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## Executive Summary

ExxonMobil Production Company (ExxonMobil) is requesting approval for Interim Trucking to transport Santa Ynez Unit (SYU) processed crude oil from the Las Flores Canyon (LFC) facility to market destinations. The facility is located at 12000 Calle Real, approximately twelve miles west of the city of Goleta.

Since 1993, the Plains All American Pipeline (PAAPL) Lines 901 and 903 have been the only means of transporting crude oil to markets from LFC. Operations at LFC have been temporarily suspended as a result of the PAAPL 901 pipeline incident in May 2015 and subsequent pipeline shutdown. ExxonMobil is seeking a permit to conduct interim crude oil trucking until a transport pipeline becomes available. This will enable limited production to resume at the Santa Ynez Unit.

This Transportation Quantitative Risk Assessment (TQRA) assesses the potential hazardous materials risks to the public from the proposed interim crude oil truck transportation. Limited crude oil production with a maximum of 70 crude oil truck loads per day have been assessed from LFC to two designated unloading stations; Phillips 66 Santa Maria Pump Station, and PAAPL Pentland Pump Station in Maricopa.

ExxonMobil propose to use contract carriers to haul the crude oil. Contractor selection and auditing procedures will ensure the contractor meets or exceeds all applicable health, safety, security, and environmental compliance standards. The Crude Oil Transportation Risk Management \& Prevention Program (CO-TRMPP) has been developed to ensure that the interim trucking is conducted in a safe and efficient manner.

Route specific truck accident rates have been developed from an analysis of California accident data. Local influences on accident data associated with road access, road gradients, visibility and weather are therefore inherently included within these route specific accident rates.

The total public risks have been calculated for both proposed truck routes, and the highest risks per one kilometer ( 0.62 miles) road segment have been identified to assess the acceptability of potential serious injury and fatality risks.

The significance of risk has been assessed utilizing the Santa Barbara County (SBC) Risk Profile. The thresholds for acceptable risk to the public are defined by the SBC Risk Criteria in three zones; green, amber and red. The mitigated risks are within the following zones of acceptability for both proposed truck routes:

- Mitigated risk of serious injury profile is within the green "Insignificant Risk" zone for acceptability.
- Mitigated risk of fatality profile is within the green "Insignificant Risk" zone for acceptability.


## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

ExxonMobil Production Company (ExxonMobil) is requesting approval for Interim Trucking to transport Santa Ynez Unit (SYU) processed crude oil from the Las Flores Canyon (LFC) facility to market destinations. The facility is located at 12000 Calle Real, approximately twelve miles west of the city of Goleta.

Since 1993, the Plains All American Pipeline (PAAPL) Lines 901 and 903 have been the only means of transporting crude oil to markets from LFC. Operations at LFC have been temporarily suspended as a result of the PAAPL 901 pipeline incident in May 2015 and subsequent pipeline shutdown. ExxonMobil is seeking a permit to conduct interim crude oil trucking until a transport pipeline becomes available. This will enable limited production to resume at the Santa Ynez Unit.

The proposed interim crude oil truck transportation is subject to discretionary land-use permits and environmental review by Santa Barbara County (SBC). This includes the analysis of potential public exposure to acute risks associated with significant quantities of hazardous materials. ExxonMobil has requested that Dixon Risk Consulting (DRC) conduct a Transportation Quantitative Risk Assessment (TQRA) to assess the significance of risks to the public associated with truck transportation of crude oil from LFC to proposed unloading facilities.

### 1.2 Scope of Work

This TQRA assesses the potential hazardous materials risks to the public from the proposed interim crude oil truck transportation. The following activities have been assessed:

- Limited crude oil production with a maximum of 70 crude oil truck loads per day, at 160 barrels per load. During operations, one or both locations may be utilized for crude oil delivery on any day, totaling 70 trucks a day.
- Transportation routes have been assessed from LFC to two designated unloading stations; Phillips 66 Santa Maria Pump Station, and PAAPL Pentland Pump Station in Maricopa.
- Route specific truck accidents rates on public roads have been utilized to calculate incident rates and societal risk.

The public risks of a hazardous material release have been assessed for the transportation of crude oil from LFC to the designated unloading facilities. The total public risks have been calculated for both truck routes. The highest risks per one kilometer ( 0.62 miles) road segment have been identified to assess the acceptability of potential serious injury and fatality risks.

The significance of risk has been assessed utilizing the Santa Barbara County (SBC) Risk Profile ${ }^{(24)}$. The thresholds for acceptable risk of serious injury or fatality to the public are as
defined by the SBC Risk Criteria. The County has published thresholds of acceptability in order to determine the significance of impacts in a consistent manner.

Within this report, an accident is defined as an event that occurs when a vehicle is involved in a collision. The terms accident, collision and crash have been used interchangeably. An incident is defined as a release of crude oil that may occur as a result of a tanker truck collision, or a truck failure of containment in transit.

### 1.3 Transportation Quantitative Risk Assessment Methodology

Transportation Quantitative Risk Assessment is an established methodology to quantify the risk of a potential incident by estimating the likelihood and consequence of the event. The risk of serious injury or fatality has been assessed using the following steps:

- Evaluation of proposed truck routes for road characteristics.
- Quantify traffic volumes along the proposed routes.
- Development of accident frequencies utilizing California accident data and published national accident data.
- Estimate the probability of release, size of release, and ignition.
- Determine the consequences and potential impact of a crude oil release.
- Combine the likelihood and consequences of a release to calculate the societal risk for the highest one kilometer segment, and present as a risk profile.
- Quantify mitigation measures to minimize the risk.
- Assess the significance of risk of serious injury or fatality against the SBC Risk Profile Criteria.

TQRA provides an estimate of the risks, which tends to err on the side of conservatism. The approach was to make reasonable assumptions on the likelihood and severity of an incident, and the potential impact of a hazardous material release. In the process of TQRA, numerous assumptions must be made based on best available information. Where appropriate, sources of these assumptions, estimates and reasoning have been described.

## 2. Las Flores Canyon Crude Oil Transportation

### 2.1 Project Description

The Santa Ynez Unit facility is located in Las Flores Canyon, approximately twelve miles west of Goleta. The facility processes crude oil from the offshore platforms; Hondo, Harmony and Heritage, with an average density of about 19 degrees API gravity. Production is currently suspended as a result of the PAAPL 901 pipeline incident in May 2015, and subsequent pipeline shutdown.

Under the LFC Interim Trucking proposal, SYU will operate at a production level of approximately 10,000 to 12,000 barrels of oil per day. This will be transported to markets using no more than seventy crude transport truck trips per day.

Trucks will travel from LFC to one or both of two designated offsite locations; Phillips 66 Santa Maria Pump Station in Santa Barbara County, and Plains Pentland Pump Station in Kern County. These designated facilities are currently permitted to handle this type of crude transport truck unloading and have the equipment and capacity to accommodate the expected number of trucks for the LFC interim trucking.

Two transport truck scenarios have been assessed for the TQRA. In Scenario 1, all of the trucks will load product at LFC and travel to the Phillips 66 Pump Station in Santa Maria for unloading. In Scenario 2, all the trucks will load product at LFC and travel to the Pentland PAAPL Station in Maricopa for unloading. In actual operation, trucks could deliver product to one or the other or both of the two facilities on a given day. For risk calculation purposes, after unloading, it has been assumed the trucks return directly back to LFC to reload.

The following average daily laden truck traffic is proposed:

Scenario 1 to Phillips 66 Pump Station in Santa Maria

- Maximum number of trucks = 70 per day
- Maximum volume of product per truck = 160 barrels (bbls)
- Annual number of truck trips $=70 \times 365=25,550$
- Total distance to Phillips $66=54.3$ miles

Scenario 2 to Pentland PAAPL Station in Maricopa

- Maximum number of trucks = 68 per day
- Maximum volume of product per truck = 160 barrels (bbls)
- Annual number of truck trips $=68 \times 365=24,820$
- Total distance to Pentland PAAPL $=140.0$ miles

All trucks entering and leaving the LFC facility would use the Refugio Road junction for access to United States Highway (US) 101. Trucks will be routed northbound from LFC and utilize US 101 and State Route (SR) 166. The following roadways will be utilized:

| Destination Facility | Facility Address | Roadways |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phillips 66 Santa Maria Pump Station | 1580 East Battles Road, Santa Maria, CA 93454 | - LFC facility interior road <br> - Corral Canyon Road <br> - Calle Real Road <br> - Refugio Road <br> - Highway US 101 to Santa Maria <br> - E. Betteravia Road <br> - Rosemary Road <br> - E. Battles Road to Phillips 66 |
| Plains All American Pipeline Pentland Pump Station | 2311 Basic School Road, Maricopa, CA 93252 | - LFC facility interior road <br> - Corral Canyon Road <br> - Calle Real Road <br> - Refugio Road <br> - Highway US 101 to Santa Maria <br> - Highway SR 166 (Santa Maria to Maricopa) <br> - Basic School Road to PAAPL |

The location of the LFC facility and proposed trucking routes are shown on Figure 2.1, and described below in Section 2.3.

### 2.2 Truck Descriptions

Crude oil will be transported by selected contract carriers that meet or exceed all regulatory requirements and safety standards. Trucks will have 2017 or newer engines, and will incorporate safety controls and complete inspections and oversight prior to leaving LFC.

Crude oil will be transported by cargo trucks designed to comply with US Department of Transport (DOT) 406 or DOT 407 specifications in 160 barrel loads. These trucks are designed according to construction requirements for cargo tank motor vehicles specifications in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 49 CFR 178.346 and 178.347. These regulations prescribe the requirements for packaging and containers used in the transportation of hazardous materials. DOT 406/407 tank trucks are constructed of stainless steel or aluminum steel. Typical design parameters are as follows:

## DOT 406 Trucks

- Atmospheric pressure tank, Maximum Allowable Working Pressure (MAWP) $=3 \mathrm{psig}$
- Single shell with wall thickness 0.188 to 0.25 inches
- Oval shaped cross section
- Flat or nearly flat tank ends


## DOT 407 Trucks

- Low pressure cargo tank, MAWP up to 40 psig
- May be double shell with insulation
- Circular cross section
- Rounded tank ends

The cargo tank may be divided into compartments by internal bulkheads, which reduces the movement of liquid during the road trip. The inlet/outlet valves are self-closing stop valves which are located within the tank to provide protection from damage in the event of a collision.

ExxonMobil propose to use contract carriers to haul the crude oil. Contractor selection and auditing procedures will ensure the contractor meets or exceeds all applicable health, safety, security, and environmental compliance standards. The Crude Oil Transportation Risk Management \& Prevention Program (CO-TRMPP) has been developed to ensure that the interim trucking is conducted in a safe and efficient manner, including:

- LFC operations personnel will conduct a safety and operability inspection checklist of trucks prior to loading and prior to transport from LFC to verify proper operation and no leaks.
- During loading both the ExxonMobil operator and the truck driver will be in attendance at all times.
- As required by SBC regulations, the Lease Automatic Custody Transfer (LACT) unit will incorporate a grounding/overfill protection system. Truck loading will stop in the case of an interrupted ground or determination of high truck level.
- Trucks will be equipped with an operating speed monitoring system.
- An annual inspection of truck transport trailers will be conducted to verify all ports are sealing properly, and repair any leaking ports prior to use.


### 2.3 Truck Route Descriptions

The proposed truck routes were surveyed by driving the routes and completing a form to describe the type of road, distances, and road conditions that may impact the transportation risk. The routes were divided into segments with similar characteristics, for example; the number of lanes, divided/undivided road, number of interchanges, the density of housing/businesses, how traffic feeds onto the road, passing lanes, visibility and topography. The proposed transportation routes are described below, and the road segments to each proposed truck unloading station shown on Figure 2.1. Facility access roads from LFC to highway US 101, and roads to the designated pump stations are shown on Figures 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 .

Highways may be classified as a freeway or expressway, depending on the type of access controls. A freeway will have road access at designated locations with on and off ramps. An expressway will have intersections that are not controlled by an on or off-ramp. US 101 is a divided freeway. At some locations along US 101, the freeway designation is changed on some rural sections to allow access to properties. SR 166 is a 2-lane undivided arterial highway with no road access controls.

Truck route segments were classified according to the definitions described in Table 2.1, and listed in Tables 2.2 and 2.3.

## Scenarios 1 and 2 - LFC to Santa Maria via Highway US 101

Both proposed truck routes use the same roads from LFC to Santa Maria via highway US 101. The route to Phillips 66 Terminal in Santa Maria exits the highway at the Betteravia Road junction. The route to Pentland PAAPL Terminal continues north through Santa Maria, and exits US 101 onto SR 166 east.

The route to Santa Maria is approximately 52.4 miles in length, and has been divided into 10 segments, designated A through J. Trucks will follow the main LFC plant road to the front gate on Calle Real. Calle Real from the LFC facility to US 101 is a rural 2-lane road. The road passes ranchland, and accesses the US 101 at Refugio State Beach area. All trucks entering and leaving the LFC facility will access US 101 at the Refugio Road junction, as shown on Figure 2.2.

Highway US 101 is a four-lane divided freeway in populated areas from Refugio Road junction to Betteravia Road junction. In some rural areas, the freeway designation is changed to allow access to properties and rural roads. The route initially travels west parallel to the Pacific Ocean, with state beaches to the south and primarily ranchland to the north of the road. At Gaviota, the road turns north over Gaviota State Park. The road passes a rest area, a short tunnel, and a winding section over the hills. North of the junction with State Route 1, the highway goes across gently rolling hills, past ranchland and scattered farms to the small town of Buellton. North of Buellton to Santa Maria, the highway passes through gently rolling hills, ranchland, vineyards, and the small town of Los Alamos. In Santa Maria, the road widens to a 6 -lane divided highway.

## Scenario 1 - Highway US 101 to Phillips 66 Terminal in Santa Maria

For scenario 1, trucks exit US 101 at Betteravia Road, and travel 1.9 miles to Phillips 66 Terminal. The total route from LFC is approximately 54.3 miles in length, and has been divided into 13 segments, designated $A$ to $M$.

Betteravia Road east of US 101 is a 2-lane arterial road used for access to agricultural and oil production areas. For a short section, the road has four lanes to provide access to the truck stop and service stations. The truck route uses Betteravia Road for about 1.0 miles, then turns north onto Rosemary Road, then west onto Battles Road to the Phillips 66 Terminal. Rosemary Road and Battles Road are 2-lane collector roads that serve mostly agricultural and oil production areas. The route segments are defined in Table 2.1 and shown on Figures 2.1 and 2.3.

## Scenario 2 - Highway US 101 to Pentland PAAPL Terminal in Maricopa

For scenario 2, trucks continue north on US 101 through Santa Maria and exit US 101 east onto SR 166. The total route from LFC to Pentland PAAPL Terminal in Maricopa is approximately 140.0 miles in length, and has been divided into a total of 20 segments, designated A to J and N to W .

State Route 166 is a 2-lane undivided arterial highway. The road passes across the Sierra Madre Mountains. The route is rural with some ranch and farm land in the Cuyama River Valley, and passes through the small rural town of New Cuyama. SR 166 combines with SR 33
for a 13.7 mile section up to the town of Maricopa, where the highways separate. As SR 166/SR 33 passes down the mountains into the San Joaquin Valley, the gradient is 4 to $7 \%$, and slow truck passing lanes are provided. After Maricopa, SR 166 continues east through mainly flat land with oil development and rural areas to Basic School Road and the Pentland PAAPL Terminal. The route segments are defined in Tables 2.1 and 2.2, and shown on Figures 2.1 and 2.4.

### 2.4 Average Daily Traffic

Average annual daily traffic (AADT) is the primary measure used to evaluate traffic volumes for regional highways. Average daily traffic is measured by the California Department of Transportation ${ }^{(26)}$ (CalTrans) on a sampling basis, and the numbers adjusted for total annual volumes divided by 365 days. These are published annually by CalTrans for vehicles and trucks. This data was obtained for the years 2012 through 2016, and used to calculate an average volume by route segment. The calculated average vehicle and truck AADTs are shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3.

Potential traffic impacts on local roads associated with the Project have been assessed for existing and future traffic conditions in a separate study by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) January $2018^{(2)}$. The traffic counts were used to estimate current accident rates for nonhighway roads, and project future traffic with the addition of potential traffic due to the interim truck project as shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3.

### 2.5 Population Densities

The public population primarily at risk from a crude oil release will be those involved in a vehicle collision, or a vehicle stopped on the road due to a collision. There is also the potential for public impact to those in buildings and outdoors in areas adjacent to the road.

The population density has been assessed along the proposed transportation routes by driving the routes and review of aerial photographs. The density has been assigned to a category for each road segment, based on population categories published in the ADL NGL report (1990) ${ }^{(1)}$ and the TNO Green Book ${ }^{(7)}$. These categories are described in Table 2.4, and have been assigned for each transportation road segment as shown in Tables 2.1 through 2.3.

The population present at night will not be the same as during the day for commercial or industrial areas. The population densities listed in Table 2.4 are day time averages, and have been adjusted for night time densities as listed below. The distribution of people indoors and outdoors also varies depending on the population category, and whether it is day or night. Population distributions have been estimated from those published in the TNO Green Book ${ }^{(7)}$ as follows:

| Day: | 100\% of population listed in Table 2.4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Night: | $100 \%$ present in housing areas <br>  |
|  | 5\% present in industrial areas |
|  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Day: } & \begin{array}{l}
80 \% \text { indoors, } 20 \% \text { outdoors in all areas except, } \\
20 \% \text { indoors, } 80 \% \text { outdoors in agricultural areas } \\
\text { Night: }
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}
95 \% \text { indoors, } 5 \% \text { outdoors }
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

Populations adjacent to the road will not be evenly distributed. Within an area that may be impacted by a hazardous material release, several people may be exposed, whereas other areas may be empty. To account for uneven distribution, residential densities have been grouped into three persons in close proximity, which is the average occupancy of a house. Industrial and commercial areas are assumed to have six people in close proximity.

The LFC facility is not accessible to the public; therefore, there is virtually no potential for public exposure to any hazards that occur within the LFC facility boundaries. The public population on-site is assumed to be zero.

### 2.6 Weather Data

In the event of a crude oil release during transportation, a flammable vapor cloud and/or fire may occur. To characterize these hazards, two meteorological conditions have been selected to represent worst case and more typical conditions. A worst case of "F" stability and 1.5 meters per second wind speed represents low wind speed during the night when flammable vapors may accumulate. A more typical case of "D" stability and 4 meters per second wind speed represents average weather conditions during the day and part of the night hours. Weather data from the Santa Maria airport station has been used to estimate the following:

| Stability Class | Wind Speed | Percent Occurrence |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F | $1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}(3.5 \mathrm{mph})$ | $35 \%$ |
| D | $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}(9 \mathrm{mph})$ | $65 \%$ |

Figure 2.1 Map of Truck Route Segments


Figure 2.2 Map of Las Flores Canyon Access Road Segments


Figure 2.3 Map of Phillips 66 Terminal Access Road Segments


Figure 2.4 Map of Pentland PAAPL Terminal Access Road Segments


Table 2.1 Road Type Classifications

| Road Type | ID | Description |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Urban | U | Urbanized areas and small urban areas designated by the Bureau of the <br> Census as having a population of five thousand (5,000) or more. |
| Rural | R | Rural areas comprise the areas outside the boundaries of small urban and <br> urbanized areas. |
| Local | L | Local roads provide primary access to residential areas, businesses, farms, <br> and other local areas. Posted speed limits are usually between 20 and 45 <br> mph. |
| Collector | A | Collectors are major and minor roads that connect local roads and streets <br> with arterials. Posted speed limits are usually between 35 and 55 mph. |
| Arterial | Arterials are major through roads that carry large volumes of traffic. <br> Arterials are often divided into major and minor arterials. |  |
| Freeway | F | Limited access roads that provide largely uninterrupted travel, often using <br> partial or full access control. |
| Divided Road | Di | Road with division barrier or separation between directions of travel. |
| Undivided Road | Un | Road without division barrier or separation between directions of travel. |

Table 2.2 Route 1 - Road Segments from LFC to Phillips 66 Terminal in Santa Maria

| ID | H’Way I Road | Section |  | Length (miles) | Lanes (both ways) | Road Type* | Population Category** | Population Density per mile ${ }^{2}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | To |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | Coral Canyon | LFC Loading Area | LFC Exit | 0.8 | 2 | RLUn | Non-public road | 0 | LFC internal road through rural canyon. |
| B | Calle Real | LFC Exit | Jct Refugio Rd / <br> US $101 \mathrm{~J}-120$ | 1.6 | 2 | RCUn | Rural | 20 | Collector road to freeway junction. Access to ranches and beaches. |
| C | US 101 | Jct Refugio Rd / US 101 J-120 | Gaviota Rest Area | 10.2 | 4 | RFDi | Rural / Rec | 30 | Freeway parallel to the pacific ocean, with beaches / $25 \%$ recreation areas to the south and ranchland to the north. |
| D | US 101 | Gaviota Rest Area | Jct US 101/SR <br> 1, End State Park | 2.1 | 4 | RFDi | UnPop | 2 | Freeway across the hills of Gaviota State Park. Some steep sections and winding road. |
| E | US 101 | Jct US 101/SR <br> 1, End State Park | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-139$, start Buellton | 7.6 | 4 | RFDi | Rural | 20 | Gently rolling hills, ranchland and scattered farms. |
| F | US 101 | US 101 J-139, start Buellton | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-140 \mathrm{~B}$, end Buellton | 1.1 | 4 | UFDi | Mixed-L | 1,000 | Small town of Buellton, population approx 5,000 . Mixed commercial and housing, with good setbacks from freeway. |
| G | US 101 | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-140 \mathrm{~B}$, end Buellton | Start Los <br> Alamos area | 12.8 | 4 | RFDi | Rural | 20 | Gently rolling hills, ranchland and vineyards. |
| H | US 101 | Start Los Alamos area | End Los Alamos area | 1.2 | 4 | RFDi | Mixed-L | 1,000 | Los Alamos, small rural town of less than 2,000. Mixed commercial and housing adjacent to freeway. |
| 1 | US 101 | End Los Alamos area | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-165$ Clark Ave | 10.6 | 4 | RFDi | Rural | 20 | Gently rolling hills, ranchland and vineyards. |

Table 2.2 Route 1 - Road Segments from LFC to Phillips 66 Terminal in Santa Maria

| ID | H’Way I Road | Section |  | Length (miles) | Lanes (both ways) | Road Type* | Population Category** | Population Density per mile ${ }^{2}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | To |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J | US 101 | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-165$ Clark Ave | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-169$ / Betteravia Rd | 4.4 | 4 / 6 | UFDi | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mixed-M / } \\ \mathrm{Ag} \end{gathered}$ | 2,100 | Urban freeway through the town of Santa Maria. Mainly level, with good visibility. Mixed housing and commercial to west of freeway, agricultural to east. |
| K | Betteravia | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-169$ / <br> Betteravia Rd | Jct Betteravia / Rosemary | 1.0 | 2 | UCUn | Com-L / <br> Ag | 600 | 2-lane arterial road serves mainly agricultural areas. Short 4-lane section to the east of US 101 junction, provides access to truck stop and service stations. |
| L/M | Rosemary / Battles | Jct Betteravia / <br> Rosemary | Rosemary Rd, Battles Rd and P66 Entrance | 0.9 | 2 | RCUn | Ag / Rural | 110 | Mainly agricultural area. Rosemary Rd is a 2-lane collector road. Battles Rd is a rural road with traffic mainly to the Phlilps 66 facility. |
| Route Length (miles) |  |  |  | 54.3 |  |  |  |  |  |

* Road Types defined in Table 2.1
** Population Density categories defined in Table 2.4

Table 2.3 Route 2 - Road Segments from LFC to Pentland PAAPL Terminal in Kern County

| ID | H'Way I Road | Section |  | Length (miles) | Lanes <br> (both ways) | Road Type* | Population Category** | Population Density per mile ${ }^{2}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | To |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Segments A through J described in Route 1 Table 2.2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | US 101 | US $101 \mathrm{~J}-169$ / Betteravia Rd | Start Santa Maria River Bridge | 4.4 | 6 | UFDi | Mixed-M | 4,000 | Urban freeway through the town of Santa Maria. Mainly level with good visibility. Mixed housing and commercial. |
| 0 | US 101 | Start Santa Maria River Bridge | Jct US 101 / <br> SR 166 East | 0.8 | 6 | UFDi | UnPop | 2 | 6-lane divided highway bridge across the Santa Maria River area. Unpopulated canyon. |
| P | SR 166 | Jct US 101 / <br> SR 166 East | Start of Cuyama River Valley | 28.3 | 2 | RAUn | Rural / <br> UnPop | 11 | Rural arterial highway across hills. Winding road, scattered ranches. |
| Q | SR 166 | Start of Cuyama River Valley | Start of town New Cuyama | 23.7 | 2 | RAUn | Rural | 20 | Rural arterial highway through Cuyama River Valley. Farms and ranchland. |
| R | SR 166 | Start of town New Cuyama | End of town New Cuyama | 1.1 | 3 | RAUn | Res-L | 1,000 | Small rural town of New Cuyama, population about 500, surrounded by farmland. |
| S | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SR } 166 \text { / } \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | End of town New Cuyama | End Cuyama Valley, start of hills | 11.2 | 2 | RAUn | Rural | 20 | Rural arterial highway through Cuyama River Valley. Farms and ranchland. |
| T | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SR } 166 \text { / } \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | End Cuyama Valley, start of hills | Start of town Maricopa | 11.7 | 2/3/4 | RAUn | UnPop | 2 | Rural arterial highway across hills. Winding road, with steep sections of 4 to $7 \%$ gradient. Mainly undeveloped. |
| U | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } 166 \text { / } \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | Start of town Maricopa | End of town Maricopa | 1.3 | 2 | RAUn | Res-M | 3,000 | Small rural town of Maricopa, population 1150. Speed limits 45 / 35 mph , junction with stop sign in town. |
| V | SR 166 | End of town Maricopa | Jct SR 166 / <br> Basic School | 4.7 | 3 | RAUn | Rural | 20 | Oil development, scattered homes and some farms. |

Table 2.3 Route 2 - Road Segments from LFC to Pentland PAAPL Terminal in Kern County

| ID | H'Way I Road | Section |  | Length (miles) | Lanes (both ways) | Road Type* | Population Category** | Population Density per mile ${ }^{2}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | To |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W | Basic School Rd | Jct SR 166 / <br> Basic School | Entrance to PAAPL facility | 0.4 | 4 | RAUn | Rural | 20 | Oil development and farm areas. |
| Route Length (miles) |  |  |  | 140.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

* Road Types defined in Table 2.1
** Population Density categories defined in Table 2.4

Table 2.4 Population Density Categories

| Code / Category | Description | Population Density <br> (per square mile) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Com-H - <br> Commercial - High | Office buildings and shopping areas in a <br> town center | 10,000 |
| Com-M <br> Commercial - Medium | Office buildings and shopping areas with <br> space surrounding the buildings | 5,000 |
| Com-L <br> Commercial - Low | Scattered buildings | 1,000 |
| Res-H <br> Residential - High | Busy residential area with a number of <br> multi-family homes | 10,000 |
| Res-M <br> Residential - Medium | Quiet residential, single family homes | 3,000 |
| Res-L <br> Residential - Low | Scattered housing, semi-rural | 1,000 |
| Mixed-H <br> Mixed Use - High | Mix of office buildings, commercial and <br> multi-family homes | 10,000 |
| Mixed-M <br> Mixed Use - Medium | Mix of office buildings, commercial and <br> single family homes | 4,000 |
| Mixed-L <br> Mixed Use - Low | Scattered buildings | 1,000 |
| Ind-M <br> Industrial - Medium | One and two story buildings with industrial <br> facilities surrounding offices | 2,000 |
| Ind-L <br> Industrial - Low | Scattered industrial facilities with low <br> density offices | 1,000 |
| Ag <br> Agricultural | Cultivated Fields | 200 |
| Rec <br> Recreation | Average beach and camp-site areas | 100 |
| Rural | Ranchland / Low density oil development | 20 |
| UnPop <br> Unpopulated | Undeveloped land, forest or hills | 2 |

## 3. Accident / Incident Frequency

The likelihoods of a truck accident have been calculated from published national and state data. Route specific accident rates have been developed where possible, and compared to state and national accident data. In the event of an accident and hazardous material release, a serious injury or fatality to the public may occur.

The terms "accident" and "crash" have been used interchangeably for a vehicle collision. The term "incident" has been used to describe a release of hazardous material, which may occur as the result of a vehicle collision, or a cargo containment failure.

Produced SYU crude oil is classified as hazardous materials (HM) according to the Code of Federal Regulations (49CFR). Hazardous materials are classified into 9 material classes as defined in Table 3.1. Crude oil is classified as a Class 3 Hazardous Material (HM-3), which includes flammable and combustible liquids. This classification system is used within the published incident databases described below.

### 3.1 Truck and Vehicle Accident Data

Truck accident rates are reported in published data as vehicle miles traveled and are typically quoted per million vehicle miles, or per $10^{6}$ miles (MVMT). Reported accident rates range from 0.32 to 14 accidents per million vehicle miles ${ }^{(11)(20)}$ depending on accident reporting threshold, road type, collision speed, and type of vehicle. Truck and vehicle accident rates are affected by specific road conditions, such as; traffic density, urban or rural routes, and divided or undivided highway. An assessment has been made of California accident data, national accident databases, and published accident rates, to develop route specific truck accident rates.

### 3.1.1 California Accident Data

Accidents that occur on California public roads are recorded by the California Highway Patrol (CHP) in the California Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS). The database serves as a means to collect and process data gathered from a collision scene, and is submitted by city and county jurisdictions. This includes data on the accident location, vehicle types, occupants, level of injury, number of injuries, and cause of the accident.

The SWITRS data is categorized by five levels of severity by the highest level of resulting injury:

- Fatality involved accident,
- Severe injury accident,
- Visible injury accident,
- Pain injury accident, and
- Property Damage Only (PDO) collisions.

Raw data was obtained for the five year period 2012 through $2016^{(4)}$ in order to develop accident rates by road segment. Data from all of California was analyzed to obtain average state vehicle and truck accident data. This included over 2 million accident records, and over 100,000 truck accidents. Accident data from 3 counties, and 3 municipalities were extracted to identify accidents that occurred over the 5 year period on proposed truck routes. These accidents were then categorized by road segment to calculate the accident rate for vehicles and trucks by segment.

The accuracy of the data is subject to reporting levels of the law enforcement agencies supplying the collision reports. The accident reporting threshold used by the CHP is \$500 property damage or personal injury. However, some municipalities follow different reporting thresholds, and may report only tow-away crashes, or crashes with damage of greater than $\$ 1,000$. The CHP estimates that it receives collision reports from municipalities for approximately $100 \%$ of fatal accidents, $90 \%$ of injury accidents and $40 \%$ of property damage only accidents. A review of SWITRS data collection by the Highway Safety Information System (HSIS) office ${ }^{(21)}$ found that accidents are mostly reported accurately by the Highway Patrol, which respond to freeway accidents (urban and rural), and rural roads outside municipalities. Some municipalities were not as consistent with accident reporting. Accidents occurring on route segments analyzed for this TQRA are primarily within the CHP jurisdiction, and are therefore likely to be reported accurately.

