
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES AND WATER

Senator Henry Stern, Chair

2021 - 2022 Regular

Bill No:	SB 467	Hearing Date:	April 13, 2021
Author:	Wiener		
Version:	March 22, 2021 Amended		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Katharine Moore		

Subject: Oil and gas: hydraulic fracturing, acid well stimulation treatments, steam flooding, water flooding, or cyclic steaming: prohibition: job relocation

BACKGROUND AND EXISTING LAW

California is a major oil and gas producing state. According to the US Energy Information Administration, the state was 7th and 14th for oil and natural gas production, respectively, among the 50 states in 2020. Production of oil was about 135M barrels.

Existing law establishes the Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) in the Department of Conservation. CalGEM regulates oil and gas production in the state, and CalGEM's leader is the State Oil and Gas Supervisor (supervisor).

According to data obtained from CalGEM's website, there are approximately 125,000 active and idle oil and gas wells in the state (2021 data) and related production facilities located in over 180 oil and gas fields. The state's oil and associated gas fields are older, and many have been in production for decades. Because of this, in part, state oil production depends upon the use of "enhanced oil recovery" (EOR) – secondary and/or tertiary oil production where heat and/or fluid or other applied pressure – is used to facilitate hydrocarbon production from the subsurface. In contrast, primary oil production is when the existing properties of the hydrocarbon-bearing formation and the hydrocarbon itself are generally sufficient for the hydrocarbon to flow into the production well and either flow or be brought to the surface.

Injection wells are typically used for EOR. In California, water or steam are pumped into the hydrocarbon-bearing reservoir through an injection well and then the hydrocarbon/fluid mixture is produced from separate wells. These injection wells are water or steam flood injection wells. Another type of well somewhat unique to the state is a cyclic steam injection well, sometimes known as "huff and puff." Cyclic steam injection wells operate by injecting steam into a well, shutting in the well after the steam is injected, and, after some period of time while the steam "soaks" in the formation, then producing the well. A cyclic steam injection well is different from a water or steam flood injection well as the steam injection and hydrocarbon/fluid mixture production occurs in the same well bore. All three of these injection wells are considered Class II Underground Injection Control (UIC) program wells. CalGEM through a "primacy" agreement with the US EPA regulates Class II UIC wells in California.

Estimates vary of how much of the oil and gas production in the state is due to EOR and the use of injection wells. Within the last several years, CalGEM has offered multiple estimates ranging from 60% to 80% (80% is the most recent number). Committee staff were unable to obtain an estimate recently from CalGEM for production associated with

water flood or steam flood projects. About 20% of the state's annual oil production is attributable consistently to cyclic steam injection wells. It is unknown if production from cyclic steam injection wells is incorporated into the 60% to 80% estimate of total production cited above. Recently, a consultant to opponents of this bill estimated that 95% of state oil production stems from EOR. A review of the supervisor's annual report for 2018 showed that water or steam injection was reported in about 100 of the state's oil and gas fields responsible for over 90% of annual production. While this is an imperfect assessment method, it is additional evidence that EOR, and therefore injection wells, are responsible for a high percentage of oil production in the state.

Generally distinct from the use of injection wells for hydrocarbon production, hydraulic fracturing (or "fracking") of an oil or gas well is a well stimulation technique where a fluid mixture is injected at high pressure into a subsurface hydrocarbon-bearing formation in order to create fractures that would improve the ability of the hydrocarbon contained in the formation to be subsequently produced through the well.

SB 4 (Pavley, Chapter 313, Statutes of 2013) instituted a comprehensive statutory framework for the regulation of well stimulation treatments, including fracking, in the state. The first well stimulation treatment (WST) emergency regulations went into effect on January 1, 2014, and were succeeded by the "permanent" regulations on July 1, 2015 which remain in effect. SB 4 provides the strongest regulation of WSTs in the country (other than where banned). The approval of a WST permit is discretionary. The definition of a WST excludes steam flooding, water flooding, and cyclic steam injection. State regulation further differentiates between injection wells and WSTs, and recognizes that a WST can be performed on an injection well.

