



# OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL

## ABOVEGROUND PETROLEUM STORAGE ACT (APSA) ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, June 4, 2024**

**9:30 AM to 2:30 PM**

710 Riverpoint Court, Suite 150, Conference Room 101

**Note:** This meeting was held in-person and via teleconference.

**Staff Present:**

Jennifer Lorenzo, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor), Committee Chair

Mary Wren-Wilson, Environmental Scientist

Denise Villanueva, Environmental Scientist

Glenn Warner, Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist)

Eireann Flannery, Regulatory Analyst

**Members Present:**

Aleasha Enciso,\* Southern Region Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA)

Christina Graulau,\* U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Liaison

Craig Fletcher, Fletcher Consultants, Inc.

Dante Wiley, Northern California Fire Prevention Officer (FPO)

Devra Lewis, Bay Area Region CUPA, Co-Chair

Eloy Luna, Southern Region CUPA

Eric Scott\*, Santa Fe Springs Fire Department

Greg Matas, Donlee Pump Company

Jason Rizzi, University of California (UC) Davis Health Fire Marshal's Office

Jeremy Gates, Southern California Edison

Kevin Buchan, Western States Petroleum Association

Michael Chilberto,\* Oil Changers

**Members Present (continued):**

Mike Huber,\* DoD Liaison  
Paul McCarty, Northern Region CUPA  
Veronica Badillo, DoD Liaison

**Subject Matter Experts:**

Janice Witul, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) John Paine, California  
Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA)  
Joe Mentzer, Steel Tank Institute (STI)/Steel plate Fabricators Association (SPFA)  
Steve Pollock, STI/SPFA

**Guests Present:**

Bernadette Santos Kim Gregory  
John Velarde  
Robin Ward, Santa Clara County CUPA  
Talle Lopez  
Tom Parker, Butte County CUPA

**Members Absent:**

Chris Reardon,\* California Farm Bureau  
Lori Lucas-Nakagawa,\* Pacific Gas and Electric  
Mark Taylor, Mosier Bros.  
Peter Ansel, California Farm Bureau Yama Noorzai, Central Region CUPA Jovan Diaz,  
Glendale Fire Department Stacey Miner,\* Walmart

\* Alternate member

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

- A. The Committee Chair, Ms. Jennifer Lorenzo, called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendees and guests introduced themselves.
- B. Ms. Denise Villanueva conducted the roll call, and it was determined a quorum was not present.
- C. Approval of minutes from previous meeting  
Minutes from the meetings on January 24, 2024, and April 3, 2024, were reviewed. Minor amendments were made. Since a quorum was not present, there was no voting to approve the minutes. The minutes will be voted on at the next meeting.

D. Announcements

The Committee Chair announced the following:

- Tank Facility Statement form has been revised and posted on the web; the reset button has been removed. We will ask our I.T. to re-post the Word version to replace the PDF version.
- OSFM will be offering its first webinar at the end of this month (June).
- A reminder to committee members that if their term will end soon and they want to continue to participate in the APSA Advisory Committee, then resubmit a request for interest to OSFM. There is no representation from the Southern Region FPO. We have reached out several times since the previous member retired years ago. The Central Region CUPA and Northern Region CUPA do not currently have alternates. If interested, let OSFM know.

**II. APSA PROGRAM UPDATES**

A. Regulations

1. Status on current rulemaking

The Committee Chair stated it is unknown when the rulemaking will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). The Economic and Fiscal Impact Statement (Std. 399) was submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) in early April. When it is approved by DOF, we are still able to submit our rulemaking package to OAL. OAL will have a 30-day review, and there is likely a 15-day public comment period. We may still be able to get everything completed and submit the package again to OAL within the one-year period by November 3, 2024.

2. Tank in an Underground Area (TIUGA) Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan template

At the last meeting, the committee stopped at Table 3 of the template. Mr. Jeremy Gates mentioned that the requirements on the template were underground rulemaking. However, we discussed that if the template is adopted by reference, it is not considered underground regulations.

To make it easier for everyone to understand, the Committee Chair suggested that the committee mimic the requirements found in the Federal SPCC rule, specifically, Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 112, Section 112.6(a) on Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan requirements.

