the entire facility. Susan asked committee members if anyone knows of any updated information about SCAQMD paying for it, and Andrea commented that it depends upon what the community collectively wants.

Getting back to the monitors, the Axetris and the Argos Scientific monitors seemed to be in agreement with each other; if one showed a spike in methane so did the other. Susan asked if different types of monitors could be used in a fenceline to surround a facility, and Andrea said generally they choose one type and go with that.

Susan asked about a VOC monitor testing, and Andrea stated that the VOC units are very sensitive to humidity and moisture. Katie mentioned that there were some VOC capture tests that were triggered when the methane levels went about a certain reading during the SS-25 blowout period. Andrea stated it may be better to wait until later in the year closer to fall (when moisture is lower) to test a VOC unit (in Porter Ranch.)

Stakeholder asked if the new Argos Scientific unit methane measurements will be available to see (on website & our phones) and Susan stated she understand the 40 days are just for testing the unit for now. But it is all along the lines of trying to figure out what is the best type of unit to use for an ultimate fenceline system for our community and for other communities.

Kevin stated that as a representative of an elected official (Senator Henry Stern), it is super important to focus on the fact that this is the type of technology can be used in many other communities. Getting political will and votes, it needs to make sense for more communities rather than just ours alone. Accessibility is important and how it could help out other communities would be key.

Katie: Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (LACDPH)

Katie thanked everyone who called in their symptoms. She knows how much time it takes to call and they continue to log calls.

Symptom Report: In November, they had 11 symptom reports from 6 households and the majority were headaches and coughing.

Then, in December, when we had two leaks, they got 33 reports with over half being on or around December 18, 2017 which was the second leak. The 33 reports were from 30 household, and they were 63% headaches 30% bloody nose 25% eye irritation and 15% each of 15% skin rash 15% fatigue and 15% throat irritation. *(Note: Yes, numbers add up to more than 100%. Per Katie, it was done this way because people reported multiple symptoms. We will clarify this at the next meeting.)*

LA County Department of Health directed SoCalGas on January 4, 2018 to immediately notify LA County Department of Health Emergency desk for any releases or leaks from now on. There were NOT receiving notification from SoCalGas. SoCalGas was already required to notify Los Angeles County Fire Department. Katie was not sure who SoCalGas notified in December at the leaks. Senator Stern's office did not receive any notification, per Kevin.

For December 1 "venting event", SoCalGas notified Dept. of Health the day AFTER, and that came from SoCalGas Public Relations Department, and Katie said from now on SoCalGas must go through the proper Emergency Desk to notify LA County Department of Health. LA County Department of Health has a protocol and system to go through in cases of public health emergencies and incidents, and that is the Emergency Desk.

Susan asked if SoCalGas will notify LA County Department of Health BEFORE a planned venting, and Katie said SoCalGas is not required to notify any agency ahead of time. Susan said she has a problem with that. Susan stated she would want to know ahead of time, so we could make a decision about say jogging or sending kids out to recess. Katie stated they had a conversation with SoCalGas about this and they said the maintenance on the compressor was planned, but they did not anticipate the methane venting. Katie said this is a problem, because they did not anticipate it and it showed up at high levels of 50 or 60 ppm on the monitors, so that is concerning. Susan asked if planned venting is the same as planned maintenance, and Katie said she understands those terms to be one in the same. Katie said that this event in itself is good evidence for why we need fenceline monitoring, for even that mile between the compressor station and the fenceline.

Kevin stated that we need this to be required by the regulators. And Katie added perhaps SoCalGas should be required to report the onsite ppm levels when these venting/leaks occur.

Stakeholder asked if they are currently required to notify Los Angeles County Department of Health, and Katie said they were not, and that is why they directed SoCalGas on Jan 3, 2018 to notify them from now on. It is a Directive from LA County DH to SoCalGas. Are

there any punitive damages if SoCalGas does not comply? Any teeth? Katie stated that brings us to an agenda item that was for Jarrod to update us on. Katie explained that the Los Angeles County Board Supervisors and LACDPH Legal Counsel are looking at the regulatory teeth question to better understand what authority they have or can have. That is actively being worked on across the county for all issues.

Katie explained that LACDPH can issue directives. Katie explained that another directive (in addition to the one they just issued for SoCalGas to contact their Emergency Desk when there is a leak) was the Temporary Relocation Directive that SoCalGas did comply with to relocate people during the SS-25# blow out (starting in late November 2015.) Since SoCalGas complied to the Relocation Directive, they did not go to court. For the House Cleaning Directive, however, SoCalGas did not comply, so they took that to court.

