

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2023-2024 Regular Session

SB 556 (Gonzalez)
Version: March 22, 2023
Hearing Date: April 25, 2023
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
CK

SUBJECT

Oil and gas wells: health protection zones: civil liability

DIGEST

This bill makes an operator, owner, or person who serves on the board of an owner of an oil or gas production facility or well with a wellhead presumptively jointly and severally liable for certain medical conditions and injuries where certain conditions are met, including that the injured party resided within 3,200 feet of the defendant's facility for at least two years.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Given the significant health risks of proximity to oil and gas extraction facilities and operations, the Legislature recently passed legislation that established "health protection zones." These zones encompass the area within 3,200 feet of a sensitive receptor," which includes homes, schools, and other community and health centers. The law now prohibits the Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) from approving the drilling of new oil or gas wells or the reworking of existing oil or gas wells within a health protection zone with certain exceptions. To bolster community safety, the law also establishes additional monitoring, leak detection and other safety-related control requirements for existing oil and gas operations in a health protection zone, and mandates reporting from operators of these facilities.

This bill seeks to hold those operating facilities within these zones accountable for adverse health effects on local residents. It creates a presumption of liability for respiratory ailments in seniors and children, pre-term births or high-risk pregnancies suffered by pregnant persons, and people's cancer diagnoses when certain conditions apply, including that the person resided within the health protection zone for at least two years and the facility was within that zone. Operators can avoid this liability by establishing that they implemented the best available technology and remediation

efforts without interruption and at full capacity during the time the person resided within the zone, as specified.

The bill is sponsored by Consumer Watchdog. It is supported by a wide variety of groups, including the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment, and Breast Cancer Action. It is opposed by a wide coalition of industry groups, including the California Independent Petroleum Association and the Civil Justice Association of California.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) in the Department of Conservation. CalGEM is the principal state agency responsible for regulating the drilling, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of all oil, gas, and geothermal wells in the state. (Pub. Res. Code § 30418.)
- 2) Provides that CalGEM is led by the State Oil and Gas Supervisor (supervisor). (Pub. Res. Code § 690.)
- 3) 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. (Pub. Res. Code § 3011.)
- 4) Requires the operator of any well, before commencing the work of drilling the well, to file with the supervisor or the district deputy a written notice of intention (NOI) to commence drilling. Drilling shall not commence until approval is given by the supervisor or the district deputy. (Pub. Res. Code § 3203.)
- 5) Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2023, CalGEM from approving a NOI within a health protection zone, except NOIs necessary for any of the following:
 - a) to prevent or respond to a threat to public health, safety, or the environment;
 - b) to comply with a court order finding that denying approval would amount to a taking of property, or a court order otherwise requiring approval of a NOI; or
 - c) to plug and abandon or reabandon a well, including an intercept well necessary to plug and abandon or reabandon a well. (Pub. Res. Code § 3281.)

- 6) Defines “health protection zone” as the area within 3,200 feet of a sensitive receptor. Defines “sensitive receptor” as a residence, education resource, community resource, health care facility, live-in housing, or any building open to the public. (Pub. Res. Code § 3280.)
- 7) Requires an operator of an oil or gas well who submits a NOI to submit a sensitive receptor inventory map of the area within the 3,200-foot radius of the wellhead or proposed wellhead locations. Requires the map to be submitted in compliance with the American Disabilities Act. (Pub. Res. Code § 3281.)
- 8) Requires, commencing January 1, 2025, all oil or gas production facilities with a wellhead in a health protection zone to meet the following: compliance with local, state and federal permit requirements; requirements to post contact information to receive complaints; limits on sound levels; limits on light generation; dust prevention measures; vehicle speed limits; ceased use of all facilities and equipment if in noncompliance with air district requirements; and, submission to CalGEM of chemical analysis for produced water. (Pub. Res. Code § 3282.)
- 9) Requires all operators with a production facility or well with a wellhead in a health protection zone to develop a leak detection for target chemical constituents and detailed response plan by specified dates. Establishes requirements for the leak detection and response plan. (Pub. Res. Code § 3283.)
- 10) Requires an operator to contact property owners and tenants within a health protection zone with a record of delivery and offer to sample and test water wells or surface water on their property before drilling. Specifies the process for conducting sampling and reporting to CalGEM. Requires water quality sampling data to be submitted to the State Water Board and appropriate regional water board. (Pub. Res. Code § 3284.)
- 11) Requires, by July 1, 2023, every operator to submit to CalGEM a sensitive receptor inventory and map that includes a list of sensitive receptors in the health protection zone, among other information. Requires CalGEM to review at least 30% of the inventories and maps annually for accuracy and make them available to the public. (Pub. Res. Code § 3285.)
- 12) Requires, commencing January 1, 2027, and annually thereafter, an operator with a production facility in a health protection zone to report specified information to CalGEM. (Pub. Res. Code § 3286.) Requires, on or before July 1, 2027, CalGEM to report to the Legislature on the implementation of health protection zones. (Pub. Res. Code § 3287.)

