



“TURNED HER BACK”

VISUAL	AUDIO	FACTS
	<p>Voiceover Announcer: Offshore drilling</p> <p>They want it.</p> <p>We don't.</p>	<p>Oil Companies Including The Koch Brothers Want To Drill In The Santa Barbara Channel. In May of 2017, Newsweek reported: “William Koch’s Harvest Energy and his brothers’ Koch Industries have all shown interest in building or leasing pipelines in the Santa Barbara Channel. William Koch is a paying member of the Florida White House resort Mar-a-Lago and threw Trump fundraisers last year, though Charles and David Koch publicly campaigned against Trump during the election. This year, they’ve warmed up to him. The Koch brothers lobbied feverishly in a successful effort to have Oklahoma anti-EPA crusader Scott Pruitt appointed head of the EPA and have already spent more than \$3 million this year lobbying against environmental policies like the Clean Air Act. Before the last election in California, the Koch-funded organization Americans for Prosperity ran a 15-city ‘Already Taxed to the Max’ campaign against new taxes in the state budget. It worked. The Koch brothers co-own active oil rigs north of Santa Barbara in an area that Obama designated a national marine sanctuary for the native Chumash tribe. (Devon Energy, Exxon Mobil, Freeport-McMoRan and others also own active wells in the area.) Trump’s latest offshore drilling order also prohibits the designation or expansion of a national marine sanctuary, unless it ‘includes a timely, full accounting from the Department of the Interior of any energy or mineral resource potential in the designated area.’” [Newsweek, 5/9/2017]</p> <p>Poll: Californians Oppose Offshore Drilling By Wide Margin. In January of 2018, the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) announced: “The PPIC Statewide Survey has asked the question, “Do you favor or oppose allowing more oil drilling off the California coast?” every July since 2003. In the 2017 PPIC survey, a record low 25% of California adults favored more oil drilling off the California coast while a record high 69% opposed it. What’s most remarkable is the agreement over time on the topic of offshore oil drilling. Since the early 2000s, a slim majority has been in favor of drilling only twice (51% in 2008 and 2009); in</p>



		<p>most years a majority has opposed it. Moreover, public consensus on this topic has grown. Since July 2012, support for more oil drilling has dropped by 23 points (48% to 25%) while opposition has grown by 21 points (48% to 69%).” [Public Policy Institute of California, 1/8/2018]</p>
<p>Super: Career Politician Diane Harkey</p>	<p>But Diane Harkey turned her back on protecting the California coast.</p>	
<p>Super: Harkey Took Over \$100,000 in Contributions from Oil and Gas Industry OpenSecrets.org</p>	<p>Harkey took over a hundred thousand from the oil and gas industry</p>	<p>Diane Harkey Has Received Over \$100,000 In Campaign Donations From The Oil And Gas Industry. According to California campaign finance records compiled by the National Institute on Money in Politics, Diane Harkey received \$88,774 in contributions from the Oil and Gas industry as a candidate for state office. As a candidate for Congress, according to federal campaign finance records compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics, Diane Hakery received \$13,650 in contributions from the Oil and Gas industry. [Followthemoney.org accessed 9/20/2018; Opensecrets.org accessed 9/20/2018]</p>
<p>Super: Harkey Refused to Vote Against Drilling Off Our Coast 3 Times California Assembly Daily Journals, 4/20/09, 7/9/09, and 7/23/09</p>	<p>No wonder Harkey refused to vote against drilling off our coast -- three times.</p>	<p>April, 2009: Harkey Refused To Cast A Vote On AJR 3, Opposing Oil Drilling Off California’s Coast. On April 20, 2009, Diane Harkey did not cast a vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 3. According to the Legislative Counsel’s digest, “This measure would memorialize the Legislature’s support of legislation currently pending in the United States Congress that would protect the Pacific Coast from new offshore oil drilling. This measure would also memorialize the Legislature’s opposition to the proposed expansion of oil and gas drilling off the Pacific Coast and any federal energy policies and legislation that would weaken California’s role in energy siting decisions due to those policies.” [2009-2010 California Legislature AJR-3]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diane Harkey Was Present For Votes When AJR 3 Was Considered And Voted On Measures Immediately Before And After AJR 3. According to the Assembly Daily Journal for April 20, 2009, the day that

