

# wrong plant, wrong place.

**NO Asphalt Plant at Haystack Landing**  
**VISIT: [www.SaveShollenberger.com](http://www.SaveShollenberger.com)**

By way of their website, press releases and various advertisements, the Dutra Group has made a variety of claims about their proposed asphalt plant at Haystack Landing. They state these opinions as if they were fact. Following is some clarity on these issues.

## HEALTH HAZARDS

**1. Claim:** Asphalt is not a toxic environmental hazard.

*"Asphalt processing and asphalt roofing manufacturing facilities are major sources of hazardous air pollutants such as formaldehyde, hexane, phenol, polycyclic organic matter, and toluene. Exposure to these air toxics may cause cancer, central nervous system problems, liver damage, respiratory problems and skin irritation."*

~ Environmental Protection Agency

(<http://www.epa.gov/EPA-AIR/2001/November/Day-21/a28192.htm>)

~~~~~

**2. Claim:** The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) concluded the plant poses no 'significant' health risk.

*"The threshold for diesel emission impacts is calculated with a 'level of significance' of one (1.0). This project reaches a level of .97. This impact is calculated from property line to property line...because this project is located adjacent to one of the largest diesel particulate generators - Highway 101 - and other businesses, this project, in a cumulative analysis, would have a significant air quality impact."*

~ Pamela Torliatt,

Chairperson - Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and  
Mayor of the city of Petaluma

## DUTRA'S HISTORY

**3. Claim:** Dutra has operated their facilities in compliance with local agency and BAAQMD permit requirements and that they are a good neighbor to residential, commercial and other industrial users. **Really?**

*“It is important to consider the difficulties that Marin County, the US Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration have had in obtain Dutra’s compliance with permits and reclamation plans. In recent years the Dutra Group has been the subject of a Grand Jury Investigation, litigation resulting in over \$700 thousand in fines, and numerous unresolved complaints.”*

~ Steve Birdlebough,  
Chair – Sierra Club, Sonoma Group Executive Committee

~~~~~

**4. Claim:** Dutra is simply relocating an existing plant they have operated in Petaluma the last three years.

*“...according to the BAAQMD records, Dutra’s asphalt operation has not operated since Nov. 1, 2007.”*

~ Pamela Torliatt,  
Chairperson - Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and  
Mayor of the city of Petaluma

~~~~~

## RIVER NAVIGATION

**5. Claim:** Dutra’s moored barge and tug will not pose a navigation safety hazard in the Petaluma River.

*“Hazards to navigation exist with the positioning of Dutra’s moored barge and tug at the river frontage to their project, as presented in the application. Without changing the position and location of Dutra’s mooring by tucking the barge and tug into the bank, collisions and sideswipes will occur on this turn of the river with other barges and large traffic on the river.”*

~ All seven members of the Petaluma City Council

## LAND USE

**6. Claim:** Haystack Landing, The proposed site located next to Shollenberger Park, is an **industrial** site.

*“The proposed project will require a Sonoma County General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation on the primary portion of the project site from Limited Commercial to Limited Industrial; a Specific Plan Amendment (Petaluma Dairy Belt Plan) to change the land use designation from Limited Commercial to Limited Industrial; and a Zone Change from LC.”*

*~ Dutra Environmental Impact Report  
(Vol. 1, 2 Summary Pg. 1)*

~~~~~

## ROAD TRAFFIC

**7. Claim:** “Trucks will not travel on city streets. Trucks entering or leaving the plant will use Highway 101 and the freeway off-ramp portion of Petaluma Boulevard South.” **That is if they can safely get up to the appropriate speed...**

*“The proposed acceleration lane would extend 560 feet north from the project driveway and would terminate just north of the northbound on-ramps. When fully loaded, such larger capacity vehicles would have a substantially higher weight-to-power ratio. Given this parameter, the appropriate acceleration distance would be 800 feet. The NCHRP report acknowledges that this parameter may lead to excessive acceleration distances, but given that the weight-to-power ratio of a fully loaded 23-ton capacity truck may exceed 200 pounds-to-horsepower, it is evident that 560 feet is potentially inadequate.”*

*~ Dutra Environmental Impact Report  
(Vol. 1, V.J. Transportation/Traffic Pg. 30)*