Ms. Eireann Flannery went over the TIUGA Regulations Table (Word document), which is posted on the committee website. The committee will review this document, similar to the process that the committee did for the APSA program regulations. For the first five pages, there are three columns: Federal and State Citations; Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR) Justifications; and Advisory Committee Comments. As the committee goes through the content on the TIUGA Regulations Table, the committee will answer several questions and categorize information on paper. Since the TIUGA SPCC Plan template uses the federal regulations as base, we will explain in our regulatory documents what that slice is, the difference between the federal requirements and our requirements. Are the differences substantive changes or additional requirements based on state law? Is the additional layer [of requirements] considered to meet or exceed because of state law requirements? The committee can add, separate, and continue to refine the content on the TIUGA Regulations Table. Pages 1 through 5 of the TIUGA Regulations Table contain the introduction and background information describing some of the changes that apply to the entire document to provide context.

Ms. Flannery further explained that starting at the bottom of Page 5 of the TIUGA Regulations Table, in bolded text is the heading 'Regulations', and this is where the draft proposed regulations start for the TIUGA SPCC Plan template. The next table has four columns labeled Heading; Comments for Federal Changes; Edits for TIUGA Regulations; and Advisory Committee Notes.

The third column ('Edits for TIUGA Regulations') serves as the base and is a copy of the federal requirements along with our draft proposals. For purposes of the TIUGA SPCC Plan template, we have only one option for a tank facility that has a TIUGA and stores less than 1,320 gallons of oil. The federal SPCC rule provides three different SPCC Plan options [for Tier I qualified facilities under Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 40, Part 112, Section 112.6(a)]. We deleted portions of the federal requirements on the TIUGA Regulations Table that are not needed or not applicable, but we did not change any of the numbering. As the committee is closer to having the content completed and narrative refined, then the citations within the proposed text can be reviewed. The last column on the TIUGA Regulations Table contains notes, including committee discussion notes.

Ms. Janice Witul asked how the federal regulations can be tied to facilities with TIUGAs, since these facilities are under the threshold quantity [of less than 1,320 gallons of oil], and they're not recognized by US EPA.

The Committee Chair replied that, instead of continuing to work on the TIUGA SPCC Plan template as we have been doing, we will use a step-by-step process and identify which requirements we want to have for these TIUGA facilities that will use the template. We are starting from the beginning, since Mr. Gates expressed concerns about underground regulations with the template, and there was confusion about requirements on the template without any basis for authority to require them. We will develop the SPCC Plan requirements specific to TIUGA facilities [with less than 1,320 gallons of oil], which will contain similar requirements as the Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan template, as described in 40 CFR 112.6(a).

The Committee Chair further stated that our authority [to adopt the SPCC Plan requirements for TIUGAs] comes from our statute, which requires the OSFM to adopt an alternative format [in lieu of the facility having to prepare and implement an SPCC Plan that meets all the latest requirements of the SPCC rule per Health and Safety Code (HSC), Section 25270.4.5(a)].

We are in the [pre-rulemaking] process of adopting the alternative format. Instead of working on the template right away as we have been doing, we will work on writing down the requirements first. These requirements will eventually be included in and adopted into our regulations found in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 19, Division 1, along with the APSA program regulations.

Mr. Glenn Warner suggested using I and II for Tier I and Tier II facilities instead of the numbers 1 and 2 to maintain consistency with federal regulations. Ms. Lorenzo acknowledged and stated that the change will be made in the future.

Ms. Flannery explained that since we will be using the federal regulations as base, we will need to replace federal terms with state terms, where necessary. For example, whenever the federal regulations talk about a facility, material, or container, or code section, there will be blank lines. We will be filling in those blank lines. If a federal term or regulation is not applicable, then it is removed from our draft proposal; it may or may not be replaced.

The introduction text on Page 1 of the TIUGA Regulations Table would be included in the top of the ISOR or the notice of proposed action (NOPA). It tells the reader a story. What are we doing? We're using the federal model

as our base. Our facilities are much smaller; they have different requirements.