### 3.1.2 National Accident Data

The two primary Federal crash data sets are the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) and the General Estimates System (GES) databases. Trucks are identified in each but lack details on the type of truck and cargo.

The Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS) is a census of all motor vehicles in fatal accidents on public roads in which at least one person has died. FARS is maintained by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the data is obtained from police reports, driver records, vehicle records, and death certificates. FARS is recognized by government agencies and analysts as the most reliable national crash database. A large truck is defined in FARS as a truck with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of more than 10,000 pounds.

The Trucks Involved in Fatal Accidents (TIFA) database is managed by the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI). Large truck accident data is extracted from FARS, and supplemental data on the crashes are collected by a survey. The TIFA data collection protocol is based on a telephone survey of the motor carrier, driver, dispatcher, or safety director of the truck involved in the crash, as well as the reporting officer, and is considered highly reliable.

The General Estimates System (GES) is also maintained by the NHTSA, and is a nationally representative sample of police-reported fatal, injury, and property-damage-only crashes. The categories of injury, and property-damage-only crashes are the same as for the California SWITRS data. GES estimates are subject to sampling error for injury and PDO crashes, but provide data consistent with California data. National estimates of million vehicle miles travelled
are also provided for vehicles and trucks. The GES definition of a large truck is the same as the FARS definition.

The Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS) crash file is maintained by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), and submitted by the States from data extracted from police accident reports. A MCMIS reportable crash must involve a truck (a vehicle designed, used, or maintained primarily for carrying property that has at least two axles and six tires) or a bus. The crash must result in at least one fatality, or one injury which requires immediate attention at a medical facility, or one disabled vehicle that is towed from the scene. The MCMIS crash file is a useful source of information on hazardous materials transportation accidents, although not all data is accurately completed and the reporting criteria are different from the FARS, GES and California data. A review by the Hazardous Material Cooperative Research Program (HMCRP) in $2009^{(27)}$ estimated the reporting rate was about $80 \%$.

The Hazardous Materials Incident Reporting System (HMIRS) is maintained by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) of the DOT. All carriers of hazardous materials by road, rail, water, or air must fill out a DOT Form and submit it to PHMSA within 30 days of a reportable hazmat incident that results in a release of any quantity of hazardous material. The reportable incident could occur during loading/unloading, while in transit, or while in temporary storage when traveling between the hazmat shipment origin and its final destination. The database is a useful source of information on hazmat releases during transportation, and casualties resulting from exposure to the hazardous material. Prior to 1998, only interstate carriers were required to report hazardous material incidents, and few nonrelease reports are filed when there is damage to the hazmat container which does not result in a release. Incidents are self-reported by carriers, although PHMSA staff may contact the carrier and request clarification of the information they receive, and all injuries and fatalities are validated to determine if they were caused by a hazardous material release.

The definitions of injury and the level of reporting are not consistent between the state and various national databases, which may explain some inconsistencies in reported accident rates. However, a fatality accident is likely to be reported and is not subject to interpretation by the authority reporting on the accident.

### 3.1.3 Hazardous Materials Truck Accident Data

A study on the comparative risks of hazardous materials (HM) and non-HM transportation was conducted by Battelle for the FMCSA in $2001^{(11)}$. The study calculated the risks associated with each category of hazardous material and analyzed data from the HMIRS database, and the MCMIS accident database. Events were analyzed that involved the transportation of hazardous materials that may or may not have resulted in the release of a hazardous material.

In the 2001 FMCSA study, truck accident rates were developed for HM and non-HM truck transportation. HM shipments constituted approximately $5 \%$ of the total truck mileage, and ranged in the type of materials carried from perfumes to explosives. HM Class 3 (HM-3) includes flammable and combustible materials, the bulk of which was gasoline transported in cargo tanks. SYU crude oil transported from the LFC will be HM Class 3 materials. It was reported in the 2001 FMCSA study that $52 \%$ of the HM vehicles carried Class 3 flammable and
combustible liquids, and represented $56 \%$ of all of the impacts (1391 accidents). The accident rates were calculated as follows:

- Non-HM truck accident rate $=0.73$ per million vehicle miles
- HM truck accident rate $=0.32$ per million vehicle miles
- HM Class 3 cargo trucks $=0.5$ per million vehicle miles

The truck accident rates quoted are for accidents included in the MCMIS database, which include fatalities, significant injuries and tow-away accidents. The resulting accident rates are therefore lower than those reported in the California SWITRS and GES databases that have different injury and property damage reporting levels. However, the FMCSA data indicates that trucks carrying hazardous materials have an average accident rate of less than half non-HM trucks, and Class 3 cargo trucks an average accident rate about $30 \%$ lower than non-HM trucks.

The average truck accident rates reported in the California SWITRS and GES databases do not account for the added safety of HM trucks as identified in the 2001 FMCSA study. The drivers of trucks carrying hazardous materials are required to have more training and experience than the average truck driver. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, average truck accident rates have been reduced by a factor of $30 \%$ to reflect the greater safety of HM Class 3 cargo truck drivers over non-HM truck drivers.

### 3.1.4 Truck Accident Data By Road Type

A study conducted by Harwood and Russell in $1992{ }^{(20)}$ calculated truck accident rates by road type. This study data has been widely used in literature and by analysts to conduct simplified assessments of hazardous material routes, because it provides truck accident data by road class. Harwood demonstrated that road type such as urban or rural, and divided or undivided highway, has a direct influence on the accident rate and severity of an accident. The high density of traffic in an urban area significantly increases the chance of a collision, whereas the accident rate is reduced by a divided, limited access freeway. Hazardous materials release probabilities were also found to be influenced by road type. Accidents that occurred at higher speed in rural areas were found to have a higher release probability due to the higher impact speed. The following accident rates and HazMat release probabilities were reported:

| Area | Roadway | Truck Accident <br> Rate per $0^{6}$ vmt | HazMat Release <br> Probability |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | Two-lane | 2.19 | 0.086 |
| Rural | Multilane, undivided | 4.49 | 0.081 |
| Rural | Multilane, divided | 2.15 | 0.082 |
| Rural | Freeway (limited access) | 0.64 | 0.090 |
| Urban | Two-lane | 8.66 | 0.069 |
| Urban | Multilane, undivided | 13.92 | 0.055 |
| Urban | Multilane, divided | 12.47 | 0.062 |
| Urban | Freeway (limited access) | 2.18 | 0.062 |

Reference: Harwood and Russell (1992) ${ }^{(20)}$

### 3.2 Accident Fatality, Injury and Damage Rates

### 3.2.1 National Truck and Vehicle Accident Rates

Truck and vehicle accident data are collected nationally in the FARS and GES data, and reported annually by the FMCSA ${ }^{(15)}$. The crash severity accident rates have been averaged for the five year period of analysis 2012 to 2016 as follows:

| Vehicle Type <br> Involved and <br> Year of Data | Accident Rate per Million Vehicle Miles and \% of Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal Crashes | Injury Crashes | Property Damage <br> Only Crashes | Total |
| Trucks 2012 to 2016 | 0.014 | 0.312 | 1.142 | 1.47 |
| Percent of Total | $0.97 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ | $77.8 \%$ |  |
| Vehicles 2012 to 2016 | 0.016 | 1.055 | 2.542 | 3.61 |
| Percent of Total | $0.46 \%$ | $29.1 \%$ | $70.4 \%$ |  |

The accident data shown above is for the number of vehicles involved. The overall truck accident rate is less than half of the rate for all vehicles. This is likely due to the greater training truck drivers receive, and that a larger percent of truck miles occur on highways or rural roads where the accident rate is lower.

The likelihood of a fatality is higher in a crash between a truck and a passenger vehicle than between two passenger vehicles, due to the difference in vehicle weight. However, due to the lower overall accident rate for trucks, the fatality rate for trucks and all vehicles per million vehicle miles has been calculated to be about the same at 0.014 and 0.016 per mvmt for trucks and vehicles respectively.

### 3.2.2 Reduction in Accident Rates Over 25 Years

Since the 1990's, vehicle and truck accident rates have been significantly reduced by improvements in roads, vehicles and driver awareness. National vehicle and truck accident rates have been published by the FMCSA ${ }^{(15)}$ and show a significant reduction over the 25 year period, as illustrated in Figure 3.1 for fatal accidents. The following changes have been calculated:

| Vehicle Type and <br> Year of Data | Accident Rate per Million Vehicle Miles |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal Crashes | Injury Crashes | Property Damage <br> Only Crashes | Total |
| Truck 1991 | 0.029 | 0.522 | 1.66 | 2.21 |
| Truck 2016 | 0.015 | 0.381 | 1.35 | 1.74 |
| \% Reduction | $-50 \%$ | $-27 \%$ | $-19 \%$ | $-21 \%$ |
| All Vehicles 1991 | 0.025 | 1.649 | 3.26 | 4.94 |
| All Vehicles 2016 | 0.017 | 1.267 | 2.81 | 4.09 |
| \% Reduction | $-35 \%$ | $-23 \%$ | $-14 \%$ | $-17 \%$ |

For trucks there has been an overall accident rate reduction of $21 \%$ since 1991. For fatal crashes, there has been an accident rate reduction of $50 \%$, greater than for all accident types, which may be due to improved passenger vehicle safety equipment.

### 3.3 California Route Specific Accident Data

Route specific accident rates have been developed by an analysis of five years of California data obtained from the CHP SWITRS database ${ }^{(4)}$, for years 2012 to 2016. This accident data was categorized by road segment for the proposed truck routes from LFC. Local influences on accident data associated with road access, road gradients, visibility and weather are inherently included within these route specific accident rates. Accident rates have been calculated by route segment for vehicles and trucks as shown in Table 3.2 and 3.3.

Traffic volumes on local roads associated with the Project have been assessed for existing and future traffic conditions in the 2018 traffic study by ATE $^{(2)}$. There was insufficient accident data to calculate historical rates for access roads to the LFC site and the two proposed truck unloading terminals. Average vehicle and truck accident rates were therefore used for these segments.

There was insufficient data to develop statistically significant accident rates on short highway segments through small towns. Adjacent highway segments were therefore used to calculate average accident rates for these segments when the road conditions were similar.

Accident rates for HM Class 3 cargo trucks have been estimated by reducing the route specific average truck rates by $30 \%$, as discussed in Section 3.1.3. The calculated vehicle and truck accident rates by route section are shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3, and summarized as follows:

| Scenario | Description | Vehicle <br> Accident <br> Rate per 10 <br> miles | HM Class 3 <br> Truck <br> Accident <br> Rate per 10 <br> miles | HM Class 3 <br> Truck <br> Accident Rate <br> per laden trip |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LFC to Phillips 66 Santa Maria Pump <br> Station via US 101 | 0.80 | 0.32 | $1.8 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| 2 | LFC to PAAPL Pentland Pump Station <br> via US 101 and SR 166 | 0.95 | 0.38 | $5.4 \times 10^{-5}$ |

### 3.4 Causes of Truck Collisions

A review has been conducted on the causes of truck collisions using published truck accident studies and collision data. This data has then been used to identify the types of accidents more likely to result in a hazardous material spill, identify potential mitigation measures, and quantify the benefit in terms of risk reduction.

California accident data includes vehicle information and the primary collision factor. Truck accident data, for the latest 5 years available, has been grouped into critical events for the years 2011 to 2015, as shown in Table 3.4.

The Large Truck Crash Causation Study (LTCCS) ${ }^{(17)}$ was designed as a one-time study to analyze crash causes and contributing factors. The study was undertaken jointly by FMCSA and NHTSA, utilizing a representative sample of nearly 1,000 injury and fatal crashes involving large trucks that occurred between April 2001 and December 2003. The Report to Congress was published in $2006{ }^{(17)}$. The accidents selected were of a greater severity than other national crash databases, and included $23 \%$ fatality and $29 \%$ incapacitating injury severity levels. The LTCCS critical accident events have been compared to those reported in the California SWITRS data shown in Table 3.4 and summarized as follows:

| Primary Collision Factor | CA SWITRS Data 2011 to 2015 |  | LTCCS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Injuries and <br> Fatalities <br> per year | 1067 | Serious Injury <br> and Fatality <br> $\%$ |
| Truck Loss of Control | 654 | $12 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Truck Out of Lane or Unsafe Move | 467 | $8 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Truck Improper Turning or Crossing <br> Intersection | 280 | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Other | 3187 | $56 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Truck Driver Not Assigned Fault | 5655 | $100 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Total |  |  | $100 \%$ |

The primary collision factor due to truck driver action or inaction totals approximately $50 \%$ of injury or fatality collisions.

### 3.5 Accident Spill Probabilities

A public hazard may occur due to a vehicle collision that causes a rupture or leak of the tanker truck. The likelihood of a release has been calculated from a review of published reports and hazardous materials truck accident data.

The release probability, given an accident, is reported by Harwood ${ }^{(20)}$ to be between $5 \%$ and $9 \%$, depending on the speed of the accident. A review of transportation data by Arthur D. Little in $1990^{(1)}$ reported a conditional probability of a large spill from a gasoline truck as $7 \%$, given a reportable accident.

Five years of accident data (2012 to 2016) reported in the MCMIS database ${ }^{(15)}$ have been analyzed for truck crashes involving hazardous material cargo. Hazardous materials are classified by cargo type, accident severity, and if a release occurred. Class 3 flammable and combustible liquids make up about $49 \%$ of the HM accidents and $54 \%$ of the HM release incidents. For HM Class 3 liquid cargo trucks, the following release probabilities have been calculated:

- Fatal accidents $=40 \%$ probability of release
- Serious injury or tow-away accidents = 15\% probability of release

The MCMIS data includes injury and PDO accidents for only those accidents which require immediate medical attention or a tow-away. Less severe accidents, which are less likely to result in a release, are included in the California SWITRS data used for this TQRA. A comparison of accident reporting rates between databases found that only $36 \%$ of the accidents included in the GES and SWITRS data are included in the MCMIS hazardous materials data. A correction factor has been applied to estimate the following accident release probabilities for California reporting categories:

- Fatal accidents $=40 \%$ probability of release
- Injury or PDO reported accidents $=5 \%$ probability of release

The average spill probability for a reportable accident is lower than reported by Harwood ${ }^{(20)}$ in 1992, and ADL ${ }^{(1)}$ in 1990. The introduction of DOT 406/407 truck designs in 1993 have enhanced container integrity over the older MC 306/307 designs, and the use of truck roll stability systems may have also contributed to the reduced frequency of rollover events.

An analysis of the spill probability due to cargo tank rollovers was conducted by Battelle for the FMCSA 2005 study ${ }^{(14)}$. It was found that cargo tanks are vulnerable to a spill on rollover. Spills were reported to occur in $66 \%$ of the rollovers, which makes rollover prevention an important factor in minimizing the risk of a hazardous material release.

An analysis has been conducted of hazardous material releases recorded in the HMIRS database for the years 1991 to 2015. Releases of hazardous material may be associated with a vehicle collision event, or a non-collision event. Non-collision releases were due to equipment failure, human error, or inadequate maintenance. Releases of less than $10 \%$ of the tank contents were categorized as "small". The following in-transit crude oil releases were identified:

| Release Type | In-Transit Crude Oil Releases 1991 to 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of <br> Releases | $\%$ | Small | Average <br> Size S | Medium / <br> Large | Average <br> Size M/L |
| Non-Collision | 70 | $21 \%$ | 64 | 1 bbl | 6 | 86 bbl |
| Vehicle Collision | 257 | $79 \%$ | 122 | 4 bbl | 135 | 109 bbl |
| Total | 327 | $100 \%$ | $186(57 \%)$ | 3 bbl | $141(43 \%)$ | 108 bbl |

As shown in the table above, non-collision events were identified as the cause of $21 \%$ of crude oil releases. These were primarily small releases due to overfilling, equipment failure, or failure to properly close valves/dome. Six larger non-collision releases occurred which were due to equipment failure in transit. Release sizes were categorized as being $43 \%$ medium/large, and 57\% small.

A study of LPG road transportation by ADL in $1990^{(1)}$ reported a similar release size distribution, with large spills occurring in 35 to $45 \%$ of releases. Non-collision release events were also estimated to occur in about 20\% of releases for LPG transportation.

Based on the analysis of crude oil releases reported in the HMIRS database, the accident release probabilities have been increased by $20 \%$ to account for non-collision related releases in-transit. Representative spills sizes for all types of releases have been selected as:

- 40\% large 160 barrels
- 60\% small 16 barrels


### 3.6 Hazardous Material Ignition Probabilities

The HMIRS database has been analyzed to develop ignition probabilities for a release of crude oil. Gasoline has been included in the table below for comparison purposes. The following crude and gasoline releases and fires were identified over the twenty-five year period 1991 to 2015:

| Release <br> Material | Release Size | Releases In-Transit 1991 to 2015 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of <br> Fires | Ignition <br> $\%$ |  |
| Crude Oil | Small | 186 | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| Crude Oil | Medium + Large | 141 | 23 | $17 \%$ |
| Gasoline | Small | 509 | 15 | $3 \%$ |
| Gasoline | Medium + Large | 857 | 237 | $28 \%$ |
| Total |  | 1693 | 278 | $16 \%$ |

The ignition probability for a HM Class 3 release has been reported as $15 \%$ by the FMCSA ${ }^{(11)}$. The source data was taken from spills reported in 1996, and is consistent with the average ignition probability identified above for 25 years of HMIRS data.

The probability of ignition is higher for larger spills due to the release being more likely to encounter an ignition source. A review of crude oil releases in the HMIRS database found only 3 out of 186 small releases had ignited. An ignition rate $2 \%$ ignition has been selected for a small crude oil release, and $20 \%$ ignition has been conservatively selected for a large crude oil release.

- $20 \%$ ignition large release
- $2 \%$ ignition small release


### 3.7 Exposure to a Hazardous Material Release

In a tanker truck collision, the primary cause of injury or fatality is due to the force of the collision, not a release of hazardous material. However, a single crash of a hazardous material truck in a crowded area has the potential for deaths and injuries beyond the vehicle occupants.

A release of any quantity of hazardous material must be reported to the PHMSA, and recorded in the HMIRS database. The report includes information on injuries and fatalities due to exposure to a hazardous material release. A search was performed of the HMIRS database to identify casualties due to exposure to crude oil and gasoline releases for the period 1991 to 2015:

| Release Material | Releases In-Transit 1991 to 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Employee Casualty Incidents |  |  | Public Casualty Incidents |  |  |
|  | Fatality | Serious <br> Injury | Non- <br> Hospital <br> Injury | Fatality | Serious <br> Injury | Non- <br> Hospital <br> Injury |
| Crude Oil | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Gasoline | 106 | 43 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 10 |
| Total Incidents | 110 | 45 | 12 | 13 | 8 | 10 |
| Total Casualties | 111 | 46 | 13 | 26 | 12 | 13 |

All fatalities were due to vehicle occupants being trapped and exposed to fire. Public fatalities were associated with occupants of other vehicles involved in a collision, or occupants of a vehicle near the collision. For example, in 1993 an incident occurred when a gasoline truck was hit by a train, and 5 occupants of 3 other vehicles were killed in the fire.

The probability of public fatality due to a release and crude oil fire is 1 in 26 fires, or 4\%. The probability of public fatality in a gasoline fire is 12 in 252 fires, or $5 \%$. The probability of fatality in a gasoline fire is statistically more significant than the one crude oil incident, and the hazards of a fire are similar for each hazardous material. A $5 \%$ probability of fatality has therefore been assumed for crude oil.

There were fewer serious public injuries reported due to an in-transit hazardous material fire than fatalities. This may be due to under reporting of public injuries by the carrier companies submitting the reports. All fatalities are likely to be reported and investigated by PHMSA staff, but burn injuries may not have been reported if other trauma injuries also occurred.

Due to the likely underreporting of injuries, an assumption has been made that the injury rate is approximately twice that of the fatality rate. The probabilities of a public casualty incident have been estimated for a crude oil release as follows

- large ignited release:
- small ignited release:

5\% fatality event
10\% injury event
$2 \%$ fatality event
5\% injury event

The number fatalities that have occurred in a crude oil or gasoline truck fire ranged from 1 to 5 , with an average of 2 public fatalities per incident. According to the DOT Bureau of Transportation Statistics, the average vehicle occupancy is 1.6 for all roads, and about 1.2 on highways. The distribution of public casualty numbers in each incident has been estimated as follows:

| Number of Public Casualties <br> per Incident | Probability |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $4 \%$ |
| 4 | $6 \%$ |
| 3 | $10 \%$ |
| 2 | $20 \%$ |
| 1 | $60 \%$ |

### 3.8 Unladen Truck Trips

A laden truck has the potential to release up to 160 barrels of crude oil, which if ignited may result in casualties to on-road or off-road populations. There is also the potential for hazards associated with a small release from an unladen truck.

Unladen trucks typically contain small quantities of oil as residue in the tank, and within the loading lines and hoses underneath the truck. The product piping is known the "wetlines", and may contain up to 50 gallons of oil. If these lines fail, or are impacted due to a vehicle collision, there may be a small release of crude oil. A review was conducted of historical failures associated with below tank product piping recorded in the PHMSA HMIRS database.

There were a total of 327 crude oil releases in transit recorded in the HMIRS database between 1991 and 2015. Approximately 60\% (186 releases) were small releases with an average release size of 3 barrels ( 126 gallons), as described in Section 3.5 above. From incident descriptions, the following 28 small releases were identified as being associated with a wetline failure:

| Wetline Release Cause 1991 to 2015 | Number of <br> Incidents | Number of <br> Fires |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Other vehicle impact with wetlines | 8 | 0 |
| Rollover event - due to collision or avoiding another vehicle | 2 | 0 |
| Rollover event - due to driver loss of control on a curve | 2 | 0 |
| Non-collision event - equipment failure (e.g. hose, fittings, tire <br> burst or other equipment impacting wetlines) | 16 | 0 |
| Total | 28 | 0 |

There have been no wetline incidents on crude oil trucks that resulted in fire, injury or fatality in the 25 year period reviewed. There is, however, a small public risk if a wetline release ignited
after a vehicle collision. An ignition probability of $2 \%$ has been estimated for a small crude oil release, as discussed in Section 3.6. On average, there may be 1 ignited release for every 50 small crude oil releases.

A review was also conducted of the HMIRS database for small ignited releases from gasoline trucks that may be associated with a wetline release. The probability of ignition of a small gasoline release is higher than for a small crude oil release, and due to a greater number of gasoline trucks on the road, the number of historical incidents is higher. There were 509 small gasoline releases over the 25 year period. Of these, 2 were identified as being releases from wetlines during a vehicle collision that ignited causing public fatality.

Using the HMIRS gasoline wetline incident frequency, an estimate has been made of the likelihood of a crude oil wetline incident for the proposed LFC temporary trucking. On Route-1, a casualty associated with wetlines may occur approximately every 30,000 years. On Route-2, a casualty may occur approximately every 10,000 years.

A search was conducted of historical crude oil unladen incidents recorded in the HMIRS database. One of the 28 crude oil wetline release incidents occurred when the truck was empty on the return journey. In another 4 incidents, there was insufficient data in the report to determine if the truck was laden or unladen, and 23 incidents occurred when the truck was laden. The risks associated with the unladen truck trip are very low, and for the TQRA analysis, all historical release incidents have been assumed to occur when the truck is laden.

The assumption that all historical incidents occurred during the laden trip results in an overestimate in the likelihood of failure on the laden truck trip in order to include any risk associated with the unladen return journey.

Table 3.1 Hazardous Material Classifications

| Hazardous <br> Class Code | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Class 1 | Explosives |
| Class 2 | Gases |
| Class 3 | Flammable and combustible liquids (includes crude oil, gasoline, diesel and <br> petroleum distillates. |
| Class 4 | Flammable solids, spontaneously combustible materials and dangerous when wet <br> materials |
| Class 5 | Oxidizers and organic peroxides |
| Class 6 | Toxic (poison) materials and infectious substances |
| Class 7 | Radioactive materials |
| Class 8 | Corrosive materials |
| Class 9 | Miscellaneous dangerous goods |

Defined in Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 49

Figure 3.1 Trends in Truck and Vehicle Fatal Accident Rates


The estimation of million vehicle miles traveled (mvmt) is done annually by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ${ }^{(15)}$ using the number of registered vehicles. This data is used together with the number of fatal crashes to estimate accident rates per mvmt for different types of vehicles.
** In 2007, the FHWA implemented an enhanced methodology for estimating vehicle miles traveled. This resulted in a $22 \%$ increase in the large truck vehicle miles estimate, and no significant change to the estimate of passenger vehicle miles. The apparent reduction in large truck accident rate from 2006 to 2007 is therefore due to the change in calculation method.

The truck accident rate reduction in 2009, is also an anomoly in the calculation method. The number of vehicle miles traveled is based on the number of large trucks registered. The financial crash in 2008/9 caused a significant reduction in commerce, and therefore the number of miles traveled per vehicle. This was not accounted for in the calculation of large truck vehicle miles.

Table 3.2 Route 1 - LFC to Phillips 66 in Santa Maria, Vehicle and Truck Accident Rates

| ID | H'Way /Road | Section |  | Vehicle AADT | Truck AADT | \% Trucks <br> on <br> Segment | Accident Rate per Vehicle Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | Accident Rate per Truck Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | HM Class 3 <br> Truck Accident Rate per $10^{6}$ miles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From / To | Length (miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | Coral Canyon | LFC Loading Area to LFC Exit | 0.8 | 400 | 140 | 35\% | 2.4 * | 1.0 * | 0.72 * |
| B | Calle Real | LFC Exit to Jct Refugio Rd / US 101 | 1.6 | 320 | 144 | 45\% | 2.4 * | 1.0 * | 0.72 * |
| C | US 101 | Jct Refugio Rd / US 101 to Gaviota Rest Area | 10.2 | 29,600 | 3,200 | 11\% | 0.7 | 0.53 | 0.37 |
| D | US 101 | Gaviota Rest Area to Jct US 101/SR 1 | 2.1 | 29,600 | 3,200 | 11\% | 3.1 | 1.12 | 0.79 |
| E | US 101 | Jct US 101/SR 1 to start Buellton | 7.6 | 23,100 | 2,800 | 12\% | 1.2 | 0.50 | 0.35 |
| F | US 101 | Start Buellton to End Buellton | 1.1 | 21,900 | 2,800 | 13\% | 0.9 | 0.58 | 0.24 ** |
| G | US 101 | End Buellton to Start Los Alamos area | 12.8 | 27,800 | 3,300 | 12\% | 0.5 | 0.23 | 0.16 |
| H | US 101 | Start Los Alamos to End Los Alamos | 1.2 | 29,510 | 3,600 | 12\% | 0.5 | 0.13 | 0.21 ** |
| 1 | US 101 | End Los Alamos to Jct US 101 / Clark Ave | 10.6 | 28,600 | 3,500 | 12\% | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.28 |
| J | US 101 | Jct US 101 / Clark Ave to <br> Jct US 101 / Betteravia Rd | 4.4 | 46,200 | 4,500 | 10\% | 0.7 | 0.38 | 0.27 |
| K | Betteravia | Jct US 101 / Betteravia to Rosemary Rd | 1.0 | 9,300 | 2,800 | 30\% | 2.4 * | 1.0 * | 0.72 * |

Table 3.2 Route 1 - LFC to Phillips 66 in Santa Maria, Vehicle and Truck Accident Rates

| ID | H'Way /Road | Section |  | Vehicle AADT | Truck AADT | \% Trucks on Segment | Accident Rate per Vehicle Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | Accident Rate per Truck Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | HM Class 3 Truck Accident Rate per $10^{6}$ miles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From / To | Length (miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L/M | Rosemary / Battles | Jct Betteravia / Rosemary to Battles Rd and P66 Entrance | 0.9 | 1,260 | 410 | 32\% | 2.4 * | 1.0 * | 0.72 * |
| Total Route |  | LFC to P66 Santa Maria | 54.3 |  |  |  | 0.80 | 0.46 | 0.32 |
| Accident Rate per Trip |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1.8 \times 10^{-5}$ |

AADT = Average Annual Daily Traffic on California Highways, published annually by CalTrans ${ }^{(26)}$
Truck and Vehicle Accident Rates calculated from 5 years of California accident data extracted by road section (2012 to 2016$)^{(4)}$

* Average vehicle and truck accident rates used for these short segment due to no historical data not statistically significant.
** Short segment. Data not statistically significant. Adjacent highway segments used to calculate average accident rates.

Table 3.3 Route 2 - LFC to Pentland PAAPL in Maricopa, Vehicle and Truck Accident Rates

| ID | H'Way /Road | Section |  | Vehicle AADT | Truck AADT | \% Trucks on Segment | Accident Rate per Vehicle Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | Accident Rate per Truck Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | HM Class 3 Truck Accident Rate per $10^{6}$ miles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From / To | Length (miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Accident rates for Segments A through J shown above in Table 3.2

| N | US 101 | Jct US 101 / Betteravia to Start Santa Maria River Bridge | 4.4 | 63,000 | 6,100 | 10\% | 1.6 | 0.92 | 0.64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | US 101 | Start Santa Maria River Bridge to Jct US 101 / SR 166 East | 0.8 | 67,000 | 6,700 | 10\% | 1.4 | 0.92 ** | 0.64 ** |
| P | SR 166 | Jct US 101 / SR 166 to Start of Cuyama River Valley | 28.3 | 3,100 | 860 | 27\% | 1.4 | 0.61 | 0.42 |
| Q | SR 166 | Start of Cuyama River Valley to New Cuyama | 23.7 | 2,800 | 670 | 24\% | 0.8 | 0.43 | 0.3 |
| R | SR 166 | Start of New Cuyama to End town New Cuyama | 1.1 | 3,000 | 670 | 22\% | 0.6 | 0.51 | 0.36 ** |
| S | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SR } 166 \text { / } \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | End town New Cuyama to End Cuyama Valley, start of hills | 11.2 | 3,100 | 680 | 22\% | 0.8 | 0.73 | 0.51 |
| T | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SR } 166 \text { / } \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | Start of hills to Maricopa | 11.7 | 3,600 | 930 | 26\% | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.86 |
| U | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SR } 166 \text { / } \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | Start of Maricopa to End of Maricopa | 1.3 | 3,600 | 930 | 26\% | 0.4 *** | $0.55^{* * *}$ | 0.38 *** |
| V | SR 166 | End of Maricopa to Jct SR 166 / Basic School | 4.7 | 2,800 | 830 | 30\% | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.81 |

Table 3.3 Route 2 - LFC to Pentland PAAPL in Maricopa, Vehicle and Truck Accident Rates

| ID | H'Way /Road | Section |  | Vehicle AADT | Truck AADT | \% Trucks on Segment | Accident Rate per Vehicle Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | Accident Rate per Truck Involved per $10^{6}$ miles | HM Class 3 Truck Accident Rate per $10^{6}$ miles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From / To | Length (miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W | Basic School Rd | Jct SR 166 / Basic School to PAAPL Entrance | 0.4 | 450* | 340* | 75\% | 2.4 * | 1.0 * | 0.72 * |
| Total Route |  | LFC to PAAPL | 140.0 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.55 | 0.38 |
| Accident Rate per Trip |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $5.4 \times 10^{-5}$ |

AADT = Average Annual Daily Traffic on California Highways, published annually by CalTrans ${ }^{(26)}$
Truck and Vehicle Accident Rates calculated from 5 years of California accident data extracted by road section (2012 to 2016) ${ }^{(4)}$

* Average vehicle and truck accident rates for non-highways used on these segments.
** Short segment. Data not statistically significant. Adjacent highway segments used to calculate average accident rates.
${ }^{* * *}$ No truck accidents and only 2 vehicle collisions were recorded in Maricopa during the 5 year period. An average truck accident rate has been assigned to account for possible underreporting.

