



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, November 13, 2017,
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

Introductions

Susan welcomed the eight 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
Jarrod DeGonia, Senior Field Deputy, Supervisor Kathryn Barger
Katie Butler, Health Impact Assessment Analyst, County of Los Angeles Public Health
Andrea Polidori, Atmospheric Measurements Manager, AQMD

Procedures for Ad Hoc Committee

Susan explained 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.

Follow Ups from Last Meeting

Jarrod discussed progress made from meeting with Supervisor Sheila Kuehl regarding possible funding of a permanent fence line by AQMD. Jarrod stated he, Katie, and Dr. Cyrus Rangan (County of Los Angeles Public Health) met and discussed the possibility of using \$1 million from the AQMD settlement money for a fence line monitoring system because the \$1 million for a long term health study would just be a drop in the bucket in regards to what County Health and others think is needed for a study. Supervisor Kuehl's office was intrigued by the idea of using the \$1 million for air monitoring. Her staff said they'd take it to the AQMD Governing Board. So the good news is Supervisor's Kuehl's office is interested in helping, but Jarrod needs to get back to her office and see where they are in this process.

They will try to handle it administratively first. Susan asked how this works. Do they have to make a motion before the AQMD Board? Katie said at this point the \$1 million is designated for a health study. Concurrently, AQMD pulled together the Health Expert Panel in the last month to figure out what they could do with \$1 million, and exposure air monitoring is a component of that. So the process would be the Health Expert Panel will take their summary with a menu of options of what to do with that \$1 million and go back to the community for input. They don't have to get approval from the AQMD governing board to do that.

Susan said there was \$1 million, but there was also maybe about \$4.5 million in the settlement that went back to the (AQMD) General Fund, and that was what we were trying to get for the permanent fence line system. Jarrod thought we were trying for both (sets of funds). Katie said \$1 million is already designated, so that is easier. We were trying to get that shifted to the health study, but at the last Health Panel Meeting the additional general fund settlement money, the \$4.5 million, was considered "off the table." Katie said to use the additional money (beyond the designated \$1 million) would take AQMD Board approval.

Susan said she is not comfortable with an either/or situation with either air quality monitoring or a health study. Jarrod & Katie said they are focusing on both. Jarrod said the \$4.5 or \$5.5 will need some motion to release funds from the AQMD General Fund. Andrea said there is a possibility of doing both. We want to keep idea of doing both alive. Andrea said getting the monitoring first is desirable because a very wide and thorough health study will take years. Katie sees the \$1 million to be used now for more immediate needs for air monitoring. Stakeholder said she wants a vote. Katie said the Health Expert Panel will come back to the community with the options and get community's feedback and input. Susan asked what that will look like. Town Hall? The whole PRNC Board would want some input as well. Jarrod stated they'd come back to PRNC Board and give a presentation at a meeting. The Health Panel is open to such a process (of getting input from community). Do we have a timeline on that? Katie and Jarrod will check back for timeline.

Jarrold said he could not speak for another office, but he mentioned that he and Katie were on a conference call with Senator Stern's office and he was surprised on how up to date they were and the work they have done trying to find funds for a health study conducted by the state. They have done a lot of work. They have an administrative and a legislative strategy and have been in contact with several agencies. Still not certain if it will take an administrative type fix or call for new legislation, but they have done a lot of research. Senator Stern's new District Director is Kevin Taylor so that is a benefit for us because he is so familiar with neighborhood councils, with PRNC and the Aliso Canyon situation. Susan circled back regarding \$1 million they have a lot of flexibility with. Andrea stated he heard the \$4.5 (or \$5.5) is less flexible. Andrea said health study will take years, and he thinks in terms of the air monitoring, \$1 million, will give us amazing information. Susan confirmed an air monitoring will go around the whole facility. Stakeholder asked if it would be like the information we can see every day (like Argos Scientific) and Andrea said yes it would. Andrea said you can have lower cost sensors as well and spread them out over the area. Stakeholder said we want a long term solution as long as Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility is open or even after it is closed because it continues to give off gas.