Susan said there is a report back in 90 days on this issue of how much authority LACDPH has. Katie said all heads of all agencies met last week to discuss this. Jarrod explained at the last meeting that clarification of LAPDH authority may be an administrative fix or may require new legislation.

Castlebay Lane Elementary School update

Katie spoke to their senior epidemiologist and public health nurses who conducted a survey of all teachers at Castlebay Lane Elementary School and asked them about cancers and other symptoms. It has been compiled and entered into a database, and the next step is to share it with the teachers and the school district first, and then a letter will come out summarizing the data. The letter will be publically available. Katie thought they are in the process of looking for a meeting date for teachers. Review is wrapping up this month, so meeting could be next month. Letter may be a couple week after that.

Stakeholder asked how thorough was this? It was a survey only, Katie answered.

Stakeholder said December 18, 2017, LACDPH got 33 notices of health issues, but then SoCalGas sends out a notice and says over news channels that there are no health effects or risks from the leak. Katie said they did the same thing on the mercaptan leak on the west side. Stakeholder asked can't LACDPH come out with a statement that counteracts what SoCalGas is saying, which is not true? Maybe even a neutral statement that we don't know health effects yet? Katie said SoCalGas did that throughout the SS-25 well blow out, too, insisting there are no health effects.

Whose call is that? Katie said PIO, which stands for Public Information Office. Susan asked how can we advocate for such a statement from LACDPH? What is the best way?

Stakeholder said they asked about this 8 months ago. Curious what is the hindrance? Where is the apprehension for LACDPH to counter an unproven claims?

Katie said she does not think there is apprehension and she will take this feedback back to her office again. Susan asked how we can help? Katie said are we asking for a press statement? Katie said the media contacts LACDPH all the time, and LACDPH report the facts.

Stakeholder asked if we can have a statement from LACDPH to say SoCalGas statement is false. Susan asked can there be a directive from LACDPH that says when there is a leak that LACDPH should be the one to make the decision and the statement regarding health effects.

Stakeholder would like a statement like LACDPH does not endorse the statements made by SoCalGas that there are no health impacts from the leaks.

How can we advocate? Katie Butler will not be doing this letter; we know that. Perhaps a letter from PRNC? Katie said this is not the first time industries have made claims that are counter to Department of Public Health. Susan asked, then, what do other communities do? Katie said she is trying to think about how to get the message out there.

Stakeholder asked who does this, and Katie said this is the PIO. Natalie Hernandez is the Public Information Official. Katie feels great frustration at this, too.

Kevin suggested asking our public officials to help direct, and to take what is a proactive position that is outside the way they normally function. That notion is different than the way LACDPH usually functions. Calling a press conference is not usually what public health does. Maybe there should be a discussion that should take place between the County Board of Supervisors and Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, whereby the County Supervisors would direct LACDPH to take this proactive stand and make such a statement. That would be the way the press could get their hands on this statement.

Susan will take this back to PRNC Board and suggest we as a board write a letter to Kathryn Barger and LACDPH. This would have to be at our next PRNC Board meeting, since PRNC Board agenda for this Wednesday has already been posted. That could be part of what the County investigates and part of what they report back within 90 days. Katie stated LACDPH cannot control what SoCalGas says.

Stakeholder does not believe it would have to be a legislative fix, but an administrative one in order to give LACDPH more authority.

Kevin brought up the 2 days of public hearings held at the Hilton Hotel ballroom in Woodland Hills with the CPUC, and the fact that the LACDPH made their views about the health impact widely known and that went on the record.

Susan pointed out that SoCalGas has a huge public relations department with lots of money and that government agencies cannot match that. Stakeholder stated that he believes LACDPH can easily put out a statement that would not cost much money.

Susan stated we will go back to the PRNC Board and make a motion to send a letter to Kathryn Barger and LACDPH regarding putting out a statement. Also, Susan requested if anyone thinks of anything else that another neighborhood has done that would help this type of situation, please email her. Susan said she wished we had better communications with other neighborhoods in situations such as ours with environmental issues.

Stakeholder asked Kevin if he was suggesting that we in the community point the press back to public meetings where the LACDPH has stated the health impacts of Aliso Canyon? Kevin stated that the nature of this discussion is really well founded, really reasonable, and we do need to hold SoCalGas accountable and how we can do that is something we need to learn to do better. Kevin will go back to his team and discuss this issue with them. Stakeholder stated to Kevin that he has our full support, and, also to please not let SB 57 die.