Table 3.4 Truck Critical Accident Events

| Primary Collision Factor | CA SWITRS Data 2011 to 2015 |  |  | LTCCS |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatality <br> Accidents <br> per year | \% | Injury <br> Accidents <br> per year | \% | Serious <br> Injury and <br> Fatality \% |
| Unsafe Speed | 21.0 | 8.5 | 990 | 18.8 | 13.0 |
| Driver Impairment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Failure (brakes, tires, etc.) | 2.2 | 0.9 | 40 | 0.8 |  |
| Total Truck Loss of Control | 1.2 | 0.5 | 13 | 0.2 |  |
| Unsafe Lane Change or Passing <br> Following Too Closely <br> Unsafe Move, Parking or Other | 5.0 | $\mathbf{9 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 6}$ |
| Violation | 0.4 | 0.2 | 52 | 7.2 |  |
| Total Truck Out of Lane or Unsafe | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2}$ | 2.7 | 211 | 4.0 |  |
| Move | $\mathbf{4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 7}$ |  |
| Total Truck Improper Turning or | $\mathbf{2 2 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| Crossing Intersection | 6.0 | 2.4 | 218 | 4.1 | 12.8 |
| Other Vehicle in Lane | 3.6 | 1.5 | 29 | 0.6 | 2.8 |
| Pedestrian <br> Unknown | 0.6 | 0.2 | 22 | 0.4 |  |
| Total Other | $\mathbf{1 0 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 6}$ |
| Truck Driver Not At Fault | $\mathbf{1 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 4}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |

LTCCS = Large Truck Crash Causation Study ${ }^{(17)}$ by FMCSA and NHTSA, using national truck accident data from April 2001 to December 2003.

## 4. Consequences of Release

In the event of a crude oil truck road incident, there is the potential for a hazardous material release and fire. The public population primarily at risk from a crude oil release will be those involved in the vehicle collision, or within a vehicle stopped on the road due to the collision. However, a single crash of a hazardous material truck in a crowded area has the potential for deaths and injuries beyond the vehicle occupants. There is the potential for public impact to those in buildings and outdoors along the transportation route.

The hazards of a crude oil release to public populations adjacent to the road are assessed in the following section. Crude oil is flammable and if a release is ignited, it will form a pool fire. If ignition is delayed, a flammable vapor cloud may initially develop, which if ignited, may result in a vapor cloud fire and/or pool fire. The likelihood of casualties to the public adjacent to the road is low because a crude oil pool fire takes time to develop, and those in the vicinity would normally have the ability to escape.

Potential vulnerabilities of the public adjacent to the road have been calculated by applying a probability that a person may suffer serious injury or fatality for a minimum defined exposure to fire.

### 4.1 Material Properties

Material properties of produced crude oil from the Santa Ynez Unit have been used to conduct hazard consequence modeling. A summary of the crude oil properties are shown in Table 4.1.

The crude oil has an average API gravity of about 19 degrees. It has been assumed that the crude oil is transported at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. On release, light oil fractions in the crude oil will start to evaporate and may produce a vapor cloud. The vapor cloud will be flammable where the concentration is between the lower and upper flammable limits of $1.4 \%$ and $7.8 \%$. On ignition of crude oil, the fire will burn with an orange flame and emit dense clouds of black smoke.

### 4.2 Flammable Release Events

A release of crude oil will result in a flammable cloud. The vapor cloud will then disperse to the lower flammable limit, and may ignite if a source of ignition is encountered.

A release of flammable liquid may result in one or more of several different hazards:

- Immediate ignition causing a pool fire.
- Pool evaporation and initial dispersion of a flammable vapor cloud, which on delayed ignition may result in:
- vapor cloud fire and/or
- liquid pool fire
- Release with no ignition


### 4.3 Consequence Modeling

The methodology for calculating the release rates and hazards of a potential release are described in the following section. Published formulas and publicly available dispersion models have been used for the analysis. These methodologies are expected to provide conservative results.

### 4.3.1 Pool Evaporation

On release, a liquid will spread to a minimum depth of 1 inch ( 2.5 centimeters) on a flat nonabsorbing surface, such as a road surface. The pool is assumed to spread radially to the maximum area for evaporation. The evaporation rates for SYU crude oil have been calculated using the method as provided in the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) RMP Guidance ${ }^{(28)}$ and the EPA Technical Guidance for Hazards Analysis ${ }^{(30)}$.

### 4.3.2 Vapor Dispersion

A liquid pool is assumed to produce a continuous evaporating cloud. This cloud will disperse downwind to the Lower Flammability Limit (LFL), unless the cloud is ignited.

For flammable vapor dispersion, the EPA and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ALOHA ${ }^{(29)}$ model was used. This is a publicly available model and is widely used for estimating hazard release distances. The heavy gas model in ALOHA is based on a simplified form of the DEGADIS model developed by Spicer and Havens (1989).

### 4.3.3 Pool Fire Radiation Hazards

Liquid releases from a tank truck were modeled as a circular pool fire with a sooty flame. The soot absorbs radiation and obscures the flame, thereby reducing the thermal radiation. The pool fire model used is based on publicly available correlations described in the TNO Yellow Book ${ }^{(6)}$.

### 4.4 Levels of Concern and Vulnerability Criteria

The following levels of concern have been selected as minimum exposure levels that may result in a serious injury or fatality. However, personnel exposed to a minimum level of concern are not necessarily seriously or fatally injured. Personnel may be sheltered within vehicles or buildings, or be able to find shelter from exposure. This is called the vulnerability, and is the probability that a person exposed within the distance to a level of concern will suffer a serious injury or fatality.

The thermal radiation exposures are also not at the same intensity within the distance to a level of concern. Closer to the fire, the vulnerability will be higher. Average vulnerabilities have been estimated within the distance to a level of concern.

## Vapor Cloud Flash Fire Levels of Concern

A flammable release may be ignited on release or shortly after release if the concentration is within the flammable range between the Lower and Upper Flammability Limits (LFL and UFL). An unignited flammable vapor cloud will drift downwind and start to disperse. The calculated
concentration levels are time-averaged. The concentration of vapor in air is not uniform and there will be areas where the concentration is higher or lower than the average.

The duration of a flash fire is short, and those outside the flash fire area are unlikely to be exposed to thermal radiation for sufficient time to cause serious injury. The area of the LFL cloud is assumed to be the hazard zone for potential fatality. The area of $1 / 2$ LFL where a flame may ignite is assumed to be the hazard zone for serious injury.

The following average vulnerability levels have been applied, based on a review of incident reports and assumptions made in published QRA reports:

| Severity Level | Flammable Range | Average Vulnerability <br> of People In Buildings | Average <br> Vulnerability of <br> People Outdoors |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Potential Fatality | Source to LFL | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Serious Injury | Source to $1 / 2$ LFL | 0.2 | 0.5 |

## Pool Fire Radiation Levels of Concern

Pool fires produce radiant heat, and the effects are dependent on the level of intensity and the duration of exposure. Thermal radiation levels of $5 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ and $10 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ correspond approximately to the minimum level for serious injury (second degree burns) and potential fatality.

A crude oil pool fire will typically develop slowly allowing personnel outside the burning area time for escape. Personnel are assumed to be fatalities if they are outside within the pool fire area.

The probability of fatality outdoors has been calculated as $1 \%$ for an exposure of $10 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ for 30 seconds. This is based on the radiation probit equations published in the TNO Green Book ${ }^{(7)}$. The fatality rate will decease within the distance from the pool fire boundary to the minimum fatality distance. An average vulnerability of $10 \%$ has been estimated within this area. The remaining outdoor population within this area may suffer serious injury. Additional serious injuries may also occur between the radiation levels of $10 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ to $5 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. An average serious injury vulnerability of $20 \%$ has been estimated from the pool fire boundary to $5 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$.

Personnel within buildings have protection from a pool fire and radiant heat. Within the pool fire area, a fatality rate of $50 \%$ has been assumed, and the remaining population may suffer serious injury. Buildings provided significant protection from radiant heat, and only those near open window or doors that are unable to escape may suffer casualties.

The following average pool fire vulnerabilities have been applied:

| Severity Level | Thermal Radiation <br> Range | Average Vulnerability <br> of People In Buildings | Average <br> Vulnerability of <br> People Outdoors |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Potential Fatality | Source to Pool Fire <br> Boundary | 0.5 | 1 |
| Serious Injury | Source to Pool Fire <br> Boundary | 0.5 | 0 |
| Potential Fatality | Pool Fire to $10 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.01 | 0.1 |
| Serious Injury | Pool Fire to $5 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.05 | 0.2 |

### 4.5 Calculation of Hazard Distances

Hazard zones have been calculated to the selected levels of concern using the crude oil properties, release quantities, and typical weather conditions.

The following assumptions were made:

- Two representative weather conditions have been selected for performing the dispersion calculations under worst case and typical conditions; stability F with wind speed $1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, and stability D with wind speed $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$.
- Rural conditions have been applied for atmospheric dispersion of vapor clouds.
- Crude oil releases are assumed to spill onto a flat non-absorbing surface, and spread to a depth of 1 inch ( 2.5 centimeters).
- A vapor cloud is assumed to be fully developed to the maximum area before ignition.
- Pool fire hazard areas have been conservatively calculated using the maximum downwind hazard distance.
- No allowance was made for topography.

The calculated hazard distances and impact areas are shown in Tables 4.2 and 4.3, and consequence model input and output files attached in Appendix C.

### 4.6 Ignition Probability

A flammable release may ignite immediately resulting in a pool fire, or a flammable vapor cloud may form and disperse downwind. As the cloud encounters ignition sources such as vehicles on the highway, it may ignite causing a vapor cloud fire then pool fire. Historical data on the ignition of flammable releases due to cargo truck accidents have been reviewed to estimate the probability of ignition, as discussed in Section 3.6.

The following ignition probabilities have been estimated for large and small crude oil releases:

- $20 \%$ ignition large release
- $2 \%$ ignition small release


### 4.7 Release Event Trees

The likelihood that a tanker truck accident results in a large ignited pool fire has been calculated using event trees, as shown in Figure 4.1. The probabilities for each severity level have been calculated in Section 3 as follows:

| Accident Severity | Fraction <br> Occurrence | Release <br> Probability |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Accidents | 0.01 | 0.4 |
| Injury or PDO <br> Accidents | 0.99 | 0.05 |
| All Accidents | 1 | 0.054 |

The probabilities of the various outcomes of a truck accident are illustrated in Figure 4.1 as follows:

- Large pool fire
- Large unignited spill
- Small pool fire
- Small unignited spill
- No release
0.0043 (0.43\%)
0.0173 (1.73\%)
0.0006 (0.06\%)
0.0318 (3.18\%)
0.946 (94.6\%)

A large pool fire has the potential to cause injury or fatality if those involved in the accident, or public on an adjacent property, are unable to escape quickly. Fatalities and injuries may extend up to 180 or 240 feet respectively from the release source. Small pool fires are assumed to impact only those on the road.

An analysis of hazardous material releases has been conducted to estimate the probability of public casualties within vehicles on the road, as discussed in Section 3.7. The following casualty probabilities were developed for a crude oil release:

- large ignited release:
- small ignited release:
$5 \%$ fatality event
$2 \%$ fatality event

10\% injury event
5\% injury event

The number of off-road public casualties will depend on the speed of liquid release, the probability of immediate ignition, and the ability of people to escape. The following probabilities have been conservatively assumed from a review of HMIRS accident reports, where sufficient information is provided:

- Rapid liquid release
0.25 (25\%)
- Immediate ignition

The predicted number of off-road fire casualties has been estimated using the probability of a large pool fire, half the potential impact area (the other half impacting the road area), and the vulnerability criteria discussed in Section 4.4.

The hazard areas associated with a flammable vapor cloud are significantly smaller than the pool fire hazard areas, as shown in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. A vapor cloud may develop downwind of a release if ignition is delayed. In this case, downwind public persons near the release may be exposed to both a vapor cloud fire then pool fire radiation. There may be a small risk of additional casualties within this area. Conservative pool fire hazard areas have been applied to simplify the calculation process, and compensate for potential vapor cloud fire casualties.

## Table 4.1 Crude Oil Properties

| Property | Light Crude Oil |
| :--- | :---: |
| Average properties: |  |
| LFL \% mol | 1.4 |
| UFL \% mol | 7.8 |
| TVP @ 130 F | 2.68 psia |
| Specific Gravity 60/60 | 0.940 |
| API Gravity | 19 |
| Transportation Temperature | $130^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |

Table 4.2 Flammable Vapor Dispersion

| Release Source | Release Rate / Pool Evaporation Rate ( $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{min}$ ) | Weather Conditions** | Distance to Flammable Concentration from Release (ft) |  | Flammable Hazard Areas (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LFL | 1/2 LFL | LFL | 1/2 LFL |
| Large Crude Oil Truck Release - 160 bbls |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crude Oil Release to pavement | 150 | F/1.5 | 130 | 180 | 15,000 | 28,000 |
|  | 320 | D/4 | 96 | 150 | 2,000 | 4,600 |
| Small Crude Oil Truck Release - 16 bbls |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crude Oil Release to pavement | 15 | F/1.5 | 36 | 57 | 850 | 1,600 |
|  | 32 | D/4 | 36 | 51 | 340 | 560 |

** Weather conditions $D$ stability, $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ wind (typical conditions during the day), and F stability $1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ wind (worst case weather conditions at night).

Table 4.3 Fire Radiation Hazards

| Release Source | Pool Dimensions | Weather Conditions** | Hazard Distance from Release (ft) |  | Pool Fire and Radiation Hazard Areas (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fatality** | Injury*** | Pool Fire | Fatality*** | Injury** |
| Large Crude Oil Truck Release - 160 bbls |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crude Release | Average depth = 1 inch | F/1.5 | 110 | 160 | 11,000 | 38,000 | 80,000 |
| to Pavement | Average radius $=59 \mathrm{ft}$ | D/4 | 180 | 240 | 11,000 | 100.000 | 180,000 |
| Small Crude Oil Truck Release - $\mathbf{1 6}$ bbls |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crude Release to Pavement | Average depth = 1 inch | F/1.5 | 83 | 110 | 1,100 | 5,400 | 38,000 |
|  | Average radius $=19 \mathrm{ft}$ | D/4 | 110 | 130 | 1,100 | 38,000 | 53,000 |

** Weather conditions D stability, $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ wind (typical conditions during the day), and F stability $1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ wind (worst case weather conditions at night).
*** Pool fire radiation hazards:
Potential fatality $=10 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$
Potential injury $=5 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$

Figure 4.1 Event Tree For Truck Accident Release

|  | Release? <br> (Section 4.7) | Release Size (Section 3.5) | Ignition? <br> (Section 3.6) | Event <br> Probability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.0043 |
|  |  |  | Large Pool Fire |  |
|  |  | 0.4 |  |  |
|  |  | Large Release |  |  |
|  | 0.054 |  | 0.8 | 0.0173 |
|  | Release |  | Unignited Spill |  |
| Truck Accident |  |  | 0.02 | 0.0006 |
|  |  |  | Small Pool Fire |  |
|  |  | 0.6 |  |  |
|  |  | Small Release |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0.98 | 0.0318 |
|  |  |  | Unignited Spill |  |
|  | 0.946 |  |  | 0.946 |
|  | No Release |  |  |  |

## 5. Truck Hazard Mitigation

The mitigation of hazards associated with truck transportation can be addressed using improved safety culture, driver selection and training, improved vehicle maintenance, and onboard safety systems (OBSS). Modern trucks often feature one or more OBSSs to help the driver mitigate or avoid a crash, and studies have been conducted to quantify the benefits.

Literature has been reviewed to assess the potential effectiveness of improved safety culture and onboard safety systems at reducing the likelihood of a crash and release of a hazardous material. This assessment has been used to quantify proposed mitigation measures for the interim crude oil transportation from LFC.

### 5.1 Safety Culture

Organizational and safety culture can play an important role in reducing accident rates. For example, an organization with a poor safety culture is more likely to utilize a young driver with little experience. Hazardous material carriers have lower accident rates than the average truck carrier. This is likely due to better safety culture of the hazardous material haulers, increased driver safety training, and the hiring of more experienced drivers. An accident reduction rate of $30 \%$ has been applied to the average truck rate for HM Class 3 truck carriers based on a study for the FMCSA, as discussed in Section 3.1.3.

Hazardous material regulations have specific training requirements for drivers transporting hazardous cargo. These include:

- The properties and hazards of the material transported.
- Loading and unloading of materials.
- Vehicle inspection before every trip as well as periodically while on the road.
- Use of vehicle controls and equipment, including operation of emergency equipment.
- Training in vehicle characteristics including those that affect vehicle stability, such as effects of braking and curves, effects of speed on vehicle control, and dangers associated with maneuvering through curves.
- Emergency response training.

Large truck carrier companies currently employ a range of safety programs. This has likely contributed to the steady reduction in truck crash rates. National vehicle and truck accident rates have been published by the FMCSA ${ }^{(15)}$ over a 25 year period, which show a reduction in truck accident rates of about 20\% overall, and a $50 \%$ reduction in fatality rate, as discussed in Section 3.2.2. This has been attributed to improvements in roads, vehicles and driver training.

### 5.2 Contractor Selection and Driver Training

Contractor selection and auditing procedures will be used by ExxonMobil to ensure contract carriers meet or exceed all applicable health, safety, security, and environmental compliance standards. Carriers will complete the "Crude Oil - Motor Carrier Safety Survey" prior to starting shipments, as described in the Crude Oil Transportation Risk Management and Prevention Program (CO-TRMPP).

Many of the factors that relate to driver risk, such as; age, experience, training, and driver fatigue, have been researched. The results are published in literature by the FMCSA, Transportation Research Board (TRB), Murray (2005) ${ }^{(22)}$, Short (2007) ${ }^{(25)}$, and numerous others.

## Driver Experience

In the Large Truck Crash Causation Study (LTCCS 2005) ${ }^{(17)}$, information was recorded on driver experience. This included the number of years driving a truck, the number of years driving the class of vehicle involved in the crash, and the date and type of driver training. Comparison data on the historical driver performance was used to estimate the value of hiring safe drivers.

Experience driving a large truck is clearly a factor in driver safety. In the LTCCS, driver performance was identified as the critical collision reason in nearly $50 \%$ of crashes. This included driver drowsiness, inattention, driving too fast for conditions, and failure to control vehicle. A well trained experienced driver would be expected to have better control of the vehicle in a hazardous situation.

The selection of experienced drivers with a good safety record will reduce the probability of a crash, and provide a reduction in the probability of a truck rollover and hazardous material spill in a collision event. Hazardous material driver training includes rollover prevention awareness. Data from the FMCSA $2007^{(10)}$ rollover study indicates that driver error is a contributing factor in over $75 \%$ of rollovers. Drivers who are well trained and experienced are more likely to avoid sudden movements that may lead to rollovers, and control the load during turns. The FMCSA $2007{ }^{(10)}$ study found that drivers with less than 5 years' experience were almost twice as likely to roll the truck in a serious crash, than more experienced drivers. The potential benefit of improved driver training on the likelihood of a crash and rollover was estimated to result in a risk reduction of up to $10 \%$ for less experienced drivers.

## Driver Fatigue

Truck driver impairment due to drowsiness has been reported to be a contributing factor in approximately $30 \%$ of crashes. Truck drivers behind the wheel for more than eight hours are reported to be twice as likely to be involved in a crash ${ }^{(12)}$.

Current FMCSA regulations specify Hours of Service (HOS) requirements to reduce the likelihood of driver fatigue. Since 2017, electronic logging devices have been required to monitor HOS. This is assumed to be incorporated within the crash data.

## Employment Screening

An analysis by the FMCSA $(2013)^{(18)}$ found that motor carriers utilizing an employment screening program had a decline in crash rates by about $8 \%$. Employment screening is likely to result in the selection of experienced drivers with a good safety record. The selection of a contractor with effective employment screening programs is likely to provide a minimum of an $8 \%$ reduction in crash rate.

## Collision Risk Reduction for Contractor Selection and Driver Training

Contractor selection and auditing procedures are likely to ensure the carrier contractors exceed all applicable standards, and hire experienced drivers with a good safety record. The risk reduction has been estimated as:

- Collision risk reduction for contractor selection $=10 \%$


### 5.3 Truck Speed Limiters

Speed limiting technology is a standard feature on new trucks. Speed limiters are devices that interact with a truck engine to prevent trucks from exceeding a pre-programmed maximum speed. Therefore, speed limiters cannot address speeding on roads with speed limits lower than the speed setting, nor ensure the speed limiter is appropriately set.

Traveling too fast for conditions is a major contributor to large truck crashes. The Large Truck Crash Causation Study ${ }^{(17)}$ reported that unsafe truck speed was the critical factor in $13 \%$ of all large truck crashes. Truck collision factors for California crash data report unsafe truck speed in $19 \%$ of injury or fatality crashes (Table 3.4). However, only $10 \%$ all of the speeding events listed in the LTCCS occurred above posted speed limits. A study conducted by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) in 1987 found similar results, with only $6.6 \%$ of the truck unsafe speed collisions being above the posted speed limit. Most collision events occurred due to driving too fast for conditions.

Truck crash rates published in recent years will include trucks that have speed limiters installed, and the benefit will already be partially incorporated into the base crash rate. The risk reduction for ensuring the appropriate use of truck speed limiters has been estimated as:

- Collision risk reduction $10 \%$ of $19 \%$ speed initiating events $=1.9 \%$


### 5.4 Truck Loading / Unloading Procedures

From a review of HMIRS hazardous release incident reports, approximately $20 \%$ of in-transit releases are due to non-collision events, as discussed in Section 3.5. About half of these were due to human error such as; overfilling the tank, or failure to properly close valves or secure equipment. The other half were due to equipment failure.

Hazardous material cargo drivers are required to have training for loading / unloading, and conducting a vehicle inspection before every trip. To reduce the likelihood of human error, LFC operations personnel will conduct a safety and operability inspection checklist of trucks prior to
loading and prior to transport from LFC to verify proper operation and no leaks occur. During loading both the ExxonMobil operator and the truck driver will be in attendance at all times.

To minimize the risk of overfilling the truck tank, the LACT unit will incorporate a grounding/overfill protection system that will stop the loading process in the case of an interrupted ground or determination of high level.

The application of these safety measures is estimated to reduce the likelihood of human error by about $50 \%$ from the average HM cargo industry performance.

- Non-collision risk reduction: 50\% due to human error failure $\times 50 \%$ reduction $=25 \%$


### 5.5 Vehicle Inspection / Maintenance

From a review of HMIRS hazardous release incident reports, approximately $20 \%$ of in-transit releases are due to non-collision events, as discussed in Section 3.5. Approximately half of these were due to equipment failure.

Most carriers are reported to conduct vehicle maintenance every 30 to 90 days, and drivers are required to inspect their vehicle prior to every trip. The use of modern trucks with 2017 or newer diesel engines and regular maintenance will reduce the likelihood of equipment failure.

The use of new trucks with regular maintenance is estimated to reduce the likelihood of equipment failure by about $50 \%$ from the average HM cargo industry performance.

- Non-collision risk reduction: $50 \%$ due to equipment failures $\times 50 \%$ reduction $=25 \%$


### 5.6 Summary of Potential Collision Reduction Systems

The following table summarizes the potential risk reduction of collision related events for each safety program or OBSS assessed.

| Safety System | Crashes Related to <br> Safety System (\%) | Effectiveness <br> (\%) | Crash Rate <br> Reduction (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety Culture | Risk reduction of 30\% for a hazardous material truck <br> incorporated into the HM-3 truck incident rate. |  |  |
| Contractor Selection and Driver Training | $100 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Truck Speed Limiters | $19 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| Total Collision Risk Reduction |  |  | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ |

The following table summarizes the potential risk reduction of non-collision in-transit releases for each safety program:

| Safety System | Non-Collision <br> Related <br> Releases**(\%) | Effectiveness <br> (\%) | Release Rate <br> Reduction (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loading / Unloading Procedures and <br> Overfill Protection | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Modern truck fleet with LFC Operations <br> personnel inspection prior to and after <br> loading | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ |
| Total Non-Collision Risk Reduction |  |  | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |

** Non-collision related releases account for an additional $20 \%$ of the total number of collision events.

## 6. TRANSPORTATION RISK

The risks associated with transporting LFC crude oil to market by truck have been calculated in terms of the public risk of serious injury or fatality due to exposure to a hazardous material. The acceptability of these risks has been evaluated against the Santa Barbara County societal risk criteria, with the selected mitigation measures applied.

### 6.1 Truck Routes

Risks have been calculated along transportation routes to two potential unloading terminals. The following transportation scenarios have been assessed:

Scenario 1 to Phillips 66 Pump Station in Santa Maria

- Maximum number of trucks = 70 per day
- Truck route north via US 101 to Santa Maria
- Total distance to Phillips $66=54.3$ miles

Scenario 2 to Pentland PAAPL Pump Station in Maricopa

- Maximum number of trucks = 68 per day
- Truck route north via US 101 to Santa Maria, then east via SR 166 to Maricopa
- Total distance to Pentland PAAPL $=140.0$ miles

Route specific truck accident rates have been developed from an analysis of California accident data. This accident data was categorized by road segment for the proposed crude oil truck routes. Local influences on accident data associated with road access, road gradients, visibility and weather are therefore inherently included within these route specific accident rates. The truck accident rates for each segment are shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3. Accident rates for Hazardous Material Class 3 cargo trucks have been estimated by reducing the route specific average truck rates by $30 \%$ to account for the lower accident rates reported for hazardous material trucks.

The calculated vehicle and truck accident rates by route segment are shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3, and summarized as follows
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|l|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Scenario } & \text { Description } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Vehicle } \\ \text { Accident } \\ \text { Rate per 10 } \\ \text { miles }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { HM Class 3 } \\ \text { Truck } \\ \text { Accident } \\ \text { Rate per 10 } \\ \text { miles }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { HM Class 3 } \\ \text { Truck }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Accident Rate } \\ \text { per laden trip }\end{array}\right]$

### 6.2 Calculation of Societal Risks

Transportation risks have been calculated for the hazards associated with a crude oil release for both on and off-road public populations. The calculation of "Risk" is as follows:
Risk = Likelihood of hazardous event X Probability of serious injury or fatality

The likelihood of a hazardous event has been calculated by multiplying the frequency of release on each road segment, with the probability of the outcome being a fire. The probability of serious injury or fatality in the event of a fire, has been calculated separately for on and off-road populations, then combined to calculate the risk per road segment length. The on-road public risks are primarily to persons within vehicles involved in the accident. Both small and large pool fires may result in on-road casualties due to the close proximity of persons within vehicles and the possibility of being unable to escape. Off-road casualties will depend on the speed of liquid release, the probability of ignition and the ability of people to escape. Only large releases that escalate quickly are assumed to have the potential to impact offsite populations. The population densities along each road segment have been characterized as day or night, and the probability that persons will be within buildings or outside.

In the calculation of potential serious injury and fatality a minimum of one casualty has been assumed. The risk of casualty to less than one person makes no sense; therefore the frequency of impact has been adjusted.

The public risks due to a hazardous material release along the crude oil transportation routes have been calculated for each road segment per one-kilometer ( 0.62 miles) length, to identify the highest risk segment, and evaluate the risk against the SBC acceptability criteria, as described below. The risk profiles for serious injury and fatality for the proposed interim crude oil transportation are shown as F-N curves in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 for Route 1, and Figures 6.3 and 6.4 for Route 2.

### 6.3 SBC Societal Risk Criteria

Santa Barbara County requires an assessment of the significance of impacts to public safety associated with an application for a land-use permit. The safety thresholds are intended to measure the acceptability of involuntary public exposure to hazardous materials. Such activities include facilities that handle or transport hazardous materials.

A societal risk profile is required for gas and hazardous liquid pipelines, including oil if a significant risk is expected, and the transport of compressed natural gas or natural gas liquids ${ }^{(23)}$. The risk profiles for acute risk from a crude oil release have been calculated to assess the level of risk as defined the SBC societal risk criteria.

The thresholds for risk acceptability of serious injury or fatality to the public are defined by the SBC societal risk criteria ${ }^{(24)}$. These thresholds provide three zones of significance; green, amber and red, for determining the acceptability of involuntary public exposure to acute hazardous material risks resulting from new or modified developments. The same SBC risk criteria thresholds are applied to fixed facilities and to the highest risk one kilometer ( 0.62 miles) segment of a transportation route. This effectively makes the level of significant societal risk from a fixed facility equivalent to that of the highest one kilometer segment of road. This is the same approach used to assess acceptability of transportation societal risk as applied in several European countries, and adopted in other countries around the world. The level of significance selected by SBC is 10 times more stringent than the transportation societal risk criteria applied in the Dutch and Swiss criteria.

The three SBC risk criteria zones are defined as follows and shown on the societal risk profiles in Figures 6.1 through 6.8:

Green: Less than significant impact to public safety and no mitigation (or additional mitigation) is required for purposes of compliance.

Amber: Potentially significant public impact, which can be reduced or avoided by implementation of mitigation measures.

Red: Significant public impact, which can be reduced by implementation of mitigation measures.

The Santa Barbara County definition of a "serious injury" is physical harm to a person that requires significant medical intervention.

### 6.4 Mitigation Measures

ExxonMobil propose to use contract carriers to haul the crude oil. Contractor selection and auditing procedures will ensure the contractor meets or exceeds all applicable health, safety, security, and environmental compliance standards. The Crude Oil Transportation Risk Management \& Prevention Program (CO-TRMPP) has been developed to ensure that the interim trucking is conducted in a safe and efficient manner, including:

- LFC operation personnel will conduct a safety and operability inspection checklist of trucks prior to loading and prior to transport from LFC to verify proper operation and no leaks.
- During loading both the ExxonMobil operator and the truck driver will be in attendance at all times.
- As required by SBC regulations, LACT units will incorporate a grounding/overfill protection system. Truck loading will stop in the case of an interrupted ground or determination of high truck level.
- Trucks will be equipped with an operating speed monitoring system.
- An annual inspection of truck transport trailers will be conducted to verify all ports are sealing properly, and repair any leaking ports prior to use.

Proposed mitigation measures to reduce the likelihood of a hazardous material release have been assessed and quantified in Section 5, Truck Hazard Mitigation. The following risk reduction measures have been applied to the truck transportation incident rates to calculate mitigated societal risks.

| Mitigation Measure | Collision Risk <br> Reduction <br> (\%) | Non-Collision Risk <br> Reduction** <br> (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor Selection and Driver Training | $10 \%$ |  |
| Truck Speed Limiters | $2 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Loading / Unloading Procedures and Overfill <br> Protection |  | $25 \%$ |
| Modern truck fleet with LFC Operations personnel <br> inspection prior to and after loading |  | $50 \%$ |
| Total | $12 \%$ |  |

[^0]
### 6.5 Mitigated Societal Risk Profiles

The risks of serious injury and fatality to the public due to a crude oil truck transportation incident have been calculated. The mitigated risks of casualty were calculated for on and offroad populations by route segment, then the results combined by segment and total route. A summary of the average route incident rates, frequencies of release and frequencies of casualty for the two proposed routes are shown in Table 6.1.