Jarrold stated Katie and other health officials got in touch with District Attorney's office and there is not a lot they can do to reopen the case against SoCalGas. (This was a discussion we had at last meeting, where stakeholder brought up the concern that SoCalGas was not fulfilling their settlement agreement of providing methane monitoring around the facility for 3 years, because their system seems to be manipulating the data and not giving the community the information we need.) Katie said she is not giving up yet. Katie said the District Attorney said they do not feel they can legally challenge that based on problems we see with their monitoring system.

County Lawsuits Update

The restraining order of trying to prevent SoCalGas from reinjecting, even at these low levels, is off the table. So they did reinject gas, but at a low level, and it remains at a low level for now.

Jarrold stated that there are still two lawsuits:

- (1) Gas Co vs. Los Angeles County
- (2) Los Angeles County vs. CPUC (California Public Utilities Commission)

For (1), we are still in the discovery phase. There have been conversations related to discovery and to what the next steps will be. For (2), Jarrold has to get more information on that. Susan clarified that just because the restraining order piece was not upheld, that does not mean these two lawsuits were dismissed. These two lawsuits are continuing on.

Stakeholder asked for explanation as to what "restraining order" he was referring to. Jarrold explained that in the summer (July) when the state said SoCalGas could reinject gas into Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility, LA County sued to prevent SoCalGas from reinjecting, but we lost that when it went before a judge and then an Appellate judge, and then to the California Supreme Court. But again, we lost and SoCalGas was allowed to reinject. Susan clarified that SoCalGas was only allowed to reinject gas at a lower level (of volume) around 21 to 23 billion cubic feet (bcf) instead of the 87 bcf that they were at, at the time of the well blowout. Then, SoCalGas wrote a letter to CPUC stating they really needed to be able to resume normal operations, so we don't have gas shortages, but CPUC said no (and restricted injections to this lower level). Jarrold stated LA Times did a really good job on an article about this. SoCalGas went to CPUC and said there was a concern about energy reliability, and SoCalGas wanted to resume full operations. CPUC said no. CPUC said they were concerned about reliability, and that SoCalGas has 4 pipelines they are doing repairs on. CPUC said no, we don't need to get Aliso Canyon back up to normal operations. Susan reiterated that Aliso Canyon is considered "asset of last resort" meaning if the state cannot get gas from anywhere else; they can draw it from Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility.

Stakeholder asked where we get our gas, then, and Susan explained that there are pipelines coming into the area that can provide necessary gas. We have not had to draw from Aliso

Canyon Gas Storage Facility in two years. There were, she remembers, two draws in that time but those are being investigated because it appears SoCalGas had access to piped in gas and did not need to draw from Aliso Canyon. So the longer we go without Aliso, it appears to prove we do not need them for energy reliability. We've also used workarounds such as increasing battery storage at the utility level, and those are still in place and being used.

Jarrold added that the Energy Reliability Study being done right now by the CPUC also looks at battery storage and other electrical providers. Susan asked didn't CPUC already do an energy reliability study? Jarrold stated the LA County did, and showed that Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility was not necessary for energy reliability across the region, but the state is undertaking another study per SB 57 mandate. That is not complete yet.

Susan asked about the statement someone at the state level made, saying Aliso Canyon may be shut down in 10 years. Who said that and where are we on that? Jarrold stated that the CPUC did issue a statement that they want to see the phase out of Aliso Canyon over 10 years. Is there any teeth in that statement? Any legislation? Jarrold said that is the CPUC making this statement, so yes, it has some teeth. Susan would like to see a statement from CPUC stating that they WILL (definitely) phase out Aliso Canyon in 10 years. Lane said she met with Senator Stern, and she believes the 10 years came from Governor Brown.

Number of Smell Complaints since #SS25 was plugged

Andrea emailed that statistics:

Since 2/11/17 (through 9/12/17), there have been 544 Complaints alleging So Cal Gas (or Sempra) as the source, an Unknown source that the Inspector identified as So Cal Gas, or an Unknown source that was not verified that the complaint description mentions "gas", "methane", or "Aliso".

Since 2/18/17 (through 9/12/17), that number is 539.

Susan asked if the same protocol is in place, that being, when someone smells gas they call 1-800-CUT-SMOG to report it, and that 3 people must call within 60 minutes for AQMD to send out an inspector. Yes, procedure is the same.