Scientific research required to be conducted by SB 4 suggested that approximately 20% of the state's oil and gas production pre-SB 4 was facilitated by WSTs. During the Brown Administration, estimates of the amount of the state's oil production from wells subject to WSTs were on the order of 10%. At least anecdotally, the advent of WST-specific regulation in the state was associated with a reduction in its use. Most recently, CalGEM reported that in 2019 less than 2% of state oil production was attributable to wells that received WSTs. (More information specific to fracking in California is provided in the SB 25 (Hurtado, 2021) Committee bill analysis.)

Measures taken to implement SB 4 helped to reveal significant issues with CalGEM's implementation of its UIC program. Literally thousands of wells had been improperly permitted. CalGEM, with significant legislative support, started to undertake a series of reforms to improve both the implementation of its programs, and its oversight of the state's oil and gas production. At the same time, it became increasingly evident that at least some of the state's cyclic steam injection wells were operated at sufficiently high pressures that the injected steam was fracturing the formation surrounding the well bore (see the June 2014 US GAO Report "EPA Program to Protect Underground Sources from Injection of Fluids Association with Oil and Gas Production Needs Improvement").

According to a 2014 report by the Natural Resources Defense Council, over 5.4 million Californians live within one mile of one or more oil and gas wells. More than one third of these people live in areas considered to be the most burdened by environmental pollution based upon the results of the state's screening tool, CalEnviroScreen. In addition, of those at risk, over 90 percent are people of color.

In November 2019, the Newsom Administration issued a press release ordering three actions specific to oil and gas development and production. One of the actions announced the start of what was intended to become a regulatory process to update public health and safety protections for communities near oil and gas production operations. According to the Administration, the rulemaking process has sought input from environmental and public health advocates, experts, community members and others to consider the best available science and data to inform new protective requirements. The original self-imposed deadline for discussion draft regulations was December 2020. This deadline has since been delayed until at least Spring 2021 in order, in part, for a more comprehensive evaluation by public health experts. The other two actions involved a review of WST permitting and a review of high pressure cyclic steam injection wells. While the WST permitting review has been completed, it is unclear what the status of the cyclic steam injection well review – which barred permitting for new projects – is.

In late 2020, Governor Newsom committed to “working with the Legislature to change state law to prohibit the practice of hydraulic fracturing by 2024.”

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that the purposes of the state’s oil and gas conservation laws include protecting public health and safety and environmental quality, including the reduction and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the development of hydrocarbon and geothermal resources in a manner that meets the energy needs of the state.
 - a) The supervisor shall coordinate with other state agencies and others to further the goals of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and to help support the state’s clean energy goals. (Public Resources Code (PRC) §3011)
- 2) Directs the supervisor to so supervise the drilling, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of wells and the operation, maintenance, and removal or abandonment of tanks and facilities attendant to oil and gas production, as specified, so as to prevent, as far as possible, damage to life, health, property, and natural resources, as provided.
 - a) The supervisor shall also supervise the drilling, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of wells so as to permit the owners or operators of the wells to utilize all methods and practices known to the oil industry for the purpose of increasing the ultimate recovery of underground hydrocarbons, as specified. (PRC §3106)
- 3) Provides a statutory framework for the specific regulation of well stimulation treatments, including permitting, groundwater monitoring, and reporting requirements. (PRC §§3150 *et seq.*)
 - a) Well stimulation treatments include hydraulic fracturing, acid fracking and acid matrix stimulation, and do not include steam flooding, water flooding, and cyclic steaming.

- b) WST permits are valid for one year, and cannot be renewed.
- 4) Requires the operator of a well to file a written notice of intention (NOI) to commence drilling, and prohibits any drilling until approval is given by, the supervisor or district deputy. (PRC §3203)
 - a) Once issued, a NOI is valid for drilling or re-drilling work, as applicable, for two years and cannot be renewed. A NOI effectively authorizes the operation of the well once the well is completed.