The mitigated public risks have been calculated for each road segment per one kilometer ( 0.62 miles) length to identify the highest risk segments for each route, as described above in Section 6.2. The highest risk segments for each route have been identified as:

- Route 1 - Segment D on Highway US 101 across the hills of Gaviota State Park.
- Route 2 - Segment N on Highway US 101 north of Betteravia Road junction to the Santa Barbara County line.

The combined on and off-road casualties for these two segments are shown in Table 6.2. Detailed calculation tables for all segments are provided in Appendix B. The frequencies of one or more casualties for the highest risk one-kilometer segments are:

Route 1 - Segment D

- Frequency of one or more serious injuries $=5.6 \times 10^{-6}$ per km-year
- Frequency of one or more fatalities $=2.8 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{per} \mathrm{km}$-year

Route 2 - Segment N

- Frequency of one or more serious injuries $=6.2 \times 10^{-6}$ per km-year
- Frequency of one or more fatalities $=3.7 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{per} \mathrm{km}$-year

Societal risks are often presented as F-N curves, also called risk profiles. F-N curves are logarithmic plots of the cumulative frequency ( $F$ ) of an event against the number ( $N$ ) of one or more potential injuries or fatalities. Societal risk provides a measure of one or more public casualties along a transportation segment or fixed facility. The mitigated risk profiles for serious injury and fatality for the proposed interim crude oil transportation are shown as F-N curves in Figures 6.5 and 6.6 for Route 1, and Figures 6.7 and 6.8 for Route 2.

For the total transportation route lengths, off-road serious injury and fatality risks are about 5\% of the total public casualty risks. The highway routes primarily pass through rural or undeveloped areas. Within residential areas, off-road public risk may be up to $50 \%$ of the total risk. The distribution of public risk on the highest risk road segments have been calculated as:

- Route 1 - Segment D off-road public casualty $=0.06 \%$
- Route 2 - Segment N off-road public casualty $=40 \%$

The Santa Barbara County societal risk profiles have been established to evaluate the acceptability of hazardous material facilities or activities for public risk of serious injury and fatality. Mitigated societal risk profiles for the highest risk transportation route segment are shown in Figures 6.5 through 6.8 against the SBC acceptability criteria. The mitigated truck transportation risks are within the following zones for acceptability:

Route 1 - Segment D

- Mitigated risk of serious injury profile is within the green "Insignificant Risk" zone for acceptability.
- Mitigated risk of fatality profile is within the green "Insignificant Risk" zone for acceptability.

Route 2 - Segment N

- Mitigated risk of serious injury profile is within the green "Insignificant Risk" zone for acceptability.
- Mitigated risk of fatality profile is within the green "Insignificant Risk" zone for acceptability.

Table 6.1 Hazardous Material Frequency of Release and Casualty

|  | Truck Route 1 to Phillips 66, Santa Maria | Truck Route 2 to Pentland PAAPL Kern County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route Length | 54.3 miles <br> ( 87.4 km ) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 140.0 \text { miles } \\ & (225.3 \mathrm{~km}) \end{aligned}$ |
| Mitigated Incident Rate per $10^{6}$ miles** | 0.32 | 0.38 |
| Truck Incident Rate per trip** | $1.7 \times 10^{-5}$ | $5.3 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| Number of Daily Trips | 70 | 68 |
| Number of Annual Trips | 25,550 | 24,820 |
| Truck Incidents per year | 0.44 | 1.3 |
| Probability of Large Fire on Incident | 0.0043 | 0.0043 |
| Probability of Small Fire on Incident | 0.00064 | 0.00064 |
| Frequency of Large Fire per year | $\begin{gathered} 1.9 \times 10^{-3} \\ \text { (1 in } 530 \text { years) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.6 \times 10^{-3} \\ \text { (1 in } 180 \text { years) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Frequency of Small Fire per year | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \times 10^{-4} \\ (1 \text { in } 3,500 \text { years }) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.4 \times 10^{-4} \\ (1 \text { in } 1,200 \text { years }) \end{gathered}$ |
| Frequency of 1 or More Serious Injuries per year (total route) | $\begin{gathered} 2.1 \times 10^{-4} \\ (1 \text { in } 4,800 \text { years }) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.2 \times 10^{-4} \\ (1 \text { in } 1,600 \text { years }) \end{gathered}$ |
| Frequency of 1 or More Fatalities per year (total route) | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \times 10^{-4} \\ (1 \text { in } 9,500 \text { years }) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.2 \times 10^{-4} \\ (1 \text { in } 3,200 \text { years }) \end{gathered}$ |
| Location of Public Casualties | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \text { Off-Road } \\ & 95 \% \text { On-Road } \end{aligned}$ | 5\% Off-Road 95\% On-Road |

[^1]Table 6.2 Casualty Frequencies for Mitigated F-N Societal Risk Profiles (highest 1-km Segments)

Route 1 to Phillips 66 Pump Station, Santa Maria - Road Segment D

| Number of Serious Injuries | Frequency of Public Injuries per km-year | Frequency of $\mathbf{N}$ or More Public Injuries per km-year | $\begin{gathered}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Fatalities }\end{gathered}$ | Frequency of Public Fatalities per km-year | Frequency of N or More Public Fatalities per km-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 2.3E-07 | 5 | 1.1E-07 | 1.1E-07 |
| 4 | 3.4E-07 | 5.6E-07 | 4 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 3 | 5.6E-07 | 1.1E-06 | 3 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 5.6E-07 |
| 2 | 1.1E-06 | 2.3E-06 | 2 | 5.6E-07 | 1.1E-06 |
| 1 | 3.4E-06 | 5.6E-06 | 1 | 1.7E-06 | 2.8E-06 |

Route 2 to Pentland PAAPL Pump Station, Kern County - Road Segment N

| Number of Serious Injuries | Frequency of Public Injuries per km-year | Frequency of $\mathbf{N}$ or More Public Injuries per km-year | Number of Fatalities | Frequency of Public Fatalities per km-year | Frequency of N or More Public Fatalities per km-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 1.8E-07 | 1.8E-07 | 5 | 8.8E-08 | 8.8E-08 |
| 4 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 1.3E-06 | 4 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 2.2E-07 |
| 3 | 4.5E-07 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 3 | 2.2E-07 | 4.4E-07 |
| 2 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 2 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 1 | 3.3E-06 | 6.2E-06 | 1 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 3.7E-06 |

Figure 6.1 Route-1 Highest Non-Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Injury per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria


Figure 6.2 Route-1 Highest Non-Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Fatality per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria


Figure 6.3 Route-2 Highest Non-Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Injury per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria


Figure 6.4 Route-2 Highest Non-Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Fatality per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria


Figure 6.5 Route-1 Highest Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Injury per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria


Figure 6.6 Route-1 Highest Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Fatality per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria


Figure 6.7 Route-2 Highest Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Injury per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria


Figure 6.8 Route-2 Highest Mitigated Risk Segment for HazMat Fatality per One-Kilometer - SBC Risk Criteria
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## Appendix A

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

| A | Arterial |
| :---: | :---: |
| AADT | Average Annual Daily Traffic |
| ADL | Arthur D. Little |
| ALOHA | Areal Locations of Hazardous Atmospheres |
| API gravity | American Petroleum Institute gravity |
| ATE | Associated Transportation Engineers |
| bbl | barrel |
| BIT | Biennial Inspection of Terminals |
| BOPD | barrels oil per day |
| C | Collector |
| CA | California |
| Cal OSHA | California Occupational, Safety and Health Administration |
| CalTrans | California Department of Transportation |
| CHP | California Highway Patrol |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| CO-TRMPP | Crude Oil Transportation Risk Management and Prevention Program |
| DEGADIS | Dense Gas Dispersion model |
| Di | Divided Road |
| DOT | U.S. Department of Transportation |
| DRC | Dixon Risk Consulting |
| EPA | US Environmental Protection Agency |
| ExxonMobil | ExxonMobil Production Company |
| F | Freeway |
| ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ | degree Fahrenheit |
| F-N | Cumulative Frequency-Number of 1 or more |
| FARS | Fatality Analysis Reporting System |
| FMCSA | Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration |
| ft | feet / foot |
| GES | General Estimates System |
| GVWR | gross vehicle weight rating |


| HazMat | Hazardous Material |
| :--- | :--- |
| HM | Hazardous Material |
| HM-3 | Hazardous Material Class 3 |
| HMCRP | Hazardous Material Cooperative Research Program |
| HMIRS | Hazardous Materials Incident Reporting System |
| HOS | Hours of Service |
| HSIS | Highway Safety Information System |
| Hwy | Highway |
| IIHS | Insurance Institute of Highway Safety |
| km | kilometer |
| kW/m | kilowatts per meter squared |
| L | Local |
| LACT | Lease Automatic Custody Transfer |
| Ib/min | pounds per minute |
| LFC | Las Flores Canyon |
| LFL | lower flammability limit |
| LPG | liquid petroleum gas |
| LTCCS | Large Truck Crash Causation Study |
| MAWP | Maximum Allowable Working Pressure |
| MCMIS | Motor Carrier Management Information System |
| mins | minutes |
| m/s | meters per second |
| mph | miles per hour |
| MVMT | Million Vehicle Miles Traveled |
| NHTSA | National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Integrated Traffic Record System |
| NGL | natural gas liquids |
| OBSS | Onboard Safety Systems |
| PAAPL | Plains All American Pipeline |
| PDO | Property Damage Only |
| PHMSA | Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration |
| psig | RBITRS |
| R | RBP |


| SYU | Santa Ynez Unit |
| :--- | :--- |
| TIFA | Trucks Involved in Fatal Accidents |
| TNO | Toegepast Natuurwetenschappelijk Onderzoek (The Netherlands |
|  | Organization for Applied Scientific Research) |
| TQRA | Transportation Quantitative Risk Assessment |
| TRB | Transportation Research Board |
| TVP | True Vapor Pressure |
| U | Urban |
| UFL | upper flammability limit |
| UMTRI | University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute |
| Un | Undivided Road |
| VNTSC | Volpe National Transportation Systems Center |

## Appendix B

## TQRA Calculation Tables

## Truck Transportation Data

| Item | Number | Report Ref |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scenario 1 to Phillips 66 Pump Station in Santa Maria |  |  |
| Number of Daily Trips | 70 | Section 2.1 |
| Number of Annual of Trips | 25,550 | Section 2.1 |
| Section ID's | A to M | Section 2.3 |
| Scenario 2 to Pentland PAAPL Station in Maricopa |  |  |
| Number of Daily Trips | 68 | Section 2.1 |
| Number of Annual of Trips | 24,820 | Section 2.3 |
| Section ID's | A to J and N to W |  |

The risk of public impact has been calculated separately for on-road and off-road populations due to different exposure risks and population densities for these two groups. The results of the on-road and off-road risks per 1-kilometer ( 0.62 miles) segment are then combined to calculate the societal risk profiles for serious injury and fatality.

## Calculation of Release Frequencies by Road Segment

| Section ID <br> (Report Section 2) | H'Way I Road | Section Length miles | HM-3 <br> Truck Accident Rate MVMT | Accident <br> Release Rate per mile-trip | Non- <br> Collision Release Rate per mile-trip | Total <br> Release <br> Rate per mile-trip | Mitigated <br> Accident <br> Release <br> Rate <br> per <br> mile-trip | Mitigated NonCollision Rate per mile-trip | Total Mitigated Release Rate per mile-trip |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Coral Cny | 0.8 | 0.72 | 3.9E-08 | 7.7E-09 | 4.6E-08 | 3.4E-08 | 3.9E-09 | 3.8E-08 |
| B | Calle Real | 1.6 | 0.72 | 3.9E-08 | 7.7E-09 | 4.6E-08 | 3.4E-08 | 3.9E-09 | 3.8E-08 |
| C | 101 | 10.2 | 0.37 | 2.0E-08 | 4.0E-09 | 2.4E-08 | 1.8E-08 | 2.0E-09 | 2.0E-08 |
| D | 101 | 2.1 | 0.79 | 4.2E-08 | 8.4E-09 | 5.1E-08 | 3.7E-08 | 4.2E-09 | 4.1E-08 |
| E | 101 | 7.6 | 0.35 | 1.9E-08 | 3.7E-09 | 2.2E-08 | 1.6E-08 | 1.9E-09 | 1.8E-08 |
| F | 101 | 1.1 | 0.24 | 1.3E-08 | 2.6E-09 | 1.6E-08 | 1.1E-08 | 1.3E-09 | 1.3E-08 |
| G | 101 | 12.8 | 0.16 | 8.8E-09 | 1.8E-09 | 1.1E-08 | 7.7E-09 | 8.8E-10 | 8.6E-09 |
| H | 101 | 1.2 | 0.21 | 1.1E-08 | 2.3E-09 | 1.4E-08 | 9.9E-09 | 1.1E-09 | 1.1E-08 |
| I | 101 | 10.6 | 0.28 | 1.5E-08 | 3.0E-09 | 1.8E-08 | 1.3E-08 | 1.5E-09 | 1.5E-08 |
| J | 101 | 4.4 | 0.27 | 1.4E-08 | 2.9E-09 | 1.7E-08 | 1.3E-08 | 1.4E-09 | 1.4E-08 |
| K | Betteravia | 1.0 | 0.72 | 3.9E-08 | 7.7E-09 | 4.6E-08 | 3.4E-08 | 3.9E-09 | 3.8E-08 |
| L/M | Rose/Battl | 0.9 | 0.72 | 3.9E-08 | 7.7E-09 | 4.6E-08 | 3.4E-08 | 3.9E-09 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| N | 101 | 4.4 | 0.64 | 3.4E-08 | 6.9E-09 | 4.1E-08 | 3.0E-08 | 3.4E-09 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| O | 101 | 0.8 | 0.64 | 3.4E-08 | 6.9E-09 | 4.1E-08 | 3.0E-08 | 3.4E-09 | 3.4E-08 |
| P | 166 | 28.3 | 0.42 | 2.3E-08 | 4.5E-09 | 2.7E-08 | 2.0E-08 | 2.3E-09 | 2.2E-08 |
| Q | 166 | 23.7 | 0.30 | 1.6E-08 | 3.2E-09 | 1.9E-08 | 1.4E-08 | 1.6E-09 | 1.6E-08 |
| R | 166 | 1.1 | 0.36 | 1.9E-08 | 3.8E-09 | 2.3E-08 | 1.7E-08 | 1.9E-09 | 1.9E-08 |
| S | 166/33 | 11.2 | 0.51 | 2.7E-08 | 5.5E-09 | 3.3E-08 | 2.4E-08 | 2.7E-09 | 2.7E-08 |
| T | 166/33 | 11.7 | 0.86 | 4.6E-08 | 9.2E-09 | 5.5E-08 | 4.0E-08 | 4.6E-09 | 4.5E-08 |
| U | 166/33 | 1.3 | 0.38 | 2.1E-08 | 4.1E-09 | 2.5E-08 | 1.8E-08 | 2.1E-09 | 2.0E-08 |
| V | 166 | 4.7 | 0.81 | 4.3E-08 | 8.6E-09 | 5.2E-08 | 3.8E-08 | 4.3E-09 | 4.2E-08 |
| W | Basic Sch | 0.4 | 0.72 | 3.9E-08 | 7.7E-09 | 4.6E-08 | 3.4E-08 | 3.9E-09 | 3.8E-08 |
| Total | Scenario 1 | 54.3 | 0.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Scenario 2 | 140.0 | 0.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HM-3 truck accident rate per MVMT Probability of release on accident = Probability of release non- collision = Mitigated accident release rate $=$ Mitigated non-collision release rate $=$ Number of truck trips per year
0.054
$0.2 \times$ accident rate $0.88 \times$ accident rate $0.5 \times$ non-collision rate Scenario 1 = 25550 Scenario 2 = 22820

Tables 3.2 and 3.3
Section 3.5 / 4.7
Section 3.5
Section 6.4
Section 6.4
Section 2.1

Calculation of Fire Frequencies by Road Segment

| Section ID <br> (Report <br> Section 2) | H'Way / Road | Section <br> Length <br> kilometers | Release Rate <br> per <br> $\mathrm{km}-$ trip | Mitigated <br> Release Rate <br> per <br> km-trip | Mitigated <br> Large Fire <br> Freq <br> per <br> km-year | Mitigated <br> Small <br> Fire <br> Freq <br> per <br> $\mathrm{km}-$ year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Coral Cny | 1.3 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $7.2 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| B | Calle Real | 2.6 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $7.2 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| C | 101 | 16.4 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.5 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| D | 101 | 3.4 | $3.1 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $5.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $7.9 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| E | 101 | 12.2 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3.5 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| F | 101 | 1.8 | $9.6 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $7.9 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.6 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| G | 101 | 20.6 | $6.5 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $5.3 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $1.6 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| H | 101 | 1.9 | $8.4 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $6.9 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| I | 101 | 17.1 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $9.2 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.9 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| J | 101 | 7.1 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $8.7 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| K | Betteravia | 1.6 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $7.2 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| L/M | Rose/Battles | 1.4 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $7.2 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| N | 101 | 7.1 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $6.2 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| O | 101 | 1.3 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $6.2 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| P | 166 | 45.5 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $4.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| Q | 166 | 38.1 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $9.9 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| R | 166 | 1.8 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3.5 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| S | $166 / 33$ | 18.0 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $3.3 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $5.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| T | $166 / 33$ | 18.8 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $5.5 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $8.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| U | $166 / 33$ | 2.1 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.5 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| V | 166 | 7.6 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $5.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $7.8 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| W | Basic School | 0.6 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.7 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $7.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| Total | Scenario 1 | 87.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Scenario 2 | 225.3 |  |  |  |  |

Conversion of miles to kilometers Probability of large fire on release Probability of small fire on release Number of truck trips per year
miles $\times 1.6$
$0.4 \times 0.2=0.08$
$0.6 \times 0.02=0.012$
Scenario $1=25550$
Scenario 2 = 22820

Section 3.5 and 3.6
Section 3.5 and 3.6
Section 2.1

## Off-Road Population Impact Tables

| Weather | ID | Probability | Report Ref |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F Stability, $1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ wind, night | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | Section 2.6 |
| D Stability, $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ wind, night | D/4/N | 0.15 | Section 2.6 |
| D Stability, $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ wind, day | D/4/D | 0.5 | Section 2.6 |

Population Distribution by location - Fraction of Day Numbers (Section 2.5)

| Population Type | Day | Day <br> Inside | Day <br> Outside | Night | Night <br> Inside | Night <br> Outside |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential / Rural / <br> Unpopulated | 1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.95 | 0.05 |
| Commercial | 1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.05 | 0.0475 | 0.0025 |
| Industrial | 1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.19 | 0.01 |
| Agricultural | 1 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.05 | 0.0475 | 0.0025 |
| Mixed Residential / <br> Commercial | 1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.525 | 0.4988 | 0.0263 |
| Agricultural / Rural / Rec | 1 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.095 | 0.005 |
| Industrial-Low / Rural | 1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.19 | 0.01 |

## Pool Fire Impact Areas (source Table 4.3)

| Fire Hazard | Weather | Radius <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Area <br> $(\mathrm{ft})^{2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 \times \text { Area }}$ <br> $(\mathrm{ft})^{2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 \times \text { Area }}$ <br> minus PF (ft) $)^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pool fire (PF) |  | 59 | $1.1 \times 10^{4}$ | $5.5 \times 10^{3}$ |  |
| Distance to $10 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{~F} / 1.5$ | 110 | $3.8 \times 10^{4}$ | $1.9 \times 10^{4}$ | $1.4 \times 10^{4}$ |
| Distance to $10 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{D} / 4$ | 180 | $1.0 \times 105$ | $5.1 \times 10^{4}$ | $4.5 \times 10^{4}$ |
| Distance to $5 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{~F} / 1.5$ | 160 | $8.0 \times 10^{4}$ | $4.0 \times 10^{4}$ | $3.5 \times 10^{4}$ |
| Distance to $5 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{D} / 4$ | 240 | $1.8 \times 10^{5}$ | $9.1 \times 10^{4}$ | $8.5 \times 10^{4}$ |

$50 \%$ of pool fire area impacts assumed to be off-road, $50 \%$ on-road.
Pool Fire Vulnerabilities (source Section 4.4)

| Location | Within Pool Fire Area |  | Pool Fire to <br> $\mathbf{1 0 k W} / \mathbf{m}^{2}$ | Pool Fire to <br> $\mathbf{5 k W} / \mathbf{m}^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal Prob | Injury Prob | Fatal Prob | Injury Prob |
| Outdoor | 1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Indoor | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.01 | 0.05 |

## Off-Road Public Population Distribution

| Section ID <br> (Section 2) | Population Category (Section 2) | Population Density per mile ${ }^{2}$ (Section 2) | Population per Group (Section 2) | Group Density per $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ (Section 2) | Weather / Day I Night | Outdoor <br> Probability | Indoor Probability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Non-Public | 0 | - | - | F/1.5/N | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | - | - |
| B | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| C | Rural / Rec | 30 | 3 | 3.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.800 | 0.200 |
| D | UnPop | 2 | 1 | 7.2E-08 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| E | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.800 | 0.200 |
| F | Mix-L | 1000 | 6 | 2.2E-04 | F/1.5/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| G | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| H | Mix-L | 1000 | 6 | 2.2E-04 | F/1.5/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| I | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.800 | 0.200 |
| J | Mix-M / Ag | 2100 | 3 | 2.3E-04 | F/1.5/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| K | Com-L / Ag | 600 | 3 | 6.5E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.010 | 0.190 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.010 | 0.190 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.010 | 0.800 |
| L/M | Rural / Ag | 110 | 3 | 1.2E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.800 | 0.200 |


| Section ID (Section 2) | Population Category (Section 2) | Population Density per mile ${ }^{2}$ (Section 2) | Population per Group (Section 2) | Group <br> Density per $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ (Section 2) | Weather / Day / Night | Outdoor <br> Probability | Indoor Probability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | Mix-M | 4000 | 3 | 4.3E-04 | F/1.5/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.026 | 0.499 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| 0 | UnPop | 2 | 1 | 7.2E-08 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| P | Rur/UnPop | 11 | 3 | 1.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| Q | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.800 | 0.200 |
| R | Res-L | 1000 | 3 | 1.1E-04 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| S | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.005 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.800 | 0.200 |
| T | UnPop | 2 | 1 | 7.2E-08 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| U | Res-M | 3000 | 3 | 3.2E-04 | F/1.5/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.050 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.200 | 0.800 |
| V | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.010 | 0.190 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.010 | 0.190 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.010 | 0.800 |
| W | Rural | 20 | 3 | 2.2E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.010 | 0.190 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/N | 0.010 | 0.190 |
|  |  |  |  |  | D/4/D | 0.010 | 0.800 |

Group Density $=$ Population density per mile ${ }^{2} \times$ population per group $\times 3.587 \times 10^{-8}$

Calculation of Off-Road Public Population Impacts

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Section } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Mitigated Large Fire Freq per km-year | Weather / Day I Night | Prob of Weather/ Day I Night | Frequency of Casualty Event per km-year | Population Within Pool Fire Area | Population in Pool Fire Area to 10kw/m ${ }^{2}$ | Population in Pool Fire Area to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 4.8E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 9.0E-07 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| B | 4.8E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 7.0E-07 | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 1.0E-06 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| C | $2.5 \mathrm{E}-05$ | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 3.6E-07 | 0.018 | 0.04 | 0.11 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 1.6E-07 | 0.018 | 0.15 | 0.27 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 5.2E-07 | 0.018 | 0.15 | 0.27 |
| D | 5.2E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 2.3E-06 | 0.0004 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 9.8E-07 | 0.0004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 3.3E-06 | 0.0004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
| E | 2.3E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 4.8E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| F | 1.6E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.177 | 2.91 | 7.48 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 5.0E-08 | 1.177 | 9.78 | 18.30 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.177 | 9.78 | 18.30 |
| G | 1.1E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 1.6E-07 | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 6.8E-08 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| H | 1.4E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 1.0E-07 | 1.177 | 2.91 | 7.48 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 4.4E-08 | 1.177 | 9.78 | 18.30 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 1.5E-07 | 1.177 | 9.78 | 18.30 |
| I | 1.9E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 1.2E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 3.9E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| J | 1.8E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 2.6E-07 | 1.236 | 3.06 | 7.85 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.236 | 10.27 | 19.21 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | $3.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.236 | 10.27 | 19.21 |
| K | 4.8E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 7.0E-07 | 0.353 | 0.87 | 2.24 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 3.0E-07 | 0.353 | 2.93 | 5.49 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 1.0E-06 | 0.353 | 2.93 | 5.49 |
| L/M | 4.8E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 7.0E-07 | 0.065 | 0.16 | 0.41 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.065 | 0.54 | 1.01 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 1.0E-06 | 0.065 | 0.54 | 1.01 |


| Section ID | Mitigated Large Fire Freq per km-year | Weather / Day I Night | Prob of Weather/ Day / Night | Frequency of Casualty Event per km-year | Population Within Pool Fire Area | Population in Pool Fire Area to $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Population in Pool Fire Area to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 4.2E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $6.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 2.354 | 5.83 | 14.96 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 2.6E-07 | 2.354 | 19.55 | 36.59 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 8.7E-07 | 2.354 | 19.55 | 36.59 |
| 0 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0004 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 7.8E-07 | 0.0004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 2.6E-06 | 0.0004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
| P | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-05$ | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 4.0E-07 | 0.006 | 0.02 | 0.04 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.006 | 0.05 | 0.10 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 5.7E-07 | 0.006 | 0.05 | 0.10 |
| Q | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 1.2E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 4.1E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| R | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-05$ | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 3.4E-07 | 0.588 | 1.46 | 3.74 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.588 | 4.89 | 9.15 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 4.8E-07 | 0.588 | 4.89 | 9.15 |
| S | 3.3E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 4.8E-07 | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 6.9E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| T | 5.5E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 2.4E-06 | 0.0004 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 3.5E-06 | 0.0004 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
| U | $2.5 \mathrm{E}-05$ | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $3.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.765 | 4.37 | 11.22 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.765 | 14.66 | 27.44 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 5.2E-07 | 1.765 | 14.66 | 27.44 |
| V | 5.2E-05 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | 7.6E-07 | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | 3.3E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| W | 4.7E-06 | F/1.5/N | 0.35 | $6.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
|  |  | D/4/N | 0.15 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |
|  |  | D/4/D | 0.50 | 9.8E-07 | 0.012 | 0.10 | 0.18 |

Calculation of Population Group Impact per year:
Frequency of large fire per km-year
X Probability of weather / time
X Rapid release and immediate ignition $\quad 0.25 \times 0.5=0.125$
/ Number in each group
by road segment above
Section 2.6
Section 4.7
Section 2

Calculation of Max Population Within Pool Fire Area:
Group Density per $\mathrm{ft}^{2} \mathrm{x}$ Off-Road Pool Fire Area $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$