Andrea is working on getting the number from 9/13 to present date of complaints. He may get an update to his phone during this meeting. Lane asked Andrea to repeat the numbers, and he read the above statistics.

Andrea talked about recent smells in Seal Beach, which may be related to tankers. Protocol is the same everywhere. Susan stated we appreciate when the AQMD inspectors come out when we have called, especially Larry Israel who seemed to become our best friend during the height of the gas well blow out and came out so many times for us to investigate our complaints. Andrea also reviewed their procedures, such as when they deployed their mobile methane monitor vehicle to gather more information. Susan asked under what circumstances the sensor vehicles were deployed, and Andrea explained that up until July 2016 they were doing twice weekly monitoring using their mobile methane monitoring

vehicles. Since then, they were deployed after the airplane flyover showed large concentrations of methane in Aliso Canyon. They can deploy them as needed going forward.

Making Sense of Sensors Conference

Susan thanked Andrea for organizing and being such a big part of the AQMD Making Sense of Sensors Conference (September 27 & 28, 2017). Susan stated the big thing we all learned was the use of smaller, hand held or personal air monitors. Lane requested explanation for those watching online. Andrea explained in 2014, AQMD started their AQ-SPEC sensor performance evaluation sensor program, where they evaluate less expensive, smaller in size sensors. Less expensive and smaller sensors can be purchased and deployed throughout a community. These sensors can measure particulate matter (PM) or other specific gases. AQMD does field testing and testing in their laboratory (in Diamond Bar) to test accuracy of these sensors; they are the only ones in the country doing this. The conference, Making Sense of Sensors, was a conference to bring people together to give presentations on these sensors and how they are being used. Conference was webcast, and 8 countries were represented. Lane asked where people can view it. Andrea suggested googling AQMD and AQ-SPEC, and at AQ-SPEC webpage, you can find it and view the webcast of this 2 day conference. (Here is the link: <http://www.aqmd.gov/aq-spec/conference-2017> to view the conference.)

Susan asked Andrea to explain the difference between sensors that measure particulate matter (PM) and ones that measure methane gas. So monitors that measure PM (which can be 2.5 which refers to the size of the particles, can also be PM 10, again referring to the size of the particle, or it could be ultrafine) measure an actual particle size of matter. What kind of pollution gives off PM? Andrea answered it would be sources such as fugitive emission from facilities, vehicles, diesel particulate matter, which is usually black carbon. Then there are other monitors that measure specific gases such as methane or CO₂.

Broadly speaking, there are 2 categories of monitors:

- Monitors that measure Particulate Matter (PM)
- Monitors that measure specific gases such as methane, CO₂, ozone, etc.

Andrea explained Axetris has a low cost devise that measures methane. Usually, just one methane monitoring equipment system costs \$30,000 - \$40,000 each. Axetris has come up with a low cost sensor, for \$5,000. However, that \$5,000 is for the “raw sensor”, because then you need to connect the sensor to a system to read, report, communicate and collect data, so that brings the total cost up to about \$6,500.

Susan stated she talked to a salesman from Axetris (at the Making Sense of Sensors conference) and he said the next phase instrument may be about \$2,500. Andrea stated that there are two concerns in that statement: one is “salesman” and the other is “next phase.” All of these instruments are very new, and cost is associated with volume. Once a lot more people start to buy them and the sales volume goes up, then the price will come down.

A couple weeks ago Axetris provided AQMD with a device for a certain amount of time, so Andrea's idea is to deploy it with the Argos Scientific monitors and to compare the data. Susan will give Andrea her contact information to get that up and running.

Susan brought up the concept of having these monitors deployed in other areas, such as The Renaissance housing community, for example. Andrea said in the monitoring world, \$6,000 is not a lot of money. It will be very interesting to see what Axetris shows, versus what Argos Scientific shows versus what SoCalGas fence line system shows. Andrea stated Axetris report out will not look like SoCalGas fence line report out. He said that he understands that the SoCalGas system is designed to warn of another blow out like SS-25 and to catch it; it is not designed to report out the detailed, varying levels of methane. AQMD wants to be able to see detailed, varying levels of methane so they can analyze the data and spot patterns. Regarding SoCalGas' fence line monitoring system, Susan made an analogy to an "idiot" light on a car, such as the oil light that flashes only when you are totally out of oil (and not a gauge that shows the level of oil.) We just don't see the variations in the SoCalGas report out on the actual methane levels as they occur in real time.