		<p>Harkey did not vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 3, Diane Harkey was present during the one-and-a-half-hour period during which legislative business was conducted that day. At 12:12pm, the Speaker placed a quorum call and at 12:19 declared a quorum. According to the roll call, Harkey responded to her name being called. The following is a summary of Harkey's actions throughout that legislative day in sequential order. According to the Daily Journal, Harkey voted Aye on AB 261, Aye on AB 457, and No on AB 442. Harkey did not cast a vote on AB 121. Harkey voted Aye on AB 239, Aye on AB 14, and Aye on AB 20. Harkey then joined a motion to be added as a co-author of Assembly Joint Resolution 9. Then Harkey voted Aye on AJR 9, Aye on AB 509. <u>Harkey did not cast a vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 3.</u> Then, Harkey voted no on AB 527, Ayes on AB 169, and Aye on AB 224. Harkey did not vote on AJR 8, though that action of the chamber and the measure was re-opened to add more co-authors. Another vote was cast on AJR 8, again without Harkey's participation. Harkey voted Aye on AB 1061, then joined a motion to become a co-author of ACR 56, which was adopted unanimously. Harkey did not cast a vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 11. Finally, Harkey voted Aye on the consent calendar roll call, which lumped together passage of 6 bills. At 1:39pm a motion to adjourn was heard and seconded. At 1:40pm, the quorum call of the Assembly was dispensed with. [California Assembly Daily Journal, 4/20/2009]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Other Members Of The Assembly Took Steps To Ensure Their Vote Was Recorded On AJR 3. According to the Assembly Daily Journal for April 20, 2009, the day that Harkey did not vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 3, Assembly members Hayashi and Anderson were granted unanimous consent to record their votes on Assembly Joint Resolution 3. Hayashi voted aye and Anderson voted no. No such entry was made for Diane Harkey. [California Assembly Daily Journal, 4/20/2009]</p> <p>Harkey Did Not Cast A Vote On July 9, 2009 Vote On Bill To Open Offshore Drilling Off The Santa Barbara Coast. On June 9, 2009, Diane Harkey did not</p>
--	--	--

cast a vote on Assembly Bill 23. According to the Legislative Counsel’s digest, this bill “Makes statutory changes necessary for the state to proceed with the reconsideration of a lease to drill for oil in the Tranquillon Ridge Field from an existing platform in federal waters of the California Coast near Santa Barbara.” [\[2009-2010 4th Extraordinary Session, California Legislature, AB 23\]](#)

- Harkey Was Marked Present On July 9, 2009, Did Not Cast Any Votes, And Did Not Make Any Attempt After The Fact To Record Her Vote For The Record On AB 23.** According to the Assembly Daily Journal for June 9, 2009, the day that Harkey did not vote on Assembly Bill 23, Diane Harkey was marked present for the morning roll call when the Assembly met at 9:53 a.m. Harkey did not cast a vote on any of the roll call votes that day. At the end of the day’s journal, an entry noted that Assembly Members Coto, Hayashi, and Torres were granted unanimous consent to record their votes on all of the bill that were voted on that day. No such entry was made for Diane Harkey. [\[California Assembly Daily Journal, 4th Extraordinary Session, 7/9/2009\]](#)

Harkey Did Not Vote On July 24, 2009 Vote On Bill To Open Offshore Oil Drilling Off The Santa Barbara Coast. In August of 2009, the San Francisco Chronicle reported: “Don’t bother looking for the California Assembly’s roll-call record of one of the most contentious issues of the budget revisions: the plan to open new offshore oil drilling off the Santa Barbara coast for the first time in 40 years. It’s not there. The July 24 vote on AB23 28 yes, 43 no, 8 not voting has been officially expunged - erased as if it never happened. [...] NOT VOTING 8 Karen Bass, D-Baldwin Vista Marty Block, D-San Diego Mike Davis, D-Los Angeles Nathan Fletcher, R-San Diego Isadore Hall, D-Compton Diane Harkey, R-Dana Point” [\[San Francisco Chronicle, 8/3/09\]](#)