## Calculation of Off-Road Public Fatality and Serious Injury Numbers

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Section } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Outdoor Fatality |  | Indoor Fatality |  | Total <br> Fatality <br> Number | Outdoor Injury |  | Indoor Injury |  | Total Serious Injury Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |
| A | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
|  | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
|  | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| B | 0.0006 | 0.0001 | 0.0056 | 0.0003 | 0.0066 | 0.0000 | 0.0007 | 0.0056 | 0.0036 | 0.0099 |
|  | 0.0006 | 0.0005 | 0.0056 | 0.0009 | 0.0076 | 0.0000 | 0.0018 | 0.0056 | 0.0087 | 0.0161 |
|  | 0.0024 | 0.0020 | 0.0047 | 0.0008 | 0.0098 | 0.0000 | 0.0073 | 0.0047 | 0.0073 | 0.0193 |
| C | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0008 | 0.0000 | 0.0010 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0008 | 0.0005 | 0.0015 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0008 | 0.0001 | 0.0011 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0008 | 0.0013 | 0.0024 |
|  | 0.0141 | 0.0117 | 0.0018 | 0.0003 | 0.0279 | 0.0000 | 0.0439 | 0.0018 | 0.0027 | 0.0484 |
| D | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | 0.0003 |
|  | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0002 | 0.0003 | 0.0005 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0006 |
| E | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0000 | 0.0007 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0006 | 0.0004 | 0.0010 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0001 | 0.0008 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0006 | 0.0009 | 0.0016 |
|  | 0.0094 | 0.0078 | 0.0012 | 0.0002 | 0.0186 | 0.0000 | 0.0293 | 0.0012 | 0.0018 | 0.0323 |
| F | 0.0309 | 0.0076 | 0.2935 | 0.0145 | 0.3465 | 0.0000 | 0.0393 | 0.2935 | 0.1865 | 0.5192 |
|  | 0.0309 | 0.0257 | 0.2935 | 0.0488 | 0.3988 | 0.0000 | 0.0961 | 0.2935 | 0.4563 | 0.8458 |
|  | 0.2354 | 0.1955 | 0.4707 | 0.0782 | 0.9798 | 0.0000 | 0.7318 | 0.4707 | 0.7318 | 1.9344 |
| G | 0.0006 | 0.0001 | 0.0056 | 0.0003 | 0.0066 | 0.0000 | 0.0007 | 0.0056 | 0.0036 | 0.0099 |
|  | 0.0006 | 0.0005 | 0.0056 | 0.0009 | 0.0076 | 0.0000 | 0.0018 | 0.0056 | 0.0087 | 0.0161 |
|  | 0.0024 | 0.0020 | 0.0047 | 0.0008 | 0.0098 | 0.0000 | 0.0073 | 0.0047 | 0.0073 | 0.0193 |
| H | 0.0309 | 0.0076 | 0.2935 | 0.0145 | 0.3465 | 0.0000 | 0.0393 | 0.2935 | 0.1865 | 0.5192 |
|  | 0.0309 | 0.0257 | 0.2935 | 0.0488 | 0.3988 | 0.0000 | 0.0961 | 0.2935 | 0.4563 | 0.8458 |
|  | 0.2354 | 0.1955 | 0.4707 | 0.0782 | 0.9798 | 0.0000 | 0.7318 | 0.4707 | 0.7318 | 1.9344 |


| Section ID | Outdoor Fatality |  | Indoor Fatality |  | Total <br> Fatality <br> Number | Outdoor Injury |  | Indoor Injury |  | Total Serious Injury Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |
| I | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0000 | 0.0007 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0006 | 0.0004 | 0.0010 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0001 | 0.0008 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0006 | 0.0009 | 0.0016 |
|  | 0.0094 | 0.0078 | 0.0012 | 0.0002 | 0.0186 | 0.0000 | 0.0293 | 0.0012 | 0.0018 | 0.0323 |
| J | 0.0324 | 0.0080 | 0.3081 | 0.0153 | 0.3639 | 0.0000 | 0.0412 | 0.3081 | 0.1958 | 0.5452 |
|  | 0.0324 | 0.0269 | 0.3081 | 0.0512 | 0.4187 | 0.0000 | 0.1009 | 0.3081 | 0.4791 | 0.8881 |
|  | 0.2471 | 0.2053 | 0.4943 | 0.0821 | 1.0288 | 0.0000 | 0.7684 | 0.4943 | 0.7684 | 2.0311 |
| K | 0.0035 | 0.0009 | 0.0335 | 0.0017 | 0.0396 | 0.0000 | 0.0045 | 0.0335 | 0.0213 | 0.0593 |
|  | 0.0035 | 0.0029 | 0.0335 | 0.0056 | 0.0456 | 0.0000 | 0.0110 | 0.0335 | 0.0521 | 0.0967 |
|  | 0.0035 | 0.0029 | 0.1412 | 0.0235 | 0.1711 | 0.0000 | 0.0110 | 0.1412 | 0.2196 | 0.3717 |
| L/M | 0.0003 | 0.0001 | 0.0031 | 0.0002 | 0.0036 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | 0.0031 | 0.0020 | 0.0054 |
|  | 0.0003 | 0.0003 | 0.0031 | 0.0005 | 0.0042 | 0.0000 | 0.0010 | 0.0031 | 0.0048 | 0.0089 |
|  | 0.0518 | 0.0430 | 0.0065 | 0.0011 | 0.1023 | 0.0000 | 0.1610 | 0.0065 | 0.0101 | 0.1775 |
| N | 0.0618 | 0.0153 | 0.5869 | 0.0291 | 0.6931 | 0.0000 | 0.0785 | 0.5869 | 0.3730 | 1.0384 |
|  | 0.0618 | 0.0513 | 0.5869 | 0.0975 | 0.7976 | 0.0000 | 0.1921 | 0.5869 | 0.9125 | 1.6915 |
|  | 0.4707 | 0.3911 | 0.9414 | 0.1564 | 1.9597 | 0.0000 | 1.4637 | 0.9414 | 1.4637 | 3.8688 |
| 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | 0.0003 |
|  | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0002 | 0.0003 | 0.0005 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0006 |
| P | 0.0003 | 0.0001 | 0.0031 | 0.0002 | 0.0036 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | 0.0031 | 0.0020 | 0.0054 |
|  | 0.0003 | 0.0003 | 0.0031 | 0.0005 | 0.0042 | 0.0000 | 0.0010 | 0.0031 | 0.0048 | 0.0089 |
|  | 0.0013 | 0.0011 | 0.0026 | 0.0004 | 0.0054 | 0.0000 | 0.0040 | 0.0026 | 0.0040 | 0.0106 |
| Q | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0000 | 0.0007 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0006 | 0.0004 | 0.0010 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0001 | 0.0008 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0006 | 0.0009 | 0.0016 |
|  | 0.0094 | 0.0078 | 0.0012 | 0.0002 | 0.0186 | 0.0000 | 0.0293 | 0.0012 | 0.0018 | 0.0323 |


| Section ID | Outdoor Fatality |  | Indoor Fatality |  | Total <br> Fatality <br> Number | Outdoor Injury |  | Indoor Injury |  | Total Serious Injury Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Within Pool Fire Area | Pool Fire to $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |
| R | 0.0294 | 0.0073 | 0.2795 | 0.0138 | 0.3300 | 0.0000 | 0.0374 | 0.2795 | 0.1776 | 0.4945 |
|  | 0.0294 | 0.0244 | 0.2795 | 0.0464 | 0.3798 | 0.0000 | 0.0915 | 0.2795 | 0.4345 | 0.8055 |
|  | 0.1177 | 0.0978 | 0.2354 | 0.0391 | 0.4899 | 0.0000 | 0.3659 | 0.2354 | 0.3659 | 0.9672 |
| S | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0000 | 0.0007 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0006 | 0.0004 | 0.0010 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | 0.0001 | 0.0008 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0006 | 0.0009 | 0.0016 |
|  | 0.0094 | 0.0078 | 0.0012 | 0.0002 | 0.0186 | 0.0000 | 0.0293 | 0.0012 | 0.0018 | 0.0323 |
| T | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | 0.0003 |
|  | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0002 | 0.0003 | 0.0005 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0006 |
| U | 0.0883 | 0.0219 | 0.8385 | 0.0415 | 0.9901 | 0.0000 | 0.1122 | 0.8385 | 0.5328 | 1.4834 |
|  | 0.0883 | 0.0733 | 0.8385 | 0.1393 | 1.1394 | 0.0000 | 0.2744 | 0.8385 | 1.3036 | 2.4165 |
|  | 0.3530 | 0.2933 | 0.7061 | 0.1173 | 1.4697 | 0.0000 | 1.0978 | 0.7061 | 1.0978 | 2.9016 |
| V | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0011 | 0.0001 | 0.0013 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0011 | 0.0007 | 0.0020 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0011 | 0.0002 | 0.0015 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | 0.0011 | 0.0017 | 0.0032 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0047 | 0.0008 | 0.0057 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | 0.0047 | 0.0073 | 0.0124 |
| W | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0011 | 0.0001 | 0.0013 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0011 | 0.0007 | 0.0020 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0011 | 0.0002 | 0.0015 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | 0.0011 | 0.0017 | 0.0032 |
|  | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0047 | 0.0008 | 0.0057 | 0.0000 | 0.0004 | 0.0047 | 0.0073 | 0.0124 |

Outdoor Casualty $=$ Population Within Impact Area $\times$ Population Fraction Outdoors $x$ Vulnerability
Indoor Casualty = Population Within Impact Area x Population Fraction Indoors x Vulnerability

Event Frequencies Adjusted for Minimum of One Public Casualty

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Section } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency of Casualty Event (per km-year) | Fatality Number | Rounded Fatality Number (min of 1) | Adjusted <br> Frequency of Fatality <br> Event (per kmyear) | Serious Injury Number | Rounded Injury Number (min of 1) | Adjusted <br> Frequency <br> of Injury <br> Event <br> (per <br> km-year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 2.1E-06 | 0.0000 | 0 | $0.0 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.0E+00 |
|  | 9.0E-07 | 0.0000 | 0 | $0.0 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.0E+00 |
|  | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.0E+00 | 0.0000 | 0 | 0.0E+00 |
| B | 7.0E-07 | 0.0066 | 1 | 4.6E-09 | 0.0099 | 1 | 7.0E-09 |
|  | 3.0E-07 | 0.0076 | 1 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-09$ | 0.0161 | 1 | 4.9E-09 |
|  | 1.0E-06 | 0.0098 | 1 | 9.8E-09 | 0.0193 | 1 | 1.9E-08 |
| C | 3.6E-07 | 0.0010 | 1 | $3.6 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0015 | 1 | $5.4 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 1.6E-07 | 0.0011 | 1 | 1.8E-10 | 0.0024 | 1 | 3.8E-10 |
|  | 5.2E-07 | 0.0279 | 1 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.0484 | 1 | 2.5E-08 |
| D | 2.3E-06 | 0.0002 | 1 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0003 | 1 | 7.6E-10 |
|  | 9.8E-07 | 0.0003 | 1 | $2.5 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0005 | 1 | 5.3E-10 |
|  | $3.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0003 | 1 | 1.1E-09 | 0.0006 | 1 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-09$ |
| E | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0007 | 1 | 2.2E-10 | 0.0010 | 1 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 1.5E-07 | 0.0008 | 1 | 1.1E-10 | 0.0016 | 1 | 2.3E-10 |
|  | 4.8E-07 | 0.0186 | 1 | 9.0E-09 | 0.0323 | 1 | 1.6E-08 |
| F | 1.2E-07 | 0.3465 | 1 | 4.1E-08 | 0.5192 | 1 | $6.1 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
|  | $5.0 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.3988 | 1 | 2.0E-08 | 0.8458 | 1 | 4.3E-08 |
|  | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.9798 | 1 | 1.6E-07 | 1.9344 | 2 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| G | $1.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0066 | 1 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-09$ | 0.0099 | 1 | 1.6E-09 |
|  | $6.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.0076 | 1 | $5.2 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0161 | 1 | 1.1E-09 |
|  | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0098 | 1 | 2.2E-09 | 0.0193 | 1 | 4.4E-09 |
| H | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.3465 | 1 | 3.5E-08 | 0.5192 | 1 | 5.3E-08 |
|  | $4.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.3988 | 1 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.8458 | 1 | $3.7 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
|  | 1.5E-07 | 0.9798 | 1 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.9344 | 2 | 1.4E-07 |
| 1 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0007 | 1 | 1.8E-10 | 0.0010 | 1 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 1.2E-07 | 0.0008 | 1 | 8.9E-11 | 0.0016 | 1 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 3.9E-07 | 0.0186 | 1 | 7.3E-09 | 0.0323 | 1 | 1.3E-08 |
| J | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.3639 | 1 | 9.5E-08 | 0.5452 | 1 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  | 1.1E-07 | 0.4187 | 1 | $4.7 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.8881 | 1 | 9.9E-08 |
|  | $3.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.0288 | 1 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 2.0311 | 2 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| K | 7.0E-07 | 0.0396 | 1 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.0593 | 1 | 4.2E-08 |
|  | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0456 | 1 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0.0967 | 1 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
|  | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.1711 | 1 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.3717 | 1 | $3.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| L/M | 7.0E-07 | 0.0036 | 1 | 2.6E-09 | 0.0054 | 1 | 3.8E-09 |
|  | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0042 | 1 | 1.3E-09 | 0.0089 | 1 | 2.7E-09 |
|  | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.1023 | 1 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.1775 | 1 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ |

ExxonMobil, Interim Trucking Project
B-12
Las Flores Canyon - TQRA 2/2020

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Section } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency of Casualty Event (per km-year) | Fatality Number | Rounded Fatality Number (min of 1) | Adjusted Frequency of Fatality Event (per kmyear) | Serious Injury Number | Rounded Injury Number ( min of 1) | Adjusted Frequency of Injury Event (per km-year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 6.1E-07 | 0.6931 | 1 | 4.2E-07 | 1.0384 | 1 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  | 2.6E-07 | 0.7976 | 1 | 2.1E-07 | 1.6915 | 2 | 2.2E-07 |
|  | 8.7E-07 | 1.9597 | 2 | 8.5E-07 | 3.8688 | 4 | 8.4E-07 |
| 0 | 1.8E-06 | 0.0002 | 1 | 4.0E-10 | 0.0003 | 1 | 6.0E-10 |
|  | 7.8E-07 | 0.0003 | 1 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0005 | 1 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0003 | 1 | 8.5E-10 | 0.0006 | 1 | 1.7E-09 |
| P | 4.0E-07 | 0.0036 | 1 | 1.5E-09 | 0.0054 | 1 | 2.2E-09 |
|  | 1.7E-07 | 0.0042 | 1 | 7.2E-10 | 0.0089 | 1 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}-09$ |
|  | 5.7E-07 | 0.0054 | 1 | 3.1E-09 | 0.0106 | 1 | 6.1E-09 |
| Q | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0007 | 1 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0010 | 1 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 1.2E-07 | 0.0008 | 1 | 9.3E-11 | 0.0016 | 1 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 4.1E-07 | 0.0186 | 1 | 7.6E-09 | 0.0323 | 1 | 1.3E-08 |
| R | 3.4E-07 | 0.3300 | 1 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.4945 | 1 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  | 1.4E-07 | 0.3798 | 1 | 5.5E-08 | 0.8055 | 1 | 1.2E-07 |
|  | $4.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.4899 | 1 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.9672 | 1 | 4.7E-07 |
| S | 4.8E-07 | 0.0007 | 1 | 3.2E-10 | 0.0010 | 1 | 4.8E-10 |
|  | $2.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0008 | 1 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0016 | 1 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 6.9E-07 | 0.0186 | 1 | 1.3E-08 | 0.0323 | 1 | 2.2E-08 |
| T | $2.4 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0002 | 1 | 5.3E-10 | 0.0003 | 1 | 8.0E-10 |
|  | $1.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0003 | 1 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0005 | 1 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | $3.5 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0003 | 1 | 1.1E-09 | 0.0006 | 1 | 2.2E-09 |
| U | $3.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.9901 | 1 | $3.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.4834 | 1 | $5.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  | $1.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.1394 | 1 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 2.4165 | 2 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  | 5.2E-07 | 1.4697 | 1 | 7.6E-07 | 2.9016 | 3 | 5.0E-07 |
| V | 7.6E-07 | 0.0013 | 1 | 1.0E-09 | 0.0020 | 1 | 1.5E-09 |
|  | 3.3E-07 | 0.0015 | 1 | 5.0E-10 | 0.0032 | 1 | 1.1E-09 |
|  | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 0.0057 | 1 | $6.2 \mathrm{E}-09$ | 0.0124 | 1 | 1.3E-08 |
| W | 6.8E-07 | 0.0013 | 1 | $9.0 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0020 | 1 | 1.4E-09 |
|  | $2.9 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.0015 | 1 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 0.0032 | 1 | $9.4 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
|  | 9.8E-07 | 0.0057 | 1 | 5.6E-09 | 0.0124 | 1 | 1.2E-08 |

## Sum of On-Road and Off-Road Public Casualties by Road Segment

| Section ID <br> (Report Section 2) | Mitigated Large Fire Freq per km-year | Mitigated Small Fire Freq per km-year | Freq of On-Road Public Fatality per km-year | Freq of On-Road Public Injury per km-year | Freq of Off-Road Public Fatality per km-year | Freq of Off-Road Public Injury per km-year | Total Freq of Public Fatality per km-year | Total Freq of Public Injury per km-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 4.8E-05 | 7.2E-06 | 0.0E+00 | 0.0E+00 | 0.0E+00 | 0.0E+00 | 0.0E+00 | 0.0E+00 |
| B | $4.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 7.2E-06 | 2.6E-06 | 5.2E-06 | 1.7E-08 | 3.1E-08 | 2.6E-06 | 5.2E-06 |
| C | $2.5 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 3.7E-06 | 1.3E-06 | 2.7E-06 | 1.5E-08 | 2.6E-08 | 1.3E-06 | 2.7E-06 |
| D | 5.2E-05 | 7.9E-06 | 2.8E-06 | 5.6E-06 | 1.8E-09 | 3.4E-09 | 2.8E-06 | 5.6E-06 |
| E | 2.3E-05 | 3.5E-06 | 1.2E-06 | 2.5E-06 | 9.3E-09 | 1.6E-08 | 1.2E-06 | 2.5E-06 |
| F | 1.6E-05 | 2.4E-06 | 8.5E-07 | 1.7E-06 | 2.2E-07 | 2.7E-07 | 1.1E-06 | 2.0E-06 |
| G | 1.1E-05 | 1.6E-06 | 5.8E-07 | 1.2E-06 | 3.8E-09 | 7.1E-09 | 5.8E-07 | 1.2E-06 |
| H | 1.4E-05 | 2.1E-06 | 7.4E-07 | 1.5E-06 | 2.0E-07 | 2.3E-07 | 9.4E-07 | 1.7E-06 |
| 1 | 1.9E-05 | 2.8E-06 | 9.9E-07 | 2.0E-06 | 7.5E-09 | 1.3E-08 | 1.0E-06 | 2.0E-06 |
| J | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 2.7E-06 | 9.5E-07 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 5.2E-07 | 6.2E-07 | 1.5E-06 | 2.5E-06 |
| K | 4.8E-05 | 7.2E-06 | 2.6E-06 | 5.2E-06 | 2.1E-07 | 4.4E-07 | 2.8E-06 | 5.6E-06 |
| L/M | 4.8E-05 | 7.2E-06 | 2.6E-06 | 5.2E-06 | 1.1E-07 | 1.8E-07 | 2.7E-06 | 5.4E-06 |
| N | 4.2E-05 | 6.2E-06 | 2.2E-06 | 4.5E-06 | 1.5E-06 | 1.7E-06 | 3.7E-06 | 6.2E-06 |
| 0 | 4.2E-05 | 6.2E-06 | 2.2E-06 | 4.5E-06 | 1.4E-09 | 2.7E-09 | 2.2E-06 | 4.5E-06 |
| P | 2.7E-05 | 4.1E-06 | 1.5E-06 | 3.0E-06 | 5.3E-09 | 9.8E-09 | 1.5E-06 | 3.0E-06 |
| Q | 2.0E-05 | 2.9E-06 | 1.0E-06 | 2.1E-06 | 7.9E-09 | 1.4E-08 | 1.0E-06 | 2.1E-06 |
| R | 2.3E-05 | 3.5E-06 | 1.2E-06 | 2.5E-06 | 4.0E-07 | 7.5E-07 | 1.6E-06 | 3.2E-06 |
| S | 3.3E-05 | 5.0E-06 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 3.6E-06 | 1.3E-08 | 2.3E-08 | 1.8E-06 | 3.6E-06 |
| T | 5.5E-05 | 8.3E-06 | 2.9E-06 | 6.0E-06 | 1.9E-09 | 3.6E-09 | 2.9E-06 | 6.0E-06 |
| U | 2.5E-05 | 3.7E-06 | 1.3E-06 | 2.7E-06 | 1.3E-06 | 1.2E-06 | 2.6E-06 | 3.9E-06 |
| V | 5.2E-05 | 7.8E-06 | 2.8E-06 | 5.6E-06 | 7.7E-09 | 1.6E-08 | 2.8E-06 | 5.6E-06 |
| W | 4.7E-05 | 7.0E-06 | 2.5E-06 | 5.0E-06 | 6.9E-09 | 1.4E-08 | 2.5E-06 | 5.0E-06 |

Fire frequencies from table above
On-Road probabilities of public casualties

Large fire probability of public fatality $=$
Small fire probability of public fatality =
Large fire probability of public serious injury =
Small fire probability of public serious injury =
Off-Road frequency of public casualties =
$0.05 \quad$ Section 3.7
0.02 Section 3.7
$0.1 \quad$ Section 3.7
$0.05 \quad$ Section 3.7
Day + Night Total 24 hr frequency

## Route 1 - Calculation for Societal Risk on the Highest Risk 1-km Segment

On Route 1, the highest risk is segment D on Highway 101 across the hills of Gaviota State Park to the junction with State Route 1. This has been selected for the calculation of societal risk.

Segment D on-road frequency of casualty event:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Frequency of On-Road Public Fatality per km-year }= & 2.8 \mathrm{E}-06 \\ \text { Frequency of On-Road Public Injury per } \mathrm{km} \text {-year }= & 5.6 \mathrm{E}-06\end{array}$
Frequency of On-Road Public Injury per km-year =
5.6E-06

| Number of <br> Casualties per <br> Event | Probability of <br> Casualty <br> Number <br> (Section 3.7) | Frequency of On- <br> Road Public <br> Fatalities <br> (per km-year) | Frequency of On- <br> Road Public <br> Serious Injury <br> (per km-year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 0.04 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 4 | 0.06 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 3 | 0.1 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 2 | 0.2 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 1 | 0.6 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-06$ |

Segment D off-road frequency of casualty event:

| Segment <br> ID | Fatality <br> Number <br> (min of 1) | Adjusted <br> Frequency of <br> Fatality Event <br> (per km-year) | Serious <br> Injury <br> Number <br> (min of 1) | Adjusted <br> Frequency of <br> Injury Event <br> (per km-year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 5 | - | 5 | - |
|  | 4 | - | 4 | - |
|  | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | 2 | - | 2 | - |
|  | 1 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-09$ | 1 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-09$ |

## Route 1 - Combined On and Off-Road Casualties for F-N Societal Profiles

## Risk per highest 1-km Segment D

| Number of <br> Fatalities | Frequency of <br> Public Fatalities <br> per km-year | Frequency of N or <br> More Public <br> Fatalities <br> per km-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 4 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 3 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 2 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 1 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-06$ |


| Number of <br> Serious Injuries | Frequency of <br> Public Injuries <br> per km-year | Frequency of N or <br> More Public <br> Injuries <br> per km-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 4 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 3 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 2 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $2.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 1 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $5.6 \mathrm{E}-06$ |

## Route 2 - Calculation for Societal Risk on the Highest Risk 1-km Segment

On Route 2, the highest risk is segment N on Highway 101 between Betteravia Road and the Santa Maria River Bridge in Santa Maria. This has been selected for the calculation of societal risk.

Segment $N$ on-road frequency of casualty event:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Frequency of On-Road Public Fatality per km-year }= & 2.2 \mathrm{E}-06 \\ \text { Frequency of On-Road Public Injury per km-year }= & 4.5 \mathrm{E}-06\end{array}$

| Number of <br> Casualties per <br> Event | Probability of <br> Casualty <br> Number <br> (Section 3.7) | Frequency of On- <br> Road Public <br> Fatalities <br> (per km-year) | Frequency of On- <br> Road Public <br> Serious Injury <br> (per km-year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 0.04 | $8.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 4 | 0.06 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 3 | 0.1 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $4.5 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 2 | 0.2 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $8.9 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 1 | 0.6 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $2.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |

Segment N off-road frequency of casualty event:

| Segment <br> ID | Fatality <br> Number <br> (min of 1) | Adjusted <br> Frequency of <br> Fatality Event <br> (per km-year) | Serious <br> Injury <br> Number <br> (min of 1) | Adjusted <br> Frequency of <br> Injury Event <br> (per km-year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 5 | - | 5 | - |
|  | 4 | - | 4 | $8.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | 2 | $8.5 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 2 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
|  | 1 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ |

Route 2 - Combined On and Off-Road Casualties for F-N Societal Profiles

## Risk per highest 1-km Segment $\mathbf{N}$

| Number of <br> Fatalities | Frequency of <br> Public Fatalities <br> per km-year | Frequency of N or <br> More Public <br> Fatalities <br> per km-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $8.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $8.8 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| 4 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $2.2 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 3 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $4.4 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 2 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 1 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $3.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |


| Number of <br> Serious Injuries | Frequency of <br> Public Injuries <br> per km-year | Frequency of $\mathbf{N}$ or <br> More Public <br> Injuries <br> per km-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.8 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| 4 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $1.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 3 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $1.7 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 2 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $2.8 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 1 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $6.2 \mathrm{E}-06$ |

## Appendix C

## Consequence Modeling Input and Output Files

```
SITE DATA:
    Location: SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA
    Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.66 (sheltered single storied)
    Time: June 1, 2018 1201 hours PDT (user specified)
CHEMICAL DATA:
    Chemical Name: N-PENTANE Molecular Weight: 72.15 g/mol
    PAC-1: 120 ppm PAC-2: 610 ppm PAC-3: 15000 ppm
    IDLH: 1500 ppm LEL: 14000 ppm UEL: }78000\textrm{ppm
    Ambient Boiling Point: 96.7}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{F
    Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: 0.68 atm
    Ambient Saturation Concentration: 677,493 ppm or 67.7%
ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
    Wind: 4 meters/second from n at 3 meters
    Ground Roughness: open country Cloud Cover: 10 tenths
    Air Temperature: 25* C Stability Class: D
    No Inversion Height Relative Humidity: 50%
SOURCE STRENGTH:
    Direct Source: 320 pounds/min Source Height: 0
    Release Duration: }60\mathrm{ minutes
    Release Rate: 320 pounds/min
    Total Amount Released: 19,200 pounds
THREAT ZONE:
    Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud
    Model Run: Heavy Gas
    Red : 32 yards --- (14000 ppm = LEL)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Orange: }49\mathrm{ yards --- (7000 ppm)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Yellow: 135 yards --- (1400 ppm = 10% LEL)
```

Time: June 1, 20181201 hours PDT (user specified)
Chemical Name: N-PENTANE
Wind: 4 meters/second from n at 3 meters
THREAT ZONE:
Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud Model Run: Heavy Gas
Red : 32 yards --- ( $14000 \mathrm{ppm}=\mathrm{LEL}$ )
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances. orange: 49 yards --- ( 7000 ppm )
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances. Yellow: 135 yards --- (1400 ppm = 10\% LEL)


```
SITE DATA:
    Location: SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA
    Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.32 (sheltered single storied)
    Time: June 1, 2018 0101 hours PDT (user specified)
CHEMICAL DATA:
    Chemical Name: N-PENTANE Molecular Weight: 72.15 g/mol
    PAC-1: 120 ppm PAC-2: 610 ppm PAC-3: 15000 ppm
    IDLH: 1500 ppm LEL: 14000 ppm UEL: }78000\textrm{ppm
    Ambient Boiling Point: 96.7}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{F
    Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: 0.68 atm
    Ambient Saturation Concentration: 677,493 ppm or 67.7%
ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
    Wind: 1.5 meters/second from n at 3 meters
    Ground Roughness: open country Cloud Cover: 0 tenths
    Air Temperature: 25* C Stability Class: F
    No Inversion Height Relative Humidity: 50%
SOURCE STRENGTH:
    Direct Source: 150 pounds/min Source Height: 0
    Release Duration: }60\mathrm{ minutes
    Release Rate: 150 pounds/min
    Total Amount Released: 9,000 pounds
THREAT ZONE: (HEAVY GAS SELECTED)
    Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud
    Model Run: Heavy Gas
    Red : 43 yards --- (14000 ppm = LEL)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    orange: 59 yards --- (7000 ppm)
    Yellow: 145 yards --- (1400 ppm = 10% LEL)
```

Time: June 1, 20180101 hours PDT (user specified)
Chemical Name: N-PENTANE
Wind: 1.5 meters/second from $n$ at 3 meters
THREAT ZONE: (HEAVY GAS SELECTED)
Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud Model Run: Heavy Gas
Red : 43 yards --- (14000 ppm = LEL)
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances. orange: 59 yards --- (7000 ppm) Yellow: 145 yards --- (1400 ppm = 10\% LEL)
yards

wind

```
SITE DATA:
    Location: SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA
    Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.66 (sheltered single storied)
    Time: June 1, 2018 1201 hours PDT (user specified)
CHEMICAL DATA:
    Chemical Name: N-PENTANE Molecular Weight: 72.15 g/mol
    PAC-1: 120 ppm PAC-2: 610 ppm PAC-3: 15000 ppm
    IDLH: 1500 ppm LEL: 14000 ppm UEL: }78000\textrm{ppm
    Ambient Boiling Point: 96.7}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{F
    Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: 0.68 atm
    Ambient Saturation Concentration: 677,493 ppm or 67.7%
ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
    Wind: 4 meters/second from n at 3 meters
    Ground Roughness: open country Cloud Cover: 10 tenths
    Air Temperature: 25* C Stability Class: D
    No Inversion Height Relative Humidity: 50%
SOURCE STRENGTTH:
    Direct Source: 32 pounds/min Source Height: 0
    Release Duration: 60 minutes
    Release Rate: 32 pounds/min
    Total Amount Released: 1,920 pounds
THREAT ZONE:
    Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud
    Model Run: Heavy Gas
    Red : 12 yards --- (14000 ppm = LEL)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Orange: }17\mathrm{ yards --- (7000 ppm)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Yellow: }72\mathrm{ yards --- (700 ppm)
```

```
Time: June 1, 2018 1201 hours PDT (user specified)
Chemical Name: N-PENTANE
Wind: 4 meters/second from n at 3 meters
THREAT ZONE:
    Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud
    Model Run: Heavy Gas
    Red : 12 yards --- (14000 ppm = LEL)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Orange: }17\mathrm{ yards --- (7000 ppm)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Yellow: }72\mathrm{ yards --- (700 ppm)
```

yards


```
SITE DATA:
    Location: SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA
    Building Air Exchanges Per Hour: 0.32 (sheltered single storied)
    Time: June 1, 2018 0101 hours PDT (user specified)
CHEMICAL DATA:
    Chemical Name: N-PENTANE Molecular Weight: 72.15 g/mol
    PAC-1: 120 ppm PAC-2: 610 ppm PAC-3: 15000 ppm
    IDLH: 1500 ppm LEL: 14000 ppm UEL: }78000\textrm{ppm
    Ambient Boiling Point: 96.7}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{F
    Vapor Pressure at Ambient Temperature: 0.68 atm
    Ambient Saturation Concentration: 677,493 ppm or 67.7%
ATMOSPHERIC DATA: (MANUAL INPUT OF DATA)
    Wind: 1.5 meters/second from n at 3 meters
    Ground Roughness: open country Cloud Cover: 0 tenths
    Air Temperature: 25* C Stability Class: F
    No Inversion Height Relative Humidity: 50%
SOURCE STRENGTH:
    Direct Source: 15 pounds/min Source Height: 0
    Release Duration: }60\mathrm{ minutes
    Release Rate: }15\mathrm{ pounds/min
    Total Amount Released: 900 pounds
THREAT ZONE: (HEAVY GAS SELECTED)
    Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud
    Model Run: Heavy Gas
    Red : 12 yards --- (14000 ppm = LEL)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Orange: }19\mathrm{ yards --- (7000 ppm)
    Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness
        make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
    Yellow: 64 yards --- (700 ppm)
```

Time: June 1, 20180101 hours PDT (user specified)
Chemical Name: N-PENTANE
Wind: 1.5 meters/second from n at 3 meters
THREAT ZONE: (HEAVY GAS SELECTED)
Threat Modeled: Flammable Area of Vapor Cloud
Model Run: Heavy Gas
Red : 12 yards --- ( $14000 \mathrm{ppm}=\mathrm{LEL}$ )
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
orange: 19 yards --- ( 7000 ppm )
Note: Threat zone was not drawn because effects of near-field patchiness make dispersion predictions less reliable for short distances.
Yellow: 64 yards --- (700 ppm)
yards

wind

## ExxonMobil LFC Crude Oil Truck Small Release

Input Values and Constants

|  | Crude Oil |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| D | pool diameter | 11.3 m | 37.1 ft |
| MW | molecular weight | $100 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mol}$ |  |
| $\rho \mathrm{l}$ | liquid density | $940 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m} 3$ |  |
| Tf | flame temperature | 1300 C | 1573.0 K |
| SEP | emissive power | $140 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m} 2$ |  |
| SEPsoot | soot emissive power | $20 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m} 2$ |  |
| $\Delta \mathrm{Hc}$ | heat of combustion | $4.40 \mathrm{E}+07 \mathrm{~J} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |
| mv | burn velocity | $6.70 \mathrm{E}-05 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |
| RH | relative humidity | 0.5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Wind Speeds |  |  |  |
| D/4 | Typical D, Uw1 | $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |
| F/1.5 | Night F, Uw2 | $1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |


| Outputs |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Uw1 Radiation Calcs |  |  |
| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ Downwind distance | 40 m | 131.2 ft |
| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Upwind distance | 14.6 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Downwind distance | 32.6 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Upwind distance | 10.3 m |
|  |  | 107.0 ft |
|  |  | 33.8 ft |
| Uw2 Radiation Calcs |  |  |
| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ Downwind distance | 34.6 m | 113.5 ft |
| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Upwind distance | 22.9 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Downwind distance | 25.4 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ Upwind distance | 14.7 m | 83.1 ft |
|  |  |  |

TNO Yellow Book Calcs - Pool Fire on Land - Section 6.5.4

## ExxonMobil LFC Crude Oil Truck Large Release

| Input Values and Constants |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: |
|  | Crude Oil |  |  |
| D | pool diameter | 35.7 m | 117.1 ft |
| MW | molecular weight | $100 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mol}$ |  |
| pL | liquid density | $940 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m} 3$ |  |
| Tf | flame temperature | 1300 C | 1573.0 K |
| SEP | emissive power | $140 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m} 2$ |  |
| SEPsoot | soot emissive power | $20 \mathrm{~kW} / \mathrm{m} 2$ |  |
| $\Delta \mathrm{Hc}$ | heat of combustion | $4.40 \mathrm{E}+07 \mathrm{~J} / \mathrm{kg}$ |  |
| mv | burn velocity | $6.70 \mathrm{E}-05 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |
| RH | relative humidity | 0.5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Wind Speeds |  |  |  |
| D/4 | Typical D, Uw1 | $4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |
| F/1.5 | Night F, Uw2 | $1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |

## Outputs

Uw1 Radiation Calcs

| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Downwind distance | 72.6 m |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Upwind distance | 26.7 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Downwind distance | 54.6 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Upwind distance | 22.6 ft |
|  |  | 179.1 ft |
| Uw2 Radiation Calcs | 74.2 ft |  |
| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Downwind distance | 49.2 m |
| $5 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Upwind distance | 43.9 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Downwind distance | 34.3 m |
| $10 \mathrm{kw} / \mathrm{m} 2$ Upwind distance | 29 m | 161.4 ft |

## Appendix C. 2

LFC Facility Truck Loading Consequence Modeling


Title: LoadingSpill


NOTES:
Case continued on page 2.