PROPOSED LAW

This bill would revise the WST statute to include injection wells, prohibit the issuance of new WST permits, and provide for a minimum 2,500 foot setback from oil and gas wells, among other things. Specifically, this bill would:

- 1) Revise the definition of a WST to include steam flooding, water flooding and cyclic steaming.
- 2) Prohibit CalGEM from issuing a new WST permit (including steam flooding, water flooding and cyclic steaming) or renewing a WST permit beginning January 1, 2022.
 - a) A WST permit issued beginning January 1, 2022 is void.
- 3) Prohibit a WST (including steam flooding, water flooding and cyclic steaming) from being used to extract or recover oil and gas and no WST are authorized beginning January 1, 2022 except pursuant to a lawful WST permit, as specified.
- 4) Authorize a local government to prohibit the use of WST in an area within its jurisdiction.
- 5) Repeal the WST article, as revised by this bill, in the PRC on January 1, 2027, and replace it with a prohibition on WST (including steam flooding, water flooding and cyclic steaming) for the extraction or recovery of oil and gas.
 - a) CalGEM is required to monitor oil and gas fields for WST activities.
- 6) Provide that the following goes into effect if CalGEM does not promulgate a final rule that creates a health protection zone of at least 2,500 feet and CalGEM stops issuing any new or modified permit related to oil and gas wells or production facilities within the health protection zone except for certain activities necessary to prevent an emergency by July 1, 2022:
 - a) Starting January 1, 2023, CalGEM is prohibited from issuing any new or modified permit for oil and gas wells or production facilities within a health protection zone except for certain activities necessary to prevent an emergency.
 - i) A “health protection zone” means the area within 2,500 feet of a sensitive receptor, or a greater distance set by a city, a county, or CalGEM.
 - (1) A sensitive receptor includes a home, community resource center, a health care facility, and a daycare, among other things.

- b) The supervisor is authorized to grant a variance to an operator if a court determines that the implementation of a health protection zone results in a taking of private property, as specified. The variance is limited to the minimum reduction in the health protection zone for the minimum time period and oil and gas development or enhancement activity necessary, as specified.
 - i) If a variance is granted, the operator is required to implement mitigation of certain emissions, and provide an individual indemnity bond to ensure full cost recovery of plugging and abandonment of the well or wells and decommissioning of attendant production facilities, as provided. A blanket indemnity bond applicable to other wells and facilities cannot be used.
 - c) CalGEM is authorized to pursue emergency regulations to implement the health protection zone. The emergency regulations will remain in effect for two years unless modified by CalGEM.
 - d) A city or county is authorized to adopt a larger health protection zone or to otherwise regulate, limit or prohibit oil and gas development, as specified.
 - e) Any permit, approval or authorizations issued by CalGEM before January 1, 2023, and that are compliant with local laws and applicable requirements are not subject to the health protection zone requirements, as provided.
- 7) Require CalGEM to develop and administer a program to identify oil and gas industry workers who have lost their jobs and provide incentives to companies engaged in the remediation of oil and gas well sites to hire these workers.
- 8) Define additional terms, as provided.
- 9) Make legislative findings, and additional technical and conforming changes to law.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT

According to the author, “SB 467 will halt the issuance and renewal of permits for extreme oil and gas extraction methods by Jan. 1, 2022, including hydraulic fracturing (fracking), acid well stimulation treatment, cyclic steaming, and water and steam flooding. The bill also establishes a health protection zone of 2,500 feet around any residences, schools, and health-care and long-term care facilities where no oil and gas extraction of any type will be permitted whatsoever. Lastly, the bill tasks the California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) to identify workers previously employed by the oil and gas industry and to offer incentives to well remediation corporations to hire said former workers.”

“The extraction practices prohibited by this bill, particularly fracking, can have extremely detrimental environmental and health impacts. While the effects range widely depending on method, the impacts often include: an increase in earthquakes and seismicity, air pollution, surface and ground water contamination, spillage of oil or contaminated wastewater, and increased occurrences of sinkholes. The majority of oil and gas operations in California take place in areas already impacted by poor air quality, meaning the pollution caused by extraction compounds this issue and can result in dangerously high levels of fine particulates, nitrogen oxides, and volatile organic compounds in the air. These pollutants have well established links to cancer, heart

disease, endocrine disruption, adverse reproductive outcomes, and increased emergency room visits, hospitalizations, and premature death.”