**8. Claim:** This plant would “reduce truck traffic on highway 101” Not so fast...

*“The project would add trips to congested segments of southbound Highway 101 during the AM peak hour, which is a potentially significant impact. The project could potentially add traffic to northbound Highway 101 during the PM peak hour where traffic has been observed to break down which is also a potentially significant impact. The project would add traffic to the congested southbound ramps during the AM peak hour where operation would be LOS F without project traffic. This is a potentially significant impact. Overall the project has a significant impact on highway operations.”*

*~ Dutra Environmental Impact Report  
(Vol. 1, V.J. Transportation/Traffic Pg. 28)*

~~~~~

**9. Claim:** “The barging operations to the Dutra plant will reduce traffic and GHG emissions by removing over 80 trucks per day” “barge access on the Petaluma River is among the primary advantages of this site, and will reduce noise, traffic and emissions compared to other sites.” **Cart ahead of the horse?**

*“Without SMART approval, neither the conveyor nor the rail crossing would be permissible. This would prevent the use of barges to import aggregate material, requiring that the resources instead be brought in by truck. Although the SMART Board has met with the project applicant, the final approval has not been obtained. Because the project sponsor does not yet have the entitlements necessary to service the site with material imported by barge, impacts would be significant.”*

*~ Dutra Environmental Impact Report  
(Vol. 1, V.J. Transportation/Traffic Pg. 42)*

~~~~~

## **VISUAL BLIGHT**

**10. Claim:** This plant would “enhance aesthetics.” **An asphalt plant with 70’ silos enhancing aesthetics?**

*“As previously mentioned, the entire area surrounding the project site west of Highway 101 is designated with a Scenic Resource zoning overlay. Application of the Visual Assessment Guidelines indicates that development of the project site would result in visual dominance of the area, which in combination with the high sensitivity assessment, would result in a significant impact to visual resources.”*

*~ Dutra Environmental Impact Report  
(Vol. 1, V.A. Aesthetics pg. 25)*

**11. Claim:** Normal operating hours will be Monday through Friday from 7am to 5pm, and the plant will only operate 24/7 when “required to do so by Caltrans, County or municipal projects” yet **their own website states:**

*“Over 80% of the aggregate and asphalt that leaves the Dutra Materials plant will be used for publicly funded road and infrastructure projects either for the County of Sonoma, the City of Petaluma, Caltrans or other government agencies.”*

~~~~~

## **WILDLIFE DEGRADATION**

**12. Claim:** The Egret and Heron nesting sites at Haystack Landing were studied in the EIR and will not be driven out.

*“...these sites may be subsequently abandoned in response to \*changes\* in the frequency or intensity of human activity. Therefore...noise, artificial lights, conveyer activity...are likely to increase the risk of abandonment.”*

~ John P. Kelly PhD

Director, Conservation and Habitat Protection - Audubon Canyon Ranch

*“Noise is also a big concern because of a nesting rookery on the northwest corner of the project, It’s been a productive colony and we’re concerned about the impact of a noisy asphalt factory very close by,”*

~ Bob Dyer – Senior Docent / Petaluma Wetlands Alliance  
Press Democrat Article 2/21/08

~~~~~

**13. Claim:** Noise from the asphalt plant will not impact surrounding wildlife.

*“I was informed about some changes contemplated in the County General Plan, initiated by the Dutra Group, that could have a negative impact (noise disturbance) on the endangered California Clapper Rail in the upper Petaluma River tidal wetlands. Please consider potential noise impacts to the breeding success of this critically endangered species prior to amending noise restrictions currently in place. The linear marshlands along the Petaluma River upstream from Ellis Creek to the Petaluma Marina also support the state-threatened California Black Rail. This species could also be negatively impacted by increased noise pollution and industrial activity at this location.”*

~ Jules Evens, Principal  
Avocet Research Associates

## JOB

**14. Claim:** This plant would support 1,000 living wage construction jobs of local construction companies.

*“...it would employ only ten individuals”. “the project would not result in long-term employment growth in the area.”*

~ Dutra Environmental Impact Report  
(Vol. 1, V.I. General Impact Pg. 1)

~~~~~

**15. Claim:** We need a new asphalt plant in southern Sonoma County.

*“There are three existing asphalt plants in Sonoma and Marin counties...based on these plant locations, it appears the region’s needs would still be met for asphalt production and recycling without the proposed project”*

~ Dutra Environmental Impact Report  
(Vol. 1, V.I. General Impact Pg. 2)