Page 2 Title: LoadingSpill

RELEASE MENU
Type of release: Unregulated, Continuous release

Release duration
Normal flow rate
Duration of normal flow
Volume of vessel
Pipe inner diameter
Equivalent release diameter
Pipe length upstream of break
Height of release point
Angle of release from horizontal
NOTES:
IMPOUNDMENT MENU
Unconfined

## NOTES:

VDVE MENU
Vapor generation and dispersion - Flammable calculation
Concentration endpoint 1 LFL mol\%
Concentration endpoint 2 1/2 LFL mol\%
Concentration endpoint 3 1/10 LFL mol\%
Dispersion coefficient averaging time
1 min

## NOTES:



TITLE: LoadingSpill

| Time (sec) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Liquid } \\ \text { Remaining } \\ \text { (ft3) } \end{gathered}$ | Pool/Dike Radius (feet) | Vapor Rate (lb/sec) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 20.0000 | 6.84010 | 4.52690 | 0.368392E-01 |
| 40.0000 | 13.6692 | 5.70210 | 0.558122E-01 |
| 60.0000 | 20.4917 | 6.52559 | 0.711630E-01 |
| 80.0000 | 27.3078 | 7.18045 | 0.845429E-01 |
| 100.000 | 34.1186 | 7.73360 | 0.966242E-01 |
| 120.000 | 40.9226 | 8.21654 | 0.107762 |
| 140.000 | 47.7242 | 8.64829 | 0.118170 |
| 160.000 | 54.5223 | 9.04035 | 0.127992 |
| 180.000 | 61.3169 | 9.40092 | 0.137328 |
| 200.000 | 68.1043 | 9.73556 | 0.146252 |
| 220.000 | 74.8883 | 10.0482 | 0.154822 |
| 240.000 | 81.6722 | 10.3425 | 0.163080 |
| 260.000 | 88.4491 | 10.6207 | 0.171061 |
| 280.000 | 95.2260 | 10.8852 | 0.178799 |
| 300.000 | 101.996 | 11.1371 | 0.186317 |
| 320.000 | 101.918 | 11.1342 | 0.183720 |
| 340.000 | 101.840 | 11.1316 | 0.182097 |
| 360.000 | 101.763 | 11.1286 | 0.180850 |
| 380.000 | 101.689 | 11.1260 | 0.179844 |
| 400.000 | 101.611 | 11.1230 | 0.179015 |
| 420.000 | 101.537 | 11.1204 | 0.178325 |
| 440.000 | 101.459 | 11.1175 | 0.177745 |
| 715.000 | 100.435 | 11.0801 | 0.175193 |
| 990.000 | 99.4179 | 11.0427 | 0.174128 |
| 1265.00 | 98.4043 | 11.0049 | 0.173061 |
| 1540.00 | 97.4014 | 10.9672 | 0.171998 |
| 1815.00 | 96.4020 | 10.9298 | 0.170938 |
| 2090.00 | 95.4096 | 10.8921 | 0.169882 |
| 2365.00 | 94.4208 | 10.8543 | 0.168826 |
| 2640.00 | 93.4391 | 10.8169 | 0.167774 |
| 2915.00 | 92.4644 | 10.7792 | 0.166722 |
| 3190.00 | 91.4968 | 10.7415 | 0.165675 |
| 3465.00 | 90.5362 | 10.7037 | 0.164632 |
| 3600.00 | 90.0665 | 10.6850 | 0.164117 |

Ending Message: Normal Ending


Title: LoadingSpill

| Length of Flame | $: 35.1$ | feet |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Flame Tilt from Vertical | $: 42.1$ | degrees |  |
| Target Elevation | $:$ | 0.0 | feet |
| Pool Elevation | $:$ | 0.0 | feet |
| Wind Speed | $:$ | 8.9 | mph |
| Substrate | Land |  |  |


| Downwind Distance | Flux to | Flux to | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| from Center of Pool (feet) | Vertical Target <br> (Btu/hr-sq.ft) | Horizontal Target (Btu/hr-sq.ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flux } \\ (\mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr}-\mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ |
| 20.0 | 13484 | 18928 | 23240 |
| 21.3 | 12397 | 17089 | 21112 |
| 22.6 | 11470 | 15186 | 19031 |
| 23.9 | 10641 | 13450 | 17150 |
| 25.4 | 9882 | 11791 | 15384 |
| 27.0 | 9170 | 10178 | 13700 |
| 28.6 | 8456 | 8630 | 12083 |
| 30.4 | 7672 | 7206 | 10525 |
| 32.2 | 6845 | 5960 | 9076 |
| 34.2 | 6037 | 4925 | 7791 |
| 36.3 | 5288 | 4078 | 6678 |
| 38.5 | 4628 | 3389 | 5736 |
| 40.9 | 4056 | 2816 | 4938 |
| 43.4 | 3567 | 2333 | 4262 |
| 46.0 | 3135 | 1917 | 3674 |
| 48.8 | 2748 | 1558 | 3159 |
| 51.8 | 2401 | 1251 | 2707 |
| 55.0 | 2085 | 991 | 2309 |
| 58.4 | 1801 | 777 | 1961 |
| 62.0 | 1548 | 604 | 1662 |
| 65.7 | 1325 | 466 | 1404 |
| 69.8 | 1130 | 358 | 1185 |
| 74.0 | 962 | 274 | 1000 |
| 78.6 | 818 | 210 | 844 |
| 83.4 | 696 | 162 | 714 |
| 88.5 | 592 | 124 | 605 |
| 93.9 | 504 | 96 | 513 |
| 99.6 | 430 | 74 | 436 |
| 105.8 | 367 | 58 | 371 |
| 112.2 | 314 | 45 | 317 |

Downwind Distances to Endpoints:

| Distance <br> (feet) | Maximum Flux <br> $(B t u / h r-s q . f t)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 48.8 | 3170 |
| 63.1 | 1585 |
| 96.7 | 475 |

## POOL FIRE RADIATION ISOPLETHS

Target is 0.0 feet Above the Flame Base


## 3170 Btu/hr-sq.ft

 1585 Btu/hr-sq.ft 475 Btu/hr-sq.ft

Title: Pump Spill


NOTES:
Case continued on page 2.


Page 2 Title: Pump Spill

RELEASE MENU
Type of release: Unregulated, Continuous release Release duration 5 min
Normal flow rate
Duration of normal flow
Volume of vessel
$62.15 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{sec}$

Pipe inner diameter
Equivalent release diameter
Pipe length upstream of break
Pipe length downstream of break
Height of release point
30 min
$0.00 \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{ft}$
10.02 inches
10.00 inches
500.0 feet
0.0 feet

Angle of release from horizontal
0.0 feet

## NOTES:

IMPOUNDMENT MENU
Unconfined
NOTES:
VDVE MENU
Vapor generation and dispersion - Flammable calculation
Concentration endpoint 1
Concentration endpoint 2
Concentration endpoint 3
1/2 LFL mol\%

Dispersion coefficient averaging time
1 min

NOTES:


TITLE: Pump Spill

| Time (sec) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Liquid } \\ \text { Remaining } \\ \text { (ft3) } \end{gathered}$ | Pool/Dike Radius (feet) | Vapor Rate <br> (lb/sec) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 20.0000 | 26.3165 | 7.37566 | 0.886743E-01 |
| 40.0000 | 52.6083 | 9.29265 | 0.134425 |
| 60.0000 | 78.8824 | 10.6362 | 0.171445 |
| 80.0000 | 105.139 | 11.7051 | 0.203718 |
| 100.000 | 131.385 | 12.6073 | 0.232874 |
| 120.000 | 157.620 | 13.3953 | 0.259749 |
| 140.000 | 183.845 | 14.0997 | 0.284859 |
| 160.000 | 210.055 | 14.7398 | 0.308559 |
| 180.000 | 236.259 | 15.3281 | 0.331090 |
| 200.000 | 262.452 | 15.8743 | 0.352629 |
| 220.000 | 288.637 | 16.3852 | 0.373309 |
| 240.000 | 314.813 | 16.8658 | 0.393261 |
| 260.000 | 340.981 | 17.3202 | 0.412529 |
| 280.000 | 367.131 | 17.7520 | 0.431224 |
| 300.000 | 393.299 | 18.1634 | 0.449390 |
| 320.000 | 393.088 | 18.1604 | 0.443217 |
| 340.000 | 392.911 | 18.1575 | 0.439381 |
| 360.000 | 392.734 | 18.1549 | 0.436449 |
| 380.000 | 392.558 | 18.1519 | 0.434090 |
| 400.000 | 392.346 | 18.1489 | 0.432172 |
| 420.000 | 392.169 | 18.1463 | 0.430563 |
| 440.000 | 391.993 | 18.1434 | 0.429240 |
| 715.000 | 389.521 | 18.1050 | 0.424015 |
| 990.000 | 387.049 | 18.0666 | 0.422406 |
| 1265.00 | 384.612 | 18.0282 | 0.420796 |
| 1540.00 | 382.140 | 17.9902 | 0.419187 |
| 1815.00 | 379.703 | 17.9518 | 0.417578 |
| 2090.00 | 377.267 | 17.9137 | 0.415990 |
| 2365.00 | 374.865 | 17.8753 | 0.414403 |
| 2640.00 | 372.464 | 17.8369 | 0.412794 |
| 2915.00 | 370.062 | 17.7986 | 0.411206 |
| 3190.00 | 367.661 | 17.7605 | 0.409597 |
| 3465.00 | 365.295 | 17.7218 | 0.408009 |
| 3600. 00 | 364.130 | 17.7028 | 0.407216 |

Ending Message: Normal Ending

| CANARY by Quest - Version 4.6.2 Pool Fire Radiation Model Case Name - PumpPoold <br> Thu Jan 3 12:42:28 2019 <br> Quest Consultants Inc., Norman, Oklahoma, USA www. questconsult.com canary@questconsult.com telephone (405) 329-7475 fax (405) 329-7734 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Title: Pump Spill |  |  |  |
| Length of Flame : 51.0 feet |  |  |  |
| Flame Tilt from Vertical : 35.2 degrees |  |  |  |
| Target Elevation : 0.0 feet |  |  |  |
| Pool Elevation : 0.0 feet |  |  |  |
| Wind Speed : 8.9 mph |  |  |  |
| Substrate : Land |  |  |  |
| Downwind Distance | Flux to | Flux to | Maximum |
| from Center of Pool | Vertical Target (Btu/hr-sq.ft) | Horizontal Target <br> (Btu/hr-sq.ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flux } \\ & \text { (Btu/hr-sa.ft) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 31.9 | 12900 | 16630 | 21046 |
| 33.7 | 11924 | 13788 | 18229 |
| 35.5 | 11002 | 11011 | 15566 |
| 37.5 | 9854 | 8526 | 13031 |
| 39.5 | 8512 | 6564 | 10749 |
| 41.7 | 7215 | 5160 | 8870 |
| 43.9 | 6101 | 4190 | 7401 |
| 46.4 | 5199 | 3504 | 6270 |
| 48.9 | 4479 | 2994 | 5387 |
| 51.6 | 3899 | 2589 | 4680 |
| 54.4 | 3432 | 2255 | 4107 |
| 57.4 | 3044 | 1963 | 3623 |
| 60.5 | 2720 | 1706 | 3210 |
| 63.8 | 2436 | 1472 | 2846 |
| 67.3 | 2183 | 1260 | 2521 |
| 71.0 | 1955 | 1068 | 2228 |
| 74.9 | 1746 | 896 | 1963 |
| 79.0 | 1554 | 744 | 1723 |
| 83.3 | 1378 | 612 | 1508 |
| 87.9 | 1217 | 499 | 1316 |
| 92.7 | 1070 | 405 | 1144 |
| 97.8 | 939 | 326 | 994 |
| 103.1 | 821 | 262 | 862 |
| 108.8 | 716 | 210 | 746 |
| 114.7 | 624 | 168 | 646 |
| 121.0 | 543 | 134 | 560 |
| 127.6 | 473 | 107 | 485 |
| 134.6 | 412 | 86 | 421 |
| 142.0 | 358 | 69 | 365 |
| 149.7 | 312 | 55 | 317 |
| Downwind Distances to Endpoints: |  |  |  |
| Distance Maximum Flux <br> (feet) $\quad(B t u / h r-$ sq.ft) |  |  |  |
| 60.93170 |  |  |  |
| 81.8 1585 |  |  |  |
| 128.6 |  |  |  |

# POOL FIRE RADIATION ISOPLETHS 

Target is 0.0 feet Above the Flame Base
Pump Spill


3170 Btu/hr-sq.ft 1585 Btu/hr-sq.ft 475 Btu/hr-sq.ft

## Appendix C. 3

SO2 Emissions from Crude Fires

## Modeling Results for $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ Emissions from Crude Oil Tanker Truck Fire

Burning of crude oil can produce emissions of toxic materials, particularly sulfur dioxide $\left(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\right)$. The extent to which a crude oil fire resulting from a truck accident will cause toxic impacts that can produce serious injuries or fatalities are discussed in this analysis.

MRS Environmental, Inc. conducted modeling to determine the potential impacts of $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ emissions from a crude oil fire. The analysis has included a blended crude with a $5.4 \%$ total sulfur content.

## Sulfur from Crude Oil Fires

As the production, storage and transportation of crude oil occurs at an oil field, a fire involving a crude oil spill could generate impacts. The impacts of a crude oil fire in the TQRA were associated with thermal radiation from the fire. Additional impacts may occur due to sulfur dioxide $\left(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\right)$ in the smoke plume that is generated during combustion of the crude oil containing sulfur. This analysis examines the potential for impacts from $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ associated with a crude oil fire.

The smoke from a large crude oil fire includes carbon dioxide, water vapor, smoke particulate, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, sulfur compounds, oxides of nitrogen, and other aerosols and gases. The pollutant of greatest interest in assessing the potential health effects from exposure to the smoke is particulate because it has been shown (NIST 1997) to be the most likely combustion product to violate ambient air quality standards. Also, exposure to $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$, which at certain concentrations can be acutely hazardous, can lead to serious injury or fatality.

There are three principle factors that determine the quantity of pollutants produced by a crude oil fire. These include the fire area, the average oil burning rate, and the average soot yield. The fire area is the area of the burning oil. The burning rate is the rate at which the oil mass is consumed by the fire, and the soot yield is the mass fraction of the oil that is converted to particulate matter instead of being combusted. Both the burning rate and soot yields are functions of the oil type and the burning conditions.

Historical experimental burns in Alaska and Canada have provided important empirical data for estimating crude oil fire plumes. These experiments were performed in the 1990s and multiple reports have been disseminated about the results. Measurements included burn rates for various types of oils, atmospheric measurements of particulates (total, less than 10 micrometers and less than 2.5 micrometers) as well as $\mathrm{SO}_{2}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and other combustion byproducts. In combination with burn rates, emission factors have also been developed for a range of pollutants, including $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ (NIST 1997).
$\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ is produced during the burning of the crude oil as a function of the sulfur content of the crude oil. Emission factors developed as part of test burns indicate a range from 3 grams $\mathrm{SO}_{2} / \mathrm{kg}$ of crude oil burned for lighter crudes with low sulfur content to 25 grams $\mathrm{SO}_{2} / \mathrm{kg}$ for Alaska ANS crude oil, with sulfur content that ranges up to $2.6 \%$ with an average of 1.3 \% between 1989 and 2010 according to ANS sampling data (Finga 2010).
$\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ is a toxic material with ERPG levels of 25 ppm and 3 ppm (ERPG-3 and ERPG-2, respectively). A concern for areas near a crude oil fire is the potential for $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ levels to exceed those ERPG-2 and ERPG-3 levels that could cause serious injury or fatality as a result of exposure. Historical investigations of crude oil burns indicate that particulate levels have not exceeded 2,000 ug/m3 (NIST 1997), with other studies indicating a substantially lower impact, down to $100 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{m} 3$, (Evans 2003, NIST 2011). Corresponding $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ levels would therefore not be above 1 ppm based on the measurements of particulates and the ratio of the emission factors between particulates and $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ (a ratio of $\mathrm{PM} / \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ ranges from $1.4-150$ depending on the crude type, with the 1.4 ratio being the equivalent of a $5.4 \%$ crude sulfur level). Note that the conversion of $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ from ug/m3 to ppm is $1 \mathrm{ppm}=2,620 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{m} 3$ as per CARB.

Modeling of crude oil fires has been conducted historically using specialized models, such as the ALOFT (NIST 2011) and Fire Dynamics Simulator (FDS) models as well as conventional dispersion models such as IST and AERMOD (Evans 2003). Dispersion models can estimate the downwind ground level pollutant impacts by incorporating the thermal induced buoyancy and plume rise along with meteorological components. Source terms have historically been developed for crude fires similar to the manner in which source terms are developed for flares using the flare model (Evans 2003, EPA 2016) where the height is determined by the heat release rate and the diameter is determined by the heat release rate in combination with the radiative heat loss fraction (EPA 2016). The flare model also assumes a release temperature of 1273 kelvin and a release velocity of 20 meters/second.

Historical test burns have indicated a range of values for burn rates, ranging from 0.019 to 0.056 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m} 2-\mathrm{s}$ (Evans 2003, NIST 1997). Crude oil heating values have also been measured and estimated in the crude oil burn studies and generally range up to about $44 \mathrm{MJ} / \mathrm{kg}$. Radiative heat loss fraction estimates have varied and are a function of a number of factors, including the extent to which the crude oil produces soot and the size of the burn area due to the fact that more heat is absorbed by the smoke plume if the burn area is larger. Modeling efforts by Evans (Evans 2003) utilized the flare model (EPA 2016) default radiative heat loss fraction of 0.55 . However, other studies of crude oil burns have indicated that radiative heat loss fractions could be as low as 0.10 for crude oil for larger fires and crude fires involving a substantial amount of soot (Yang 1994, NIST 1997). Generally, the lower the radiative heat losses, the more thermal buoyancy the plume would generate as more heat would be absorbed by the plume, as opposed to being lost to radiation. The associated increase in thermal buoyancy would decrease nearby ground level pollutant concentrations by promoting mixing with ambient air and downwind transport. AERMOD modeling indicates that the ground level impacts would decrease with a decreasing radiative heat loss factor. Therefore, the default radiative heat loss factor 0 f 0.55 was utilized in this analysis to be conservative.

In order to provide estimates of $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ ground level concentrations around crude oil fires to access potential impacts, the AERMOD model was run assuming a crude oil spill. The source terms and assumptions are listed below in Table 1. The AERMOD model was run to determine the peak 1hour ground-level concentrations using the Santa Maria Airport meteorological data for the years 2010-2014. Calms were set to a default minimum wind speed of $0.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. The use of 5 years of actual meteorological data allows for an estimate of downwind impacts over a realistic and large range of wind and stability conditions. Attachment 1 provides the AERMOD modeling files.

## Table 1 AERMOD and Modeling Inputs

| Source Term | Value | Basis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spilled area | about 1,394 m2 (150'x100') | Estimated area of the spills volume |
| Burn rate | $0.056 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | Peak burn rate associated with 6 burns in the NIST 1997 study |
| Radiative heat loss fraction | 0.55 | Flare model default values, also used by Evans 2003, and the most conservative value |
| SO2 emission factor | $104 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg}$ | NIST 1997 for ANS crude emission factor of $25 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg}$ with an average sulfur content of $1.3 \%$; ratio to $5.4 \%$ sulfur content of the project crude. |
| AERMOD version | 16216r |  |
| Point source parameters | 83.1 m height 1273 K temperature $20 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ velocity 18.98 m diameter | Based on flare model (EPA 2016) |
| Receptor grid | Polar orientation | Flat terrain |
| Meteorological files | Santa Maria Airport 2010-2014 | Calms set to $0.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Averaging time | Peak 1 hour |  |

The results of the AERMOD modeling show that, in the area immediately around the crude oil fire at ground level, $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ (and the corresponding particulate levels) remain low as the thermal buoyancy produced by the burning crude oil lift the plume substantially. In this near-field area, thermal radiation is the primary issue of concern for serious injuries and fatalities. The peak ground level value for $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ is modeled to be 0.48 ppm at a distance of close to 3 km from the crude oil fire, as the plume has cooled and mixed with ambient air as it moves downwind. Figure 1 shows the maximum 1-hour concentrations around the crude oil fire location as produced by the AERMOD model and Santa Maria Airport meteorological dataset. Note that these maximum 1-hour concentrations do not occur simultaneously but are the highest levels that could occur if the crude oil fire were to occur at any hour during the 5 -year meteorological dataset.

The analysis indicates that the peak ground level $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ concentration of 0.48 ppm is substantially below the levels that could cause serious injury or fatality ( $3-25 \mathrm{ppm}$ ). However, the levels may exceed those established by regulatory agencies for more chronic health effects, such as the California 1-hour standard for $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ of 0.25 ppm . The results of this modeling analysis show that $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ emissions from a crude oil fire would not change the risk profiles in the Crude Oil Transportation QRA.

The methodology and approach used in this analysis is supported by actual field testing results as well as EPA approved models and modeling methodology.
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Figure 1 Ground Level Peak 1-hour $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ Concentrations, PPM


Note: crude sulfur at 5.4\%, assumed complete conversion to $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$.

## Attachment 1 - AERMOD Modeling Files

** FLARE DATA
Rate
Height
Heat
HeatLoss
** BUILDING DATA no buildings
** EMISSION RATE - UNIT RATE OF 1 G/S
CO STARTING
STARTING TITLEONE CRUDE FIRE, FLAT, NO DOWNWASH
MODELOPT CONC FLAT
AVERTIME 1
POLLUTID OTHER
RUNORNOT RUN
CO FINISHED
SO STARTING
LOCATION SOURCE POINT 0.0

SRCGROUP ALL
SO FINISHED
RE STARTING
** Polar receptors GRIDPOLR POL1 STA
GRIDPOLR POL1 ORIG 0
 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { GRIDPOLR POL1 GDIR } & 36 & 10 & 10\end{array}$
GRIDPOLR POL1 END
RE FINISHED
ME STARTING
SURFFILE
PROFFIE SM_airport.sfc
PROFFILE SM_airport.pf
UATRDATA 932142010
PROFBASE 79.6 METERS
ME FINISHED
OU STARTING
RECTABLE 1 FIRST
MAXTABLE ALLAVE 50
FILEFORM EXP
RANKFILE 110 CrudeFire.FII
PLOTFILE 1 ALL FIRST CrudeFire.PLT
OU FINISHED
*** Message Summary For AERMOD Model Setup ***
--------- Summary of Total Messages --------

| A Total of | 0 Fatal Error Message (s) |
| :--- | :--- |
| A Total of | 1 Warning Message (s) |
| A Total of | 0 Informational Message (s) |

```
    ********* WARNING MESSAGES *********
```

    ********* WARNING MESSAGES *********
    ME W186 67 MEOPEN: THRESH_1MIN 1-min ASOS wind speed threshold used 0.50

```

```

$\star * *$ SETUP Finishes Successfully $* *$
***********************************

```

```

*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL

> *** MODEL SETUP OPTIONS SUMMARY ***
**Model Is Setup For Calculation of Average CoNCentration Values.
-- DEPOSITION LOGIC --
**NO GAS DEPOSITION Data Provided.
**NO PARTICLE DEPOSITION Data Provided.
**Model Uses NO DRY DEPLETION. DRYDPLT = F
**Model Uses RURAL Dispersion Only
**Model Allows User-Specified Options:

1. Stack-tip Downwash.
2. Model Assumes Receptors on FLAT Terrain.
3. Use Calms Processing Routine
4. Use Missing Data Processing Routine.
5. No Exponential Decay.
**Other Options Specified:
CCVR Sub - Meteorological data includes CCVR substitutions
TEMP_Sub - Meteorological data includes TEMP substitutions
**Model Assumes No FLAGPOLE Receptor Heights.
**The User Specified a Pollutant Type of: OTHER
**Model Calculates 1 Short Term Average(s) of: 1-HR
```
**This Run Includes:
1 Source(s);
1 Source Group(s); and
684 Receptor (s)
```

with: $\quad 1$ POINT(s), including
and: $\quad 0$ VOINTCAP (s) and
0 POINTHOR(s)
and: $\quad 0$ VOLUME source(s)
and: $\quad 0$ LINE source( $s$ )
and: $\quad 0$ OPENPIT source(s)
and: $\quad 0$ BUOYANT LINE source(s) with
0 line(s)

```
**Model Set To Continue RUNning After the Setup Testing.
**The AERMET Input Meteorological Data Version Date: 14134
**Output Options Selected:

Model Outputs Tables of Highest Short Term Values by Receptor (RECTABLE Keyword)
Model Outputs Tables of Overall Maximum Short Term Values (MAXTABLE Keyword)
Model Outputs External File(s) of High Values for Plotting (PLOTFILE Keyword)
Model Outputs External File(s) of Ranked Values (RANKFILE Keyword)
NOTE: Option for EXPonential format used in formatted output result files (FILEFORM Keyword)
**NOTE: The Following Flags May Appear Following CONC Values: c for Calm Hours
m for Missing Hours
b for Both Calm and Missing Hours

            Emission Units \(=\) GRAMS/SEC \(\quad ; \quad\) Emission Rate Unit Factor \(=0.10000 \mathrm{E}+07\)
                Output Units \(=\) MICROGRAMS/M**3
**Approximate Storage Requirements of Model \(=\quad 3.6 \mathrm{MB}\) of RAM.
```