Ms. Flannery further explained the contents on the TIUGA Regulations Table. On Page 3, changes were made to wording in the second paragraph as follows:

*Facilities with a total storage capacity ~~greater than~~ at least 1,320 gallons of all oils including petroleum ~~are~~ may be required to prepare an SPCC Plan using the self-certified plan (Tier 1 or Tier 2 qualified facility), or Professional Engineer (PE) certified plan. Those facilities may not use this TIUGA template.*

The 'may be required' is acceptable wording, but it will need to be further explained compared to when a certain plan 'is or are required'.

Mr. Jason Rizzi asked about when to use acronym and when to write them out. Different organizations may have a different writing guide or style guide that's required. We want to meet the clarity standard. Some acronyms may be done at the start of the document and then continue to use the acronym throughout the document or do it by paragraph. If you add an acronym, spell it out [first upon use], show the acronym in the paragraph, and continue to use the acronym in that paragraph.

Mr. Kevin Buchan asked if we're folding in federal regulations into the state regulation because state law requires it. The Committee Chair mentioned that State law requires development of an alternative format for smaller type facilities. Most constituents or members will not be in this category; they will be in the category for tanks exceeding 1,320 gallons of oil or petroleum.

In the APSA Advisory Committee Notes column on Page 6, the note was added:

Context: TIUGAs are generally smaller scale. Examples: Hotel Basement, Hospital.

Mr. Greg Matas had general questions about TIUGAs and whether gasoline was an oil. The Committee Chair and members provided clarification that TIUGAs are aboveground tanks located in underground locations, and gasoline, diesel, and biofuels are considered oils, including animal fats, vegetable oils. The federal definition of oil is comprehensive, while the APSA definition of petroleum is limited to a liquid at standard temperature and

pressure. Ms. Witul clarified that milk is not excluded under the federal SPCC rule, but milk containers and milk product containers are excluded.

Mr. Matas also asked if the changes will be written into local regulations, so CUPAs and local fire departments can permit and regulate the TIUGAs. [The proposed changes will be in the state regulations – CCR Title 19. State law requires Unified Program Agencies to implement and enforce the APSA program per state requirements, including program regulations that will be adopted.]

Facilities that have TIUGAs and store less than 1,320 gallons [of oil] are not regulated under the federal SPCC rule. However, the OSFM had an informal agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board on TIUGAs. Instead of these TIUGAs being subject to the [underground storage tank] requirements found in CCR, Title 23, the TIUGAs must be subject to some SPCC requirements under APSA.

Today, and for the next committee meetings, we will work on adopting requirements for an alternative SPCC Plan template for facilities that have TIUGAs and store less than 1,320 gallons [of oil]. There are currently two templates available for these facilities, which are the Tier I and Tier II qualified facility SPCC Plan templates, but many of the items on those templates may not be applicable. Or the facility could hire a professional engineer to prepare an SPCC Plan. Many of these smaller TIUGA facilities may not be familiar with the general requirements of the SPCC rule. There are CUPAs that are already inspecting TIUGAs. We will not focus on or discuss the tiny TIUGA, which stores less than 55 gallons.

We are trying to create a plan that is simpler than the Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan template, and the Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan template is being used as a model.

Mr. Warner asked, on Pages 5-6 of the TIUGA Regulations Table, Column 3, under Section XXX, if the 'oil' should be 'petroleum.' The Committee Chair responded that the committee discussed this in the last meeting. The committee further explained that 'oil' must be used in this context. A facility may have less than 1,320 gallons of petroleum but still have more than 1,320 gallons of oil and be required to prepare a Tier I [qualified facility SPCC] plan or another type of [SPCC] Plan. The facility storing at least 1,320 gallons of oil cannot use the TIUGA SPCC Plan template.

Ms. Flannery continued to go through the TIUGA Regulations Table. Where we have described the distinction between oil and petroleum, the committee may pull apart the text in the modifications field and use some of it as regulation and some as justification.

Under the Advisory Committee Comments column of the TIUGA Regulations Table, the following notes were added on Page 3:

First Criteria: 3a.

1. that facility has a potential threat of discharge to navigable water AND their total storage exceeds 1,320 gallons of oil
2. Subject to APSA if it stores 1,32 gallons or more of petroleum.
3. Tank facilities, one or more TIUGA, as long as the TIUGA is stationary and 55 gallons or larger of petroleum; and does not qualify for an exclusion or exception.