This bill:

- 1) Makes, after January 1, 2024, an operator, owner, or person who serves on the board of an owner of an oil or gas production facility or well with a wellhead presumptively jointly and severally liable for a respiratory ailment in a senior or child, a pre-term birth or high-risk pregnancy suffered by a pregnant person, and a person's cancer diagnoses if all of the following apply:
 - a) the person resided more than 24 cumulative months in a health protection zone;
 - b) the person was diagnosed after January 1, 2024; and
 - c) the operator, owner, or board member person who serves on the board of an owner of an oil or gas production facility or well with a wellhead is located in the same health protection zone where the person resided for more than 24 cumulative months.

- 2) Makes available the following complete affirmative defenses in an action described above:
 - a) after January 1, 2024, or for the duration of the time the senior, child, pregnant person, or person diagnosed with cancer resided in the health protection zone, the oil or gas production facility or well with a wellhead complied with both of the following:
 - i. the full deployment of the best available technology and remediation efforts proven to prevent respiratory ailments in seniors and children, pre-term births and high-risk pregnancies in pregnant persons, and cancer in persons, where that technology and efforts include leak detection and emission response; and
 - ii. the technology and remediation efforts operated without interruption and at full capacity for the entire time the senior, child, pregnant person, or person diagnosed with cancer resided in the health protection zone.
 - b) an operator, owner, or person who served on the board of an owner of an oil or gas production facility or well with a wellhead shall be permitted to present evidence and argument that the oil or gas production facility or well with a wellhead was not, in whole or in part, the cause of the respiratory ailments in seniors and children, pre-term birth and high-risk pregnancies suffered by the pregnant person, or cancer.

- 3) Defines the following relevant terms:
 - a) "health protection zone" means the area within 3,200 feet of a sensitive receptor, as specified;
 - b) "sensitive receptor" means any of the following:
 - i. a residence, including a private home, condominium, apartment, and living quarter;
 - ii. an education resource, as specified;

- iii. a community resource center, including a youth center;
 - iv. a health care facility, including a hospital, retirement home, and nursing home;
 - v. live-in housing, including a long-term care hospital, hospice, prison, detention center, and dormitory; and
 - vi. any building housing a business that is open to the public.
- 4) Provides that a civil penalty of not less than \$250,000 and not more than \$1,000,000 per senior, child, pregnant person, or person diagnosed with cancer shall be imposed on a defendant in such actions.
 - 5) Authorizes the court to double or triple the civil penalties if there is a finding that greater penalties are necessary to deter a defendant from further violations or to encourage proper operations, as specified.
 - 6) Authorizes, in addition to other remedies, the Attorney General, a district attorney, a county counsel, or a city attorney to bring a civil action seeking reimbursement and reasonable interest for health care-related expenditures incurred by state or local taxpayer funded health care programs for treatment of respiratory illness suffered by seniors and children, pre-term birth and high-risk pregnancies suffered by pregnant persons, and residents diagnosed with cancer.
 - 7) Provides that if a settlement or motion to dismiss an action is brought by a person or entity that is not a public prosecutor, the settlement or motion to dismiss shall not, in the case of the settlement, be effective or, in the case of a motion, be heard, until 30 days after a copy of the settlement or notice of motion has been served on the Attorney General, the city attorney, county counsel, and district attorney with jurisdiction over the health protection zone involved in the action.
 - 8) Prohibits nondisclosure provisions in settlements of these actions, as provided. Any waiver of the bill's provisions is contrary to public policy and is void and unenforceable.
 - 9) Includes a severability clause.
 - 10) States certain findings and declarations.

