March 7, 2016

Bob Alvarado  
Chair, California Transportation Commission  
1120 N Street, MS – 52  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Utah Coal Bill – SB 246 and Oakland Army Base Redevelopment Project

Dear Mr. Alvarado:

I am writing regarding a proposed bill in Utah, SB 246, which would invest $53 million in Utah taxpayer's money to contribute to the coal-export terminal in Oakland which is being funded by California tax payers thru a California Transportation Commission (CTC) grant. The Utah bill was introduced last week, about ten days before the end of Utah’s legislative session. There has been environmental and public health opposition to the bill, and I have notified the author of the bill about my concerns.

I ask that the California Transportation Commission consider postponing additional disbursements of the grant money given to the City of Oakland via Proposition 1B. Before the City of Oakland continues to receive Proposition 1B funds, I would recommend that we analyze whether funding infrastructure for a coal export facility violates the intent or Proposition 1B. California cannot continue to finance a project that would harm the air quality, health and safety of West Oakland residents.

When I met with Chairwoman Dunn in January, I informed her that I was exploring legislation and I have introduced four bills to restrict exports of pollution-inducing fuel.

Two of my bills specifically relate to the proposed terminal in Oakland. The other two add additional restrictions on the transportation of coal through California. Below is a brief summary of the bills:

- **SB 1277**: Declares that the transportation of coal through West Oakland would present a clear danger to the health and safety of Oakland residents as well as the workers that would handle the coal. This bill also prohibits the shipment of coal through an Oakland facility that has been paid, in part for, with state funds.
• **SB 1278:** Requires an environmental impact review from any public agency that has authority to approve any portion of a project relating to the shipment of coal through Oakland.

• **SB 1279:** Prohibits the use of public funds to build or operate any port that exports coal from California. The provisions apply to any port located near disadvantaged communities.

• **SB 1280:** Requires port facilities that ship bulk commodities and receive state funds to prohibit coal shipments or fully mitigate the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the combustion of the coal.

These four bills would better regulate coal shipments and put California on a path to better control fossil fuels.

Frankly, it’s not acceptable to have the City of Oakland fund a private developer to build a large new facility to export coal to countries in Asia that already suffer from air pollution to the point of creating civic unrest. We have to consider the broader impacts of what we do; exporting Utah coal through California would undermine the many forward-looking climate change and environmental policies adopted by our state.

Please consider halting the remainder of Proposition 1B funds received by the City of Oakland while this problem is reviewed. I fully support an Oakland bulk terminal export facility if coal and fossil fuels are specifically prohibited, and coal is what the Utah state legislature is considering as it makes this controversial loan to the City of Oakland.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

Respectfully,

LONI HANCOCK
Senator, 9th District