Katie stated that every time there is an incident, LACDPH is interviewed by the press and LACDPH reiterates all of these things that we stated at the hearings. Katie stated maybe she will go back and review some of those press coverages and see what gets in and what does not.

Susan pointed out that another issue is that there are a small core of people that attend all hearings and are very well informed. However, the vast majority of the public does not do that, and often their only communication on this issue is from what SoCalGas is saying or emailing.

Stakeholder reiterated that it is in the public interest that the LACDPH make a statement that SoCalGas is not qualified to make a statement about the health effects of gas leaks. Stakeholder wants a "cease and desist." Susan asked if we need to go to District Attorney for a cease and desist?

So the individuals that will get a communication from PRNC, pending a vote and approval, would be Natalie Hernandez, Kathryn Barger, District Attorney and Senator Stern.

Stakeholder brought up an issue that some residents had called in LACDPH and were told they were not taking health reports. Katie will follow up on this and will talk to all call desks to make sure they get their symptoms reported. Katie will do a memo for all call desks.

Stakeholder asked if there is a calculation or multiplier elected officials use that if 1 person calls in, they really represent x number of people? Kevin said he is not sure anyone shares a similar multiplier or a standard rule. Stakeholder stated what he means is that LACDPH gets many calls, but that also means there are many people not calling in. Katie said yes, she even thinks that 30 some people calling in is low. Katie said people have calling in fatigue, as it gets tiring.

Katie said she still wants to connect with Andrew and talk to him, as he has over 900 reports of incidents. App gets more reports than the official LACDPH call in right now.

Susan stated that government agencies are under more restrictions than an average person and they have to get things approved up the chain of command. Andrea stated things are moving. They started the refinery project in September 2015 and it took a good two years before they were able to do it. And now we have refinery rules that will require refineries

to have fenceline monitoring 24/7 and community monitoring as well in 2017! Again, things are moving, but slowly. Stakeholder asked Andrea if he was frustrated by the pace, and he said yes. Andrea said, however, he is seeing this giant machine moving faster and faster at an unprecedented level, especially in California.

Susan pointed out that we have a lot of data. We have the health incidents data, Argos Scientific data, and another equipment system coming in. Katie already said that in general the health complaints are in line with the elevations in methane levels. Katie said it is difficult for them to get an accurate time stamp, though they do have a date stamp on incoming complaints. The EHT app may help with a time stamp, so she is anxious to talk with Andrew. It would be great to link fenceline methane data with health symptom data.

Stakeholder suggested that if we had a time/date health issues along with time/date methane monitoring and epidemiological health study, we'd have enough data for someone to write a paper on.

Diane Gonzales, UC Berkley

Diane is on Katie's cell phone because she cannot speak over FB.

1. Do we have a final report on particulate matter study that was done using?
equipment placed in Porter Ranch yet?

Katie stated the study they were working on with Dr. Jarrett, GIS Keel Labs (a statistical powerhouse consulting firm) and Diane Gonzales UC Berkley doctoral candidate was prompted by some work previously done by Dr. Jarrett and Suzanne Paulson around particle monitoring in Porter Ranch. They saw some patterns that were not representative of the LA basin. The particulate monitors were in a resident's back yard and in the fall of 2016 we had a hurry up and collect data period before we thought SoCalGas was going to reinject. So in September we collected 5 day long term VOC sampling along with formaldehyde and ammonia, while Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility was depressurized, and this was useful because it was done before re-pressurization. This was to establish a baseline. This was September 2016. People were also still reporting symptoms, so we were trying to see if there were fugitive emissions as well. To be clear, Aliso Canyon was at normal pressure, but lower capacity. Katie explained that now we have a baseline for future monitoring and future studies. That is one data set that this report will be documenting.

Second set of data is Argos Scientific methane data from Jan & Feb 2017 before reinjection. They did find that during evening hours from approximately 9:00 pm to 6:00 am there is a trend of higher methane during those hours. This matches up with symptoms in general, but we need a time stamp.

Lastly, Diane monitored the particle data measure by the equipment. This did not show anything definitive, but did some comparisons to Santa Monica and found that particles in Porter Ranch were as high or somewhat higher in Porter Ranch than other more higher

density urban areas like West LA. That is surprising. There is a lot of historic data useful for future analysis.