Airplane flyovers to measure methane

Last airplane flyover (with a methane measuring system over Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility) one was on September 16, 2017. There were consecutive flights. The last one showed methane levels measuring below 250kg per hours, so no further flyovers were required. The flyover was how they found the hot spots (of large methane releases) around the Termo equipment. (Termo operates within the Aliso Canyon Gas Storage Facility.) Andrea stated also that was why they had the mobile methane monitoring vehicle deployed, and that is how they found the source to be that Termo Company compressors and storage tanks were leaking. Termo was required to fix the leaks. Stakeholder asked if they would have detected the leak without the flyover. Andrea stated it was a great question. To find the exact location of the leak, they had to follow up with mobile methane monitoring vehicle, which they drove around the Aliso Canyon facility. They probably would not have discovered it (to begin with) without the flyover.

Susan asked if they can deploy drones with these small hand held methane monitor devices. Andrea stated that a University of California Irvine drone expert is looking at this. There are FAA regulations to consider, but those are changing, too. The airplane flyovers cost about \$8,000 and they were paid for by SoCalGas, due to the state requirement. AQMD completed their report that talks about Aliso Canyon measurements, stationary measurements plus summary of all other measurements. Executive Summary is posted on SCAQMD website at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/compliance/aliso-cyn/report/executive-summary.pdf?sfvrsn=4>. The Companion Technical Report will be posted at a later date.

Also, in 2015 they did a report on all fugitive emissions. Does study include Aliso Canyon? No, but one of the reports talks about oil and gas fields and marine vessel emissions, in

general, and what technology can be used to measure emissions. (See SCAQMD website at <http://www.aqmd.gov/fenceline-monitoring>).

Katie: LA Department of Public Health Update

Last time she reported the LA County Department of Health was receiving double the amount of reports of health symptoms from the public. She thanked ALL people for sending in emails and making phone calls to report symptoms. She knows reporting it can get tiresome, but they do use the information. Symptoms have mainly included headaches, bloody noses, respiratory symptom, rashes on skin and eye irritation and they are continuing to be reported. She worked with AQMD and mapped health symptom complaints with odor complaints to see patterns. Since reinjection at beginning of July, it is following the same pattern of complaints/symptoms as during the (well SS#25) blowout. The majority of the symptoms and odor complaints come down the central canyon area and into central Porter Ranch and drop off as you go east and west. Katie is working with GIS folks to see if they can make those points unidentifiable, to respect names of people reporting. They want to preserve the pattern, but also preserve people's privacy.

There are two problems are the assessment of health impacts. The first one is the period during the (well SS#25) blowout, and the second one being the ongoing odor problems. This is a very complicated picture health wise. LA County Department of Health remains concerned that Aliso Canyon Gas Storage facility has performed reinjection, and they have eyes on the bigger risk, which is the fact that in an emergency scenario, do we have the wherewithal and engineering needs to plug up another leak? The public health risk is serious and needs to be addressed.

County Supervisors Kathryn Barger and Hahn introduced a motion at the LA County level to increase health authority to have the ability to make necessary decisions about a facility, up to and including making the decision to force a shut down if a facility is considered a great enough health hazard. There will be a report back in 90 days, Jarrod explained, to report back to the LA County Board of Supervisors and there will be recommendations in such a report. Susan asked Jarrod to thank Kathryn Barger for introducing this. Susan asked if there would be a change in the law for that increase in authority to occur. Jarrod said the report will spell this out as far as what would need to be done, whether it is an administrative fix or a law change. They'd go through Senator Stern's office if it needs legislation.

