

From: max golding <maxgolding1@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 22, 2013 11:42 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: SoCal Gas Expansion Project

LATE
DIST

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I am one of the 900 opposed/ignored non-corporation-persons. I am also requesting a continuance of public hearing on the SoCal Gas Expansion Project for the following reasons:

1. Complicity in fracking

80% of the gas stored comes from out of State. It should be assumed that some or even most of this gas will be obtained by fracking. If fracking is unsafe in Goleta, it's unsafe in Unknown Place Where Humans Live And Ecosystems Thrive. It is also complicit in the economic damages causing people to have to pay doctors to treat their cancers and other diseases caused by contaminated water, and the costs of them having to relocate where they live, uncompensated by the natural gas industry.

2. The semantics of the word fracking

Three times the phrase "without the use of hydraulic fracturing" shows up in the public hearing document. This means the county board is assuring the public "the bad thing you're afraid of is not going to happen." I have spoken to environmental lawyers who are weary about the focus on fracking because of the fact that there are numerous kinds of natural gas extraction techniques with lots of problems, but the spotlight has only been on fracking thus far. It is worth mentioning the this exact EIR and corporate representative/presentation process occurred in every single other community where fracking destroyed water supplies. You ask the question "how many parts per million of the carcinogenic chemicals" instead of "why don't you build our community wind and solar farms instead?" Whether fracking or drilling or cyclical steam extraction, it's all permanently destroying parts of the earth that renewable energy systems do not.

3. Natural Gas Industry's Use of PsyOps on US Communities

The natural gas industry has been using military psychological warfare tactics to misinform and confuse communities about the dangers of natural gas extraction techniques since at least 2009. Remember that if the word "fracking" is used, translate that into "way for company to get profits to satisfy primacy of shareholders," not as "the bad thing SoCal Gas will not be using." <http://desmogblog.com/gas-fracking-industry-using-military-psychological-warfare-tactics-and-personnel-u-s-communities>

3. Grounds of climate change

The most conservative consensus on climate change in the world says that a 2 degree increase in global temperatures should be prevented. This means the world cannot burn more than 565 gigatons of CO2 by 2050. The fossil fuel industry (including the natural gas industry, who is responsible for direct and fugitive methane emissions, methane being far more dangerous than carbon dioxide in terms of its warming potential) has an estimated 2,795 gigatons in their reserves. By the legal charter of shareholder primacy, fossil fuel corporations legally must defend all and every prospect of fossil fuel exploration, production and expansion no matter how many negative externalities may result. There is nothing in the legal charter of shareholder primacy that says "make as many profits as possible with consideration to social and environmental

consequences." Their assessments of the consequences of their profit making activities will never, by definition of their existence as shareholder primacy institutions, reflect the consequences that non-affiliated communities and ecosystems would have. You should read these requests that they have not as "we want to give more energy to Americans" but as "we want to destabilize the climate in order to give more energy to Americans."

4. SoCal Gas/Sempra Energy connections to Halliburton

Debra Reed, SoCal Gas President during the time of the first request for this project, also served as a boardmember of Halliburton. Corporate watch activists have a website dedicated to just watching Halliburton's corporate practices: halliburtonwatch.org. I recommend you explore that site for 5-10 minutes if you weren't aware of what kind of company Halliburton is. Halliburton is responsible for the legal loopholes that has allowed fracking to not have to be regulated which has resulted in the contamination of many local water supplies which has made many communities have to leave their towns or have to ship in potable drinking water.

5. Cost and Benefit Analysis & Renewable Energy

If we were to find out exactly how much money this project were to cost and find out exactly how many units of energy it would get ratepayers, then we could compare with how many units of renewable energy the same amount of money would get ratepayers, and how much money this would save all of us over time in terms of both monetary and social/environmental costs. I should mention that by SoCal Gas' own calculations, ratepayers will save less than \$5 each, one time, from this project. It is unknown how much money shareholders would make, but the potential costs of water, air and geological damage in Goleta should not be swept under the rug for unknown shareholders.

Sorry I haven't cited many sources, if you want sources for anything you're not sure about just ask. I wrote this in a rush. Thanks.

Max Golding