- *** AERMOD - VERSION 16216r *** **** CRUDE FIRE, FLAT, NO DOWNWASH
*** AERMET - VERSION 14134 *** ***

```
\(\qquad\)
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL
*** POINT SOURCE DATA ***


ALL SOURCE \({ }_{\text {*** AERMOD }}^{\text {- VERSION } 16216 r ~ * * * ~ * * * ~ C R U D E ~ F I R E, ~ F L A T, ~ N O ~ D O W N W A S H ~}\)
*** AERMET - VERSION \(14134 * * * * * *\) CRUDE FIRE, FLAI, NO DOWNWASH
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL
*** GRIDDED RECEPTOR NETWORK SUMMARY ***
*** NETWORK ID: POL1 ; NETWORK TYPE: GRIDPOLR ***

*** DISTANCE RANGES OF NETWORK ***
(METERS)
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrrrrr}
10.0, & 50.0, & 100.0, & 250.0, & 500.0, & 750.0, & 1000.0, & 1500.0, & 2000.0, \\
3000.0, & 3500.0, & 4000.0, & 4500.0, & 5000.0, & 6000.0, & 7000.0, & 8000.0, & 10000.0,
\end{tabular}

AERMOD CRUDE FIRE
\(* * * ~ D I R E C T I O N ~ R A D I A L S ~ O F ~ N E T W O R K ~ * * ~\)
(DEGREES)

*** METEOROLOGICAL DAYS SELECTED FOR PROCESSING ***
\((1=\mathrm{YES;} 0=\mathrm{NO})\)


NOTE: METEOROLOGICAL DATA ACTUALLY PROCESSED WILL ALSO DEPEND ON WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE DATA FILE.
*** UPPER BOUND OF FIRST THROUGH FIFTH WIND SPEED CATEGORIES ***

\section*{(METERS/SEC)}

*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAI
*** UP TO THE FIRST 24 HOURS OF METEOROLOGICAL DATA ***



*** AERMOD - VERSION 16216r ***
0.00876 (14022209)
0.00453 (11101524) 0.00453 (11101524) 0.00448 (12120507) \(0.00454(13111804)\) 0.00456 (13111804) \(0.00453(10060306)\) \(0.00446(13051524)\)
0.00442 (13051524)
0.00452 (12062501)
0.00513 (14051708 0.00462 (14070708) 0.00715 (14070708) 0.01033 (14070708) 0.01301 (14070708) 0.01406 (14070708) 0.01301 (14070708) 0.01033 (14070708 0.00715 (14070708

\author{
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL
}
*** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALI INCLUDING SOURCE (S): SOURCE

03/08/18
11:02:47
PAGE 8
*** NETWORK ID: POL1
; NETWORK TYPE: GRIDPOLR ***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline DIRECTION (DEGREES) & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
750.00
\]} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{DISTANCE (METERS)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2000.00} & 2500. & 00 \\
\hline 10.0 & 0.01372 & (11072009) & 0.02869 & (11072009) & 0.06807 & (11072009) & 0.09777 & (11072009) & 0.11921 & (12071008) \\
\hline 20.0 & 0.01445 & (13061608) & 0.03263 & (13061608) & 0.07899 & (13061608) & 0.11034 & (13061608) & 0.12257 & (13061608) \\
\hline 30.0 & 0.01679 & (10062708) & 0.03436 & (10062708) & 0.08121 & (10062708) & 0.11809 & (10062708) & 0.13586 & (10062708) \\
\hline 40.0 & 0.01636 & (12092610) & 0.03558 & (12061209) & 0.08916 & (12061209) & 0.12263 & (12061209) & 0.14047 & (11062309) \\
\hline 50.0 & 0.02337 & (14091009) & 0.04626 & (14091009) & 0.08905 & (14091009) & 0.11919 & (12061209) & 0.13058 & (12061209) \\
\hline 60.0 & 0.02715 & (14091009) & 0.05391 & (14091009) & 0.10264 & (14091009) & 0.12281 & (14091009) & 0.12422 & (14091009) \\
\hline 70.0 & 0.02547 & (14091009) & 0.05052 & (14091009) & 0.09664 & (14091009) & 0.11614 & (14070209) & 0.12610 & (14070209) \\
\hline 80.0 & 0.02012 & (14080109) & 0.04424 & (14080109) & 0.08844 & (12092010) & 0.12355 & (12092010) & 0.13685 & (12092010) \\
\hline 90.0 & 0.02792 & (14080109) & 0.06070 & (14080109) & 0.11126 & (14080109) & 0.12639 & (14080109) & 0.13788 & (13060810) \\
\hline 100.0 & 0.03007 & (14080109) & 0.06513 & (14080109) & 0.11832 & (14080109) & 0.13374 & (14080109) & 0.13534 & (14060908) \\
\hline 110.0 & 0.02527 & (14080109) & 0.05517 & (14080109) & 0.10231 & (14080109) & 0.12555 & (10080310) & 0.13068 & (10080310) \\
\hline 120.0 & 0.02737 & (14063010) & 0.06180 & (14063010) & 0.11048 & (14063010) & 0.12935 & (12071109) & 0.14700 & (12071109) \\
\hline 130.0 & 0.02525 & (14063010) & 0.05736 & (14063010) & 0.10364 & (14063010) & 0.12935 & (12071109) & 0.14700 & (12071109) \\
\hline 140.0 & 0.02359 & (14063009) & 0.04627 & (14063009) & 0.09373 & (14063009) & 0.12009 & (14063009) & 0.14494 & (14080208) \\
\hline 150.0 & 0.03273 & (14060808) & 0.06528 & (14060808) & 0.10576 & (14060808) & 0.13176 & (10081709) & 0.14323 & (10081709) \\
\hline 160.0 & 0.03960 & (14060808) & 0.07774 & (14060808) & 0.12265 & (14060808) & 0.13546 & (10081709) & 0.14714 & (10081709) \\
\hline 170.0 & 0.03960 & (14060808) & 0.07774 & (14060808) & 0.12265 & (14060808) & 0.13007 & (14060808) & 0.12498 & (14060808) \\
\hline 180.0 & 0.03273 & (14060808) & 0.06528 & (14060808) & 0.10576 & (14060808) & 0.11348 & (14060808) & 0.12031 & (12091910) \\
\hline 190.0 & 0.02219 & (14060808) & 0.04525 & (14060808) & 0.07685 & (14060808) & 0.10790 & (14070408) & 0.12169 & (14070408) \\
\hline 200.0 & 0.01544 & (10071110) & 0.03099 & (10071110) & 0.06739 & (14070408) & 0.09672 & (14070408) & 0.10953 & (14070408) \\
\hline 210.0 & 0.02132 & (10071110) & 0.04237 & (10071110) & 0.07293 & (10071110) & 0.08111 & (10071110) & 0.09398 & (13102311) \\
\hline 220.0 & 0.02548 & (10071110) & 0.05007 & (10071110) & 0.08384 & (10071110) & 0.09181 & (10071110) & 0.09705 & (11082309) \\
\hline 230.0 & 0.02624 & (10071110) & 0.05145 & (10071110) & 0.08574 & (10071110) & 0.09365 & (10071110) & 0.10531 & (12080410) \\
\hline 240.0 & 0.02331 & (10071110) & 0.04609 & (10071110) & 0.07827 & (10071110) & 0.10465 & (14063008) & 0.13276 & (14063008) \\
\hline 250.0 & 0.01786 & (10071110) & 0.03603 & (11083110) & 0.06888 & (11083110) & 0.09874 & (14063008) & 0.12533 & (14063008) \\
\hline 260.0 & 0.01370 & (14051708) & 0.03054 & (11083110) & 0.06459 & (14051708) & 0.09274 & (14051708) & 0.10523 & (14051708) \\
\hline 270.0 & 0.01395 & (14051708) & 0.02825 & (14051708) & 0.06581 & (14051708) & 0.09438 & (14051708) & 0.10699 & (14051708) \\
\hline 280.0 & 0.01186 & (14051708) & 0.02370 & (14051708) & 0.05545 & (14051708) & 0.08038 & (14051708) & 0.09181 & (14051708) \\
\hline 290.0 & 0.01261 & (14070708) & 0.02932 & (14061009) & 0.06759 & (11122711) & 0.09582 & (11122711) & 0.10710 & (11122711) \\
\hline 300.0 & 0.02091 & (14070708) & 0.03947 & (14070708) & 0.06797 & (10080610) & 0.09373 & (11122711) & 0.10482 & (11122711) \\
\hline 310.0 & 0.03155 & (14070708) & 0.05910 & (14070708) & 0.09453 & (14070708) & 0.10140 & (14070708) & 0.10904 & (14080908) \\
\hline 320.0 & 0.04040 & (14070708) & 0.07465 & (14070708) & 0.11560 & (14070708) & 0.12187 & (14070708) & 0.11575 & (14070708) \\
\hline 330.0 & 0.04382 & (14070708) & 0.08049 & (14070708) & 0.12320 & (14070708) & 0.12915 & (14070708) & 0.12230 & (14070708) \\
\hline 340.0 & 0.04040 & (14070708) & 0.07465 & (14070708) & 0.11560 & (14070708) & 0.12187 & (14070708) & 0.11575 & (14070708) \\
\hline 350.0 & 0.03155 & (14070708) & 0.05910 & (14070708) & 0.09453 & (14070708) & 0.10363 & (12082310) & 0.11013 & (12082310) \\
\hline 360.0 & 0.02091 & (14070708) & 0.03947 & (14070708) & 0.06653 & (14090909) & 0.08881 & (11072009) & 0.10117 & (11072009) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
** THE 1St highest 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL ** INCLUDING SOURCE (S): SOURCE
*** NETWORK ID: POL1 ; NETWORK TYPE: GRIDPOLR ***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
DIRECTION \\
(DEGREES)
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{3000.00} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\[
\begin{array}{cc} 
& \text { DISTANCE } \\
00.00 & \text { (METERS) } \\
4000.00
\end{array}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{4500.00} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{5000.00} \\
\hline 10.0 & 0.13316 & (12071008) & 0.13779 & (12071008) & 0.13797 & (14070707) & 0.14795 & (14070707) & 0.15310 & (14070707) \\
\hline 20.0 & 0.12800 & (12071008) & 0.13242 & (12071008) & 0.13181 & (12071008) & 0.12927 & (14062208) & 0.13029 & (14070707) \\
\hline 30.0 & 0.14066 & (10062708) & 0.13895 & (10062708) & 0.13426 & (10062708) & 0.12825 & (10062708) & 0.12172 & (10062708) \\
\hline 40.0 & 0.14580 & (11062309) & 0.14454 & (11062309) & 0.14023 & (11062309) & 0.13448 & (11062309) & 0.12810 & (11062309) \\
\hline 50.0 & 0.13142 & (12061209) & 0.12771 & (12061209) & 0.12199 & (12061209) & 0.12108 & (12090209) & 0.12429 & (10061508) \\
\hline 60.0 & 0.11940 & (12092610) & 0.12060 & (13081810) & 0.11968 & (10071009) & 0.11766 & (10071009) & 0.11577 & (13080107) \\
\hline 70.0 & 0.13166 & (10071609) & 0.13224 & (10071609) & 0.12944 & (10071609) & 0.12497 & (10071609) & 0.11967 & (10071609) \\
\hline 80.0 & 0.13799 & (12092010) & 0.13374 & (12092010) & 0.12724 & (12092010) & 0.12077 & (10071609) & 0.11597 & (12072409) \\
\hline 90.0 & 0.14065 & (13060810) & 0.13730 & (13060810) & 0.13128 & (13060810) & 0.13320 & (12071108) & 0.14076 & (12071108) \\
\hline 100.0 & 0.13526 & (13071909) & 0.13486 & (13071909) & 0.13514 & (10090509) & 0.14070 & (10090509) & 0.14241 & (10090509) \\
\hline 110.0 & 0.13492 & (12043010) & 0.14267 & (12043010) & 0.14632 & (11082909) & 0.14607 & (11082909) & 0.14473 & (12043009) \\
\hline 120.0 & 0.15049 & (12071109) & 0.14738 & (12071109) & 0.14133 & (12071109) & 0.13404 & (12071109) & 0.12670 & (12043009) \\
\hline 130.0 & 0.15049 & (12071109) & 0.14738 & (12071109) & 0.14133 & (12071109) & 0.13513 & (12080209) & 0.12823 & (12080209) \\
\hline 140.0 & 0.15507 & (14080208) & 0.15645 & (14080208) & 0.15359 & (14080208) & 0.14867 & (14080208) & 0.14280 & (14080208) \\
\hline 150.0 & 0.15006 & (14080208) & 0.15132 & (14080208) & 0.14845 & (14080208) & 0.14361 & (14080208) & 0.13785 & (14080208) \\
\hline 160.0 & 0.14650 & (10081709) & 0.14071 & (10081709) & 0.13291 & (10081709) & 0.12450 & (10081709) & 0.11660 & (14090609) \\
\hline 170.0 & 0.12216 & (10070410) & 0.12733 & (10070410) & 0.12753 & (10070410) & 0.12513 & (10082709) & 0.12618 & (10082709) \\
\hline 180.0 & 0.12067 & (12091910) & 0.11703 & (12091910) & 0.11159 & (12091910) & 0.11362 & (10082709) & 0.11437 & (10082709) \\
\hline 190.0 & 0.12387 & (14070408) & 0.12059 & (14070408) & 0.11712 & (10062809) & 0.11740 & (10062809) & 0.11556 & (10062809) \\
\hline 200.0 & 0.11168 & (14070408) & 0.10878 & (14070408) & 0.10799 & (11082210) & 0.10911 & (11082210) & 0.10831 & (11082210) \\
\hline 210.0 & 0.10628 & (13102311) & 0.11114 & (13102311) & 0.11169 & (13102311) & 0.10995 & (13102311) & 0.10699 & (13102311) \\
\hline 220.0 & 0.10707 & (11082309) & 0.10979 & (11082309) & 0.10860 & (13102311) & 0.10687 & (13102311) & 0.10395 & (13102311) \\
\hline 230.0 & 0.11683 & (12080410) & 0.12057 & (12080410) & 0.12013 & (12080410) & 0.11751 & (12080410) & 0.11371 & (12080410) \\
\hline 240.0 & 0.14637 & (14063008) & 0.15045 & (14063008) & 0.14933 & (14063008) & 0.14551 & (14063008) & 0.14030 & (14063008) \\
\hline 250.0 & 0.13817 & (14063008) & 0.14193 & (14063008) & 0.14071 & (14063008) & 0.13694 & (14063008) & 0.13186 & (14063008) \\
\hline 260.0 & 0.10743 & (14051708) & 0.10469 & (14051708) & 0.10359 & (13042311) & 0.10439 & (13042311) & 0.10469 & (14080207) \\
\hline 270.0 & 0.10919 & (14051708) & 0.10639 & (14051708) & 0.10142 & (14051708) & 0.09559 & (14051708) & 0.08952 & (14051708) \\
\hline 280.0 & 0.09402 & (14051708) & 0.09170 & (14051708) & 0.08741 & (14051708) & 0.08233 & (14051708) & 0.07704 & (14051708) \\
\hline 290.0 & 0.10920 & (11122711) & 0.10723 & (11122711) & 0.10339 & (11122711) & 0.09868 & (11122711) & 0.09360 & (11122711) \\
\hline 300.0 & 0.11110 & (14062008) & 0.11459 & (14080908) & 0.11485 & (14080908) & 0.11365 & (13082408) & 0.11214 & (13082408) \\
\hline 310.0 & 0.12308 & (14080908) & 0.12838 & (14080908) & 0.12886 & (14080908) & 0.12682 & (14080908) & 0.12349 & (14080908) \\
\hline 320.0 & 0.12293 & (13081709) & 0.12364 & (13081709) & 0.12070 & (13081709) & 0.12467 & (13080309) & 0.12587 & (13080309) \\
\hline 330.0 & 0.11237 & (13081709) & 0.11302 & (13081709) & 0.11422 & (13080309) & 0.11837 & (13080309) & 0.11942 & (13080309) \\
\hline 340.0 & 0.10709 & (12082310) & 0.10831 & (14070109) & 0.10774 & (14070109) & 0.10554 & (14070109) & 0.10247 & (14070109) \\
\hline 350.0 & 0.10953 & (12082310) & 0.10597 & (12082310) & 0.10099 & (12082310) & 0.09515 & (12082310) & 0.09009 & (12082310) \\
\hline 360.0 & 0.10379 & (11072009) & 0.10695 & (14060907) & 0.10813 & (14060907) & 0.10671 & (14060907) & 0.10386 & (14060907) \\
\hline *** AERMOD & SION 162 & \(16 r\) *** & UDE FIRE & , FLAT, NO & WASH & & & & & /08/18 \\
\hline ** AERMET & ION 141 & 34 *** & & & & & & & & 02:47 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
*** MODELOPTs: NonDFAULT CONC FLAT RURAL
*** THE 1ST HIGHEST 1-HR AVERAGE CONCENTRATION VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL *** INCLUDING SOURCE (S): SOURCE ,
*** NETWORK ID: POL1 ; NETWORK TYPE: GRIDPOLR ***
** CONC OF OTHER IN MICROGRAMS/M**3

AERMOD CRUDE FIRE



\title{
FATAL ERROR MESSAGES ********
}
*** NONE ***
******** WARNING MESSAGES ********
ME W186 67 MEOPEN: THRESH_1MIN 1-min ASOS wind speed threshold used
0.50

\section*{\(* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *\)}


\section*{Appendix C. 4}

Cumulative Risk Calculations

\section*{Cumulative Oil Trucking FN Calculations}

Table 1 - Plains Pentland Terminal (Segment N-Betteravia Road Interchange to State Route 166 Interchange)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ Proposed Project } & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{ With Mitigation } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of \(\mathbf{N}\) \\
or More \\
Fatalities
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of \(\mathbf{N}\) \\
or More Serious \\
Injuries
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of N \\
or More \\
Fatalities
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of N \\
or More Serious \\
Injuries
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & \(4.51 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(7.55 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(3.70 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(6.20 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 2 & \(2.12 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(3.49 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(1.70 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.80 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 3 & \(5.40 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.12 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(4.40 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.70 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 4 & \(2.70 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.57 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.20 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.30 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 5 & \(1.08 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.19 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(8.80 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(1.80 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

From ExxonMobil Interim Trucking TQRA, February 2020.

Table 2 - Aera TQRA (Segment B1-Betteravia Road Interchange to State Route 166 Interchange)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{\(\begin{array}{c}\text { \# of Fatalities/ } \\
\text { Serious Injuries }\end{array}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(\begin{array}{c}\text { Proposed Project } \\
\text { or More } \\
\text { Fatalities }\end{array}\)} & \(\begin{array}{c}\text { Frequency of N } \\
\text { or More Serious } \\
\text { Injuries }\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{c}\text { Frequency of N } \\
\text { or More } \\
\text { Fatalities }\end{array}\)
\end{tabular} \(\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { Frequency of N } \\
\text { or More Serious } \\
\text { Injuries }\end{array}\right]\)

From Aera East Cat Canyon TQRA, July 2019.

Table 3 - Peak Year of Overlapping Trucks-US 101
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Project } & \# Trucks per day & \# Trucks per Year \\
\hline ExxonMobil & 68 & 24,820 \\
\hline ERG & 13 & 4,745 \\
\hline Other North County & 1 & 365 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Data from Cumulative Project Laden Truck Analysis

Table 3a - Peak Year of Overlapping Trucks-US 101 Clark Rd to Betteravia Rd -FPP Operational
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|r|}{ Project } & \# Trucks per day & \# Trucks per Year \\
\hline ExxonMobil & 70 & 25,550 \\
\hline ERG & 13 & 4,745 \\
\hline Other NC & 7 & 2,555 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Data from Cumulative Project Laden Truck Analysis.

Table 3b - Peak Year of Overlapping Trucks-US 101 Clark Rd to Betteravia Rd -No FPP
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Project } & \# Trucks per day & \# Trucks per Year \\
\hline ExxonMobil & 70 & 25,550 \\
\hline ERG & 63 & 22,995 \\
\hline Other NC & 7 & 2,555 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Data from Cumulative Project Laden Truck Analysis.

\section*{Cumulative Oil Trucking FN Calculations}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ExxonMobil} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ERG} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Other North County} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Total Cumulative Risk} \\
\hline & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Frequency of } \mathrm{N} \\
\text { or More } \\
\text { Fatalities } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries \\
\hline 1 & 4.51E-06 & 7.55E-06 & \(9.30 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.57 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 7.16E-08 & \(1.21 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 5.51E-06 & \(9.24 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 2 & 2.12E-06 & 3.49E-06 & 4.26E-07 & 7.28E-07 & \(3.28 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(5.60 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 2.58E-06 & \(4.27 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 3 & \(5.40 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 2.12E-06 & \(1.12 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 4.37E-07 & 8.62E-09 & \(3.36 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 6.61E-07 & \(2.59 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 4 & \(2.70 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.57 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(5.83 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 3.25E-07 & 4.48E-09 & \(2.50 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 3.33E-07 & \(1.92 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 5 & \(1.08 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 2.19E-07 & \(2.35 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 4.71E-08 & 1.81E-09 & 3.62E-09 & \(1.33 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.70 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ExxonMobil risk number from TQRA, February 2020. Assume no risk reduction measures
ERG and Other North County risk numbers based upon Aera TQRA, July 2019. Numbers prorated by number of trucks per day. Assume no risk reduction measures.
Risk represents peak one-kilometer per year.

Table 5 - Cumulative Risk for Highway 101 Betteravia Interchange to State Route 166 East Interchange (Mitigated)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ExxonMobil} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ERG} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Other North County} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Total Cumulative Risk} \\
\hline & Frequency of N or More Fatalities & Frequency of N or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of N or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries \\
\hline 1 & 3.70E-06 & 6.20E-06 & \(9.30 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.57 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 7.16E-08 & \(1.21 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 4.70E-06 & 7.89E-06 \\
\hline 2 & \(1.70 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 2.80E-06 & \(4.26 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 7.28E-07 & 3.28E-08 & \(5.60 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 2.16E-06 & 3.58E-06 \\
\hline 3 & \(4.40 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.70 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(1.12 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 4.37E-07 & 8.62E-09 & \(3.36 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 5.61E-07 & 2.17E-06 \\
\hline 4 & \(2.20 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.30 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(5.83 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(3.25 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(4.48 \mathrm{E}-09\) & \(2.50 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 2.83E-07 & \(1.65 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 5 & 8.80E-08 & \(1.80 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.35 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 4.71E-08 & \(1.81 \mathrm{E}-09\) & 3.62E-09 & \(1.13 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 2.31E-07 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ExxonMobil risk number from TQRA, February 2020 and assume incorporation of Applicant proposed risk reduction measures
ERG risk numbers based upon Aera TQRA, July 2019. Numbers prorated by number of trucks per day. Assumes no risk reduction measures for ERG.
Risk represents peak one-kilometer per year.

\section*{Cumulative Oil Trucking FN Calculations}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Segment} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Total Frequency per km-year}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Ratio} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & Fatality & Injury & Fatality & Injury \\
\hline Segment J-Clark Road to Betteravia Road & 1.50E-06 & 2.50E-06 & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{41\%} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{40\%} \\
\hline Segment N-Betteravia Road Interchange to State Route 166 Interchange & 3.70E-06 & 6.20E-06 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Proposed Project
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{ With Mitigation } \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of N \\
or More \\
Fatalities
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of N \\
or More Serious \\
Injuries
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of N \\
or More \\
Fatalities
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Frequency of N \\
or More Serious \\
Injuries
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1 & \(1.83 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(3.04 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(1.50 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.50 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 2 & \(8.59 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.41 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(6.89 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.13 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 3 & \(2.19 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(8.55 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.78 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(6.85 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline & \(1.09 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(6.33 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(8.92 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(5.24 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline 4 & \(4.38 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(8.83 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(3.57 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(7.26 \mathrm{E}-08\) \\
\hline 5 & \\
From ExxonMobil Interim Trucking TQRA, February 2020. & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

From ExxonMobil Interim Trucking TQRA, February 2020.
Calculated from ExxonMobil Interim Trucking TQRA based
(Ry based upon ratio of total frequency per kilometer-year for fatality and injury by segment.
Table 7-Aera (Segment J-Clark Road to Betteravia Road)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Segment & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ Total Frequency per km-year } & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{ Ratio } \\
\hline & Fatality & Injury & Fatality & Injury \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline Segment L1-Clark Road to Betteravia Road & \(30 \%\) & \\
\hline Segment B1-Betteravia Road Interchange to State Route 166 Interchange & \(5.70 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.90 \mathrm{E}-06\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Proposed Project} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{With Mitigation} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
Frequency of \(N\) \\
or More \\
Fatalities
\end{tabular} & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries \\
\hline 1 & \(2.52 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(4.23 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(1.69 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.90 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 2 & \(1.15 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(1.96 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 7.85E-07 & \(1.33 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 3 & \(3.04 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.18 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.11 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(7.85 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline 4 & \(1.58 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 8.76E-07 & \(1.06 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(5.74 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline 5 & \(6.38 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 1.27E-07 & \(4.23 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 8.46E-08 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

From Aera East Cat Canyon TQRA, July 2019
Calculated from Aera Trucking TQRA based upon ratio of total frequency per kilometer-year for fatality and injury by segment.

\section*{Cumulative Oil Trucking FN Calculations}

Table 8 - Cumulative Risk for Clark Road to Betteravia Road (Unmitigated)-With Foxen Canyon Pipeline
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ExxonMobil} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ERG} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Other North County} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Total Cumulative Risk} \\
\hline & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of N or More Serious Injuries \\
\hline 1 & \(1.83 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(3.04 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.82 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(4.74 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.52 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.55 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.26 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(3.77 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 2 & 8.59E-07 & \(1.41 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 1.29E-07 & \(2.20 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 6.96E-08 & \(1.18 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 1.06E-06 & 1.75E-06 \\
\hline 3 & 2.19E-07 & 8.55E-07 & \(3.40 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(1.32 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.83 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 7.11E-08 & \(2.71 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.06 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 4 & \(1.09 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 6.33E-07 & \(1.77 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 9.82E-08 & 9.53E-09 & 5.29E-08 & \(1.37 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 7.84E-07 \\
\hline 5 & \(4.38 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 8.83E-08 & 7.14E-09 & \(1.42 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 3.85E-09 & 7.66E-09 & \(5.48 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(1.10 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ExxonMobil risk number from TQRA, February 2020. Assume no risk reduction measures.

ERG and Other North County risk numbers based upon Aera TQRA, July 2019. Numbers prorated by number of trucks per day. Assume no risk reduction measures.
Risk represents peak one-kilometer per year.

Table 9 - Cumulative Risk for Clark Road to Betteravia Road (Mitigated)-With Foxen Canyon Pipeline
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \# of Fatalities/ Serious Injuries & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ExxonMobil} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ERG} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Other North County} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Total Cumulative Risk} \\
\hline & Frequency of N or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of N or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of N or More Fatalities & Frequency of N or More Serious Injuries \\
\hline 1 & \(1.50 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.50 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(2.82 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 4.74E-07 & \(1.52 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 2.55E-07 & \(1.78 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 2.97E-06 \\
\hline 2 & \(6.89 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.13 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(1.29 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.20 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 6.96E-08 & \(1.18 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(8.18 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.35 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 3 & \(1.78 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(6.85 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(3.40 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(1.32 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.83 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 7.11E-08 & \(2.12 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(8.18 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline 4 & 8.92E-08 & 5.24E-07 & \(1.77 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 9.82E-08 & 9.53E-09 & 5.29E-08 & \(1.07 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 6.22E-07 \\
\hline 5 & 3.57E-08 & 7.26E-08 & 7.14E-09 & \(1.42 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 3.85E-09 & 7.66E-09 & \(4.28 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(8.68 \mathrm{E}-08\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ExxonMobil risk number from TQRA, February 2020 and assume incorporation of Applicant proposed risk reduction measures
ERG and Other North County risk numbers based upon Aera TQRA, July 2019. Numbers prorated by number of trucks per day. Assumes to risk reduction measures.
Risk represents peak one-kilometer per year.

\section*{Cumulative Oil Trucking FN Calculations}

Table 10 - Cumulative Risk for Clark Road to Betteravia Road (Unmitigated)-Without Foxen Canyon Pipeline
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ExxonMobil} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{ERG} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Other North County} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Total Cumulative Risk} \\
\hline & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries \\
\hline 1 & 1.83E-06 & 3.04E-06 & 1.37E-06 & 2.30E-06 & \(1.52 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.55 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(3.35 \mathrm{E}-06\) & \(5.60 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 2 & 8.59E-07 & \(1.41 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 6.27E-07 & \(1.07 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 6.96E-08 & \(1.18 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.56 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 2.59E-06 \\
\hline 3 & 2.19E-07 & 8.55E-07 & \(1.65 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 6.40E-07 & \(1.83 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 7.11E-08 & 4.02E-07 & \(1.57 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 4 & \(1.09 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 6.33E-07 & 8.57E-08 & \(4.76 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(9.53 \mathrm{E}-09\) & \(5.29 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(2.05 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.16 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 5 & 4.38E-08 & 8.83E-08 & \(3.46 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 6.89E-08 & 3.85E-09 & 7.66E-09 & 8.23E-08 & \(1.65 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ExxonMobil risk number from TQRA, February 2020. Assume no risk reduction measures.

ERG and Other North County risk numbers based upon Aera TQRA, July 2019. Numbers prorated by number of trucks per day. Assume no risk reduction measures.
Risk represents peak one-kilometer per year.

Table 11 - Cumulative Risk for Clark Road to Betteravia Road (Mitigated)-Without Foxen Canyon Pipeline
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\# of Fatalities/ \\
Serious Injuries
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ExxonMobil} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{ERG} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Other North County} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Total Cumulative Risk} \\
\hline & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & \begin{tabular}{l}
Frequency of \(N\) or More \\
Fatalities
\end{tabular} & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries & Frequency of \(N\) or More Fatalities & Frequency of \(N\) or More Serious Injuries \\
\hline 1 & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & \(1.37 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 2.30E-06 & \(1.52 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(2.55 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.37 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 2.30E-06 \\
\hline 2 & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & 6.27E-07 & \(1.07 \mathrm{E}-06\) & 6.96E-08 & \(1.18 \mathrm{E}-07\) & 6.27E-07 & \(1.07 \mathrm{E}-06\) \\
\hline 3 & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & \(1.65 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(6.40 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(1.83 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(7.11 \mathrm{E}-08\) & \(1.65 \mathrm{E}-07\) & \(6.40 \mathrm{E}-07\) \\
\hline 4 & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & 8.57E-08 & 4.76E-07 & \(9.53 \mathrm{E}-09\) & \(5.29 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 8.57E-08 & 4.76E-07 \\
\hline 5 & 0.00E+00 & \(0.00 \mathrm{E}+00\) & \(3.46 \mathrm{E}-08\) & 6.89E-08 & 3.85E-09 & 7.66E-09 & 3.46E-08 & 6.89E-08 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ExxonMobil risk number from TQRA, February 2020 and assume incorporation of Applicant proposed risk reduction measures.
ERG and Other North County risk numbers based upon Aera TQRA, July 2019. Numbers prorated by number of trucks per day. Assumes to risk reduction measures.
Risk represents peak one-kilometer per year.

\section*{Appendix C. 5}

\section*{Draft ExxonM obil Crude Oil Transportation Risk M anagement and Prevention Program}

\section*{SYU LFC INTERIM TRUCKING CRUDE OIL TRANSPORTATION RISK MANAGEMENT AND PREVENTION PROGRAM (CO-TRMPP)}

\subsection*{1.0 Introduction and Objective}

ExxonMobil's Santa Ynez Unit Facility (SYU) finalized permitted and construction and began operations in 1993. Since that time, all crude oil export has occurred via the Plains All American Pipeline Line 901 and 903 (PAAPL) which is connected to the LFC facilities at the LFC Transportation Terminal. In May 2015, the PAAPL Line 901 pipeline experienced an incident where a failure resulted in the shutdown of both Line 901 and 903 that SYU utilized to transport crude to refineries.

ExxonMobil is submitting the SYU LFC Interim Trucking application to allow production operations to re-start at the Santa Ynez Unit following shutdown of the PAAPL pipeline and subsequent preservation of the SYU facilities. The application requests operation of interim trucking until a pipeline alternative is available. The interim trucking facilities would be located in Las Flores Canyon (LFC) approximately twelve (12) miles west of Goleta and consist of the activities described in Attachment A. 3 Description..

All highway transportation from LFC will be limited to State Highway 101; no truck traffic will be directed through State Highway 154. Transportation in urban areas will be limited to the extent feasible.

Truck loading and transportation operations would occur seven days a week, 24-hours per day except as noted below. After unloading at one of the designated facilities, the trucks could return directly back to LFC to reload or they could be reassigned to other operations.

This Crude Oil Transportation Risk Management and Prevention Program (CO-TRMPP) has been developed to ensure that the interim trucking is conducted in a safe and efficient manner.

\subsection*{2.0 Elements of the CO-TRMPP}

The CO-TRMPP shall apply to any and all highway shipments of product from ExxonMobil's SYU facility in Las Flores Canyon to the regional receiving locations as part of the LFC interim trucking.

Product carriers shall be required to complete the "Crude Oil - Motor Carrier Safety Survey" (Exhibit A) prior to starting shipments from LFC. LFC Operations personnel will verify that each carrier meets or exceeds the safety standards. LFC Operations personnel will also conduct a safety and operability inspection (checklist) of trucks prior to loading and prior to transport from LFC. Any truck that receives an unsatisfactory inspection will no longer be permitted to transport product until the issue has been corrected.

LFC Operations has also developed a procedure for the trucks to follow during the truck loading. If, based on ExxonMobil operator observations, the carrier's actual performance in loading at LFC is inconsistent with the Safety Survey, safety inspection, or the procedure, ExxonMobil will re-evaluate the carrier's ability to safely load and haul product. If the issues cannot be resolved to demonstrate the carrier's ability to safely load and haul product, use of that carrier will be discontinued until they successfully satisfy ExxonMobil's requirements.

There are no specific, pre-established criteria for terminating use of a carrier insofar as there are potentially many different situations in which ExxonMobil may decide to take such action. For the most part, this decision will be based on operational and technical judgment made by LFC operating and engineering personnel after reviewing the facts of the situation at that time. In general, any human or mechanical issues that pose the potential to compromise safe operations will be cause for discontinuing use of any carrier until such issues are resolved to ExxonMobil's satisfaction.

An ExxonMobil operator will be present during the loading activities. The operators will be trained prior to commencing loading operations and what to inspect using the developed procedure and checklist. The operator will advise his or her supervisor if there is an issue with the truck or driver. If an issue is observed prior to loading, the truck will not be loaded and the carrier's dispatcher will be notified to correct the issue before the truck will be loaded or to send another truck. If an issue is discovered after a truck is loaded (e.g., overload, leak), the driver will be instructed not to leave LFC until the issue is corrected.

In addition to the ExxonMobil LFC company compliance plans, the selected carrier will have compliance plans in place to respond to accidents and other incidents such as listed below:
- Emergency Action Plan
- Spill Prevention Emergency Response Containment Plan
- Incident Investigation and Reporting Policy
- Incident Reporting Flow Chart

ExxonMobil will include provisions in its contracts with each carrier to require a number of safety and operational requirements. The requirements are included in the Crude Truck Loading Procedure and the LFC Site Specific Safety Training for All Truck Drivers.

A number of the safety and operational requirements are summarized below (Reference Crude Transport Truck Driver Training):

Required Pre-Mobilization Training Requirements
- Carrier(s) Driver Orientation and Passport Safety Training
- ExxonMobil Las Flores Canyon Site Specific Training
- LFC Crude Transport Truck Driver Training

Required Clothing and PPE for Drivers in LFC:
- Compliance with Facial Hair Policy
- FRCs (Coveralls or Long Sleeve Shirt and Long Paints)
- Sturdy Steel-Toed Work Boots
- Safety Glasses/Goggles, Impact Resistant Gloves, and Hardhat
- Personal \(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}\) Monitor
- Earplugs

Reminders:
- Smoking not allowed when within LFC
- Zero tolerance for Alcohol / Drugs / Firearms - Do not bring on site; Subject to random search
- No liquids (e.g., water, coffee, etc.) allowed to be poured on the ground when within LFC

Truck Restrictions:
- Truck equipped with operating speed monitoring system
- Truck trailer empty when arriving at LFC per contract
- Trailers used for The LFC interim trucking exclusively dedicated to crude oil transportation service
- Trailer empty prior to loading
- Truck/Trailer placards in accordance with DOT regulations
- Crude Oil Safety Data Sheet (SDS) in Truck
- Crude Transport Truck Driver Training document in Truck
- Maximum Truck/Trailer height cannot exceed 13.5 feet
- Maximum Truck/Trailer weight with full load cannot exceed 80,000 pound limit

\section*{Truck Route Restrictions}
- Routes to and from LFC restricted
- Use of Hwy 101 El Capitan Beach exit not allowed
- Truck operations to occur 24-Hours per day, 7 days per week
- Exception: All trucks involved in the LFC interim trucking will observe a curfew when travelling on Calle Real if deemed appropriate. Truck traffic will not travel on Calle Real between El Capitan exit and Refugio exit during the hours of 7:45 am to 8:30 am and 2:55 pm to 3:40 pm. This restriction only applies when the school is in regular operation and students are being bussed.

\section*{Driving in LFC}
- Protected species known to be on site - Do not approach, harass or intentionally harm any wildlife
- Watch for wildlife on and adjacent to road: Avoid where safe to do so; All wildlife is protected on site. Includes deer, rabbits, foxes, bobcats, frogs, turtles, etc.
- Report observations of injured, dead or potentially dangerous wildlife to ExxonMobil representative
- Truck speed limit within LFC is 15 MPH - no exceptions
- Watch for oncoming traffic. Some areas of the road are narrow and have blind curves
- Watch for directional signs to Weigh Area, Holding Area, and Loading Area
- Drivers to have an operating cell phone; Phone use prohibited within LFC facility (includes driving, waiting or loading)

EXHIBIT A - Crude Oil - Motor Carrier Safety Survey

\title{
EXHIBIT A \\ Crude Oil- Motor Carrier Safety Survey Santa Ynez Unit Facility
}

\section*{General Information}

Interview Location \(\qquad\)
Carrier Personnel Interviewed \(\qquad\)
Date of Interview \(\qquad\)
Equipment: No. of tractors owned by Company/Operator \(\qquad\)
Replacement Policy for Tractors \(\qquad\)
No. of trailers/tanks owned by Company/Operator \(\qquad\)
Replacement Policy for Tanks/Trailers \(\qquad\)

No. of Drivers \(\qquad\)

\section*{Company Safety Indicators}
a. DOT reportable accident rate per million vehicle miles: \(\qquad\)
b. Insurance premium cost per one hundred dollars of gross receipts: \(\qquad\)
c. Insurance Carriers \(\qquad\)
d. Liability Limits \(\qquad\)
e. Deductible \(\qquad\)
f. Does your insurance extend to subhaulers? \(\qquad\)
g. Current Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety (BMCS) rating \(\qquad\)
h. Date of last BMCS Safety Survey \(\qquad\)
i. Type of BMCS Violations Recorded \(\qquad\)
j. Citations/fines, if any, by Department of Transportation during past 3 years.

\section*{Company Drivers}
a. Minimum Years Driving Experience \(\qquad\)
b. Physical Examination Required? \(\qquad\)
c. Number of Moving Violations permitted \(\qquad\)
d. Number of reportable accidents permitted \(\qquad\)

\section*{Driver Training}