“These often life-threatening health complications are far worse for those communities directly near oil and gas production. Studies in both California and in other states show a correlation between the distance a community resides near a well and increased rates of birth defects, premature birth, and low birth weights. Further, asthma rates increase closer to an active well, as do hospitalizations for heart failure, fatigue, stress, and other serious health complications. Nearly 7.5 million Californians live within one mile of an operational oil or gas well, while over 2 million live within 2,500 feet of an operational well – a majority of whom are low-income, and people of color. Over 350,000 students attend school within a mile of an active well, while over 120,000 students attend school within half a mile of an active well.”

“California cannot continue to have the image of an environmental beacon while we are actively poisoning our citizens and destroying our state. We can no longer allow for the risky practices of injecting unknown chemicals and pressurized liquids into our ground in the efforts to melt and crack away rock just to access oil. We can no longer allow fossil fuel corporations to disregard the health and wellbeing of our most vulnerable populations by drilling directly next to their homes and schools. SB 467 ensures that the most dangerous and destructive forms of oil and gas extraction, including drilling next to population centers, are no longer permitted and will not occur anywhere in the state.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION

The Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA) writing in opposition, states that this bill “would result in a nearly complete shutdown of California’s oil and gas production industry, will cost the state billions in lost revenue and legal liability and will lead to massive job loss.”

WSPA continues, “SB 467 would force the premature shut in of more than 95% of the state’s oil production. [...] Because SB 467 is focused strictly on supply and does nothing to reduce demand, it is estimated that it would take an increase of 400 tanker vessels to offset the production loss attributable to the bill’s prohibitions.” According to WSPA there would be port infrastructure capacity concerns that could spike the price of a gallon of gasoline up considerably.

WSPA adds “[i]t is also important to note that the proposed prohibition on nearly all operations related to oil production by 2027 would result in a significant impairment of operators’ property rights, requiring the payment of just compensation under the federal and state constitutions. [...] The proposed halt in permitting will result in substantial liability as operators have established vested rights in these permitted operations that cannot be taken without compensation in the absence of showing of nuisance.”

The California Independent Petroleum Association (CIPA) echoes the points that WSPA makes and adds that SB 467 is bad for the state and local governments due to the loss of “billions” in tax revenues. CIPA also notes that “petroleum byproducts are used in thousands of consumer products, including health care” and cites the importance of “PPE and the life-saving equipment made from petroleum” and used by first responders and others during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Writing in opposition, the State Building & Construction Trades Council state that they “oppose any effort to prevent California from meeting its own energy needs. Efforts to curtail oil production will negatively impact blue-collar workers, our mobility, and our collective economy – with little to no benefit to the environment.”

The Building Trades continue, “California’s refineries are supplied by California’s oil fields. Because of a partnership with the oil and gas industry, the Building Trades have been able to increase California’s apprenticeship program by a full third. [...] It bears mentioning that both California’s oilfields and refineries are merely meeting the energy needs of the state as it exists today.”

They close with “we ask you to stand with California’s blue-collar families and stop enabling extremist politics at the expense of the livelihood of working families. Curtailing production here that will do nothing to impact California’s dependence on fossil fuels but merely enrich foreign jurisdictions that do not share the values that we fight hard for every day in California.”

COMMENTS

This bill is double-referred to the Senate Environmental Quality Committee. Elements of the bill subject to that Committee’s jurisdiction will be discussed there and are included here for completeness and context only.

Author’s amendments. The Chair has granted permission to the author to include proposed author amendments in this bill analysis which could not be taken by the author prior to the bill coming before this Committee for hearing. [Amendment #1]

Analysis of the author’s amendments. The author’s amendments revise and revamp the provisions of the bill related to WSTs and injection wells. Only limited technical changes are proposed to the bill’s provisions related to the health protection zones.

