

mailed to BOS 04-29-22

Land use permit for the Martinez Refinery Renewable Fuels Project at 150 Solano Way in Pacheco

Land use permit for the Phillips 66 Rodeo Renewable Project at 1380 San Pablo Ave in Rodeo

Letters received for Board consideration

Packet 2

Pg 1	J.A. Zaitlin, Kensington	4/29/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 2	Cori Pansarasa, El Cerrito	4/29/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 3	Marcia Liberson, Walnut Creek	4/29/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 4	Cathy Druck, Crockett	4/29/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 5	Betty Lobos, Concord	4/29/2022	oppose
Pg 6	Bonnie Pannell, Crockett	4/29/2022 _____	oppose
Pg 7	Jane Courant, Richmond	4/30/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 8	Jackie Mann, 350 Contra Costa	4/30/2022	oppose
Pg 9	Ogie Strogatz, Walnut Creek	4/30/2022	oppose
Pg 10	Janet Pygeorge	4/30/2022	
Pg 11	Denice A. Dennis, 1000 Grandmothers for Future Generations Cynthia Mahoney, M.D., Climate Health Now; Medical Society Consortium on Climate & Health; Clinical Associate Professor of	4/30/2022	oppose
Pg 12	Medicine, Stanford University (ret)	4/30/2022	oppose
Pg 13	Nora Privitera, Oakland	4/30/2022	oppose
Pg 14	Jennifer Russell, Walnut Creek	4/30/2022	oppose
Pg 15	Nick Ratto, City of Alameda; 350 Bay Area Action	4/30/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 16	Diane Dulmage, Richmone	5/1/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 17	Michael Freeman, El Cerrito	5/1/2022	oppose
Pg 18	Mike Moore, Oakley (Marathon)	5/1/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 19	Mike Moore, Oakley (Phillips 66)	5/1/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 20	Emily Wheeler, Walnut Creek	5/1/2022 form-EIR	oppose
Pg 21	Debi Clifford	5/1/2022	oppose
Pg 22	Jeffrey Mann, Lafayette Vanessa Warheit, El Cerrito, EV Charging Access for All; Emerge	5/1/2022	oppose
Pg 23	CA Class of '21	5/1/2022	oppose
Pg 24	Marinell Daniel, El Sobrante	5/2/2022	oppose
Pg 25	Elena Engel, San Francisco	5/2/2022	oppose
Pg 26	Helena Birecki, 350 Bay Area	05-2-022	oppose
Pg 27	Scott Bartlebaugh, Crockett Improvement Association	5/2/2022	oppose
Pg 28	Roland Saher, Live Oak	5/2/2022	oppose

From: Marcia L. [redacted]@com>
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 4:53 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Sincerely,

Marcia Liberson, Walnut Creek CA

From: cathy druck <[redacted]@contra.com>
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 5:07 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

I appreciate your attention to this matter

Catherine Druck

Crockett, California

From: Betty Lobos <[redacted].net>
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 6:03 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa County Supervisors,

I am concerned about the environmental impact reviews (EIRs) for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments failed to address many of those points. I urge you to reject the land use permits and to require additional EIRs.

The final EIRs inadequately meet the following expectations:

- Providing an adequate, detailed project description
- Accounting for safety and air pollution concerns from potential hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen
- Accounting for impacts of burning human food as "feedstock" in biofuel production
- Adequately considering climate impacts
- Complying with the CEQA Requirement to respond to public comments

I was proud when my county [declared a Climate Emergency](#) that commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects must have a more thorough EIR.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth (Betty) Lobos
Concord, CA

From: Bonnie Pannell <...>
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 9:41 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Please Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I live in a "cancer belt" because of the refineries near me, such as Phillips 66. Communities such as mine are pacified with occasional public meetings sponsored by the county government with representatives giving lip service to a plan of environmental improvements, but it never happens. What we get is the status quo or something worse. Our country is on a trajectory toward severe global warming and extinction and, yet, we still give more consideration to the big polluters than we do the health of the planet. As the advice goes, "think globally, act locally." I hope you will align with that slogan in all of your deliberations.