COMMENTS

1. The health impacts of oil and gas extraction facilities

Proximity to oil and gas extraction sites poses known significant health risks due to increased air pollution and threats to drinking water quality. Hazardous air pollutants

that are known to be emitted from oil and gas development sites include benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes, hexane and formaldehyde – many of which are known, probable, or possible carcinogens and/or teratogens and which have other adverse health effects:

Research shows that people who live near oil and gas drilling sites are exposed to harmful pollution and are at greater risk of preterm births, asthma, respiratory disease and cancer.

Residing near oil wells is linked to reduced lung function and wheezing, and in some cases the respiratory damage rivals that of daily exposure to secondhand smoke or living beside a freeway, according to a recent study published in the journal *Environmental Research*.

Another study, published in the journal *Environmental Health Perspectives*, analyzed nearly 3 million births in California of women living within 6.2 miles of at least one oil or gas well. The authors concluded that living near those wells during pregnancy increased the risk of low-birthweight babies.¹

This greatly affects the health of a significant number of Californians as more than 2 million of them “live within 2,500 feet of an operational oil and gas well and another 5 million – 14% of the state’s population – are within 1 mile.”²

In response to these issues, 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. As part of that effort, CalGEM convened a panel of public health and other experts on the California Oil and Gas Public Health Rulemaking Scientific Advisory Panel (Panel). After extensive scientific research and study, the Panel itself concluded with “a high level of certainty that the epidemiologic evidence indicates that close residential proximity to [oil and gas development] is associated with adverse perinatal and respiratory outcomes, for which the body of human health studies is most extensive in California and other locations.”³

The Panel also concluded “with a high level of certainty that concentration of health-damaging air pollutants, including criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, are

¹ Emma Newburger, ‘Ground zero for pollution:’ In this L.A. neighborhood surrounded by oil refineries, residents grapple with health issues (October 9, 2021) CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/10/09/oil-wells-in-la-nearby-residents-grapple-with-health-problems.html>. All internet citations are current as of April 7, 2023.

² Ibid.

³ Response to CalGEM Questions for the California Oil and Gas Public Health Rulemaking Scientific Advisory Panel (October 1, 2021) Panel, https://www.conservation.ca.gov/calgem/Documents/public-health/Public%20Health%20Panel%20Responses_FINAL%20ADA.pdf.

more concentrated near oil and gas development activities compared to further away,” and that “studies consistently demonstrate evidence of harm at distances less than 1 km, and some studies also show evidence of harm linked to oil and gas development activity at distances greater than 1 km.”

2. Responding to the harms

In order to respond to this massive public health issue, SB 1137 (Gonzalez, Ch. 365, Stats. 2022) established “health protection zones” that are 3,200 feet in all directions from a “sensitive receptor.” Sensitive receptors include residences, education resources, community resources, health care facilities, live-in housing, and any buildings with businesses open to the public. (Pub. Res. Code § 3280.) The law put strict limitations on oil and gas extraction within these critically sensitive zones. SB 1137 prohibits CalGEM from approving the drilling of new oil or gas wells or the reworking of existing oil or gas wells within a health protection zone with certain exceptions and establishes additional monitoring, leak detection and other safety-related control requirements for existing oil and gas operations in a health protection zone. Starting in 2027, operators are required to provide regular reports on facilities within these zones, including information on leaks and faulty detection systems.