Stakeholder gave the example of a hair salon, which the health department would immediately shut down if a customer were harmed from a chemical (used in treating hair). Katie used the analogy of a restaurant, which if it had health infractions, would also be shut down immediately. The stakeholder then asked Katie about what she thought about the app for smart phones that someone in the community came up with to track health symptoms. Susan will give Katie the email for Andrew, who created the app. There may be a one-time fee for \$2.99 for the app. Lane stated the name of the app is EHT Real Time Symptom Reporter. Go to EnvironmentalHealthTracker.com and you will find Andrew's

app. Comment from those following this meeting on Facebook: Community has reported over 400 health complaints on Andrew's app! Katie said sometimes what is done is you can create a health registry, and then periodic surveys sent to those families who are registered and this is a CDC type model. Maybe this can all be incorporated. Susan will give Katie Andrew's contact information so they can share information and work together.

Stakeholder had questions about her headache and nausea. She is near Porter Ranch Drive and Rinaldi. She submitted her complaint online. She asked more about the trajectory of the gas and symptoms. Katie responded by asking her to call AQMD to report odor, and then also call LA County Health to report health symptoms at 213-738-3220 and leave a message if no one answers and they will call back in 24 hours. Katie then explained the trajectory pattern as being denser in the center of Porter Ranch, but if you smelled odor and had symptoms at the same time that is meaningful. Odors are fleeting and in pockets. Katie can go back and look at the map and she will give stakeholder her contact information to follow up with her.

Andrea stated based on the data gathered from the mobile methane monitor vehicle, most of the complaints were from central Porter Ranch because of the way the wind disburse the gas. The wind comes down into the canyons. It seems to be going into The Highlands, then into Porter Ranch Estates, and then goes down Limekiln Canyon.

Stakeholder asked about water testing into Limekiln Canyon, but no water has been tested there by the LA County Department of Health, at least.

Any follow up on cancers for teachers at Castlebay? Katie will check back with public health nurse on that.

Andrea got follow up data on number of complaints on his phone just now, and they are as follows: Since 7/31/2017, there have been 170 complaints. About 65 September, 103 October and 10 November (so perhaps total is 178, not 170). Jarrod asked if that starts a NOV (Notice of Violation) process. Andrea said probably not.

Assembly Bill (AB) 617

This is a new law whereby state of California stipulated that all AQMD (Air Quality Management Districts) must conduct air toxic measurements at all known sources such as refineries.

There are two components which are:

- Fence line type monitoring at facilities
- Community type monitoring in the community surrounding facilities.

California Air Resources Board (CARB) is in charge of coordinating this. CARB is talking to all Districts in CA to elucidate how AB 617 will be implemented. By Fall of 2018 AQMD needs to have a state wide plan. Each AQMD area will be identifying toxic sources and have a plan to monitor the air toxins in those communities. AQMD has previous knowledge and expertise in both fence-line and community monitoring. So we are going to help CARB organize plan. A couple weeks ago they had meeting in Los Angeles, which both Andrea and Susan attended, where they laid out the outline of the plan and took input from the public. Andrea said AQMD must come up with a list of facilities, how many communities to monitor and types of technologies to involve. There is lots of money involved and this is very revolutionary. Toxics could be metals, chromium, VOC (volatile organic compounds), ozone, etc. They are recognizing that these toxins are very important. This is the next step in the evolution of air monitoring.

Susan asked which facilities in the state will be monitored? Susan stated that of course at the meeting downtown she advocated for Porter Ranch, but there are a lot of facilities and areas in Los Angeles that need monitoring, too, like Boyle Heights. There are communities that sit in the middle of three different freeways. How do we advocate for Porter Ranch? Jarrod made note to follow up with Supervisor Barger regarding advocating for Porter Ranch. Jarrod offered that the County has a Legislative Affairs Dept. and he will email them in regards to this as well.

Susan asked how the funding for AB 617 will work. Is there one pot of money that must get divided up? Or will facilities that need monitoring be identified and then does the state of California work to find the money to fund those fence-line systems? Andrea stated that he knows there is funding for the first year for sure. Actual monitoring won't start until 2019.

Katie & Jarrod said they used the discrepancies between monitoring reports from Argos v. SoCalGas in their discussions with District Attorney and Kathryn Barger to show need for independent monitoring.

