
SACRAMENTO ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

Margie Namba
Mark White
Robert Bailey
Dana Curran, Vice Chair
George "Buzz" Link, Chair
Dr. Anthony DeRiggi
Secret Charles-Ford
Mark Barry

A JOINT COMMISSION APPOINTED BY:
County of Sacramento
City of Sacramento
City of Isleton
City of Folsom
City of Galt

MEETING MINUTES

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2014, 6P.M.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
10590 ARMSTRONG AVENUE MATHER, CALIFORNIA 95655**

ITEM

1. Call to Order – Chair Link

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

2. Roll Call – Staff Secretary

Commission Members Present: Margie Namba, Mark White, Robert Bailey, Dana Curran, George "Buzz" Link, Dr. Anthony DeRiggi, Secret Charles-Ford, Mark Barry

Staff Members Present: Val Siebal, Jill Koehn

3. Introduction of Commissioners – Chair Link

The Commission Members each took a turn introducing themselves.

4. Public Comment – Chair Link

There was no public comment.

5. CONSENT ITEMS – Approval of January 2014 Minutes

A motion was made by Robert Bailey and seconded by Mark White, to approve the minutes of the January 2014 meeting.

Ayes: Margie Namba, Robert Bailey, Dana Curran, George " Buzz" Link, Dr. Anthony DeRiggi, Secret Charles-Ford, Mark Barry, Mark White

Noes: None

Abstentions: None

6. Presentation on Safer Consumer Products Initiative Update by Lynn Goldman, Staff Attorney at the Department of Toxic Substances Control

Ms. Goldman's focus at DTSC for the last year has been the Safer Products Initiative. The initiative not only pinpoints toxic substances contained in consumer products but includes a regrettable substitution list as well, so that one toxic chemical is not substituted for another. For example, BPA in plastic products was replaced by manufacturers with BPS, which is just as toxic as BPA, so much so, that it is showing up in urine analysis and bio monitoring studies.

The new regulation will require manufacturers to ask the questions: Is it necessary to have this chemical in the product? Manufacturers using toxic chemicals are being pressured to consider alternative analysis of nontoxic chemicals.

The Candidate Chemicals list is composed of 1200 chemicals from already published data lists. DTSC will pinpoint five priority products containing chemicals from this list that DTSC will eventually regulate after the list is made public on March 3rd. Manufacturers of the priority products can willingly substitute a safer chemical in the product that is on the DTSC list and DTSC will issue a "no response" as their regulatory response or follow up with other regulatory actions.

All consumer products are open to regulation except medical products, pesticides, and prescription drugs. The DTSC publishes the chemical lists on their website and people can look at the character traits of that toxin. Hazard Traits lists and Exposure Indicator lists are the measuring tools used to determine if the toxic substance appears on the Chemical of Concerns List. A chemical that appears on both lists, hazard and exposure, is part of the 150 chemicals from which the priority products containing this chemical are chosen.

Five products will be announced next month by the DTSC as priority products. Three public workshops will be scheduled near the end of May to discuss these priority products. DTSC is asking manufacturers to look at what happens to their product if a safer chemical alternative is used and to look at the full life cycle of the product to consider adverse impacts.

What are the regulatory responses the DTSC may issue? No response, additional information request, consumer warning labels on product, use restrictions, prohibitions on sales, end of life stewardship, or, requiring manufacturers to contribute to a research fund to find alternative chemicals. This priority product list creates an incentive to be innovative and green. The regulations will be enforced by actual auditing. No additional financial resources will be diverted and twenty seven staff are working on this program.

Commissioner DeRiggi volunteered to follow this item and report back to the Commission in March.

7. Fracking by Bill Allayaud, Environmental Working Group

Mr. Allayaud informed the Commission that SB 4 was passed in September 20, 2013. Fracking in California, including acid matrix well stimulation, now requires a permit, disclosure of the chemicals used, a notice to surrounding property owners, water monitoring, and provides for a Data base, to name a few of the new regulations. DOGGR, the Division of Gas and Geothermal Resources, is the regulating agency in California. DOGGR regulations preempt local regulations in regards to fracking. Mr. Allayaud met with DOGGR in 2011 and at that time they insisted there was no fracking going on in California, but following that meeting, Mr. Allayaud gathered 35 papers on fracking enterprises within California.