There was also a methane exposure model. Dr. Jarrett worked with Cambridge University during the SS-25 blowout, modelled it using the complex terrain in the mountainous area and their model matched up with our data and where we had the highest symptoms reported. They used directional wind data for this.

Stakeholder asked if we could use that for Castlebay Lane Elementary, and Katie said no it could probably not be used for that. Katie said they are determined to publish this report by the end of the month. It will be posted on LACDPH on their website.

Susan asked about incident map. Katie stated they can do a heat map with data to see if it matches up. Data Andrew is collecting may be powerful.

There were two types of particulate matter collectors in the community. Katie said they concentrated on the ones less than .1. Diane's monitor collected slightly larger particles. Susan stated Diane had mentioned that smaller particles were more problematic because they can get deeper into the lungs.

Andrea stated particle size matters. Composition is also important.

Stakeholder asked about ultrafine particles. Diane explained ultrafine particles were not speciated, so we won't know what they are made up of chemically. Katie said we all have only so many resources and so much funding.

Susan asked if Diane was the only one measuring particulates? Yes, as far as we know.

Any update on grant application(s)?

Diane explained they are applying for a grant and the application is an National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant. She has been working with community members, and what the community feels will be a good environmental tracking system for the next 5 years. She is putting together a mixture of outdoor sampling, indoor sampling, and possibly including other things like water and soil testing. She is in the process right now of pricing it all out. It takes a lot of time putting together all of it for submission. There is a lot of work yet to be done to submit. She is hoping if funded to start the middle of next year.

Dollar amount of year is \$5 million for 5 years from NIH (National Institute of Health).

Susan asked when grant application is due. Diane said there is a deadline in June. They were going for February, but want to do June now. One thing they had discussed was the EHT app and to integrate that into it.

A stakeholder encouraged the Ad Hoc Committee to continue to move forward since there is no guarantee that Diane and team will get the grant. Susan agreed.

Kevin Taylor

Some of the things Kevin is talking about, he explained tonight, may not necessarily materialize into bills as much as materialize into work they will do with regulators. Sometimes legislation is not the right venue, but working different angles may be the way to go. They will have more clarity in February. Things they are looking at with Senator Stern may not necessarily result in any legislation, but may be more in the way of other strategies.

Senator Stern is looking into funding for a health study, and discussing what it would look like, etc. They are working with all partners on this, and this is a high priority. Where it will go, they don't know yet. They hear from the community that it is a high priority. They may be working with SCAQMD, the \$1 million for a health study, and in other areas.

Senator Stern's office is also working on mandating that industries disclosure chemical exposures, despite their "proprietary notion" the industry has contended. Senator Stern is looking for opportunities via legislation or directives on this. May be legislative if need be.

Another focus is making sure all outcomes of how much this incident costs SoCalGas & Sempra is not passed onto rate payers.

SB 801 is still alive and Senator Stern is still concerned about the root cause analysis (of the SS-25 well blow out). This may ultimately point to a strategy about how to shut down the facility and the Senator reaffirms that a 10 year plan to shut down Aliso Canyon is not acceptable; it has to be sooner than that. He will not rest until we have something much more quickly. There is no reason not to shut it down; Senator Stern stands by the community. They can put pressure on regulators and others they can think of to make this happen.

Within a week or so Senator Stern will draft a letter to the CPUC asking for clarification out SoCalGas taking pipelines offline at this most important time for gas delivery (winter months) and why that was done.

Kevin stated that the SoCalGas fenceline going offline coincidentally during large methane releases, makes them skeptical and Senator Stern thinks that is another show of bad faith and bad corporate practice. They are looking for more accountability on this. The large 66.6 ppm venting for almost one hour has not gone unnoticed by Senator Stern's office. Kevin stated a letter to the CPUC will be the venue for many of these concerns from Senator Stern. The Senator is happy to hear about the work we are all doing on this as well.

Most of this will go into a letter to the CPUC. How do we look at intentionality on the monitors being down? Kevin is not sure how we go about that, whether it is the County, whether it is counsel, and they are looking into figuring this out.

Stakeholder asked is it really compliance with a court settlement if SoCalGas monitors go down at important times? Are they truly complying? Another stakeholder and Katie, too, stated that the lawsuit settlement does not actually require SoCalGas to have the monitors

reporting out to a website; the settlement just required the monitors themselves. Stakeholder asked if SCAQMD asked for report out to be public and Katie said that SoCalGas voluntarily made it so and it is not in the court settlement.