The law provides that every operator in these zones is required to submit, by July 1, 2023, a sensitive receptor inventory and map that includes certain information, including a list of all sensitive receptors within 3,200 feet of an operator’s wellheads and production facilities by field, the type of sensitive receptors, and a map showing each sensitive receptor’s location in relation to the operator’s wellheads and production facilities. Opponents to the law have put a referendum on the November 5, 2024, ballot to challenge the law, staying the operative date of its provisions.⁴

This bill builds on these landmark protections by seeking to hold operators presumptively liable for harms within these zones that are connected to nearby oil and gas development.

3. Creating a presumption of liability

This bill provides that after January 1, 2024, an operator, owner, or person who serves on the board of an owner of an oil or gas production facility or well with a wellhead is presumptively jointly and severally liable for a respiratory ailment in a senior or child, a pre-term birth or high-risk pregnancy suffered by a pregnant person, and a person’s cancer diagnoses if certain conditions apply.

⁴ Associated Press, *New California Oil Well Ban Put on Hold for Voters to Decide* (Feb. 4, 2023) NBC Bay Area, <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/california-oil-well-ban-on-hold-voters/3148130/>.

The harms at the core of this presumption are those that the research has established are associated with proximity to oil and gas development. However, those in opposition assert that the conditions are more expansive than the science establishes. For example, a coalition of industry groups including the California Chamber of Commerce point to skin or breast cancer as predicate medical conditions that trigger this extraordinary liability but which lack adequate connection to the facilities themselves. It should be noted that there is scientific evidence to this effect, including one study that “observed that proximity to an oil refinery was associated with a statistically significantly increased risk of incident cancer diagnosis across all cancer types.”⁵

The presumption in the bill only takes effect where the person with the specified health condition has resided within the health protection zone for at least two years and the relevant facility was located within that zone. The diagnosis must also be after January 1, 2024. To be sure that the alleged injury occurs after the effective date of the bill, the author has agreed to an amendment that requires the complaint to allege the claim accrued after January 1, 2024.

The bill allows for public enforcement in addition to claims brought by the injured parties. In addition to other remedies, civil penalties of \$250,000 to \$1,000,000 per senior, child, pregnant person, or person diagnosed with cancer are required to be imposed on those in violation.

Presumptive liability essentially places the burden on the defendant to produce evidence that rebuts that presumption. Here, the bill specifically requires that the operator, owner, or board member of the oil or gas production facility or well be permitted to present evidence and argument that the facility or well was not, in whole or in part, the cause of the respiratory ailments, pre-term birth and high-risk pregnancies suffered, or cancer. The Chamber coalition argues that this puts an immense burden on defendants that is triggered without proving any causation:

This presumption means that any covered individual may sue any nearby operator (or their Board Member) for their entire medical damages *without proving causation*. Instead, SB 556 places the burden entirely on the operator to disprove causation. This means that, in each case, the operator will need to pursue invasive and exhaustive discovery on every aspect of the individual’s life to identify the true causes of their illness.

In addition, the bill provides an affirmative defense to defendants that relieves them of liability if they can establish that they fully deployed the best available technology and remediation efforts proven to prevent respiratory ailments in seniors and children, pre-

⁵ Stephen B. Williams, et al., *Proximity to Oil Refineries and Risk of Cancer: A Population-Based Analysis* (Oct. 7, 2020) JNCI Cancer Spectrum, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7691047/pdf/pkaa088.pdf>.

term births and high-risk pregnancies in pregnant persons, and cancer in persons, where that technology and those efforts include leak detection and emission response. These efforts must have been operated continuously at full capacity for the entire time the injured party resided in the health protection zone. Concerns have arisen that some of these terms are too vague and that better clarity is necessary. In response, the author has agreed to amendments that more precisely draw out terms such as “best available technology” and replace the term “resided” with “domiciled.”

Amendments

Insert the following definitions:

“Best available technology” means state-of-the-art technology used in the drilling, completion, and reduction of wells; transportation; spill response; leak detection; and remediation that eliminates, reduces, or prevents air pollution, soil and water contamination, and waste to the maximum degree of protection possible in health protection zones that is commercially available.”

