

Chevron's refinery project* –conditions to fight for

Community First!

We can change Chevron's project¹ to build more clean energy jobs in our communities.

Chevron's EIR says its project could increase greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions more than every other GHG-cutting measure in Richmond could reduce them. As proposed now, only about 1% of the work to offset this emission increase would be done locally.

But the project could still be operating and emitting GHGs in 2035 or 2050, and we can do much more, right here, locally, to achieve our GHG-reduction targets for 2035–2050. At a minimum, the City of Richmond should require Chevron to:

Implement all achievable measures to mitigate potential GHG impacts of the project locally, including community-based measures to achieve GHG targets for 2035–2050.

Support a community-controlled, community-governed Clean Energy Jobs Program in Richmond, North Richmond, and San Pablo that implements all feasible energy conservation, energy efficiency, car alternatives (e.g., bikes), public transit, distributed solar, energy storage, and electric vehicle infrastructure and rebates.

Cleanup First!

We can change Chevron's project to support clean air and community health.

The way it is now, the Air District has reported some toxic and smog-forming emissions from Chevron's refinery that exceed the existing emissions limits in Chevron's permit. The EIR says the project could further increase those emissions, and, according to the EIR, at least some of those emissions are not even being monitored reliably.

But the EIR also says Chevron can take steps to prevent the emission increases and comply with its existing emission limits. And the U.S. EPA has shown how to improve the emissions monitoring that the EIR has questioned. At a minimum, the City should require that, before implementing any change in Chevron's current oil feedstock quality or quantity, Chevron must demonstrate that:

Its refinery's toxic and smog-forming emissions² do not increase or exceed any existing permit limit, as measured on a source-by-source and pollutant-by-pollutant basis using the best available monitoring technology.³

It has caused its air permit to include an emission limit measured as FCC fresh feed throughput, subject to citizen enforcement, and set not greater than the baseline FCC throughput stated in the EIR as an average in any consecutive 12-month period.

¹ *For a summary of the project see "Chevron's Proposed Project" on the other side of this flyer.

² These include but are not limited to fluid catalytic cracker (FCC) emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

³ PM₁₀ limits must be met as PM₁₀ is defined (particulate matter 10 microns in diameter and smaller) based on monitoring that includes PM_{2.5}, even if the permit must be revised to require this monitoring.

Communities for a Better Environment (CBE)

Get Involved: Call Andrés Soto at CBE (510) 282-5363 www.cbecal.org June 2014

Chevron's refinery project* –conditions to fight for

Safety First!

We can change Chevron's project to prevent more refinery spills, fires and explosions.

The EIR says that, by allowing Chevron to process more corrosive grades of oil, the project could increase the same hazard that led to its catastrophic pipe failure and fire that sent 15,000 of us to the hospital in August 2012. In many parts of the refinery, Chevron proposes to wait to replace old equipment that is vulnerable to this hazard, even though the project would increase this hazard and the corrosion is not always caught in time by monitoring it alone. This proposal would repeat the mistakes that led to its 2012 fire.

But the EIR also shows that Chevron can replace its old and unsafe equipment now. In its crude unit, Chevron proposes to replace old equipment that is vulnerable to corrosion as part of the project. Chevron should do that in all parts of its refinery where the project increases this hazard. In fact, it's more effective and cheaper to install inherently safer technology as part of the project, rather than after it is already built and operating.

At a minimum, the City of Richmond should require that, before implementing any change in its current oil feedstock quality or quantity, Chevron must demonstrate:

Carbon steel components that process oil hotter than 450 °F and are more than 25 years old have been replaced with inherently safer technology that is maximally resistant to corrosion by sulfur and other hazards identified for each component.

Chevron no longer relies on temporary leak-failure repairs ("clamps"). Instead, causal investigation is conducted and inherently safer technology is implemented as soon as safely possible after discovery of any such loss-of-containment failures ("leaks").

Verification and Accountability

The City should require that, before implementing any change in Chevron's current oil feedstock quality or quantity, there is publicly-verified data and documentation that demonstrates compliance with these project conditions, and a right to enforcement and recourse if the conditions are violated.

*Chevron's Proposed Project

What is Chevron's Richmond Refinery 'Modernization' Project? Briefly, please!

Chevron's proposed project would greatly expand its capacity to process high-sulfur gas oil, to make the hydrogen for that processing, and to recover sulfur from that processing. This would enable the refinery to process both crude with substantially greater sulfur content *and* a substantially greater volume of separately purchased high-sulfur gas oil. High-sulfur gas oil carries other contaminants and can be as dense as 'heavy' crude oil. The refinery's oil feedstock could thus grow in volume and become denser and more contaminated, increasing corrosion of processing equipment in high temperature service and pollutant releases to the environment. Total fossil fuel use, including hydrogen feeds and combustion of petroleum 'catalyst' coke, natural gas and other fuels, would increase.

Communities for a Better Environment (CBE)

Get Involved: Call Andrés Soto at CBE (510) 282-5363 www.cbecal.org June 2014