The author amendments:

- 1) Prohibit the issuance of new WST permits and the renewal of existing WST permits as of January 1, 2022, as specified.
- 2) Revise the WST definition as of January 1, 2023 to include the operation of high pressure cyclic steam injection wells.
- 3) Prohibit WSTs as of January 1, 2023.
- 4) Revise the repeal and replacement of the WST article in the PRC on January 1, 2027 to incorporate additional necessary definitions and a savings clause, among other things, as provided.
- 5) Prohibit the operation of an injection well without an injection well operating permit issued by CalGEM as of January 1, 2023, as provided.
 - a) The injection well operating permit supersedes and replaces any applicable UIC project approval letter, among other requirements.

- b) Injection well operating permits may be issued for water flood, steam flood, low pressure cyclic steam, and other injection wells. Permits for the operation of high pressure cyclic steam injection wells are prohibited.
 - c) An injection well permit is valid for one year and may be renewed or extended, as specified.
 - d) CalGEM is authorized to issue emergency regulations to establish the injection well operating permit.
- 6) Prohibit the issuance of an injection well operating permit for low pressure cyclic steam injection wells as of January 1, 2027.
 - 7) Prohibit the issuance of an injection well operating permit for water flood and steam flood injection wells as of January 1, 2035.
 - 8) Prohibit the approval of a new NOI to drill or re-drill a high pressure cyclic steam injection well as of January 1, 2022. Similarly, a new NOI shall not be approved for a low pressure cyclic steam injection well as of January 1, 2025, and for a water flood or steam flood injection well as of January 1, 2035.
 - 9) Make additional and conforming changes to statute, and add or revise the definition of various necessary terms, as specified.

The existing language of the bill, as amended on March 22, 2021, treats all specified injection wells as WSTs. Leaving aside technical concerns with that characterization, by prohibiting the issuance of new WST permits the day the bill would go into effect with the expanded WST definition would provide no time for any injection well to obtain a WST permit. Injection wells, under existing law, are specifically excluded from the definition of a WST, and it is unclear if regulations to modify permit requirements could be pursued prior to the expanded WST definition going into effect. While fracking could continue for one year, it is unclear that any would be conducted as none of the customary EOR production methods to produce the oil from the fracked well would be authorized.

The author amendments address this by leaving the existing definition of WST in effect for one year, and still prohibiting the issuance of any new WST permits for fracking/related as of January 1, 2022. After January 1, 2023, an injection well operating permit is required for any injection well. High pressure cyclic steam injection wells are prohibited, and their operation is also added to a revised definition of WST that goes into effect on January 1, 2023. Thereafter, the use of injection wells for EOR is also phased out by prohibiting the issuance of injection well operating permits for these wells on the following schedule: January 1, 2027 (low pressure cyclic steam injection wells), and January 1, 2035 (water flood and steam flood injection wells).

New NOIs for drilling/re-drilling the injection wells are prohibited two years before the injection well operating permits are prohibited, as NOIs are valid for two years.

This bill is a work-in-progress. The author's amendments make progress towards achieving the author's goals with this bill. There are some additional considerations that the author may wish to consider as the bill proceeds. As follows:

- The bill may benefit from tightening the language, particularly where specific definitions are not provided, to ensure that there is no flexibility for regulatory interpretation where the author does not wish to provide it. The framework for the bill, particularly with respect to obsolete/potentially obsolete provisions, may also benefit from further scrutiny.
- The California Workforce Development Board (CWDB) or other workforce/employment entity may be a better location than CalGEM for the employment development provisions provided. The CWDB released its “*Putting California on the High Road: A Jobs and Climate Action Plan for 2030*” report last fall which includes a section on transitioning oil and gas industry workers to other opportunities.

In view of this, the Committee may wish to direct staff to continue working with the author’s office as the bill proceeds. Should ensuing amendments to the bill be substantive and within the Committee’s jurisdiction, the Committee may wish to rehear the bill.