See Health and Safety Code Section 25270.3(c)(1) and (c)(2) for the applicability for TIUGA tank facilities.

The Committee Co-Chair inquired whether the owner or operator was required to use the TIUGA SPCC Plan template or if they had the option of preparing their own SPCC Plan. The Committee Co-Chair clarified her question, is it okay for a TIUGA facility [with less than 1,320 gallons of oil] to develop their own abbreviated plan without having to use the TIUGA template. The Committee Chair stated that they could either use the TIUGA SPCC Plan template or follow the federal regulations, which allow three different plans. The committee concluded that a TIUGA facility [with less than 1,320 gallons of oil] cannot develop their own abbreviated plan using the proposed requirements for a TIUGA SPCC Plan template; they would either use the TIUGA SPCC Plan template [as allowed under HSC Section 25270.4.5(c)] or follow the plan options under the federal requirements [as allowed under Section HSC 25270.4.5(a)].

Mr. Eloy Luna expressed concern that so many available options might cause confusion and problems for the smaller owners or operators since a lot of them are having difficulties with following the Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan template. Mr. Luna further mentioned that we are asking for trouble if we give these owners or operators the option to develop their own plan that follows federal regulations. Making the TIUGA SPCC Plan template as user-friendly as possible should be the committee's focus.



Based on committee discussion, under the Advisory Committee Comments Page 1 of the TIUGA Regulations Table, the following notes were added:

*What are the plan options for TIUGA stakeholders?*

*Can follow federal regulations, which allows for three types of plan: Tier1, Tier 2 or PE Plan*

*Statute allows for TIUGA Template.*

*Yes: TIUGA Template adopted by the OSFM*

*No: TIUGA Template requirements (aligned with the TIUGA requirements but no[t] the template). The federal regulations allow for this on the federal level, but STATE LAW does not allow this section option. The TIUGA template must be used if using state requirements.*

*In the body: allow for the TIUGA template*

*Feds: Use the template or follow the template requirements.*

Mr. Craig Fletcher asked which TIUGA facilities were not regulated by the federal government and requested clarification be added to the second paragraph in the Introduction portion. Ms. Flannery added the clarification that TIUGA tank facilities *with less than 1,320 gallons of oil*. The Committee Chair also asked Ms. Flannery to choose 'to' or 'for' within the last sentence of the third paragraph in the Introduction; 'for' was stricken.

The Committee Co-Chair asked if descriptions of oils versus petroleum were going to be added to the Introduction. The Committee Chair agreed that examples of oils should be added in the Introduction.

The following notes were added to Page 3 of the TIUGA Regulations Table, under ISOR Justifications column:

*Federal*

*Section 112 includes an expansive definition of oil. This includes additional products beyond the state definitions such as oils include diesel, gasoline, biodiesel, animal fats, vegetable and nut oils, waste or used oil, lube oil, mineral oil, asphalt emulsions.*

Ms. Witul was confused about the pressure [in reference to the last sentence under Federal in the Modifications section, column 2 of the TIUGA Regulations Table]. Ms. Flannery was trying to summarize the federal requirements, but if it didn't make sense, then the statement can be removed. The state definition of petroleum was very specific regarding the temperature and pressure, while the federal regulations does not specify. Ms. Flannery removed the last sentence containing 'pressure and temperature.'

Under Section XXX(a)(1) TIUGA Tank Facilities, the second paragraph (as noted below) was removed or struck out, since this is not allowed by statute [reference 40 CFR 112].

~~If you do not follow the template in XX section of these regulations, you must prepare an equivalent SPCC Plan that meets all of the applicable requirements listed in this section, and you must supplement it with a section cross-referencing the location of requirements listed in this Section and the equivalent requirements in the other prevention plan.~~

Mr. Steven Pollock thought it was a good idea and to provide a quick example for the small business shop owner or hotel manager, including those that they would not ordinarily think of. He suggested that an FAQ or some outreach may be necessary for those that do not have patience to go through the laws and regulations. In the last committee meeting, another member suggested including examples of what is and what is not for clarification on the introduction of the template. Mr. Jason Rizzi commented that sometimes CUPA inspectors are educators in order to help their business community, since regulations may be complex.

There were no comments from the committee on the technical amendments section (Section 112(a)(2)) on the TIUGA Regulations Table.