“Domicile” means that place in which a person’s habitation is fixed, wherein the person has the intention of remaining, and to which, whenever the person is absent, the person has the intention of returning. At a given time, a person may have only one domicile.

This will provide a clearer path for owners of these facilities to take advantage of this safe harbor.

While presumptive liability is an extraordinary measure, it is not unprecedented. In California law, it can be seen in habitability claims (Civ. Code § 1942.3), false legal advertising (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6158.1), and firearm industry regulations (Civ. Code § 3273.52). In other states, presumptive liability has specifically been used for harms caused by oil and gas production, mainly with environmental contamination, based solely on the proximity of the damage and the facility. For instance, North Carolina law provides:

Presumptive Liability for Water Contamination. — It shall be presumed that an oil or gas developer or operator is responsible for contamination of all water supplies that are within a one-half mile radius of a wellhead that is part of the oil or gas developer’s or operator’s activities unless the presumption is rebutted. . . .

(N.C. Gen. Stat. § 113-421.)

Similarly, West Virginia law provides:

Unless rebutted by one of the defenses established in subsection (c) of this section, in any action for contamination or deprivation of a fresh water source or supply within one thousand five hundred feet of the center of the well pad for horizontal well, there is a rebuttable presumption that the drilling and the oil or gas well or either was the proximate cause of the contamination or deprivation of the fresh water source or supply.

(W. Va. Code § 22-6A-18.) Pennsylvania has an extremely similar law on their books as well. (58 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 3218.)

The argument is, if presumptive liability can reasonably attach when the damage is done to water systems, the same logic should arguably apply when establishing liability for associated harms to children, seniors, those with cancer, and pregnant people.

According to the author:

Of the approximately five and a half million Californians who live within a mile of an oil and gas well, one-third also live in an area that is burdened by environmental pollution, and 92% of Californians living in these overburdened neighborhoods are people of color. Moreover, this proximity brings disastrous health implications, including increased risk of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, pre-term births and high-risk pregnancies, and cancer.

In 2015, the California Council on Science and Technology reviewed existing scientific studies and determined that, from a public health perspective, the most significant exposures to toxic air contaminants occur within one-half mile of an oil or gas well, and recommended that the State of California develop science-backed setback requirements for wells to limit these exposures. The Legislature followed that guidance with the passage of SB 1137 in 2022.

In California, more than 28,000 operational oil and gas wells are located within 3,200 feet of a home, hospital, school, or other sensitive receptor. The number of existing wells, and potential new wells, near these sensitive receptors is a serious public health concern. For these reasons, it is imperative that the oil and gas industry implement the best available technology to prevent future harm to California's vulnerable populations. The oil and gas industry is not oblivious to science and should be held accountable for the negative health outcomes caused by their oil and gas production in health protective zones.

SB 556 creates a liability presumption to hold the oil and gas industry accountable for the harm they have caused to Californians that reside

within 3,200 feet of their wellheads or production facilities. Specifically, SB 556 provides that after January 1, 2024, an owner, operator, or board member of these wells and facilities be jointly and severally liable for a respiratory ailment diagnosed after January 1, 2024 in a senior or child, a pre-term birth or high-risk pregnancy suffered by a pregnant person, and a person's cancer diagnoses. The presumption applies jointly and severally to an operator, owner or board member (all corporate decision-makers) but only applies, (i) if the facility or well is located in the same health protection zone where these vulnerable populations reside for more than 24 cumulative months; (ii) to respiratory ailments in seniors and children, pre-term or high risk pregnancies and cancers; and (iii) only if the oil and gas facility located in such a zone has failed to operationalize the best available control and remediation technology to protect its most vulnerable neighbors.

4. Stakeholder positions

A large coalition of dozens of groups, including Consumer Watchdog, the sponsor of the bill, write in support of the bill:

Living near oil wells and gas production facilities increases one's risk of asthma, respiratory problems, pre term births, high-risk pregnancies, and cancer. That is why the legislature passed, and in 2022 the Governor signed, SB 1137 (Gonzalez) to establish health protection zones of 3,200 feet around oil and gas wells to protect the health of all Californians.