CalGEM currently occupies the field underground. There is a 1976 Attorney General’s opinion that, without going into detail, argues that the state’s oil and gas conservation laws take precedence of local regulations where state law approves of oil and gas development. The opinion states:

“Cities and counties may regulate drilling, operation, maintenance and abandonment of oil, gas and geothermal wells with respect to phases of such activities not covered by state statute or regulation so long as there is no conflict with state regulation concerning other phases of such activities.”

Provisions in this bill would provide local jurisdictions the authority to limit oil and gas well development and related CalGEM-approved activities within their jurisdictions. The AG’s opinion is currently under challenge in litigation stemming from the passage of Measure Z in Monterey County in 2016. In part, Measure Z sought to prohibit certain oil field operations by prohibiting above-ground installation of associated equipment.

It is also worth noting that the development of some of the state’s oil and gas fields predated zoning regulations in at least some jurisdictions.

Potential takings. A discussion of whether or not there are vested rights associated with existing oil and gas wells is beyond the scope of this bill analysis. It may be of interest to the Committee, however, that Culver City (which has part of the Inglewood Oil Field within its jurisdiction) has explored the concept of amortization to reduce or limit the risk of liability to the City should it prohibit oil and gas development at a future date. Essentially amortization would allow oil and gas development to continue for a certain period of time to help provide some return to the operator. There is some indication that the City of Los Angeles is also exploring this concept.

Legislative direction to the regulations under development. This bill provides statutory minimum standards to CalGEM as it develops its regulations to further protect public health and safety in the vicinity of oil and gas production operations. In particular, this

bill mandates that a minimum setback distance of 2,500 feet be instituted to protect certain sensitive receptors. Existing CalGEM regulations protect against acute risks to public health and safety (i.e. well blowouts during drilling), and do not appear designed to address chronic, low-level exposures to potential emissions of oil and gas wells and related facilities.

Through zoning and local ordinances, many local jurisdictions throughout the state have established setback distances for new oil and gas wells and various permitting requirements depending upon land use. The City of Arvin recently established a 300 foot setback from schools and residences, and the required setback increases to 600 feet for certain sensitive receptors, as specified. There are some locations where oil and gas wells are in close proximity to housing (within 100 feet).

Recent public health studies in California found adverse health outcomes associated with proximity to oil and gas wells. In a recent study of potential health impacts in the San Joaquin Valley based upon data from 1998 - 2011, researchers from Stanford University found “evidence that exposure to oil and gas well sites is associated with increased risk of spontaneous preterm birth.” Previous studies had found a general association between spontaneous preterm birth and exposure to environmental contaminants and other factors. This study specifically investigated exposure to oil and gas well sites. Another recent study conducted by researchers primarily affiliated with UC Berkeley also found that “proximity to high production oil and gas development in California was associated with adverse birth outcomes among mothers residing in rural areas.” The UC study considered data from 2006 – 2015, and the adverse birth outcomes for mothers in rural areas included low (absolute) birth weights, and relatively smaller size and weight babies based upon their gestational age. Additional research is needed to further investigate the association between oil and gas wells, and adverse health impacts to pregnant women, babies, and other vulnerable populations.

This is a job killer bill. SB 467 (Wiener) is on the California Chamber of Commerce’s list for this legislative year.

Overdue reports. The overdue 2019 annual idle well report – originally due July 1, 2020 – and the overdue 2019 “Shall-witness/may-witness” report were both released within the last two weeks. There remain several other required reports that have not been received by the Legislature, or, as applicable, made available to the public. These include:

- The 2019 Annual Report of the Supervisor (due October 1, 2020, PRC §3108);
- The 2019 Well Stimulation Treatment (“SB 4”) report (due July 30, 2020, PRC §3215);
- The 2019 Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program report (due July 30, 2020, PRC §3114); and
- The April 1, 2021 report detailing the estimated costs of abandoning hazardous and deserted wells and decommissioning hazardous and deserted facilities with a timeline and specific future goals for the abandoning and decommissioning, as specified. (PRC §3258(d)(1)).

