

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Carbajal, Salud
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 9:29 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fwd: Please deny PCEC's appeal

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Steve Finkel <steve@stevefinkel.net>
Date: October 3, 2016 at 9:56:39 AM PDT
To: <SupervisorCarbajal@sbcbos1.org>
Subject: Please deny PCEC's appeal

Dear Supervisor Carbajal, I strongly support a deny decision on PCEC's upcoming appeal for the following reasons. Thank you for your consideration.

1. The Planning Commission carefully considered this project and rejected it because of the significant, unmitigated Class I impacts to Air Quality, Endangered and Sensitive Species, Critical Habitat and Water Quality. County Staff also recommends rejecting the appeal and only approving the emergency seep cans that are necessary to address the on-going seep problem from existing operations.
2. Cyclic Steam Injection method has a high well casing failure rate and there is a history of eruptive well failures at the site. The drilling would occur in an area that is already suffering extensive damage from 100 accidental oil seeps to date. The State predicts at least another 225 seeps in the next 25 years if the Project is approved.
3. The Project site is one of the most biologically rich locations in Santa Barbara County. The Project's oil seeps would potentially drown the endangered California Tiger Salamanders and destroy some of the rarest and most imperiled plant communities in the world, such as the Southern Bishop Pine forest and the Burton Mesa Chaparral. It will also have an irreversible impact on endangered Lompoc Yerba Santa plants, found in only 6 locations in the world.
4. The environmental review found significant and unavoidable risks to our water. The Project site is on a hill that intersects Orcutt creek and others that flow to the San Antonio Lagoon and Pacific Ocean. The recent Refugio oil spill demonstrates the immense risk and costs of oil spills.
5. The County cannot justify overturning the Planning Commission's decision and Staff recommendation of denial. The Project does not supply any benefits that will outweigh the potentially substantial and irreversible environmental harm from allowing PCEC to double its cyclic steam drilling operations on Orcutt Hill. Thus, the County cannot legally justify approving the Project with a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Steve Finkel
PO Box 344
370 Asegra Road
Summerland, CA 93067

Office: 805-969-2654

Cell: 805-886-2035

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Carbajal, Salud
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 5:45 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fwd: please vote to deny PCEC project

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <lee@leeheller.net>
Date: October 7, 2016 at 5:36:51 PM PDT
To: Salud Carbajal <scarbajal@sbcbos1.org>
Subject: please vote to deny PCEC project

Dear Salud,

I am writing to urge you deny PCEC's appeal of the Orcutt Hills Resource Enhancement Plan and approve the Seep Can Only alternative.

The EIR has made it clear that the project has too many Class I impacts to justify its approval. Leaving aside impacts to endangered species, it is clear that PCEC cannot ensure that steam drilling at the site won't result in oil seeps.

Further, PCEC has not demonstrated that this project will benefit the County economically, while its history of spills and seeps makes it likely that the project will impose a burden on County resources and threat to species and habitats.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Lee

Lee E Heller, Ph.D., J.D.
PO Box 1592
Summerland CA 93067
lee@leeheller.net
805-451-5787

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Kovacs, Naomi
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 3:55 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Ex Parte 10/11/16 Pacific Coast Energy Company - Orcutt Hill
Attachments: 2016-10-10 Ex Parte - PCEC - email with M Rodriguez.pdf

Attached please find an email conversation from Supervisor Wolf's office regarding the PCEC Orcutt Hill project, before the Board of Supervisors tomorrow.

If you'd please confirm receipt of this attachment, I would greatly appreciate it.

Best,

-Naomi

Naomi Kovacs, MPA

Office of County Supervisor Janet Wolf

105 E. Anapamu St.

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

(805) 568-2191

nkovacs@countyofsb.org

Kovacs, Naomi

From: Kovacs, Naomi
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2016 12:33 PM
To: 'Martin Rodriguez'
Cc: Wolf, Janet; O'Gorman, Mary
Subject: RE: Question re: SB 54

Thank you.

From: Martin Rodriguez [mailto:martin@ironworkers433.org]
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 6:17 PM
To: Kovacs, Naomi; John@ibew413.com; Erin Lehane
Subject: Question re: SB 54

SB 54 came about after a brutal legislative battle against the refineries and the building trades and community activist that insisted that all workers in a refinery be skilled and trained. This legislation was in response to several high profile explosions at the refineries and a concern that these explosions might be linked to the low wage out of state day-labor that the refineries were bringing to California to perform the all-important turn-arounds at the refineries. On the heels of SB 54, the state building trades renewed relationships with some of California's oil and gas extractors who wanted to use highly trained union construction workers to ensure that their projects were built as safely and efficiently as possible. The first to step out was California Resources Corporation, California's largest extractor. Upon the signing of both SB 54 and the CRC PLA, it became a state wide agenda of the Building Trades to seek to forge relationships with all ends of the oil industry in California to ensure that these projects are built and maintained by the most highly skilled workers in the state. We also firmly believe that by having union workers in these facilities, rather than day labor, we take away the fear that a lot of the oil field workers feel against voicing concerns about operations. Pacific Coast Energy is a small operator state wide but the approval of this project could have huge ramifications in our attempts to standardize the rest of the oil and gas industry. A set back with this projects approval, would likewise, be a set back to our state wide efforts.

On Oct 7, 2016, at 4:08 PM, Martin Rodriguez <martin@ironworkers433.org> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Kovacs, Naomi" <nkovacs@countyofsb.org>
Date: October 7, 2016 at 3:54:47 PM PDT
To: John Hughes <john@IBEW413.org>, Martin Rodriguez <martin@ironworkers433.org>
Cc: "O'Gorman, Mary" <mogorman@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Question re: SB 54

Good afternoon John & Martin,

Supervisor Wolf has reviewed Senate Bill 54 and would like clarification on the sections highlighted below, in light of your meeting with her yesterday.

Many thanks,

-Naomi

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_54_bill_20131013_chaptered.htm:

Senate Bill No. 54

CHAPTER 795

An act to add Section 25536.7 to the Health and Safety Code, relating to hazardous materials.

[Approved by Governor October 13, 2013. Filed with Secretary of State October 13, 2013.]

From the LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST:

This bill would require an owner or operator of a stationary source that is engaged in certain activities with regard to petroleum and with one or more covered processes that is required to prepare and submit an RMP, when contracting for the performance of construction, alteration, demolition, installation, repair, or maintenance work at the stationary source, to require that its contractors and any subcontractors use a skilled and trained workforce to perform all onsite work within an apprenticeable occupation in the building and construction trades, including skilled journeypersons paid at least a rate equivalent to the applicable prevailing hourly wage rate. The bill would not apply to oil and gas extraction operations. Because the bill would make a knowing violation of these requirements a crime, and would otherwise impose new duties upon local agencies administering the program, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

SEC. 2.

Section 25536.7 is added to the *Health and Safety Code*, to read:
25536.7.

(a) (1) An owner or operator of a stationary source that is engaged in activities described in Code 324110 or 325110 of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), as that code read on January 1, 2014, and with one or more covered processes that is required to prepare and submit an RMP pursuant to this article, when contracting for the performance of construction, alteration, demolition,

installation, repair, or maintenance work at the stationary source, shall require that its contractors and any subcontractors use a skilled and trained workforce to perform all onsite work within an apprenticeable occupation in the building and construction trades. This section shall not apply to oil and gas extraction operations.

Naomi Kovacs, MPA

Office of County Supervisor Janet Wolf

105 E. Anapamu St.

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

(805) 568-2191

nkovacs@countyofsb.org

Erin Lehane

erin@erinlehane.com