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [**Declaration of Climate Emergency**](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Pannell

St.

Crockett, Ca 94525

From: Jane Courant <[redacted]@[redacted].com>
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 6:42 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Hi Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as “feedstock” in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Sincerely yours,

Jane Courant

[redacted] Avenue

Richmond 94804

From: jackie mann <jackiemann@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 8:18 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: May 3rd Appeal for on Renewable Fuels Projects for Marathon and Phillips 66

Please submit my letter to the Supervisors and for the record.

Sincerely,
Jackie Garcia Mann, 350 Contra Costa
Lafayette

Dear Supervisors, 29 April 2022

The purpose of CEQA is to create actions to mitigate environmental impacts. Likewise, these EIRs are vague, generalized and ignore many impacts which require mitigation. This is a violation of CEQA and creates legal jeopardy for the county. As the Appeals from environmental groups focus on specific failures of the EIR, **I wish to address the lack of guardrails and limits. These projects purposely have vague and open-ended descriptions, which may not reflect what is actually implemented.**

The refineries should post bonds for clean up and remediation of these hazardous refinery sites and [risk bonds](#) for accidents. **This should begin immediately, while there is leverage for this permit** (not 15 years down the road as currently proposed). If the companies fail, taxpayers will be burdened with expensive toxic cleanup sites that negatively impact community health, local economics, and property values. It is not fair to externalize these economic risks onto the communities. The externalized health impacts are bad enough.

For instance, if state policy changes and LCFCs are removed or biofuel refining is no longer economically feasible, these refineries may close with short notice. This is apparent in the recent closing of Marathon Refinery for economic reasons. They could sit "idle" for decades with little hope to reopen and no plan or financing for clean up. **Bond the cleanup/decommissioning in advance as a condition of approval.**

The land-use permits should specify exact products and maximum production amounts. There is no limit on throughputs. As currently written, the refineries can double the proposed production or switch to SAF or some other bio-product. This would have health and safety impacts NOT EVALUATED in the current EIRs. Guardrails should include production caps which apply to specific products and require a new permit for new biofuel products, SAF, or different ratios of products.

When refineries seek to produce Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) as a main product, require a new land use permit and EIR review.

What are the limits on petroleum refining? As written, the Phillips 66 permit allows "temporary increase" in petroleum refining. How can EIR impacts be evaluated without specific information compared to current operations? This is an open ticket. Do current permits for petroleum refining expire? **Specify an end-date and amount.**

Community Recourse: Pollution, noise, odors, explosions, flaring, fires, oh my!

These things happen now and may increase with increased hydrogen cracking needed for biofuel refining. Regulatory agencies and fines have done little. Sink some teeth into this land use permit and safeguard the frontline community with **conditions of approval that retain local authority** to shutdown the refineries for violations or being a bad neighbor. **BOS, protect your people!**

From: Ogie Strogatz <ogiestrogatz@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 8:20 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Respectfully,

Ogie Strogatz

~~100 Miramonte Road~~, Walnut Creek CA 94597

Sent from my iPhone

From: Denice A Dennis · dennismp1@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 12:00 PM
To: Karen Mitchoff; Supervisor Candace Andersen; Diane Burgis; District5; John Gioia
Cc: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Items D1 and D2, 5/3/22 BOS Meeting Agenda Public Comment

Dear Chair Mitchoff and members of the Board,

I am writing to urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects conflict with that commitment. Please support a more thorough EIR for both proposed biofuel projects.

Denice A. Dennis, MPH

1000 Grandmothers for Future Generations

From: cynthia mahoney <[redacted]@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 1:20 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Cc: Jackie Mann
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
 - *The surrounding community already suffers from high pollution and excessive asthma and cancer which must be addressed and mitigated.*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as “feedstock” in biofuel production*
 - *This is especially important as we see heat and other climate disasters impacting food supplies, like the situation now in India with devastating effects on the wheat crop*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
 - *We have to stop burning things - not just fossil fuels, but burning and releasing carbon. We have to stop clearing land to grow things to burn - which doubly impacts the carbon cycle imbalance.*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
 - *The experience with corn ethanol shows how easily a “feel good” proposal can be a boondoggle which does not actually lower total emissions.*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents.