It is difficult to assess CalGEM's current performance without the timely submission of these reports. Additionally, CalGEM has acknowledged that some of the information provided in the 2019 "Shall-witness/may-witness" report warrants revision.

Recent related legislation

SB 25 (Hurtado, 2021) would largely codify two regulatory provisions applicable to well stimulation treatments. *(This bill is pending before this Committee.)*

SB 47 (Limón, 2021) would increase funds available to CalGEM to plug and abandon orphan wells and attendant facilities, among other things. *(This bill is pending before this Committee.)*

SB 84 (Hurtado, 2021) would institute additional reporting requirements at CalGEM related to certain idle well reports, among other things. *(This bill is pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.)*

SB 406 (Stern, 2021) would require increased public transparency at CalGEM, among other things. *(This bill is pending before this Committee.)*

SB 419 (Stern, 2021) would require the use of a skilled and trained workforce for certain work conducted on oil and gas wells and related facilities. *(This bill is pending before this Committee.)*

AB 896 (Bennett, 2021) would create a new collections unit at CalGEM, among other things. *(This bill is pending before the Assembly Appropriations Committee.)*

AB 345 (Muratsuchi, 2020) would have provided direction to CalGEM related to public health setbacks surrounding oil and gas wells in the state. *(This bill did not pass this Committee.)*

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT 1

See attached

SUPPORT

Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment (CRPE) (sponsor)

Voices in Solidarity Against Oil in Neighborhoods (VISIÓN) (sponsor)

350 Bay Area Action

350 Conejo/San Fernando Valley

350 Humboldt 350 Sacramento

350 Santa Barbara

350 Silicon Valley

350 South Bay Los Angeles

350 Ventura County Climate Hub

1000 Grandmothers for Future Generations

ACCE Action

ActiveSGV

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

American Academy of Pediatrics California

American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology District IX
Asian Americans Advancing Justice
Asian Pacific Environmental Network
Azul
Black Women for Wellness
Breast Cancer Action
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Environmental Justice Alliance
California Green New Deal
California Interfaith Power & Light
California League of Conservation Voters
California Nurses Association
Castro Valley Democratic Club
Center for Biological Diversity
Center for Climate Change and Health
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ)
Center for Environmental Health
Central California Asthma Collaboration
Central California Environmental Justice Network
Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE)
Central Valley Air Quality Coalition
Citizens Climate Lobby
Citizens Climate Lobby Ventura
Citizens' Climate Lobby West LA Chapter
City of Santa Barbara
Clean Water Action
Climate 911
Climate Action Campaign – Public Health Advisory Council
Climate Action Santa Monica
Climate First: Replacing Oil & Gas (CFROG)
Climate Health Now
Climate Psychiatry Alliance
Climate Tzedek Committee of Congregation Netivot Shalom
Coalition for Clean Air
Comite Progreso de Lamont
Committee for a Better Arvin
Committee for a Better Shafter
Communities for a Better Environment
Community Environmental Council
Conejo Climate Coalition
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Watchdog
County of Santa Barbara
Courage California
Dayenu
Delano Guardians
Democrats of Rossmoor
Drug Policy Alliance
Earthjustice

Environment California
Environmental Defense Center
Environmental Working Group
Faith in the Valley
Field 661
Food and Water Watch
Fossil Free California
FracTracker Alliance
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glendale Environmental Coalition
Greenfield Walking Group
Greenpeace USA
Heal the Bay
Holman United Methodist Church
Indivisible CA: State Strong
Indivisible California Green Team
Indivisible South Bay LA
Indivisible Ventura
Interfaith Climate Action of Contra Costa County
LandWatch Monterey County
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability
Leap Lab
Live from the Frontlines
Los Padres Forestwatch
Mi Familia Vota
Mothers Out Front
NARAL Pro-Choice California
National Parks Conservation Association
Natural Resources Defense Council
NextGen California
Normal Heights Indivisible
Northern California Recycling Association
Pacoima Beautiful
People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)
Physicians for a National Health Program – California
Physicians for Social Responsibility – Los Angeles
Physicians for Social Responsibility – San Francisco Bay Chapter
Plastic Pollution Coalition
Progressive Democrats of Benicia
Protect Monterey County
Redeemer Community Partnership
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
Rooted in Resistance (Indivisible)
Rootskeeper
San Diego 350
San Diego Pediatricians for Clean Air
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
San Francisco Baykeeper
San Francisco Marin Medical Society