Gas deposits are prevalent in Northern California while oil deposits are prevalent in Southern California, so the geographical areas that oil companies choose to frack in are usually based on the commodity they want to extract.

Once a frack well becomes a production well, the producer has to report to DOGGR monthly, the amount of gas or oil the well produced, as well as the amount of produced water that is extracted. They often re-inject the water into the ground so the ground doesn't sink.

Venoco is, and has been, fracking in Monterey County according to Mr. Allayaud. There is a confidential well status in place for 4 years after fracking begins at a site, where the company is not

required to disclose what the well is producing. This confidentiality status makes it difficult to ascertain where oil companies are actually drilling and what they are extracting. The website www.fracfocus.com maps out where industries have fracking wells operating.

The Halliburton exemption states that fracking is exempt from the Safe Drinking Water Act unless the oil company fracks with diesel. Millions of gallons of diesel have been injected into the ground across the nation according to Mr. Allayaud, but the public cannot find out where exactly they should look for it in order to monitor and test the water because of the proprietary secret clause.

Clean stim, a fracking chemical, has been developed using food grade additives. Mr. Allayaud has not found any oil company definitively using clean stim in their fracking process. Acid well stimulation is not monitored by DOGGR. Gas migrates through strata and areas near the frack sites and the public has reported illnesses in both animals and humans and tainted water sources. There is a huge amount of industry pressure to not investigate pollution at frack sites. Oil producers insist they have strict regulations to follow regarding fracking well casings so it is a safe extraction process.

Mr. Allayaud displayed a map of California where gas and oil deposits are heavy. These areas are not necessarily being targeted for fracking but indicate where companies may choose to extract in the future. The industry continues to transport gas by train although methane and Bakken Shale, fracked gas, are extremely flammable. Fracking for methane is more environmentally destructive than fracking for oil because the methane gas tends to leak and migrate and is highly potent as a greenhouse gas. The ozone in Jackson Hole, Colorado is now as comparably polluted as Los Angeles due to fracking for methane, per Mr. Allayaud.

Five hundred to eight hundred thousand gallons of water are used per well per year to extract oil and gas by fracking. This may become a controversial issue in water short years when agriculture is competing for the water.

8. **Formation of a Website Subcommittee**

Chair Link asked for volunteers to be on a three person subcommittee to finalize the information to be used on the SEC website and review guidelines for including links to other sites. Dr. Anthony DeRiggi will be chairing the subcommittee and Secret Charles Ford and Buzz link are committee members.

9. **Sacramento County Environmental Management Department (EMD) Director's Report – Val Siebal**

Val Siebal highlighted items in the Monthly EMD Update and Mark White asked about the state of the McKinley Village Development. Mr. Siebal stated that EMD comments in the draft EIR include the statement that McKinley Village would need to monitor gases in the development or provide other mitigation measures to ensure the safety of residents. The City of Sacramento would also have to spend more money to upgrade their safety practices at the closed landfill.

10. **Environmental News Review – Vice Chair Dana Curran**

11. **Commissioner Comments-**

The commission members discussed contacting various organizations to solicit nominations for the 2013 Environmental Award.

Bob Bailey volunteered to research which businesses in Folsom are collecting pharmaceutical wastes, and to report back at the next meeting.

Commission members suggested that the Commission invite DOGGR, Larry Greene and/or the Regional Water Board to update the Commission on issues related to fracking.

12. **Adjournment – 8:05 pm. Next Meeting, March 17, 2014, 6:00 pm in the Main Conference Room at the County of Sacramento's Environmental Management Department, 10590 Armstrong**

Avenue, Mather, California

This meeting is being audiotaped in its entirety and will be available at the Environmental Management Department office.

Agendas are posted in the offices of the City of Sacramento, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Rancho Cordova, Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, and the County of Sacramento and also on the EMD Website at: emd.saccounty.net. Agendas are also forwarded to interested parties upon request.