The Committee Chair suggested changing the use of the word "You" or "Your" to "Owner or Operator". As such, since this impacts the proposed regulations text, Ms. Flannery added "You, your" under the Federal Regulations section and added "owner or operator" under the State Regulations section for non-substantive changes on Page 2 of the TIUGA Regulations Table. Ms. Flannery also added the note, "In next draft, modify 'you' and 'your' to 'owner or operator'."

The Committee Chair asked who was responsible for signing off on the TIUGA Facility SPCC Plan template. After a brief discussion, the committee determined that it would remain with management.

There was general discussion from the committee about the plan options, with the TIUGA template being the first option. Then if the facility does not meet the TIUGA facility criteria [as described in HSC Section 25270.3(c)], then the other plan options are Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan, Tier II qualified facility SPCC Plan, or professional engineer-certified SPCC Plan [as allowed under HSC Section 25270.4.5(a)].

The committee had a general discussion on the requirements for TIUGA facilities based on those listed on Section 112(a)(3) of the TIUGA Regulations Table. The table only contained the federal requirements under Sections 112.7 and 112.8 that are applicable to TIUGA facilities [as described in HSC Section 25270.3(c)].

Ms. Rob Ward asked if the facility diagram was included in the requirements list for the TIUGA facility SPCC Plan template. The Committee Chair reminded that this template was based on the Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan template, which does not require a facility diagram. Ms. Ward confirmed the requirements list on the TIUGA Regulations Table [in Section 112(a)(3) Plan Template and Applicability Requirements] excludes the facility diagram.

Mr. Matas asked what facilities do with the template once completed. The Committee Chair replied that the owner or operator must implement their SPCC Plan, including conducting inspections per industry standards, maintain certain records, and so forth. Mr. Matas also asked whether the plan must be submitted to CERS. The SPCC Plan is not required to be submitted to CERS.

In column 3, under the SPCC Plan Template and Applicable Requirements on the TIUGA Regulations Table, the following federal requirements were removed: 112.7(k), 112.8(c)(4), and 112.8(c)(5).

APSA requires TIUGAs to have secondary containment, while Section 112.7(k) is an alternative measure for secondary containment requirements, including a contingency plan. Hence, Section 112.7(k) was removed. Sections 112.8(c)(4) and 112.8(c)(5) apply to buried and partially buried tanks, so these sections were removed. TIUGAs cannot be buried.

Committee members asked why the subsections of Section 112.8(d) are not included on the Tier I qualified facility SPCC Plan template. Ms. Witul replied that there may not be a lot of piping associated with the smaller facilities; however, she is not entirely certain about this. The Committee Chair stated that Section 112.8(d)(1) is already addressed in the APSA program regulations, which will apply to all APSA facilities. The committee compromised on adding Section 112.8(d)(3), since not all members agreed about adding the other subsections. However, to ensure that the 112.8(d)(3) applies to all APSA facilities, then Section 112.8(d)(3) may also need to be added to the APSA program regulations as a requirement for all facilities.

Under the Advisory Committee Comments column, within the SPCC Plan Template and Applicable Requirements on the table, the following notes were added based on committee discussion:

Highlight this statement and requirement in the introductions and regulations:  
This TIUGA template has been developed to meet the requirements of Health and Safety Code Chapters 6.67 and 40 CFR Part 112.

In the Failure Analysis section of the proposed regulations noted on the TIUGA Regulations Table, there were no additional edits from the committee.

In the TIUGA secondary containment requirements section (Section 112(a)(3)(ii)) on the TIUGA Regulations Table, the last two sentences were removed or struck out. The APSA statute pre-empts the last two sentences. The definition of TIUGA includes secondary containment for the tank, piping and ancillary equipment. After additional discussion on this section, the committee agreed to remove or strike out the entire section on TIUGA secondary containment (Section 112(a)(3)(ii)).

On the Advisory Committee Notes column on the TIUGA Regulations Table, the following committee feedback was added to Section 112(a)(3)(ii):

THIS IS NOT APPLICABLE.  
BUT: This is a table in the DRAFT template...The table in the DRAFT template is described sufficiently by the Health and Safety Code, without needing additional detail in these regulations. Statute says there has to be... secondary containment. Statute preempts this section.

