September 12, 2018

Re: Aliso Canyon Settlement Agreement

Ms. Nichols,

As one who has raised a family in a home which is one of the closest to Aliso Canyon and the blow out well SS-25, I now understand the health impacts this facility has caused my family and community. Why my children suffered spontaneous and frequent bloody noses growing up. Why we are a household that is part of an unusual cancer cluster on my street. We are not alone. Thousands have been directly impacted by health issues and emotional stress of SoCalGas’ admitted negligence of well SS-25 and years of improper maintenance and oversight of Aliso Canyon. Nor have the regulators who are in charge of setting safety standards accepted their full responsibility of this epic failure, the largest methane blow out in US history. Are we angry, yes, and for very good reasons. As head of an agency in charge of air safety, you should be angry as well. Hopefully, we are motivated to make change.

The settlement agreement has some good aspects to it, so thank you to those responsible. However, 2 issues are not acceptable to the impacted community.

1. Mitigate the exposer right here in the North San Fernando Valley were the impacted live. Not via a pet project designed to benefit SoCalGas via a bio-methane recapture hundreds of miles away. Not only is this insulting to those of us who suffered and continue to do so, the deal structure is heavily biased to protect the SoCalGas, the negligent party. The settlement allows SoCalGas to act as administrator over its own “loan” to remote dairy farms to capture more green houses gasses, pipe them hundreds of miles to shove them into the ground in a total unsafe and under-monitored facility like Aliso Canyon. This is no catalyst of change. This is scam to pump up the settlement numbers to make a few look good at the expense of the community. The mitigation deal structure is more like SoCalGas taking money from one of its pockets and putting into another one of its own pockets. This is not acceptable to those that suffered from SCG’s negligence. Keep the funding and mitigation project local and preferable in the communities impacted. This could be as simple as using the local community as an example of what a clean city could be. Fund the installation solar and battery back up systems in the homes and businesses of the area to be the model for other cities to emulate. Show how serious CARB is to a clear air and clean energy.
2. The health study language needs to include clarity of the inclusion of a group of representatives from the community on all aspects of the long-term health study process. Elected by the people, of the people and for the people directly impacted. Language should call for community involvement from development of the initial health study scope, taskforce member selection, RFP and vendor selection process, through to publication of findings, as well as each and every step in between. In addition, the settlement needs language that guarantees the community complete and full transparency to all data and decision making. Anything less than this will only foster the already low trust level the community has of its elected and those they appoint to act as agents of the regulators that are supposed to protect us. A robust community oversight would be the prudent thing to do.

You have a wonderful opportunity to begin rebuilding the trust of the community and those watching from across the country to see how this can and should be done properly. I urge you to do so.

Respectfully,

Craig Galanti

Porter Ranch Resident