Andrea stated that Los Angeles is the capital of air toxic emissions and they are everywhere. Andrea talked about the local sensors, which are very accurate but very expensive so they cannot afford or deploy a lot of them. On the other hand, there are the low cost sensors and they can deploy a lot of them across a wider geographic area, but they are less accurate. AQMD has been doing studies and if you combine all of the emissions from oil wells in the Los Angeles basin, that alone constitutes 50% of emissions from all sources. That is more than what the refineries give off. Andrea stated there are 4,000 some oil wells in Los Angeles and only 6 major refineries. Lane stated that the EPA came out with a report about fugitive emissions, and this is very serious in terms of toxic emissions. All of these facts are now being recognized. One report shows that certain areas of Los Angeles like Signal Hill, have refineries and oil wells and they have multiple pollutants. Currently, there is an old oil well in the yard of a home in Echo Park leaking methane. (See article <https://www.theeastsiderla.com/2016/06/echo-park-front-yard-oil-wells-to-be-sealed-off/>)

Lane asked if they know that SoCalGas does not investigate until their instruments read 7 ppm for methane level? Shouldn't it be less that to investigate such as 5 ppm? Andrea said it is hard to put a number on it. There are concentrations where there are 40 ppm in other areas of the city, such as a pipe leaking methane. Methane leaks are so common. Susan thinks that these low cost sensors are game changers because they can be deployed all around the city and can find these types of leaks.

Susan asked about particulate matter (PM) sensors. Andrea stated that type of pollution can come from combustion engine vehicles. PM sensors do not show what type of pollutant is in the PM. Susan asked if fires also cause PM pollution, and Andrea answered yes they do. AQMD has 80 PM sensors deployed, and Coalition for Clean Air has some more, so there are around 200 PM sensors in total in the Los Angeles area. Susan asked if there would be any benefit to our community to have a PM matter low cost monitor, such as Purple Air, in our community. Andrea stated a PM would not measure gases from Aliso Canyon Gas Storage facility. This is off topic, as it is a different kind of pollutant, but Andrea offered that we can talk another time about EPA Star Grant Program. They are working with 6-7 communities already, and so it would not cost anything to add another community. There are requirements to work with a community. For example, there has to be feedback from community, so there is some commitment, but the sensors are free to the community. Susan asked if dust being blown down from the hills in Porter Ranch is that going to show up in PM sensors? Andrea said yes and no, that it may pick up some and if it also blends with fugitive emissions from the ground that would be an issue. But, no, the PM monitors would not necessarily go crazy from the dust blown in from the hills in Porter Ranch. Lane mentioned, when Jarrod had to leave to attend another meeting, that on Facebook, where this is being streamed live, those watching thanked Jarrod as well as Katie and Andrea for what they are doing for our community!

Questions from Stakeholders

A stakeholder asked about our water quality and if she should use a filter? Katie said they looked at water sources. There are aquifers below Porter Ranch, and right now they are not being used for drinking water. But that is an ongoing question because how it will affect long term water sources is an open question.

Katie went to the drinking water report, and our LADWP water is coming from other parts of the state so it is more of a long term question. Have any chemicals from the leak made it to the aquifer? Susan said there is a plan to utilize more aquifers below Los Angeles in the long term for drinking water. There are remediation issues when using these aquifers because toxic plumes travel underground.

Lithium is supposedly not linked to Aliso Canyon. As our President PRNC stated, that if we are concerned with lithium levels, we have to go to the State Water Regulatory Board to ask them to address this (by studying/coming up with safe levels of lithium standards.)

Another stakeholder is still getting oily dots on her car. She wants it checked out. She has taken pictures of it. It seems to be more prevalent when there is dampness in the air. It

looks like brownish black dots. She asked AQMD investigator and he said it could not be tested. Andrea will follow up with stakeholder on this. Susan stated this is concerning and it is the first she has heard of this (so long after the #SS-25 was plugged.)

Another stakeholder brought up the Water Resources Board contact is Adam Tang, 213-576-6752. He was doing ground water testing supposedly in this area. We will follow up with him.

Wrap Up

- There are 2 reports posted on SCAQMD website
- Katie will follow up on cancers at Castlebay Elementary
- Jarrod will email me an update on timeline for \$1 million to fund fence line and when community can voice our opinion and get input from community.

Next meeting probably early January 2018.