For all these reasons, these projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Cynthia Mahoney MD

Climate Health Now
Advocate for the Medical Society Consortium on Climate & Health
Clinical Associate Professor of Medicine, Stanford University(ret.)

From: Nora Privitera <nprivitera@contracosta.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 4:14 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Nora Privitera
Oakland, CA

From: Jennifer Russell <
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 4:16 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Letter to Supervisors

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as “feedstock” in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Yours Truly,

Jennifer Russell

Walnut Creek CA 94595

From: ratto:
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 6:58 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Contra Costa Supervisors - Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews (EIRs) for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as “feedstock” in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Sincerely,

Nick

Nick Ratto

Legislative Lead - Transportation

City of Alameda



From: Diane D <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 11:19 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIR

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR

Diane Dulmage

1000 Lakes Dr Richmond 94804

Dilicious50@gmail.com

From: M 064 Freeman <
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 12:46 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: [BULK] Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

Biofuels are not clean energy!

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments failed to address many of the specific points, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- *Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments*

The Contra Costa County's Declaration of Climate Emergency commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Thank you,

Michael Freeman
El Cerrito, CA

From: Mike Moore <[REDACTED]@hoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 1:11 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: May 3 Meeting – Item D.2 – Phillips 66 Appeal

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permit granted by the Planning Commission and require additional EIR reviews for Phillips 66 Refinery biofuels projects and grant the further CEQA reviews requested by the 3 appellants. Joint comments from multiple environmental groups on the draft EIRs included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments failed to address many of the specific points, especially those relating to safety and land use.

The FEIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- Failure to provide an adequate project description.
- Failure to provide a correct baseline due to lack of petroleum feedstock
- Concern with Unit 250 in the Project Analysis
- Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, increased use of hydrogen.
- Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as a “feedstock” in biofuel production
- Failure to consider climate impacts.
- Findings Concerning Choice of Alternatives and Throughput Volumes
- Failure to account for cumulative impacts.
- Failure to provide adequate resources for remediation of the site once it ceased biofuel production
- Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments

The Contra Costa County’s Declaration of Climate Emergency Resolution 2020/256 commits to fight climate change and to protect the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects demand a more thorough review of the EIR.

Thank You,

From: Mike Moore <[redacted]@ioo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 1:22 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: May 3 Meeting – Item D.1 – Marathon Appeal

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permit granted by the Planning Commission and require additional EIR reviews for Marathon Refinery biofuels projects and grant the further CEQA reviews requested by the appellants. Joint comments from multiple environmental groups on the draft EIRs included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments failed to address many of the specific points, especially those relating to safety and land use.

The FEIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- Failure to provide an adequate project description.
- Failure to provide a correct baseline due to shutdown of the refinery operations
- Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, increased use of hydrogen.
- Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as a “feedstock” in biofuel production
- Failure to consider climate impacts.
- Findings Concerning Choice of Alternatives and Throughput Volumes
- Failure to account for cumulative impacts.
- Failure to provide adequate resources for remediation of the site once it ceased biofuel production
- Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments

The Contra Costa County's Declaration of Climate Emergency Resolution 2020/256 commits to fight climate change and to protect the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects demand a more thorough review of the EIR.

Thank You,

Mike Moore

From: Emily Wheeler <emily.wheeler@contra-costa.ca.gov>
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 2:22 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional Environmental Impact Reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as “feedstock” in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Sincerely,

Emily Wheeler

Walnut Creek

Stacey Boyd

From: Debi Clifford
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 6:20 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

As a longtime Contra Costa taxpayer and landlord, I urge you to reject the land use permits for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects and conduct more thorough environmental impact reviews.

In this crucial moment, the County has the leverage of the permitting process to insist that these two companies do the hard work now of proving that these projects will not irremediably and significantly harm local residents, our communities, our food supply, and the environment.