Over 2.1 million Californians live within half a mile of oil and gas wells, and that number will continue to increase with the addition of new wells. Moreover, environmental impacts disproportionately affect communities that are low income and largely of color. One third of the Californians who live near wells are additionally burdened by environmental pollution and over 90% are people of color.

Even after the passage of SB 1137, during the fourth quarter of 2022, state oil regulators approved at least 100 drilling permits for wells within the 3,200-foot zone, according to analysis by FracTracker Alliance.¹ In the first quarter of 2023, FracTracker reports that state regulators approved another 556 permits within those health protective zones.

If oil and gas companies are going to continue to endanger the health of California residents, it is only fair they pay the costs when those residents get sick.

A coalition of groups in opposition, including the Civil Justice Association of California, argue the affirmative defense provided is impossible to establish:

[T]he operator can prove that it had the “best available technology and remediation efforts proven to prevent respiratory ailments ...pre-term births and high-risk pregnancies ... and cancer...”, and that this technology operated “without interruption and at full capacity for the entire [2-year period the individual lived in the 3,200 foot zone].” Notably, is unclear what technology would even meet the compliance requirements of this bill. The bill does not specify the relevant technology beyond “the best available technology ... proven to prevent” the listed conditions. What technology is “proven” to prevent all types of cancer? What technology is “proven” to prevent premature birth? In addition, even if such technology could be identified, if the well-owner is not constantly updating its equipment – or if those updates generate even a short pause in effectiveness – then liability is waived. For example – if an operator identifies the “best available technology” that would meet the terms of this bill and has a 10-year life cycle and spends \$500 million installing it ... a slightly better technology being released a year later would void his defense. Simply put – this is a vague and impossible to meet standard.

As noted, the author has agreed to amend the bill to further focus the affirmative defense for better clarity for facilities and the fact finder in potential litigation.

The Western States Petroleum Association writes in opposition:

[T]he presumption that oil and gas operations are 100% responsible for adverse respiratory ailments, pre-term births or high-risk pregnancies, and cancer for any person in the health protection zone is scientifically flawed, because there are no studies that show any direct causation – instead, the bill simply imposes a blanket presumption of causation that oil and gas operators are singularly and totally responsible for such health effects. While the bill seeks to put the blame for respiratory, pregnancy, and cancer maladies solely on particulate matter (PM) from OGD operations, this flies in the face of the California Air Resources Board’s own statements documenting that PM originates from multiple natural and man-made sources in the state.

Many different sources of air emissions, as well as other factors, can contribute to an individual’s cancer, respiratory disease, or adverse perinatal outcomes. In some situations, the onset of the disease and the vast majority of its development will have occurred long before the individual moved to the OGD area. Yet, under SB 556, the OGD company would be 100% responsible for these individuals’ health care costs related

to the above-mentioned conditions. This outcome is arbitrary, illogical, and is not supported by science.

Most of the groups in opposition take issue with exposing board members to personal liability in this way. It is true that current law provides narrow avenues for holding board members personally liable for the injuries caused by their companies. To assuage these concerns, the author has agreed to an amendment that removes board members from the bill.

The California Independent Petroleum Association asserts in opposition: "The state's climate regime prevents oil producers from emitting any toxic substances from their oil wells and there is no scientific evidence that suggests oil production is the cause of any of the ailments mentioned in your bill."