In the overfill prevention section (Section 112(a)(3)(iii)) on the TIUGA Regulations Table, the committee did not have any additional edits.

The Committee Chair requested reviewing Page 1 of the TIUGA Regulations Table again and discuss substantial harm criteria and other things that may need to be added to the CCR Title 19 APSA program regulations, but not necessarily included on the requirements for the TIUGA SPCC Plan template. The following was added under the ISOR section:

To add to these regulations:

- Substantial harm criteria per 112.20e. If the owner or operator uses this template, they are not subject to the substantial harm criteria [checklist].

The committee discussed leak detection for certain TIUGAs (category (iv)) and whether leak detection devices for category (iv) TIUGAs should be tested. Testing leak detection devices for category (iv) TIUGAs would be proposed as a new requirement for all TIUGAs; this proposal would be in CCR Title 19 in the APSA program regulations chapter.

Section 3 and Table 4 (Below-grade/underground piping systems) of the draft TIUGA SPCC Plan Template were also discussed. Mr. Jeremy Gates favored keeping this section. The Committee Chair also mentioned that the Tier II qualified facility SPCC Plan template could also be modified to include this section on below-grade/underground piping systems. However, Mr. Fletcher was concerned that the use of the Tier I and Tier II qualified facility SPCC Plan templates will have to be restricted. The TIUGA SPCC Plan template would appear to be more restrictive than the other templates. The Committee Chair stated that the requirements for below-grade/underground piping systems on TIUGAs are already required by statute. Ms. Lewis was okay with keeping the section on below-grade/underground piping systems, because it is there; however, it could also be problematic for CUPA inspectors and may overlook the requirements for below-grade/underground piping systems.

B. Online APSA Basic Inspector Training Course

The revised training course has been live since May 7, 2024. Feedback from several new users has been provided and will be taken into consideration for future updates. When the APSA program regulations are adopted, several modules will have to be updated.

Other updates to the revised course include the requirement for the trainee to listen to the whole narration of each slide; there is no fast-forwarding capability. Certain modules were updated to reflect changes made to the statute since the original course went live in November 2017.

The older training course is still up and running as there are still students enrolled and working their way through. New trainees will be enrolled in the revised training course.

C. Webinars

Mr. Glenn Warner will be presenting the first webinar at the end of June with the topic being APSA petroleum. Announcement of the webinar, including information to attend, will be done by email; it will also be included in the monthly Unified Program newsletter, which is provided by CalEPA. OSFM is hoping to present a webinar each quarter, although OSFM may not be able to provide them during the first quarter of the calendar year due to the conference.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

A. 2025 CUPA Conference Planning

Conference planning will begin later this month. We received good feedback on last year's conference from the APSA Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and evaluations from conference attendees. Let OSFM or Ms. Rob Ward know if anyone is interested in presenting in the next conference in Anaheim from March 24-27, 2025.

**IV. MEMBERS ORGANIZATION UPDATES**

A. CUPAs

- Bay Area Region: None
- Northern Region: None
- Central Region: None
- Southern Region: None

B. FPO and Other Fire Service: None

C. US EPA: None

D. CalEPA:

- Inspection and enforcement guide is out for review.
- Administrative enforcement order (AEO) guidance should be finalized in the next month or so.

E. APSA TAG: Next meeting is August 27, 2024.

F. STI/SPFA:

- Webinar will be held next week Thursday for updates to SP001 and SP031 on June 13, 2024, at 10 a.m. (Central time).
- Underwriters Laboratories (UL) 142 is open for revision. If anyone has recommendations, feel free to submit them. Mr. Steve Pollock will forward emails regarding UL 142.

- Next SP001 aboveground tank inspector training course will be in October 2024 in Long Beach. Mr. Craig Fletcher will be the instructor.

G. DoD: None

H. Industry, Farm, and Other Members: None

**V. OPEN FORUM AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**VI. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNS**

The Committee Chair will send a poll to the members to determine the date for the next committee meeting.

The Committee Chair requested to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Jason Rizzi motioned to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Jeremy Gates seconded the motion. All other committee members that were present were in favor.

The meeting was adjourned by the Committee Chair at 2:35 p.m.