Santa Barbara County Action Network
Santa Barbara Standing Rock Coalition
Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee
Save Our Shores
Seventh Generation Advisors
Sierra Club California
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action
SoCal 350 Climate Action
Social Eco Foundation
Stand.earth
STAND-LA
Starr King Universalist Church
Strategic Concepts in Organizing and Policy Education (SCOPE)
Sunflower Alliance
Sunrise Bay Area
Sunrise Kern
Sunrise Movement LA
Sunrise Movement Sacramento
Surfrider Foundation
Temple Beth El Jewish Community Center
The 5 Gyres Institute
The Center for Oceanic Awareness, Research, and Education (COARE)
The Climate Center
UC Green New Deal Coalition
University Professional & Technical Employees – CWA 9119
UPSTREAM
Voices for Progress
Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club
Western Center on Law and Poverty

OPPOSITION

African-American Farmers of California
Agricultural Council of California
Agricultural Energy Consumers Association
American Chemistry Council
American Legion, Department of California
AMVETS, Department of California
AMVETS California Service Foundation
Associated Builders and Contractors of Central California
Association of the US Army, Northern & Southern California Chapters
Bakersfield Association of Realtors
Black Business Association
California African American Chamber of Commerce
California Association of Black Pastors
California Chamber of Commerce
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California Independent Petroleum Association
California Landscape Contractors Association

California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Poultry Federation
California Professional Firefighters
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Commanders Veterans Council
California State Council of Laborers
California State Pipe Trade Council
California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
Cal-Coast Acidizing Service, Inc.
Camarillo Chamber of Commerce
Cat Canyon Resources
Central Valley Business Federation
Central Valley Coalition for Jobs and Energy Independence
Central Valley Latino Mayors Coalition
City of Taft
Coastal Energy Alliance
County of Fresno
CoLab Ventura County
Concerned Mineral Owners of California
Disabled American Veterans, Department of California
EconAlliance
Fresno Chamber of Commerce
Fresno County Farm Bureau
Gill Ranch Storage, LLC (unless amended)
Greater Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce
Halliburton
Hispanics in Energy
Hispanic 100
Independent Oil Producers Agency
Industrial Environmental Association
International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers
International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Allied Workers
International Association of Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons
International Association of Sheet Metal Workers
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers
International Union of Bridgelayers and Allied Craftworkers
International Union of Elevator Constructors
International Union of Operating Engineers
Kern Citizens for Energy
Kern County Firefighters Local 1301 Union
Kern County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Kern Economic Development Corporation
Kern County Taxpayers Association
Key Energy Services
Latin Business Association
League of United Latin American Citizens – Council 3272
Lodi Gas Storage, LLC (unless amended)

Los Angeles County Business Federation
Marine Corps Veterans Association
Milk Producers Council
MTS Solutions
National Association of Royalty Owners – California
NISEI Farmers League
Northern California Carpenters Regional Council
OST Trucks & Cranes
Oxnard Chamber of Commerce
Painters and Allied Trades International Union
Process Instruments, Inc.
Reserve Organization of America, Golden West Chapter
Santa Barbara County Taxpayers Association
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce
Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce
San Diego Urban Sustainability Coalition
Scottish-American Military Society
Si Se Puede
Southern Company Gas/Central Valley Gas Storage, LLC (unless amended)
Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters
State Building & Construction Trades Council
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States, Canada (UA)
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America
United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers & Allied Workers
Valley Industry Commerce Association
Veterans of Foreign Waters, Department of California
Western State Council of Sheet Metal Workers
Western States Petroleum Association
Wild Goose Storage, LLC (unless amended)
Wolseley Industrial Group

-- END --