To date, the companies have failed to comply with the **CEQA requirement to respond to public comments**, as they have not responded in detail to the concerns submitted in writing by local environmental groups. Specifically, they have failed to address:

- ***Safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational hazards including flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen***
- ***Impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production***
- ***Climate and other environmental impacts***

Please do your due diligence now: don't rubber-stamp this project in your haste to nail down a solution to our county's overdependence on local fossil fuel production. You have the responsibility and authority to take more time to thoroughly analyze these biofuels conversions which offer a seductive energy alternative that – like the Trojan horse – more likely will unleash untold harm on local residents and exacerbate the climate crisis we all face.

Thank you for your service and for your serious attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Debi Clifford
Richmond, CA

From: Jeffrey Mann <... t>
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 9:55 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuel Projects' EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisors,

I have lived in CCC for 25 years, and have raised my family here.

I urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects *must* have a more thorough EIR.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Mann, MD
Lafayette

From: Vanessa Warheit
Sent: Sunday, May 1, 2022 11:26 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Cc: John Gioia
Subject: Reject the EIRs for proposed Renewable Fuels Project

Dear Contra Costa Supervisor,

I am very concerned about the proposed biofuel projects currently under consideration. I understand that these projects purport to improve the health and climate impacts of the existing refineries, but the facts [do not seem to support either of these assumptions](#) -- if anything they point to increasing both GHG impacts and health impacts to our local communities.

I therefore urge you to reject the land use permit and require additional EIR reviews for both Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. I am very concerned that joint comments from multiple environmental groups on the draft EIRs included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project, yet the responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. Specifically, the FEIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description.*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, increased use of hydrogen.*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts.*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts.*
- **Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments**

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fight climate change and to protect the health and safety of vulnerable residents. I applaud you for taking this step -- now it's time to take the next step, and demand the refineries come back with a more thorough EIR so you can make an educated decision about the merits of these proposals.

Thank you for protecting our communities. I look forward to hearing back from you on this issue.

Warm regards,
Vanessa Warheit
El Cerrito, CA

--
Vanessa Warheit

Phon

EV Charging Access for All

Emerge CA Class of '21

pronouns: she, her, hers
<https://linktr.ee/vwarheit>

From: Marinell Daniel <[redacted]@mail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 7:43 AM
To: Karen Mitchoff; John_Gioia; Supervisor Candace Andersen; Diane Burgis
Cc: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Items D1and D2, BOS Meeting Agenda Public Comment

Dear Chair Mitchoff and members of the Board,

I am writing to urge you to reject the land use permits and require additional environmental impact reviews for the Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments on the draft EIRs from multiple environmental groups included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The final EIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, and increased use of hydrogen*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as “feedstock” in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts*
- ***Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments***

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fighting climate change and to protecting the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects conflict with that commitment. Please support a more thorough EIR for both proposed biofuel projects.

Regards,

Marinell Daniel,

[redacted], El Sobrante, CA 94803

Sent from my iPad

From: Elena Engel <[redacted]@il.com>
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 7:52 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Biofuels EIRs

The EIR does not take into account all of the impacts from refining biofuels. One of the most egregious omissions is that biofuels have been shown to create more greenhouse gases than they avoid. The use of food crops for fuel is an unfortunate choice with many unintended consequences, including driving up the cost of commodities, and using more ghg-creating inputs when growing such crops.

Biofuels are not the answer. They continue to pollute the air around the refineries and they continue to create unacceptable amounts of greenhouse gases.

I urge you to reject this application, and require an actual EIR that takes into account all the impacts, rather than cherry picks what will appear more advantageous,

Elena Engel
San Francisco

From: Helena Birecki · >
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 11:01 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Uphold the Appeals of Renewable Fuels Projects EIRs-- press pause on these projects

Dear Supervisors,

Please uphold the appeals from numerous community and environmental groups-- put a pause on the projects until the companies do a more thorough EIR that addresses the inadequacies brought up in the appeal.

It is essential that you reject the EIR as it stands not only for public health and safety, but also legal precedent that will negatively impact Contra Costa County first, and then communities across the country.