- Diane Harkey Was Present On July 24, 2009 And Cast Votes Just Before And After The Expunged Vote On AB 23.** The Assembly Daily Journals covering July 23 and 24, 2009 were treated as a single session day as the session extended late into the night and legislative business



		<p>carried on to the next day. According to the proceedings on calendar day July 24, 2009, at 2:18pm a motion was made to adopt the urgency clause with respect to AB 3. Harkey voted No on the motion and then voted No on concurring in the Senate amendments to AB 3. Then, a motion was raised to consider AB 23. At 2:55pm, Assembly Member DeVote moved a call of the assembly and the Sergeant at Arms was directed to close the doors and to bring the absent members. At 2:56pm the Call of the Assembly was dispensed with. The next entry in the journal indicates “Assembly Member Torrico was granted unanimous consent that the action be rescinded and the record expunged whereby a roll call vote was taken on this day on Assembly Bill No. 23” The next legislative item considered was Senate Concurrent Resolution No 2. Diane Harkey voted Aye. Following that vote, at 3:16pm there was a motion to adjourn that was seconded and carried. [California Assembly Daily Journal, 4th Extraordinary Session, 7/23/2009-2/24/2009]</p> <p>2014: Diane Harkey Voted Against Permanently Protecting A Sensitive Marine Ecosystem From Oil Drilling On Tranquillon Ridge In State Waters Offshore From Santa Barbara. Diane Harkey voted against SB 1096 in August of 2014. According to a summary from the California Legislative Analyst’s Office, “This bill would repeal the exception to the CCSA that allows for the Commission to issue a new offshore drilling lease based on the CCSA’s drainage provision. By doing this, the state would be bringing in a large portion of the Pacific Ocean off the coast of Santa Barbara County into the full protection of the CCSA” The analysis document went on the specifically cite recent proposals to drill an area known as the Tranquillon Ridge. According to Offshore Energy Today: “The area is designated as a Marine Protected Area because of its sensitive marine ecosystem.” [California League of Conservation Voters Scorecard; 2013-2014 California Legislature SB 1096; Fiscal Analysis, SB 1096, 8/18/2014; Offshore Energy Today, 6/23/2014]</p>
<p>Super: Harkey Opposed</p>	<p>And opposed holding offshore drillers accountable</p>	<p>2013: Diane Harkey Voted Against Raising Outdated Indemnity Bond</p>



<p>Holding Offshore Drillers Accountable 2013 SB 665</p>	<p>for the damage they cause.</p>	<p>Requirements For Oil Wells, Setting \$1M Bond Requirement For Offshore Wells. In September of 2013, Diane Harkey voted against SB 665. According to a summary from the California Legislative Analyst’s Office, the bill “Increases the statutory amount for indemnity bonds that an oil and gas well operator is required to file with the Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) for its well operations.” The analysis also noted: “According to the author, the purpose of this bill is to update outdated indemnity bonds requirements "to ensure that adequate funds are available to address any environmental clean-up needs that may arise when a well is drilled or redrilled." For offshore drillers, the analysis said that the bill: “Increases the blanket indemnity bond for oil and gas wells located on state submerged lands to \$1,000,000.” The bill passed and became law without Harkey’s support. [California League of Conservation Voters Scorecard; 2013-2014 California Legislature SB 665; Fiscal Analysis, SB 665 9/5/2013]</p>
<p>Super: Career Politician Diane Harkey Puts Special Interests Ahead of Us LCV Victory Fund is responsible for the content of this advertising. Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, www.lcvvictoryfund.org, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.</p>	<p>Diane Harkey puts the special interests ahead of us. LCV Victory Fund is responsible for the content of this advertising.</p>	