SUPPORT

Consumer Watchdog (Sponsor)
1000 Grandmothers for Future Generations
350 Bay Area Action
350 Butte County
350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley
350 Humboldt
350 Marin
350 Petaluma
350 Sacramento
350 Santa Barbara
350 South Bay Los Angeles
350 Southland Legislative Alliance
350 Ventura County Climate Hub
Action for the Climate Emergency
Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
Asian Pacific Environmental Network
Azul
Ballona Wetlands Institute
Ban SUP (Single Use Plastic)
Bay Area System Change Not Climate Change
Benicians for a Safe and Healthy Community
Biofuelwatch
Breast Cancer Action
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners
California Businesses for a Sustainable Climate
California Environmental Justice Alliance
California Environmental Voters
California Kitchen

California Nurses for Environmental Health and Justice
California Public Interest Research Group (CALPIRG)
CatholicNetwork US
Center for Biological Diversity
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ)
Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment
Central California Asthma Collaborative
Central California Environmental Justice Network
Central Valley Air Quality Coalition (CVAQ)
Citizens' Climate Lobby Santa Cruz Chapter
Climate Action California
Climate First: Replacing Oil and Gas (CFROG)
Climate Hawks Vote
Climate Health Now
Coastal Lands Action Network
Coltura
Contra Costa County Climate Leaders
Contra Costa MoveOn
Defend Ballona Wetlands
Earth Care Alliance
East Contra Costa Democratic Club
East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
Ecology Center
El Pueblo Para el Aire y Agua Limpia de Kettleman City
Elders Climate Action, NorCal and SoCal Chapters
Elected Officials to Protect America - California
Environment California
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Environmental Working Group
Equity Transit
Extinction Rebellion San Francisco Bay Area
Feminists in Action, Los Angeles
Food & Water Watch
Food Empowerment Project
Fossil Free California
FracTracker Alliance
Fresnans against Fracking
Friends of the Earth US
Glendale Environmental Coalition
Good Neighbor Steering Committee of Benicia
Greenpeace USA
Health Justice Commons
Honor the Earth
Indigenous Environmental Network

Indivisible CA Green Team
Indivisible Marin
Indivisible Sacramento
Indivisible San Francisco
Indivisible San Jose
Indivisible Ventura
Indivisible Yolo
Lakota People's Law Project
Let's Go Farm
Let's Green CA!
Livelihoods Knowledge Exchange Network, Inc. (LiKEN)
Local Clean Energy Alliance
Long Beach 350
Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator
Manhattan Beach Huddle
Menlo Spark
Mothers Out Front
Natural Resources Defense Council
NextGen California
Novasutras
Oil and Gas Action Network
Parents Against Santa Susana Field Laboratory
Partners for Future Minds
Pelican Media
Physicians for Social Responsibility- Los Angeles
Physicians for Social Responsibility- Sacramento
Pink Panthers
Planting Justice
Plumas County Democrats
Presentation Sisters San Francisco
Puvunga Wetlands Protectors
RapidShift Network
Redeemer Community Partnership
Resource Renewal Institute
Romero Institute
RootsAction.org
San Diego 350
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
Santa Barbara Standing Rock Coalition
Santa Cruz Climate Action Network
Santa Cruz County Democratic Party
Save the Environmental Protection Agency
Sierra Club CA
SoCal 350 Climate Action

SolidarityINFOService
Spottswode Winery, Inc.
Stand.earth
Sunflower Alliance
Sustainable Mill Valley
System Change Not Climate Change
The Climate Center
The Climate Project - Los Angeles Chapter
The Climate Project - San Fernando Valley Chapter
The Greenlining Institute
Topanga Peace Alliance
Transformative Wealth Management, LLC
Transition Sebastopol
Voices in Solidarity Against Oil in Neighborhoods (VISIÓN)
Vote Solar
Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club
West Berkeley Alliance for Clean Air and Safe Jobs
Wishtoyo Foundation
Youth Vs Apocalypse
2 individuals

OPPOSITION

California Chamber of Commerce
California Independent Petroleum Association
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
Civil Justice Association of California
State Building and Construction Trades Council of CA
Western States Petroleum Association

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: SB 674 (Gonzalez, 2023) makes several changes to the fence line monitoring system program for communities and petroleum refineries, including expanding the program to include monitoring for biofuel refineries and additional chemicals, increasing the standards for data quality, and providing enhanced processes for notifying affected communities. This bill is currently in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Prior Legislation: SB 1137 (Gonzalez, Ch. 365, Stats. 2022) *See* Comment 2.
