

Lorena Saldana

From: Cosmo Perrone
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 5:25 PM
To: Lorena Saldana
Subject: FW: Comment on Discussion item G-1 for August 19, 2021 Board Meeting

Dear Board members,

The Board of the Hideaway Community HOA, representing 101 owner/residents, strongly supports the positions and sentiments expressed by Mr. Miller below. Air quality has been a vital concern for all the residents over the last few years and the HOA Board favors a permanent installation with real time alerts of possible toxic and/or harmful conditions.

The HOA Board suggests the GenOn generation station on Las Armas and the Sandpiper golf course as other satisfactory alternative sites for the monitoring station. Both sites have space and supporting infrastructure.

Thank you for your consideration; respectfully,

Cosmo Perrone
President, the Hideaway HOA

From: Robert Miller <>
Subject: **Comment on Discussion item G-1 for August 19, 2021 Board Meeting**
Date: August 16, 2021 at 1:13:50 PM PDT
To: las@sbcapcd.org

Dear Board Members,

On behalf of myself and many other residents of western Goleta I submit the following comments concerning discussion item G-1 on the Board's August 19 meeting agenda. My comments follow my June 15, 2021 email to Joel Cordes concerning the APCD's Air Monitoring Network Plan and a reply email from Planning Division Manager Molly Pearson, dated July 21, 2021.

Ms. Pearson explained that APCD doesn't intend to install a permanent monitoring system that gives us real time alerts of harmful toxic releases. She did indicate that APCD plans to consult with the city of Goleta on installation of a portable H2S monitor at the new fire station once it is built. It remains uncertain, however, when the fire station will be constructed, and, we, therefore, ask the APCD to explore alternative locations for a permanent installation, such as Ellwood School. Even though the school at one time may have declined such an installation, more recent toxic release events have undoubtedly caused the school to be receptive to a monitoring station that will help protect the health of its employees and young students as well as the thousands of residents in western Goleta.

Ms. Pearson also reported that the "District is now working to temporarily deploy an Airpointer in western Goleta in the fall of 2021 to measure H2S releases." These actions are welcome, however, we don't understand why the portable Airpointer monitor couldn't be fixed and permanent, instead of portable and temporary.

Adequate air monitoring is an important topic in western Goleta. In recent years we have experienced multiple exposures to the release of H₂S from industrial and agricultural activities. Our community is also located adjacent to the 101 freeway near oil, gas, aerospace and energy production and distribution activities, all of which emit particulate matter that increase a variety of health risks.

As I explained in my June 15, 2021 letter, we have several concerns with the Air Monitoring Network Plan. First, the plan seems to focus on meeting minimum regulatory compliance for industrial discharges, but it contains minimal discussion of how best to address public health concerns that arise from toxic releases. We would very much appreciate sensors and a monitoring systems that could identify the following:

- a. The source of H₂S releases in western Goleta?
- b. The duration and concentration range of H₂S releases?
- c. The daily, weekly, monthly and annual particulate matter exposures to western Goleta residents and information as to whether the exposures detected constitute a health hazard.
- d. Odors emitted from cannabis grows, which we expect to develop from near by agricultural operations? TWe understand the cannabis grows will depend on drilling water wells, the source of past toxic H₂S releases

Second, the plan does not address how the data collected will be tracked, processed, visualized, and distributed to the public. In other words, will the Network include the ability to promptly notify residents of toxic emissions. A few years ago, we learned that the system in place was unable to timely alert us to a dangerous H₂S release. It took several months to learn the source of the release. How does the APCD's new Air Monitoring Network Plan address this critical problem?

Overall, it appears the new monitoring network will do very little to assure that air quality health objectives are being met. The collection of data from sparsely distributed monitoring locations without the ability to quickly process and disseminate public alerts when dangerous releases or exposures occur will not adequately protect the public.

We appreciate that economic resources may restrict the APCD's ability to expand its services. An automatic monitoring and response system, however, should more than pay for itself due to the cost savings from reduced labor requirements, such as the manual efforts required to identify the source of toxic emissions.

Thank you for considering our comments. The health of our community is critically important, and the role performed by the APCD is greatly appreciated.

Robert K. Miller