Susan asked about \$2 million for a health study presented by Assemblyman Dante Acosta that did not pass. Stakeholder corrected Susan in that Assemblyman Acosta tried to get some budget money moved over for a health study, but it did not pass. Kevin said there is a limbo regarding the scope of the health study and the cost of the health study pending the results of the root cause analysis (of the SS-25 well blow out), because that may show who is responsible for certain aspects of the blow out, so Kevin figures there is a certain amount of waiting for results and who foots the bill. Does the government do it or wait for an outcome?

Susan pointed out that in other incidents such as the BP spill (in the Gulf of Mexico) and the Catacarb incident up north, both companies paid a good deal (of money) for those health studies. So Susan speculated maybe waiting for a root cause analysis gives us more leverage to say that SoCalGas should pay. BP paid and then NIH had some matching funds for a health study (in the Gulf spill).

Katie stated the root cause analysis is a timeline that we really want to keep on top of. It is holding up other items, as Katie explained, and it is causing delay with the water board because they want to do subsurface contamination water analysis but SoCalGas asked for an extension because they can't bore the holes until the root cause analysis is done.

AB 617

Can Senator Stern help us to advocate for Porter Ranch to have a fence line around Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility? Kevin stated that his office got this Agenda ahead of time, so their staff is already looking at this. Don't know where it will go yet.

Is there anything we can do to help you Susan asked of Kevin? Kevin said great question, and when there are legislative bills, and then we can support those bills. Kevin stated Lane has been beating the drum to get more residents and community members involved in this and that is what it takes. Our coalition must be bigger. It must include other districts, other elected officials. We need a bigger coalition. Susan asked for clarification, such as can we reach out to other neighborhoods such as the neighborhood affected by Exide and figure out ways we can support them and build coalition. Kevin said that would be incredibly powerful. Having more income friendly monitoring that is available for other neighborhoods, by working with SCAQMD, would be great. Porter Ranch needs a broader coalition.

Andrea pointed out that CARB is the one that will make the determination (about fence lines and where they go). Andrea said it is not so much doing monitoring in this neighborhood versus that neighborhood, but it is more like what problem do we tackle first? Refineries? Gas storage facilities? We have to start somewhere. AB 617 will be a long term project. Don't know the level of connections we have. Susan stated that someone from

the Exide neighborhood spoke to her at the Environmental Justice conference in December and thanked Porter Ranch, because in a strange way it helped them get funds for their neighborhoods clean up. Porter Ranch residents got relocated, and so then the neighborhoods poisoned by Exide said you relocate them and do nothing for us? Shortly thereafter they got funding from the Governor Brown for clean-up. So it was a strange dynamic but somehow it helped.

Andrea said try to make coalitions with other neighborhood groups, while at the same time organizing in Porter Ranch. Stakeholder suggested we can promote this at Earth Day.

Stakeholder asked Kevin to thank Senator Stern for shaming the regulators who are still awaiting a root cause analysis on SS-25 well blow out. Senator Stern pointed out that there was a root cause analysis of the dam break disaster in Orville and in 11 months they did an analysis and had a result. Here we are 25 months later and no one can tell us what happened in well SS-25. Katie stated there originally a one year timeline for the root causes analysis for SS-25 to be done.

Stakeholder asked about forming a Senate Oversight Committee regarding Aliso Canyon. Kevin stated he has not heard at the office yet about this, but he will ask questions. Stakeholder thought an Oversight Committee may have more power to get information and answers.

Wrap up

- We need to create a larger coalition and with other neighborhoods
- Motion for PRNC for letter to LA County Health, Senator Stern, County Assemblywoman Barger and County Attorney regarding request that LA County Department of Public Health put out a statement that there are health affects related to Aliso Canyon and that extent is not yet known until we do a health study or something to that effect.

Katie mentioned that California Council on Science & Technology is getting ready to release their report on Gas Storage in California. Report should come out in the next week or so and report is not specific to Aliso Canyon, but it is included in there. It includes health hazards in the report of all facilities, but not health risks. Maybe we want to invite them to speak at our next meeting? This report is very valuable regarding what future monitoring should look like. It looks at hazards but did not estimate risks. That would be really good for Senator Stern's office to get a copy of as well Susan suggested.

Susan asked about SCAQMD working on rules for underground gas storage facilities?
Andrea with check.

Meeting ended.