a. Length of New Driver Training \(\qquad\)
b. Frequency of Existing Driver Training \(\qquad\)
c. Type of Training Used (Circle those that apply): Lecture Video Literature
d. Training Administered by: Company Staff Driver/trainer Professional Firm
e. Records of training maintained for each driver?
f. Training Topics Covered

> Yes

No
1. Speeding Policy \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
2. Alcohol/narcotics/drug abuse \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
3. Hazardous Materials \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
4. Placarding
5. Emergency Procedures
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
6. Emergency Communications
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
7. Rail/highway crossing procedures
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
8. Vehicle Inspections
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
9. Drivers Logs
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
10. Loading/bracing/blocking
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
11. Site Safety Rule Policy \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
12. Bulk Truck Specifics
i. Loading/Unloading \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
ii. Equipment Operation \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
iii. Equipment Inspection \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
iv. Emergency Response \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)

\section*{Driver Management}
a. Do you have a speed limit policy? If so, summarize.
\(\qquad\)
b. Do you have automated speed controls on trucks? If so, summarize.
\(\qquad\)
c. Do you use remote electronic monitoring of driver performance? If so, summarize.
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
d. Are drivers required to report traffic violations? If so, summarize.
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
e. Do you have policies for logging violations? If so, summarize.
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
f. Do you have a method to allow for address public complaints? If so, summarize.
\(\qquad\)
g. Are passengers allowed in the truck cab? If so, summarize.
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
h. Do you perform regular driver performance reviews, including safety compliance?
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
i. Do you employ a full-time safety coordinator and or team?
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)

\section*{Vehicle Inspections \& Maintenance}
a. Do you drivers conduct pre-trip inspections? If so, are records kept?
\(\qquad\)
b. Do you drivers conduct post-trip inspections? If so, are records kept?
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
c. Are vehicle inspections and maintenance performed at an in-house facility or an outside professional repair facility?
\(\qquad\)
d. At what frequency are the following tractor items proactively inspected/replaced?
1. Steering Controls \(\qquad\)
2. Brakes \(\qquad\)
3. Safety/Emergency Equipment \(\qquad\)
4. Lights \(\qquad\)
5. Windshield Glass \(\qquad\)
6. Engine Hoses \(\qquad\)
7. Fluid Levels \(\qquad\)
8. Tires \(\qquad\)
9. Couplings/Air Hose Condition \(\qquad\)
10. Fifth Wheel Lube/Locking \(\qquad\)
11. Undercarriage \(\qquad\)
e. Where and how often are visual inspections of tank trailers performed?
f. Where and how often are hydrostatic tests of tank trailers performed?
\(\qquad\)

\section*{Appendix C. 6}

Cultural Resources within 500 feet of the Trucking Routes

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-40-000084 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
000084
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1950 (Lathrop, Pilling, Fenenga, University of California, Santa Barbara) \\
1970 (T. Anderson, J. M. Farrar, Archaeological Research, Inc.) \\
1999 (A. Ruby, M. Darcangelo, Far Western Anthropological Research)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-40-000094 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
000094
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1870 (Schumacher, none given) \\
1968 (H. \& I. Wadhams, none given)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-000095 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 000095
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
1874 (Schumacher, none given) \\
1968 (Homer \& Lillian Wadhams, none given) \\
1968 (R. Desautels (?), none given) \\
1968 (Al McCurdy, none given) \\
2013 (Patricia Mikkelsen, Far Western)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-000288 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
000288
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1960 (Wire, University of California) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-000298 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 000298
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1959 (Jack Smith, University of California) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-000576 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
000576
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1970 (T. Anderson and J. M. Farrar, Archaeological Research Inc. Costa Mesa) \\
2013 (Deborah Jones, Far Western Anthropological Research Group)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-40-000577 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 000577
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1970 (T. Anderson and J. M. Farrar, Archaeological Research Inc. Costa Mesa) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-000578 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 000578 / \mathrm{H}
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1970 (J. M. Farrar and T. Anderson, Archaeological Research Inc. Costa Mesa) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-000579 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 000579 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1970 (J. M. Farrar and T. Anderson, Archaeological Research Inc. Costa Mesa) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-001084 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 001084
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1983 (Dennis K. Quillen, R. Franklin, Westec Services, Inc.) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-001140 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 001140
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (H. Neff, A. Ruela, J. Harmon, UCSB) & Within \\
\hline P-40-001141 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SLO- } \\
001141
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (B. Johnson, A. Ruelas, H. Neff, UCSB) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-001142 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 001142
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (B. Johnson, A. Ruelas, H. Neff, UCSB) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-001143 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 001143 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (H. Neff, J, Hanson, P. Lagrez) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-001144 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 001144
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (C Webb, J. Wighhill, B.Glover, UCSB) 1999 (M. Darcangelo, Far Western) & Within \\
\hline P-40-001153 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 001153
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1986 (Taffe Semenza, Center for Archaeological Studies, UCSB) & Within \\
\hline P-40-002045 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 002045
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1999 (M. Darcangelo, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.) & Within \\
\hline P-40-002191 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SLO- } \\
002191
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2001 (Terry Jostlin, Krista Kiaha, Kelda Wilson, Caltrans District 05) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-002843 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SLO- } \\
& 002843
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2017 (Gerrit Fenenga, CAL FIRE) & Within \\
\hline P-40-038037 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1986 (Semenza, UCSB) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-038038 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1986 (Jim Mayberry, NMSU (Las Cruces NM)) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-40-038183 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1999 (A. Ruby, Far Western) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-038294 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 2013 (Terry L. Joslin) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-041033 & N/A & Other & Historic & 1999 (L. Leach Palm (FW), S. Mikesell (JRP), Far Western Anthropological Research Group Inc.; JRP Historical Consulting Services) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-40-041034 & N/A & Structure & Historic & 1999 (L. Leach Palm (FW), T. Joslin (Caltrans District 5), Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.; Caltrans District 5) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000085 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000085
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1928 (David B. Rogers) \\
1991 (Robert Sheets)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000086 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000086
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1929 (Rogers) \\
1985 (Joe D. Hood, California State Parks and Recreation) \\
2001 (Ivan Strudwick, LSA Assoc.) \\
2003 (Bob Sheet, Mike Imalle, Leeann Haslouer, \\
Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation) \\
2014 (M. Mealey, M. Graham, E. Pawlowski, B. \\
Tehada, Janet Hall Garcia, Various)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-42-000087 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000087
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1926 (D. B. Rogers) \\
1960 (Klug, University of California, Department of Anthropology) \\
1985 (Semenza, New Mexico State University) 1989 (P. Hines, B. Rivers, T. Wheeler, California Department of Parks and Recreation) 2001 (L. Haslouer and I. Strudwick, LSA Associates) 2003 (Bob Sheets, Mike Imwalle, Leeann Haslouer, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation) 2014 (M. Mealey, M. Graham, E. Pawlowski, B. Tejada, Janet Hall Garcia, Various)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000089 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000089
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1929 \text { (David B. Rogers) } \\
& 1999 \text { (A. Ruby) } \\
& 2015 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000090 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000090
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1929 (David B. Rogers) 1999 (A. Ruby) & Within \\
\hline P-42-000091 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
000091
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1929 (David B. Rogers) \\
1962 (E. McKinney)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000092 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000092
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1929 (David B. Rogers) 1999 (A. Ruby) & Within \\
\hline P-42-000093 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
000093 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1929 (David B. Rogers) \\
2003 (B. Sheets, L, Haslouer, M. Imwalle)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000095 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000095
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1929 (David B. Rogers) \\
2003 (B. Sheets, L. Haslouer, M. Imwalle)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000096 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000096 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1929 (David B. Rogers) \\
2004 (James J. Schmidt)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-000108 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
000108
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1928 (David B. Rogers) \\
1989 (P. Hines, B. Rivers, T. Wheeler) \\
2003 (B. Sheets, M. Imwall. L. Haslouer)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-42-000166 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
000166
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1944 (Orr) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-42-000245 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
000245
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1936 \text { (Ruth) } \\
& 2001 \text { (Ivan Strudwick) }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-000557 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 000557
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1934 \\
& 1949 \text { (W.D. Strong) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Within \\
\hline P-42-000574 & CA-SBA000574 & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1968 \\
2009 (T. Carpenter) \\
2013 (Nathan Stevens and Patricia Mikkelsen, Far Western Anthropological Research Group)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-42-000585 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
000585
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1970 (T. Anderson, JM Farrar, none given) \\
1999 (A. Ruby, T. Carpenter) \\
2013 (Patricia Mikkelsen and Valerie Levulett, Far Western Anthropological Research Group)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-42-000586 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
000586
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1970 \\
1999 (A. Ruby); \\
2013 (Patricia Mikkelsen, Valerie Levulett, Far \\
Western Anthropological Research Group; Caltrans District 5)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-42-001101 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001101 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline 1971 \\
& 2003 \text { (F.A. Riddell) }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001151 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001151 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 1980 \\
1999 \text { (J. Johnson) } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001152 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001152
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline 1980 \\
& 1999 \text { (J.Johnson) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001156 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001156 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1980 \\
& 1989 \text { (John Erlandson) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001157 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001157
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline 1981 \\
& 2003 \text { (Jon Erlandson) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001184 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001184
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1980 (J. Johnson, J. Hudson, Anth 181 field class.) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001185 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001185
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1980
1999 (J.Johnson, J. Hudson, Anth 181 field class) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001204 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001204
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline 1981 \\
& 1999 \text { (Jon Erlandson) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Within \\
\hline P-42-001506 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001506
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1974 (L. Wilcoxon) & Within \\
\hline P-42-001555 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001555 / H
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
1984 (R. Peterson, F. Duncan, Office of Public Archaeology, Anthropology, UCSB); \\
1984 (R. Peterson, F. Duncan, J. Erlandson, Office of Public Archaeology, Dept. of Anthroplogy, UCSB); 1984 (M. Wendorf, University of California, Los Angeles Regional Office); \\
1989 (A. George Toren, ERC Environmental and Energy Services Co.); \\
2014 (Jay Rehor, URS Corporation)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-42-001675 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001675 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 1981 \\
1992 \text { (Jon Erlandson) } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001731 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001731 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 1982 \\
2001 \text { (Hector Neff) } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001732 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001732
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & 1981 (L. Spanne and J.Weighill) & Within \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-42-001733 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001733
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1982 (L. Spanne, I. Weighill) & Within \\
\hline P-42-001766 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001766 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 1982 \\
2001 \text { (Dr. E.G. Stickel) }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001786 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001786
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 1982 \\
2003 \text { (K. Osland) } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001821 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001821 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1983; } \\
& 1998 \text { (T. Jacques, J. Thesken) }
\end{aligned}
\] & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001822 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
001822 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1983 (Terri Jacques) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001828 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001828 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1983 (S, Arter, K. Osland, D. Quillen, R. Franklin) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001900 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001900
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1984 \\
& 1999 \text { (Brain C. Amme) }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001901 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001901
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1984 \\
& 1999 \text { (Brian C. Amme) }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001916 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
001916 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 1985 \\
1985 \text { (J.D.Hood) } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001952 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
001952 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1985 (Joyce Clevenger, Theodore Cooley, WESTEC Services Inc., Ventura) & Within \\
\hline P-42-001954 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001954
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1985 (L. Wilcoxon, Brenda Bowser, Michael Imwalle, Consulting Archaeologist, 1322-A Montecito Pl. Santa Barbara, Ca.) \\
1987 (T. Gonzalez R. Hawkins, Dames and Moore, 820 fifth ave, San Diego, Ca. 92101) \\
1991 (L. Santoro, A.G. Toren, T. Hazeltine, Ogden Environmental and Energy Services Co. 510 State Street Suite B Santa Barbara 93101) 1999 (A. Ruby, Far Western, PO Box 413, Davis Ca 95617)
\end{tabular} & Within \\
\hline P-42-001969 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001969
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (Jon McVey Erlandson, Dept. Anth. UCSB) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001979 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001979
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (J. Pjerrou, B. Johnson, P. Lagreze, J. Schmidt, CAS (UCSB)) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001980 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001980 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (J. Pjerrou, B. Johnson, J. Schmidt, P. Lagreze, CAS (UCSB)) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001982 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001982
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (J. Pjerrou, B. Johnson, P. Lagreze, J. Schmidt, CAS (UCSB)) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001986 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001986 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (Pjerrou, Lagreze, Johnson, Schmidt, CAS (UCSB)) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-001987 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001987
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (Pjerrou, Schmidt, Lagreze, CAS (UCSB)) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001988 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001988
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Unknown & 1985 (J. Semenza, B. Glover, CAS (UCSB)) 1992 (L. Santoro, A.G. Toren, T. Hazeltine, Ogden Enviornmental and Energy Services Co., 510 State Street, Suite B, Santa Barbara CA93101) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-001990 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 001990
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (Pjerrou,Lagreze, Schmidt, Ruiz, CAS (UCSB)) 1992 (L. Santoro, A.G. Torren, T. Hazeltine, Ogden Enviornmental and Energy Services Co., 510 State Street, suite B, Santa Barabra, 93101) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-42-002011 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
002011
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1985 (P. de Barros, C.E. Drover, CCP, 10557 Beach Blvd., Stanton, CA 90680) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002028 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002028 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1986 (J. Erlandson, T. Cooley, WESTEC, 3211 5th Ave., San Diego, CA 93102) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002038 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& \text { 002038/H }
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
1985 (Chriss Webb, Center for Archaeological Studies, UCSB) \\
1991 (L. Santoro, A.G. Toren, T. Hazeltine, Ogden \\
Environemental and Energy Services, Co.) \\
2017 (Sarah Nicchitta and Reilly Murphy, Albion \\
Environmental, Inc.)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002046 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002046
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & 1986 (A.York, Dames \&Moore, 820 Fifth Ave., San Diego, CA 92101) & Within \\
\hline P-42-002048 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
002048 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1986 (Glover, Harmon, CAS (UCSB)) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002067 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
002067
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1986 (Knight, Berry, Erlandson, UCSB Anth Dept./ WESTEC Serviced) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002087 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002087
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
1986 (R. Carrico, T. Cooley, S. Briggs, WESTEC Services, Inc. 5510 Morehouse Drive, San Diego, CA 92121) \\
1990 (L. Michals, Dames \& Moore, 175 Cremona Drive, Goleta, CA 93117) \\
1999 (J. Berg, Far Western); 2003 (B. Sheets, M. Imwalle, L. Haslouer, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation, PO Box 388, Santa Barbara, CA 93102) \\
2014 (Eric Nocerino, Applied EarthWorks, Inc.)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002149 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002149
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1987 (Chester King, C. King \& Assoc. PO Box 1324, Topanga, 90290) \\
1992 (L.Santoro. AG Toren, T. Hazeltine, Ogden Environmental and Energy Services Co.)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002191 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
002191
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1988 (Shelly Slekus, Joyce Gerber, Dame and Moore, 175 Cremona Ave, Goleta CA 93117) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002484 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002484
\end{aligned}
\] & Structure , Site & Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
1986 (D. Roy, CAS, Department of Anthropology, UCSB); \\
2002 (B. Hatoff, URS Corporation, 500 12th St., \\
Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94607-4014); \\
2004 (M. Bischoff, Historian II, California State \\
Parks, Central Service Center, 21 Lower Ragsdale \\
Drive, Monterey, CA 93940)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002485 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
002485
\end{gathered}
\] & Structure , Site & Historic & 1985 (M. Imwalle, CAS, Department of Anthropology, UCSB); 1999 (J. Berg, Far Western, PO Box 413, Davis, CA 95617) & Within \\
\hline P-42-002588 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002588
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1991 (Melinda Peak, Robert Gerry, James Oglesby, Peak and Associates) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002604 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
002604
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1990 (L.R. Wilcoxon, J.M. Harmon, Larry R. Wilcoxon Archneological Consultants, 7671 Dartmoor Avenue, Goleta, CA 93117) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002625 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002625
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & 1990 (Lauren Michals, Dames and Moore, 175 Cremona Drive, Goleta, CA 93117) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-42-002633 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
002633 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1982 (Karen Osland) & Within \\
\hline P-42-002644 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002644
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1976 (L. Spanne) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002647 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
002647
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1994 (M. Valentine-Maki, J. Ruiz, Fugro West Inc. 2140 Eastman Ave., Ventura, CA 93003) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002736 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002736
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & 1995 (G. Romani, A.G. Toren, D. Kay, L. Haslouer, ISERA Group, 5370 Hollister Ave. \#5, Santa Barbara, CA. 93111.) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-002753 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 002753
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 1988 (James M. JArmon, L. Wilcoxon Archaeological Consultants, 7671 Dartmoor Avenue, Goleta Ca, 93117) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003387 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003387
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1996 (Rebecca McKim and Douglas Harro, Applied EarthWorks, Inc., 5088 N. Fruit Ave., Suite 101, Fresno, California 93711-6138) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003395 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003395
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1995 (Larry Wilcoxon \& Jose Castillo, Wilcoxon Archaeological Consultants. 6542 Covington Way. Goleta. CA 93117) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003404 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003404
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Protohistoric, Historic & 1996 (Larry Wilcoxon and Ethan Bertrando, Wilcoxon Archaeological Consultants, 6542 Covington Way, Goleta, CA 93117) & Within \\
\hline P-42-003405 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
003405
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1997 (Brian Haley, Cindy Klink, Wilcoxon Archaeological Consultants, 6542 Covington Way, Goleta, CA 93117) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003486 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
003486
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
1997 (Larry Wilcoxon and Brian Haley, Wilcoxon archaeological Consultants, 6542 Covington Way, Goleta, CA 93117) \\
1997 (K. Syda, Far Western Anthropological Research Group. Inc.)
\end{tabular} & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003602 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003602
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., P.O. Box 413, Davis, CA 95617) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003604 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
003604
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1999 (J. Berg, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc ., P.O. Box 413, Davis, CA 95617) & Within \\
\hline P-42-003618 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
003618
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Historic & 1999 (M. Darcangelo (FW), S. Mikesell (JRP), Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., P.O. Box 413, Davis, CA 95617; JRP Historical Consulting Services, 1490 Drew Ave, Suite110, Davis, CA 95616) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003621 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
003621
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Historic & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, S. Mikesell, Far Western) 2002 (S. Baker, D. Shoup, M. Smith, A/HC- 609 Aileen Street Oakland, CA 94609) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003637 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { CA-SBA- } \\
003637
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2001 (Ivan Strudwick, LSA Associates. Inc., I Park Plaza. Suite 500 Irvine. CA 92614-5981) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003639 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003639
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & 2001 (Ivan Strudwick and AI Knight, LSA Assoc., Inc., I Park Plaza, Suite 500 Irvine, CA 92614) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003679 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003679
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2002 (S. Baker, M. Smith, J. Doty, D. Shoup, A/HC609 Aileen Street, Oakland, CA 94609) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003680 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
003680
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 2002 (S. Baker, M. Smith, J. Doty, D. Shoup, A/HC609 Aileen St. Oakland, CA 94609) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-42-003681 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
003681
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2002 (S. Baker. M. Smith. J. Dory, D. Shoup,, A/HG609 Aileen Street Oakland. CA 94609) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-003727 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003727 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2003 (Bob Sheets, Leeann Haslouer, Mike Imwalle, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-003751 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
003751
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2005 (Herb Dallas, Natalie Brodie, State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Southern Service Center) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-003812 & CA-SBA003812H & Site & Historic & 2006 (Thor Conway, Heritage Discoveries Inc.) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-003991 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 003991
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2009 (K. Osland, A. Munns, Applied Earthworks) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-004005 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 004005
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2009 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-004088 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 004088 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2016 (John M. Foster, Greenwood and Associates) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-004110 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
004110
\end{gathered}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 2015 (None given, Applied EarthWorks, Inc.) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-004120 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 004120 \mathrm{H} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Structure & Historic & 2015 (Josh Smallwood, Applied EarthWorks) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-004121 & N/A & Structure & Historic & 2015 (Josh Smallwood, Applied EarthWorks) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-004122 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 004122 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & (Eric Nocerino, Applied Earthworks) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-004123 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-SBA- } \\
& 004123 / \mathrm{H}
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric, Historic & 2015 & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038083 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1989 (P. Hines, B. Rivers, T. Wheeler, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Cultural Heritage Section) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038291 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038292 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038293 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038294 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038295 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038296 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038297 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038298 & N/A & Other & Historic & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038299 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038300 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038301 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1991 (A.G. Toren, ERCE) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-42-038352 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric, Historic & 1986 (A. Hobbs, UCSB) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038353 & N/A & Other & Historic & 1986 (D. Roy, UCSB)
1999 (J. Berg, Far Western) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038419 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1988 (S. Sirkus, Dames \& Moore) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038422 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1988 (S. Sirkus, E. Ruiz, Dames \& Moore) & Within \\
\hline P-42-038423 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1988 (S. Sirkus, E. Ruiz, Dames \& Moore) & Within \\
\hline P-42-038458 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1990 (L. Michals, Dames \& Moore) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038459 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1990 (J. Gerber, Dames \& Moore) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038476 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1994 (M. Valentine-Maki, J. Ruiz, Fugro West Inc.) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038555 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1994 (T. Fulton, L. Eaglefeather, INFOTEC Research, Inc.) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038581 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1984 (C. Cagle, K. Laustsen, ACT, Inc.) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038662 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, Far Western Anthropological Research Group) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-038668 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, Far Western Anthropological Research Group) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-038872 & N/A & Other & Historic & 2014 & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-040477 & N/A & Other & Historic & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-040478 & N/A & Other & Historic & & Within \\
\hline P-42-040499 & N/A & Other & Historic & & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-040656 & N/A & Other & Historic & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-040657 & N/A & Other & Historic & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-040659 & N/A & Other & Historic & & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-040682 & N/A & Other & Historic & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outside (Within } \\
& 500 \text { feet) } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline P-42-040683 & N/A & Other & Historic & & Within \\
\hline P-42-040718 & N/A & Structure & Historic & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, S. Mikesell, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-040719 & N/A & Structure & Historic & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, S. Mikesell, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.) & Within \\
\hline P-42-040720 & N/A & Structure & Historic & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.) & \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Outside (Within } \\
500 \text { feet) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline P-42-040721 & N/A & Structure & Historic & 1999 (L. Leach-Palm, S. Mikesell, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.) & Outside (Within
500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-040731 & N/A & District & Historic & 1999 (a. Ruby, M. Darcangelo, S. Mikesell, Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.) & Within \\
\hline P-42-040750 & N/A & Site & Historic & 2002 (S. Baker, M. Smith, J. Doty, D. Shoup) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & Age & Recorded by & Distance from Project Area \\
\hline P-42-041120 & N/A & Building & Historic & 1988 (Jason Marmor, Archaeologist) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041121 & N/A & Building & Historic & 1988 (Jason Marmor, Los Padres National Forest) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041122 & N/A & Building & Historic & 1988 (Jason Marmor, Los Padres National Forest) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041123 & N/A & Building & Historic & 1988 (Jason Marmor, Los Padres National Forest) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041133 & N/A & District & Historic & 2015 (Josh Smallwood, Applied EarthWorks) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041134 & N/A & Element of district & Historic & 2015 (Josh Smallwood, Applied EarthWorks) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041135 & N/A & Element of district & Historic & 2015 (Josh Smallwood, Applied EarthWorks) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041136 & N/A & Element of district & Historic & 2015 (Josh Smallwood, Applied EarthWorks) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041138 & N/A & Element of district & Historic & 2015 (Josh Smallwood, Applied EarthWorks) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-42-041205 & N/A & Structure & Historic & 2018 (Carole Denardo, Provenience Group, Inc.) & Within \\
\hline P-15-000186 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-KER- } \\
& 000186
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1950 (M.L.) & Within \\
\hline P-15-003853 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-KER- } \\
& 003853 \mathrm{H} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & 1993 (Scott Baxter, Greg Clift, Cultural Resource Facility, CSUB) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-15-003854 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-KER- } \\
& 003854 \mathrm{H}
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Historic & 1993 (Scott Baxter, Greg Clift, Cultural Resource Facility, CSUB) & Within \\
\hline P-15-003855 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-KER- } \\
& \text { 003855H }
\end{aligned}
\] & Building, Structure , Site & Historic & 1993 (Patrice Jeppson, CRF CSUB) & Within \\
\hline P-15-003856 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CA-KER- } \\
& 003856 \mathrm{H}
\end{aligned}
\] & Building, Structure Site & Historic & 1993 (Patrice Jeppson, CRF CSUB) & Within \\
\hline P-15-004024 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-KER- } \\
& \text { 004023H }
\end{aligned}
\] & Structure & Historic & 1994 (David J. Scott, Bruce Steidl, Woodward-Clyde Consultants) 1999 (Scott M. Hudlow, Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates); 2009 (Steven J. Melvin, Rebecca Flores, JRP Historical Consulting); 2009 (K. Larsen, N. Sims, A. Stevenson, Pacific Legacy, Inc.); 2010 (M. Armstrong, D. Curtis, Pacific Legacy, Inc.); 2011 (M. Armstrong, Applied Earthworks, Inc.); 2012 (Shannon Loftus, ACE Environmental, LLC.); 2013 (A. Bell, C. Rambo, ASM Affiliates, Inc.); 2015 (ASM Affiliates, Inc.); 2019 (Unknown, Padre Associates, Inc.) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-15-006045 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { CA-KER- } \\
& 005052
\end{aligned}
\] & Site & Prehistoric & 1997 (Christine Chamberlin, Mandy Marine, California State University, Fresno, Laboratory of Anthropology) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-15-006046 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1997 (Christine Chamberlin, Mandy Marine, California State University, Fresno, Laboratory of Anthropology) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline P-15-006047 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1997 (Christine Chamberlin, Mandy Marine, California State University, Fresno, Laboratory of Anthropology) & Outside (Within 500 feet) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cultural Resources within 500 Feet of the Trucking Routes
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|l|l|}
\hline Primary No. & Trinomial & Type & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Age } & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Recorded by } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Distance from \\
Project Area
\end{tabular} \\
\hline P-15-006048 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & \begin{tabular}{l}
1997 (Christine Chamberlin, Mandy Marine, \\
California State University, Fresno, Laboratory of \\
Anthropology)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Outside (Within \\
500 feet)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline P-15-006674 & N/A & Other & Prehistoric & 1984 (J. McManus, M. Rondeau, Caltrans) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Outside (Within \\
500 feet)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline P-15-008490 & N/A & Building & Historic & 1989 (Unknown) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Outside (Within \\
500 feet)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline P-15-011692 & N/A & Site & Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
2005 (Catherine Lewis Pruett, Dorothy Fleagle, \\
Three Girls and a Shovel); 2016 (C. Letter, V. \\
Kirstine, Padre Associates)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Outside (Within \\
500 feet)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline P-15-011693 & N/A & Site & Historic & \begin{tabular}{l}
2005 (Catherine Lewis Pruett, Dorothy Fleagle, \\
Three Girls and a Shovel); 2016 (C. Letter, V. \\
Kirstine, Padre Associates)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Outside (Within \\
500 feet)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline P-15-017370 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
CA-KER- \\
009531H
\end{tabular} & Site & Historic & 2013 (Colin Rambo, ASM Affiliates, Inc.) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Outside (Within \\
500 feet)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline P-15-019171 & \begin{tabular}{l} 
CA-KER- \\
\(010450 H ~\)
\end{tabular} & Site & Historic & 2016 (Rachael Letter, Padre Associates) & Within \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```


[^0]:    ** Non-collision related releases account for an additional $20 \%$ of the total number of collision events.

[^1]:    ** Truck Mitigated Incident Rate includes incidents due to truck collisions and non-collision containment failures. Mitigation measures have been applied to both collision and non-collision incident rates as described in Section 6.4
    *** The risk of a small release associated with the unladen return trip has been included with the laden trip incident rate as described in Section 3.8.