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND: CALIFORNIANS HAVE GOOD REASON TO OPPOSE OFFSHORE DRILLING

1969: The Largest Oil Spill In California History, Spilled 100,000 Barrels, Killing Thousands Of Seabirds. In January of 2014, a Los Angeles Times story on attempts to open up offshore drilling reminded readers: “A devastating, 100,000-barrel spill in Santa Barbara in 1969 killed thousands of seabirds and led to the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act, the foundation of U.S. environmental law, and the creation of the federal Environmental Protection Agency. The 260,000-barrel Exxon Valdez spill in Alaska's Prince William Sound in 1989 exposed thousands of that state's residents to the beach-fouling consequences of spilled oil. The 4.9-million-barrel Deepwater Horizon disaster, the worst offshore oil spill in U.S. history, stirred new and broad opposition to offshore



development. Almost 50 years after the Santa Barbara spill, which remains the largest in the state's history, California's distaste for offshore drilling hasn't gone away." [[Los Angeles Times, 1/4/2018](#)]

1997: Rupture Of Pipeline From Platform Irene Spilled 163 Barrels Near Surf Beach At Vandenburg Air Force Base. In September of 2015, a Santa Maria Sun story on oil drilling noted: "The May spill at Refugio State Beach isn't the first of its kind in the area. In 1997 a rupture in a 20-inch pipe running from Platform Irene to an onshore processing facility north of Lompoc released 163 barrels of petroleum product, including oil and production water and diesel and anti-corrosion chemical compounds that were contained in the pipeline, into the ocean (163 barrels is equivalent to roughly 6,850 gallons). The spill affected 17 miles of coastline with Surf Beach at VAFB suffering most of the damage." [[Santa Maria Sun, 9/16/2015](#)]

2015: Plains All American Pipeline Burst Spilled 142,800 Gallons Near Refugio State Beach. In September of 2015, a Santa Maria Sun story on oil drilling noted: "Refugio State Beach is the type of beach the rest of the country thinks of when they think of California; tall, skinny palm trees swaying in the breeze, mellow waves lapping at the shore, and sunny skies overhead. However, in May that picture became a lot messier after a pipeline from Plains All American Pipeline spilled 142,800 gallons of oil—21,000 gallons of which eventually overflowed into the ocean. The result forced beach closures during the busy summer months, hurting the fishing industry, damaging wildlife, and halting recreation and tourism. Though cleanup is still underway, the beach looks as inviting as before. Final damage assessments can take up to a year or two, according to Doug Helton, West Coast supervisor for NOAA's emergency response team." [[Santa Maria Sun, 9/16/2015](#)]

- **Refugio Beach Spill Response May Have Cost \$257 Million.** In August of 2015, the Los Angeles Times reported: "A Plains All American Pipeline oil spill off the Santa Barbara County coast this year may have been bigger and costlier than originally expected, the company said in its quarterly earnings update Wednesday. The May 19 spill could cost the Texas company as much as \$257 million in response and cleanup costs, assessments and fines, and legal settlements, the company stated. Also, as many as 143,000 gallons of crude may have been spilled when the line ruptured, not 101,000 gallons, as Plains originally estimated. The company did not provide a new estimate on how much of that oil ended up in the Pacific; the original estimate was 21,000 gallons." [[Los Angeles Times, 8/5/2015](#)]
- **2018: After Oil Companies Tied To 2015 Refugio Beach Spill Went Bankrupt, California Is Considering Using Taxpayer Dollars To Dismantle Offshore Drilling Facilities.** In February of 2018, the San Luis Obispo Tribune reported: "It's been nearly three years since an oil pipeline ruptured in Santa Barbara County, coating seven miles of beaches with crude oil and killing dolphins, birds and sea lions. Area parks and fisheries have since re-opened. The pipeline has not, and the company that owns it is under criminal indictment. But the financial impacts of the 2015 Refugio oil spill continue to wash up in California. The latest example: State lawmakers are considering an unprecedented request to spend more than \$100 million in taxpayer money to dismantle two offshore oil-drilling facilities — a platform connected to the ruptured pipeline and a man-made island in nearby Ventura County — because the oil companies that were leasing the sites went bankrupt last year." [[San Luis Obispo Tribune, 2/6/2018](#)]