Especially concerning for public health and safety is the:

- Near-term increased risk of flaring and risk of explosion due to increased use of hydrogen for biofuels processing
- Medium term increased risk of food shortages due to so much agricultural land being shifted from food production to fuel feedstock, and
- Long-term risk of these refineries shutting down with no decommissioning plans

Especially concerning for legal precedent would be:

- Approving an Environmental Impact Report that fails to comply with legal requirements including providing an adequate project description and adequately responding to public comments.

Please uphold the law by upholding the appeals. Put a pause on the two renewable fuels projects until a more legally sound EIR that adequately addresses public health and safety is completed.

Thank you,
Helena Birecki
member of 350 Bay Area

From: Scott Bartlebaugh <[redacted].net>
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 11:03 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Public Comment on agenda item D2 Hearing regarding Rodeo Renewed project, Board of Supervisors meeting Tuesday May 3, 2022

Clerk, Board of Supervisors,

I submit the following public comment on behalf of the Crockett Improvement Association.



May 2, 2022

Re: Comment on Phillips 66 Rodeo Renewed Project -- Community Benefit Agreement

Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors,

I'm making a comment representing the Crockett Improvement Association regarding the Phillips 66 Rodeo Renewed Project Public Hearing. We believe the project has positive aspects such as a reduction in total emissions, a reduction in hazardous materials and process safety risk to the surrounding public, as well as supports an overall move to lower impact energy sources.

We have concerns with the current lack of definition of the Good Neighbor Agreement. Crockett, Port Costa, and Tormey are fenceline communities that are affected by the planned operation, permitted emissions, and any unplanned incidents that may occur in the course of operation. We request that the Crockett, Port Costa, and Tormey communities be included in discussions of the details of the Community Benefit Agreement. While this may be the plan it was not clear from the discussion at the Planning Commission hearing. This is a matter of environmental justice. A variety of incidents are documented on the Contra Costa County Health Services website, <https://cchealth.org/hazmat/accident-history.php>, including the Catacarb release in 1994 and incidents as recent as 2015. Crockett was included in a Good Neighbor Agreement following the 1994 Catacarb incident resulting in payments to the Crockett Community Foundation, and we believe a similar agreement with benefit through the Crockett Community Foundation would be appropriate.

Furthermore we believe the Crockett Community Foundation is the most appropriate body and means to administer the management and distribution of funds to the Crockett, Port Costa, and Tormey community. The Crockett Community Foundation has a significant track record of administering other Community Benefit Agreement, mitigation, and similar funds to the community. They are an elected board and have a track record of financially responsible and community engaging management of such funding.

Lastly we ask that odor control from the new project be managed with a well defined performance and enforcement structure. While the new project reduces hazardous materials inventories and

From: Roland Saher < >
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 1:45 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Reject Renewable Fuels Project's EIRs

Dear Contra Costa Supervisor,

I urge you to reject the land use permit and require additional EIR reviews for Phillips 66 and Marathon Refinery biofuels projects. Joint comments from multiple environmental groups on the draft EIRs included detailed, specific points about many technical aspects of the project. Responses to these comments **failed to address many of the specific points**, especially those relating to safety and land use. The FEIRs inadequately address the following concerns:

- *Failure to provide an adequate project description.*
- *Failure to account for safety and air pollution concerns from potentially increased operational upsets and hazards such as flaring, explosions, gas releases, increased use of hydrogen.*
- *Failure to account for impacts of burning food for fuel due to human food used as "feedstock" in biofuel production*
- *Failure to consider climate impacts.*
- *Failure to account for cumulative impacts.*
 - **Failure to Comply with the CEQA Requirement to Respond to Public Comments**

The Contra Costa County's [Declaration of Climate Emergency](#) commits to fight climate change and to protect the health and safety of vulnerable residents. These projects demand a more thorough EIR.

Even though I am not a resident of Contra Costa County - I live in Live Oak, near Capitola - I believe that this is a precedent setting plan that might well affect all parts of California in a negative way and calls, therefore, for a stringent EIR.

Thank you.

Roland Saher